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Foreword

The increasing flow of people, goods, and technology across national boundaries has opened new economic opportunities and potential. Globalization has also raised new security threats, economic challenges, and cultural concerns about what defines a nation. Migration is a critical component of globalization, and although it is not a new phenomenon, the increasing flow of global migrants in recent decades is. Like many other countries across the globe, the United States has yet to fully align its immigration policy to new global realities.

Only a few years back, America’s broken immigration policy was seen as a challenge that could be resolved. Some of our best scholars, policy practitioners, and advocates devoted countless hours to reaching policy consensus. Although they got close a few times, their efforts to bring about actual national policy change did not succeed. Immigration policy has become a polarizing and controversial issue, and one that unfortunately alienates many sensible and concerned citizens.

This is not the case for The Chicago Council’s Emerging Leaders Class of 2009. In an effort to better understand the importance of immigration to our nation and to move forward in charting a new path for our local and national leaders, The Chicago Council’s Emerging Leaders chose to focus on immigration policy for their second-year project. Of all the issues confronting our nation and city, immigration policy emerged as their choice of one of the most pressing issues needing urgent attention.

The lack of progress on immigration policy reform is deeply frustrating to all levels of society. Business leaders are hampered by their inability to match their needs with the local workforce—at both the high- and low-skilled levels. Security experts continue to raise concerns about the nation’s ability to track those entering the country and those who overstay their welcome. There are too many stories of families being ripped apart, despite their efforts to do the right thing. And although small towns, especially in the Midwest, are reversing population loss and economic decline through immigration, middle-class American workers are seeing their jobs and wages disappear and often connect it to competition from immigrant workers willing to do more for less.

Chicago has long been a destination for immigrants from all origins, and its leaders have looked for innovative ways to integrate immigrants into the economic vitality of the city. Just this past July, in
a political climate increasingly hostile toward immigrants, Chicago's mayor Rahm Emanuel launched the Office of New Americans to expand opportunities for immigrants, improve access to city services, and "make Chicago the most immigrant-friendly city in the world."

I am delighted that The Chicago Council's Emerging Leaders Class of 2009 chose to explore this topic. This report joins a growing list of studies and reports undertaken by the Council to help move forward our national debate. In 2004 the Council released the bipartisan task force report Keeping the Promise: Immigration Proposals from the Heartland. In 2006 the Council focused on Chicago's largest immigrant population with its task force report A Shared Future: The Economic Engagement of Chicago's Mexican Community. In 2007 the Council published Strengthening America: The Civic and Political Integration of Muslim Americans. In another 2007 study group report, The Global Edge: An Agenda for Chicago's Future, immigration was raised as a critical factor for our city's economic competitiveness. And in 2009 the Council released Mexican Immigration in the Midwest: Meanings and Implications. Few issues have so occupied The Chicago Council's research agenda, and I am pleased to add this Emerging Leaders report to our efforts.

The Emerging Leaders Program

The Chicago Council launched the Emerging Leaders Program in 2008 to help equip Chicago's next generation with the tools and skills they will need to allow Chicago to compete and thrive in a global era. They have been identified by their mentors and vetted by an independent selection committee as leaders in their respective fields from whom even greater leadership is expected in the years to come. Over the course of our two-year program they examined a variety of issues of global importance and local relevance and then chose one issue to define and develop for their second-year study project.

Although some of the Emerging Leaders work on and around topics of immigration policy in their own professional lives, as a group they are not experts on the topic, but concerned citizens who feel strongly that this topic needs urgent attention. Through their year-long endeavor, they debated, questioned, disagreed, and came to understand the incredible complexity of these issues. Although each and every member of the group may not agree with all the conclusions and recommendations made in the report, they did agree that these issues are pressing and deserve closer examination. Capturing the diversity of their views, opinions, and perspectives, which are reflective of our society today—and capturing it in one document—was no easy task.

This publication is not to be read as an expert document on immigration, but rather as an informative and well-grounded set of essays from concerned citizens. It is their hope, and The Chicago Council's, that this report can prove helpful to policymakers forced to make tough decisions on immigration legislation as well as to all citizens who want to read beyond the headlines.
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Introduction

When Arizona’s state legislature passed a stringent immigration law
targeting unauthorized immigrants (SB1070) in April 2010, citizens
across the United States took notice. The law, which requires immi-
grants to carry their papers with them at all times, is considered one
of the toughest in the nation. The law is also a part of a growing trend
across the United States in which local governments are legislating
immigration policy instead of leaving it to the federal government.
For some, like Illinois Governor Pat Quinn, who pulled Illinois out
of the federal government’s Secure Communities program—a pro-
gram begun in 2008 designed to identify and remove unauthorized
immigrants who are “the most serious criminal offenders” from the
United States but which has been criticized for going beyond its
original goals and becoming a more general deportation tool—the
motivation for local action is a disagreement about the direction
of federal policy. For others, particularly those focused on enforce-
ment, a turn to state action is due to the belief that the federal gov-
ernment is not making good on existing commitments. In 2005 three
hundred immigration-related bills were introduced at the state level.
By 2007 more than 1,500 immigration bills were introduced at the
state level. Another 1,305 were introduced in 2008, and about 1,500
were considered in 2009.1 Immigration has become a local political
issue, and it is roiling American communities.

Immigration policy by its very nature is contentious because it
taps into the core of what it means to be a citizen, who gets to be a
citizen, and what responsibilities go along with citizenship. But the
debate around U.S. immigration policy has grown increasingly dis-
cordant over the last few years for a number of reasons.2

First, the country’s economic malaise has weakened the coal-
tion advocating on behalf of immigrants. In 2006 when the economy
was roaring, business leaders and others were clamoring for labor
policies that would attract foreigners to fill the jobs left vacant by less
than 5 percent unemployment. Today, in an economy of more than
9 percent unemployment, fewer employers need (and thus advocate
for) foreign labor. Immigrants are more often eyed suspiciously as
competitors for scarce jobs rather than contributors to a growing
economy. According to a 2010 public opinion study conducted by

2. The Chicago Council on Global Affairs, Global Views 2010–Constrained
The Chicago Council on Global Affairs, most Americans view immigration as having a negative impact on many aspects of U.S. life, particularly jobs. Figure 1 shows that 74 percent say immigration at current levels is bad for the job security for American workers, 71 percent say it is bad for creating jobs in the United States, 63 percent say it is bad for the U.S. economy, and 58 percent say it is bad for their own standard of living.

Second, immigration now affects almost every state in the nation, and often those least equipped to deal with it. Traditionally, when immigrants came to the United States, they headed to one of six states—California, Florida, Illinois, New Jersey, New York, or Texas. Major cities like Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York City developed support structures to help integrate newcomers and in return have reaped the benefits of their productivity. Now, the jobs available to immigrants, particularly low-skilled workers, take newcomers to meat-packing, construction, and agricultural jobs across the country, and often to small towns with declining populations. Immigrants also find work in hotels or in other service sector jobs. The result is that immigrants and their families have become dispersed broadly across fifty states. Today immigrants are heavily represented in small towns and communities, often those with the fewest resources and the least experience to support successful integration.

Third, the presence of large numbers of unauthorized immigrants is deeply problematic, and there are few agreed upon policy recommendations for how to address the challenge. Not knowing who is in the country is not only an economic and security liability, but it is bad for democracy. Longtime journalist and founder of the Pew Hispanic Center Robert Suro states it succinctly when he says: “It is wrong for a society to allow part of its population to live cut off from some of the essential rights and obligations that define it as a liberal democracy.”

Most experts can agree that the presence of so many unauthorized people is far from ideal. Few can agree, however, on what to do about it. The White House stated in an August 2011 blog post that there are more than ten million unauthorized immigrants in the United States, and “it’s clear that we can’t deport such a large number.” The uncertainty and disagreement about how to move forward on this issue have seeped into the public psyche in ways that are pernicious to the broader immigration debate.

Fourth, uncertainty around immigration policy is causing real human suffering. Families are being torn apart, often because of an unnecessarily slow application process riddled with obstacles and barriers as well as the record increase in deportations of unauthorized immigrants. Good people who think they are following the rules are too often finding themselves in Orwellian situations they had worked hard to avoid. Religious leaders, many of whom have sacred scriptures that place a high premium on hospitality to the stranger and commitment to human rights, are joining the conversation, as are others who believe that some of the harshest tactics being designed to limit immigration are not the image America should be presenting to its immigrant population, or the world.

The good news is that there is a general consensus that U.S. immigration policy is broken, either because it is badly conceived or not being properly enforced. The bad news is that there appears to be no clear path for fixing it. Repeated efforts by both Republicans and Democrats to better secure the borders, pass legislation, create sensible paths to entry for low- and high-skilled workers, and develop solutions for reducing the size of the unauthorized immigrant populations have repeatedly come up short. The lack of good

---

public policy is polarizing communities, and in many places, pitting neighbor against neighbor.

**Chicago’s History Is Shaped by Immigrants**

In light of the growing divisiveness of national immigration policy, we, the members of the Emerging Leaders Class of 2009, sponsored by The Chicago Council on Global Affairs, decided to devote our second-year project to immigration policy. Chicago and Illinois have long been leaders in the area of immigrant integration. With the third largest population of urban Mexicans outside of Mexico City and Los Angeles, the largest populations of Poles outside of Warsaw, the largest populations of Greeks and Serbs outside of Greece and Serbia, and growing populations of South Asians and Africans, Chicago, and by extension Illinois, has shown considerable leadership on the immigration issue over the decades.

History has shaped this development. Chicago is a city formed—indeed, built—by immigrants. From the city’s incorporation in 1837 through the decades that followed, immigrant labor helped construct the Illinois and Michigan Canal, which, upon its opening in 1848, tied the Great Lakes to the Mississippi River. Immigrant labor also helped build the railroads. The Midwest’s evolving transportation infrastructure not only helped Chicago become a U.S. commercial center, but positioned Chicago to receive an influx of immigrants. In the 1850s, when the “Know Nothing” movement advocated an end to immigration, the Chicago Tribune reminded its readers that immigrants provided the muscle to build the new city. By 1890, 79 percent of Chicagoans were born abroad or were children of immigrants.

More than a quarter century ago, Chicago joined other cities like Los Angeles and New York as a “sanctuary city,” a city where an immigrant’s status is significantly protected. The sanctuary city law, signed in 1985 as Executive Order 85-1 by then-mayor Harold Washington, aimed “to encourage equal access by persons residing in the City of Chicago, regardless of nationality or citizenship, to the full benefits, opportunities, and services, including employment and the issuance of licenses, which are provided or administered by the City of Chicago.”

Even though some communities in Illinois such as Carpentersville and Waukegan have witnessed political tensions around immigration policies, many state and city leaders have taken a leadership role on immigrant integration issues. For most of his more than twenty years as mayor of Chicago, Richard M. Daley was a forceful advocate for progressive immigration laws. Senator Richard Durbin of Illinois has made immigration and passing the DREAM Act—a conditional path to citizenship for qualifying, unauthorized immigrant youth—a priority issue for his legislative agenda, and Governor Pat Quinn recently passed a state version of the DREAM Act with bipartisan support. Chicago’s business leadership has been front and center on this issue. Boeing’s CEO James McNerney, for example, is a prominent partner in New York’s Mayor Bloomberg’s “Partnership for a New American Economy” campaign, a national effort that supports immigration reform. Illinois is also at the forefront of experimenting with ways to offer bilingual education to preschoolers whose primary language is not English.

Immigration is a topic that Chicagoans live with—and benefit from—on a daily basis. Today, the Chicago metropolitan area is home to over 1.6 million immigrants, or 17 percent of the area’s population. Nearly one of every seven Illinois residents is an immigrant, and half of all immigrants in Illinois and metropolitan Chicago are from Latin America, with Asians accounting for almost a quarter of the foreign-born population. Poles make up nearly 10 percent of all immigrants in Illinois, ranking behind only Mexico as a leading country of origin. Overall, the number of immigrants in Illinois doubled from 1990 to 2006. And, the 2009 American Community Survey from the U.S. Census Bureau revealed that of the 1,645,920
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In the Chicago metropolitan area, just over one-third of them (588,480) live in Chicago (20.6 percent of the city’s population). In other words, immigration reaches far beyond the city limits, with suburban immigrant populations outnumbering those in Chicago.

Our Emerging Leaders group took on the topic of immigration not just because of its importance to the Chicago area, but because of the urgency with which it must be considered in light of the today’s economic environment. The state’s financial crisis means that tough public policy choices will need to be made, ones that will impact all current and future citizens. Without thoughtful leadership, the city and state could stumble into creating a more polarized environment of the kind emerging in many other areas of the country. Legacy or no legacy, maintaining a welcoming environment for immigrants and benefiting from their contributions is far from assured.

The recent movement of the debate from the federal to the state and local levels also caught our attention. Increasingly, local legislation means that we, through and with our local leaders, will become part of the immigration debate, whether we are intellectually prepared or not.

Navigating the Immigration Debate

Against this backdrop, our twenty-member group focused on preparing a document that would help city leaders and other policymakers navigate the tricky shoals of the immigration debate. We almost immediately ran into problems. We found that basic facts were hard to come by, benchmarks didn’t seem to exist, and simple definitions were proving elusive. Immigration issues penetrate almost every aspect of local policy—education policy, welfare policies, and law enforcement as well as the image that the city presents to its neighbors and the world.

But perhaps our greatest discovery has been how multifaceted and polarized the public discourse is. In an effort to better understand immigration issues at both the local and national levels, we called on experts, advocates, and local practitioners from all sides of the debate. What we found was that economic discussions led into security conversations, then slipped easily into cultural questions, and then into public policy arguments. It was exceedingly hard to have an effective debate on any one part of the issue.

In an effort to bring coherence and clarity to this controversial policy issue, we chose to devote our efforts to separating the immigration debate into its many dimensions. The goal is to provide a road map for those entering the discussion and a framework for developing recommendations. The report begins by tackling the three main pillars of the current immigration debate: economics, national security, and culture. Chapter I takes head-on the debate about whether immigrants are a net cost or benefit to the community economically.

In the current economic climate, arguments about the cost that immigrants “impose” on our society are gaining increased traction. The authors of this chapter show why different studies come to different conclusions about the costs and benefits of immigrants on a society, suggesting that much has to do with who is included in the calculations, the time frame used, and what areas are measured. The authors conclude that regardless of which study is considered, the benefits and costs of immigration are relatively modest in the context of a $14 trillion U.S. economy. While it is easy to get attention with numbers measured in the billions of dollars, most academic studies conclude that the effects of immigration, positive and nega-
Introduction

Tive, amount to no more than 1 percent of overall economic output. (This figure does not include some of the more difficult-to-measure impacts of being a magnet country for immigrants that attracts the best, brightest, and most entrepreneurial from around the world.)

Chapter II takes on arguments about the relationship between immigration and national security and crime. After the September 11 terrorist attacks in 2001, security concerns came to dominate the U.S. immigration debate. The authors of this chapter separate terrorism from domestic crime and show that short-term entry policies are the most relevant immigration policies in our defense against terrorism. In terms of domestic crime, the authors show that many of the stronger enforcement tactics often have a perverse effect on the immigrant community, making them less cooperative with local law enforcement and thus weakening local security structures.

In Chapter III the authors take on the third main pillar in the immigration debate—culture. They show that there has been a long-standing debate in American history between those who believe that America has a distinct culture, one that can be undermined by large numbers of arriving immigrants if they are not properly integrated, and those who believe that American political institutions are core to the nation's identity and that those institutions produce a culture of pluralism and diversity that is welcoming to immigrants. After examining both arguments, the authors argue that despite the historical importance of this debate, the realities of today's global economy mean that the debate might have become outdated. For Chicago and the United States to succeed in today's economy, our city and country will need to attract and engage the best and the brightest around the world. We will only be able to do so if we provide a welcoming climate for immigrants. To succeed in a global economy, we will need to be fluent in many languages, understand the cultures of many people, and show agility in integrating the ideas of others. This argument is revisited in Chapter VI, which tackles explicitly why immigrants are important to Chicago's global competitiveness.

After exploring the three main pillars of the debate, the authors of Chapters IV and V pose two questions: What does it mean to be an American, and what does it mean to be a moral community? These chapters serve as a reminder that immigration issues are difficult because they have a moral, philosophical, and psychological dimension to them. These chapters cut to the core of who we are as citizens and as a society.

Chapters VI and VII turn the spotlight directly on Chicago. Chapter VI argues that for Chicago to remain globally competitive it must continue to attract immigrants. The authors review several prominent studies about how global cities stack up against each other. After examining the key components to what makes a global city, they consider the role that immigrants have played in making Chicago a top-tier global city. The authors conclude that continuing to attract immigrants will be essential to Chicago's ability to compete in the future.

In Chapter VII, the authors turn to what local actors can do. As mentioned throughout this report, immigration has been traditionally defined as a federal, not a local, issue. The report shows that this distinction is not, nor has it ever been, quite true. In reality, the question of whether immigration is a state/local or federal issue has been continuously contested through American history. What is clear, however, is that local actors can always determine whether immigration “works” or not in their own communities.

Conclusion

Some of The Chicago Council’s Emerging Leaders are immigration experts, but as a group we are just concerned citizens who see immigration in our daily lives and have come together to grapple with this important issue. We were selected by an independent committee of The Chicago Council on Global Affairs, committed to ensuring that the next generation of Chicago's leaders has a deep understanding of global issues and how they impact Chicago. As a group we come from a cross-section of Chicago city life—the private, not-for-profit, academic, and government sectors. Because we are not experts, we are mindful and humbled by what we do not know. However, having spent the year immersing ourselves in the very important topic of immigration policy, each chapter offers ideas for how as a city we can better present and think through these pivotal issues. Immigration policy is a topic that will define us collectively moving forward. For that reason we could think of no issue more important for us to tackle as a group in an effort to help others move the public debate forward in this global city, the City of Chicago.
Chapter I
The Benefits and Costs of Immigration:
A Research Review of the Economic Effects
of Immigration in the United States

By Paul Christensen, Prithvi Gandhi,
and Joseph McCluskey

Studies of the economic effects of immigration are complex, sometimes biased, and mostly inconclusive. While there are very real economic costs and benefits associated with U.S. immigration, the results of such studies depend on (1) which population is being considered (e.g., all foreign-born residents, only unauthorized immigrants, and/or the U.S.-born children of unauthorized residents), (2) what types of effects are measured (e.g., fiscal or taxpayer-funded costs vs. macro effects on the economy, wages, and national income), and (3) what time frame is used (e.g., short-term budget periods vs. longer-term business cycles). As one might expect, different research methodologies yield different, even contradictory, findings.

Based on a review of the available economic research on immigration, the authors of this chapter found that most studies conducted at the national and state levels conclude that low-skilled immigrants, including unauthorized workers, create relatively small net fiscal deficits for government. In other words, they consume more in public benefits than they contribute in the form of taxes. In contrast, broader studies of all immigrant groups, both authorized and unauthorized, calculate a modest net positive impact on the overall economy and national income. It is also clear, however, that not all U.S. citizens benefit equally from immigration. Just as free trade can have positive and negative effects on the U.S. economy, so some native-born workers are helped by the influx of high- and low-skill immigrants, while others are hurt by it. The issues of economic equity (i.e., “not paying their fair share”) and distributional impact (i.e., “stealing our jobs”) lie at the heart of the economic debate over immigration.

What follows is a summary of many of the most important and widely published studies of the economic benefits and costs of immigration in the United States and, where available, in the state of Illinois. Unfortunately, only limited information can be found for the city of Chicago because of its sanctuary city status (see Introduction), which prevents the collection of immigrant-related data on a host of important issues.

The Benefits of Immigration

The economic benefits of immigration can be broadly divided into four principal, quantifiable categories:

- Contributions to federal, state, and local revenues in the forms of income, property, sales, and other taxes and fees;
- Contributions to gross domestic product (GDP) in the form of consumer spending;
- Contributions to economic output and national income based on immigrants’ influence on labor productivity;
- Contributions to job creation and new businesses formation.

Other benefits such as those resulting from the increased cultural diversity caused by immigration are much harder to quantify and hence are not included in most studies. Our colleagues grapple with this head-on in Chapters III, VI, and VII.

Immigrants Contribute Billions in Federal, State, and Local Taxes

It is commonly thought that immigrants do not pay their fair share of taxes and/or consume more in publicly financed benefits than they contribute in taxes. The research on this point suggests that, in aggregate, immigrants have a small positive effect on the fiscal balance. Authors from the Cato Institute and Urban Institute estimated that immigrants and immigrant-owned businesses paid $162 billion in federal income taxes in 1997, which was approximately 8.3 percent of all federal tax receipts of $2.0 trillion for fiscal year 1997-98. In addition, the U.S. Social Security Administration maintains roughly $6 billion to $7 billion of Social Security contributions in an “earnings suspense file”—an account for W-2 tax forms that cannot be matched to the correct Social Security number. The vast majority of these numbers are associated with unauthorized workers who will...
likely never claim their benefits. Furthermore, according to the IRS’s chief actuary, the agency estimates that 75 percent of unauthorized immigrants pay payroll taxes.

The National Research Council (NRC) published a landmark study of immigration in 1997 to assess the overall fiscal impact (incorporating taxes and benefits at all levels of government) of immigration. The study uses a lifetime approach in order to capture the full costs and benefits of immigrant-led households and their children, rather than measuring a single point in time. From this long-run perspective, the NRC study estimated that immigrants (including their descendants) would have a positive fiscal impact—a discounted present value of $80,000 per immigrant on average. The surplus is larger for high-skilled immigrants ($198,000) and slightly negative for those with less than a high school degree (minus $13,000).

The favorable demographic characteristics of U.S. foreign-born immigrants, particularly those who are high school educated, tend to lead to a small positive fiscal effect. Close to 70 percent of all immigrants arrive in the United States during their prime working years (ages twenty to forty). In addition, those who are high school or college educated have had the cost of their educations borne by another country. According to the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2009 American Community Survey, 69 percent of all foreign-born U.S. residents over the age of twenty-five have completed high school. As discussed later, the cost of public education for the children of unauthorized immigrants (including birthright citizens) is the single biggest immigration-related expense to U.S. taxpayers. Thus, the U.S. economy benefits from the knowledge of foreign-born and educated immigrants, without U.S. taxpayers always having to make the investment in that education.

Different studies estimate the aggregate effect that immigrants have on the solvency of pay-as-you-go entitlement programs such as Social Security and Medicare. The Social Security Administration’s 2007 OASDI Trustee Report indicates that an additional 100,000 net immigrants per year would improve the long-term actuarial balance of these programs by approximately 0.1 percent of the total taxable payroll.

**Immigrants Help Drive Consumer Spending**

In addition to paying taxes, immigrants help drive consumer spending, the single largest component of the U.S. economy. According to the March 2007 Current Population Survey published by the United States Census Bureau, there were an estimated 37.9 million foreign-born (authorized and unauthorized) immigrants in the United States. The Center for Immigration Studies, an independent, nonpartisan, nonprofit, research organization, analyzed this survey and estimated the median household income among this group to be $43,933 (compared with $49,201 for native households). Approximately 12.2 million households are headed by an individual born outside the United States. Based on the U.S. Department of Labor’s Bureau of Labor Statistics Annual Consumer Expenditure Survey (2006), households in a similar income bracket as the median immigrant-headed household spend $39,573 on average. Therefore, a reasonable approximation of the contribution of this group to total U.S. consumption is $484 billion, or 8.1 percent of $6 trillion in consumer expenditures in the United States.

**A Large Majority of U.S. Workers Gain from Immigration**

Immigrants also contribute to the U.S. economy as workers. Historically, it has been challenging to show their economic effect on the income and well-being of native-born workers because of the difficulty in isolating the effects of immigration from other economic forces at work in the U.S. economy. However, a 2007 white paper from the White House Council of Economic Advisers concluded that...

---

14. United States Department of Labor, Consumer Expenditures in 2006, October 2008. Calculated by multiplying the number of U.S. Households (121 million) and the median expenditure per household of $49,067.
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immigration has a small positive effect on the output of the U.S. economy as a whole and on the income of the native-born workforce.\(^{15}\)

The economic theory behind this conclusion, which surprised some in our group, is that immigrants change not only the size of the labor force but also the relative supplies of factors of production such as unskilled labor, skilled labor, and capital. And despite any losses from increased labor-market competition, natives benefit in total because immigrants differ in terms of their productive characteristics. For instance, while immigrants make up 15.7 percent of the total workforce in the United States (see Figure 3), they make up a much higher share of those without a high school education (35.9 percent) and those with PhDs (27.7 percent) (see Figure 4). So the presence of unskilled, foreign-born construction workers allows skilled U.S. craftsmen and contractors to build more homes at lower cost than they would otherwise be able to. As a result, higher-skilled U.S. natives’ productivity and incomes rise.

Natives may also gain from having a wider variety of goods and services to consume and from lower prices for the goods and services produced by industries with high concentrations of low-skill, foreign-born workers.

It is important to note, however, that in aggregate these effects are relatively small. Economists use a figure called the immigration surplus to indicate the total benefit of immigration derived by U.S. natives. Based on widely used assumptions regarding the immigrant workforce, the current immigration surplus is $37 billion per year or approximately 0.3 percent of GDP.\(^{16}\)

More complex economic studies measure the influence of immigration on natives’ income, differentiating workers by skill and experience and allowing for adjustments in the capital stock, i.e., the total

---


16. Ibid.
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physical capital available in the economy at any given point in time in response to changes in labor supply. a 2006 paper by gianmarco ottaviano and giovanni peri took such an approach to measuring the wage effects of immigration and concluded that immigration since 1990 has boosted the average wage of native u.s. workers by between 0.7 percent and 1.8 percent, depending on the assessment’s timeframe—the effect is more positive when the capital stock has had time to adjust. fully 90 percent of native u.s. workers are estimated to have gained from immigration.

multiplying the average percentage gains by the total wages of u.s. natives suggests that annual wage gains from immigration are $30 billion to $80 billion, which at the high end of the range is only 0.6 percent of gdp.

another study, by george borjas, estimated that immigration increases u.s. gdp growth by approximately 0.2 percent per annum. this growth is due to the increases in labor supply, the complementary nature of immigrant labor as a factor of production, and the positive effect on productivity from changes to the economy’s capital stock.

another benefit of immigration mentioned in the literature is the salutary effects unauthorized workers have on the u.s. business cycle. because unauthorized immigrants are largely lower skilled and less educated, they tend to enter the u.s. during boom times, filling in the need for employees in particular sectors. for instance, the construction-led boom in the last decade created the need for workers in excess of the supply, a gap filled by less-skilled authorized and unauthorized immigrants. studies also show that this segment of workers is more mobile across cities and states and thus responds more quickly to local economic conditions.

immigrants form new businesses and create jobs

many people are familiar with high-tech companies such as intel, ebay, and google. however, not all are aware that foreign-born immigrants have played an instrumental role in the founding of these and other highly successful business enterprises within the united states. this pattern of skilled immigrants leading job- and wealth-creating innovation has become a nationwide phenomenon in the twenty-first century. what started in california is now prevalent in many states, including new jersey, texas, massachusetts, north carolina, and washington. immigrant entrepreneurs founded 25.3 percent of the u.s. engineering and technology companies established from 1995 to 2005, according to a 2007 study from duke university (see figure 5). altogether, the study reports, this pool of immigrant-founded companies was responsible for generating an estimated $52 billion in annual sales and creating just under 450,000 new jobs over the same period. what’s more, foreign nationals—those living in the united states who are not citizens—accounted for an estimated 24.2 percent of international patent applications in 2006, up from less than 7 percent of patent applications in 1995.

comparisons to earlier academic studies of the role immigrants play in creating start-up companies in technology centers (north

17. gianmarco ottaviano and giovanni peri, “rethinking the effects of immigration on wages,” nber working paper no. 12497 (washington, dc: national bureau of economic research, august 2006).
19. gordon h. hanson and antonio splinberger, political economy, sectoral shocks, and border enforcement, nber working paper no. 7315 (washington, dc: national bureau of economic research, august 1999).
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Immigrant Entrepreneurs Contribute to the U.S. Economy

The Partnership for a New American Economy reports that nearly 20 percent of the 2010 Fortune 500 companies founded after 1985 were started by immigrants. Forty percent were founded by either immigrants or their children. In 2009 SmartMoney.com, part of the Wall Street Journal network, published a list of immigrants who came to America and founded some of its largest companies. For example, P&G, the largest American consumer products company, was founded when William Procter and James Gamble immigrated to the United States from England and Ireland. After moving to the United States as a refugee of the Hungarian Revolution in 1956, Andy Grove helped found Intel, which employed about 44,000 people at the time of the article’s publication. Carnival Cruises was founded by Israeli immigrant Ted Arison in 1972. Sergey Brin, born in Russia, cofounded Google, which then employed an estimated 13,000 people. eBay, the world’s largest online marketplace, was founded by French-born Pierre Omidyar. And Yahoo was cofounded by Taiwanese immigrant Jerry Yang in 1996.

Carolina’s Research Triangle and Silicon Valley) clearly demonstrate that foreign-born immigrants have become a significant driving force in the creation of new businesses and intellectual property within the United States, and the trend is increasing. In 1995, 39 percent of all Silicon Valley start-ups had one or more immigrants as key founders. By 2007 that number had increased to 53 percent. Similarly, in North Carolina in 2007, 19 percent of all start-ups had at least one immigrant as a key founder, compared with less than 10 percent in 1995.21

It is more difficult to quantify the indirect economic benefits or spillover effects that result from the proximity of firms within an industry. Economists have shown that positive externalities are derived from the speed with which knowledge travels among firms within an industry to facilitate innovation and growth. Examples that have been studied by these experts include the concentrated enclaves of research-and-development-based high-tech enterprises in Austin, Boston, Seattle, Silicon Valley, and other areas in the United States that immigrants have had a significant hand in developing. Despite the difficulties in measuring these effects, leading scholars of the microeconomic effects of knowledge-based industries have concluded that the presence of significant high-tech R&D resources in concentrated geographical areas meaningfully increases the total growth and output of the high-tech industry beyond what it would be in the absence of such effects. The direct effect of these spillovers is an improvement in per capita income because of the increased productivity of the engineers and scientists.22

The Costs of Immigration

A variety of studies have been conducted at the federal and state levels that work to identify the costs of immigration to U.S. taxpayers. The results vary depending on the approach of the study, but most include four major categories of public expenditures associated with unauthorized immigrants and their children living in the United States:

- Public education
- Health care
- Law enforcement and criminal justice
- Welfare

Public Education Is the Largest Public Cost Associated with Immigration

The Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR), a national public interest group that advocates for immigration restrictions, released a report in July 2010 that analyzed costs at the federal, state, and local levels called The Fiscal Burden of Illegal Immigration on United States Taxpayers. It is important to note that the FAIR study included not only children who are unauthorized immigrants, but also children who are citizens by birth but whose parents are unauthorized immigrants. This is important because more than 70 percent of the children used in the study group were U.S. citizens and therefore legally entitled to the public education benefits received. FAIR states that it included these children in the study because it does not believe they would be in the country were it not for the illegal entry or visa overstay of their parents.23

According to the FAIR study, public education for the children of unauthorized immigrants constitutes the largest cost of immigration.

21. Ibid.
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to U.S. taxpayers, with annual federal expenditures totaling $2.1 billion. The costs come from Title I, Title III, and the Migrant Education programs. The study also found that state and local governments take on a much larger share of the cost, with an estimated $49 billion in annual expenditures or more. Included in the state costs are an estimated $40 billion for K-12 education, $8 billion for English as a second language, and a variety of other education programs.

On the state level, the 2005 FAIR study Breaking the Piggy Bank: How Illegal Immigration Is Sending Schools into the Red estimated that unauthorized immigration cost Illinois taxpayers $2 billion in 2004 ($800 million to educate students who were illegally in the country and $1.2 billion to educate their siblings born in the United States to unauthorized residents). Based on the methodology used in both FAIR studies, it appears that the majority of education costs were associated with U.S.-born children. The reader will need to judge the appropriateness of the child population being used for these estimates.

Other studies that have been conducted over the past several years have projected education costs to be somewhat less than those estimated in the 2010 FAIR study. Much of this difference could be attributed to timing and methodology. For example, in an April 2006 Businessweek article, Standard & Poor’s analysts wrote: “Local school districts are estimated to educate 1.8 million unauthorized children. At an average annual cost of $7,500 (averages vary by jurisdiction) per student, the cost of providing education to these children is about $11.2 billion.”

While it is relatively easy to count the dollars spent in public school districts across the country and conclude that taxpayers would save money if we had fewer unauthorized children attending classes, it is equally important to consider the consequences of denying public education to unauthorized households. Would the U.S. truly be better off economically and financially with millions of young adults who lack a basic primary education? Shouldn’t education be viewed as an investment in human capital rather than a waste of taxpayer money? And what would happen to the thousands of teachers who would no longer be needed in the public schools because of lower enrollment? These questions and others are not addressed in any of the research identified by the authors.

Immigrants Impose Costs on the U.S. Health-Care System

Unreimbursed public healthcare expenditures are another significant cost associated with unauthorized immigrants. The Pew Hispanic Center in 2005 estimated the following breakdown of the uninsured population:

- U.S. citizens: 14 percent
- Authorized immigrants: 25 percent
- Unauthorized immigrants: 59 percent

Figure 6 - Access to and Use of Health Care for Adults and Children by Citizenship Status

All differences between citizens and noncitizens are statistically significant (p<0.05). Those who said their usual source of care was the emergency room were considered to have no usual source of care.

Source: Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured analysis of 2006 NHIS data.


Immigrants’ Use of Health Care Services

Studies show that immigrants, regardless of legal status, use significantly fewer health-care services than the American citizenry at large. The Kaiser Family Foundation found that immigrants were significantly less likely to have health insurance, use health services, or go to the emergency room. Of all noncitizens, of which the report estimated 56 percent were authorized, the average annual per capita health-care expenditures were $1,797 versus $3,702 for citizens. Also, the study found 13 percent of adult noncitizens reported an emergency room visit in the past year compared to 20 percent of citizens. Similarly, a report published in Health Affairs showed that in Los Angeles County in 2000, foreign-born adults accounted for 45 percent of the adult population but only 33 percent of health spending, and unauthorized immigrants constituted 12 percent of the population but only 6 percent of spending.

According to a study published by the Rand Corporation in 2006, of the $430 billion in national medical spending in 2000, native-born U.S. residents accounted for 87 percent of the population but for 91.5 percent of medical spending. Foreign-born residents, who include unauthorized immigrants, accounted for 13 percent of the population but for only 8.5 percent of the medical spending. Unauthorized immigrants, 3.2 percent of the total population, accounted for only about 1.5 percent of medical spending.26

The 2010 FAIR report estimated the national outlay for medical costs associated with unauthorized immigrants and their children at $5.8 billion annually. One of the major challenges in estimating health-care costs for unauthorized immigrants is that the status of a patient is often not documented when care is provided. This leads to data being extrapolated from various research studies.

It is true that many unauthorized immigrants lack insurance and cost public health care systems money when they cannot pay for the costs of their emergency and other health services. But it also appears true that immigrants are less-intensive users of health care and represent a small fraction of the rapidly growing $2 trillion health-care industry in this country.

Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Costs

In its 2010 report, FAIR estimated the cost of incarcerating unauthorized immigrants who had committed crimes at $8.7 billion annually. This figure was calculated by taking a Justice Department cost estimate for criminal justice outlays and multiplying it by a percentage estimate of the unauthorized immigrant population.

The Department of Justice’s State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP), begun in 1994, compensates states and local jurisdictions for incarcerating unauthorized immigrants who are serving time for felony convictions or at least two misdemeanors. Payments under the program in 2009 totaled $394 million. SCAAP also reimburses states and local jurisdictions with correctional officer salary costs that result from incarcerating unauthorized immigrants who have at least one felony or two misdemeanor convictions for violating state or local laws and are incarcerated for at least four consecutive days during the reporting period. FAIR stated in its 2010 report that this data is understated because not all jurisdictions that imprison deportable aliens file claims for this compensation.

Cost estimates for criminal justice enforcement are only available for the total population; therefore, trying to estimate the portion spent on unauthorized immigrants is difficult to estimate. In addition, data is frequently not based on experience but extrapolated from population estimates of unauthorized immigrants, which may be biased or incorrect.

Welfare Costs

Some immigration opponents argue that immigrants, both authorized and unauthorized, cost U.S. taxpayers millions of dollars in welfare benefits they don’t deserve. In truth, most unauthorized immigrants are ineligible for the four most common forms of welfare assistance: Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), food stamps, Supplemental Security Income (SSI), and Medicaid. Furthermore, the 1996 welfare reform law reduced legal immigrant eligibility for most welfare programs, establishing minimum U.S. residency requirements for receiving any type of assistance. As a result, few unauthorized immigrants receive any direct form of welfare other than for their U.S.-born children who are legal U.S. citizens. For example, a 2003 study by the Center for Immigration Studies estimated that less than 1 percent of all unauthorized immigrant households received TANF or SSI cash payments, while only 4.8 percent were on food stamps.27

The same study pointed out that 23 percent of households headed by an unauthorized immigrant were receiving Medicaid health benefits for their children. But it appears that the overall cost of providing health care to Medicaid-eligible immigrant families is relatively modest. According to an article published in the Journal of the American Medical Association in 2008, less than 1 percent of all Medicaid spending went to health care for unauthorized immigrants. The study used North Carolina as an example to better understand how public funds are being used to treat unauthorized immigrants.28

Like Free Trade, Immigration Distributes Costs and Benefits Unequally

Labor economics suggests that immigration, which increases the supply of available workers, results in lower market wages, especially for lower-skilled, native-born workers who must compete with immigrants willing to work for less. In a 2003 study published in the Quarterly Journal of Economics, George Borjas estimated that from 1980 to 2000 low-skilled U.S. workers saw a wage decline of 9 percent due to immigration. In contrast, David Card of the University of California at Berkeley concluded the following in a 2005 study: “Evidence that immigrants have harmed the opportunities of less-educated natives is scant.”29

In another study published by the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta using administrative data from the state of Georgia, the authors found that average wages among authorized workers were lower in industries that employ unauthorized workers, and that having a greater share of unauthorized workers in those industries further lowered wages.30 In addition, unauthorized workers have significantly lower labor supply elasticity, or opportunities to seek new employment, likely as a result of their limited employment opportunities. Furthermore, an influx of unauthorized workers does more to displace unauthorized workers hired previously than it does to displace native-born and authorized foreign-born workers.

Segments of the U.S.-born workforce may be negatively affected by a large influx of immigrants either in the form of job loss or reduced wages and income, even though the U.S. economy might benefit in the aggregate. This is analogous to the adverse economic effects on some workers caused by free trade. For example, U.S. workers have suffered because of increased imports of textiles and garments into the United States. The U.S. government responded with the Trade Adjustment Assistance program (TAA). Under TAA, the Department of Labor helps workers who lose their jobs or experience a reduction in hours and/or wages as a result of increased imports. TAA provides training, income support, and job-search and relocation allowances for participants. The authors believe that policymakers could use this precedent to consider creating a similar program targeted at the effects of immigration.

A number of other potential economic costs have been attributed to immigration, although most studies have not attempted to quantify them because of difficulties in data collection. These other costs include:

- Foreign-language translation and interpretation in schools, courts, hospitals, and other public institutions;

It is easy to get attention with numbers measured in the billions of dollars, but in truth, most academic studies conclude that the effects of immigration, positive and negative, amount to no more than 1 percent of overall economic output. The United States will not solve its unemployment problems by deporting all unauthorized workers. Nor will it eliminate a $1.5 trillion federal deficit by cutting public assistance to immigrants and their U.S.-born children. In truth, the root causes of these economic challenges go much deeper, and immigration, while important, is not the determining factor.

Finally, the authors feel that rather than arguing about which sets of numbers are more valid or the flaws in the various research methodologies, it would be more productive for government officials and the public to focus on creating policies that maximize the economic advantages and minimize the costs of immigration. For example, the federal Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors (DREAM) Act, which was voted down in 2011, would have made it possible to create a legal path to citizenship for the children of unauthorized immigrants who want to pursue a college degree or serve in the military. It is hard to believe that these young people wouldn’t help improve U.S. prosperity over time, rather than becoming a financial burden on our society. Similarly, some experts have proposed cyclical or indexed immigration policies that would admit

### Federal DREAM Act Fails; States Take Up Issue

The Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors Act, or the DREAM Act, has been proposed in several sessions of the U.S. Congress since 2001 and has also been a component of several comprehensive immigration reform proposals. The federal act would grant legal status and the potential for full U.S. citizenship to unauthorized immigrants who were brought to the United States as minors if they demonstrate “good moral character” and enroll in college or serve in the U.S. military. It would also encourage state governments to offer in-state tuition to such students. A version of the bill failed to pass Congress in the fall of 2010, which was then controlled by the Democrats. The federal legislation was introduced again in May of 2011 but is not expected to pass the Republican-held U.S. House of Representatives.

As has been seen in other aspects of the immigration debate, when the federal government fails to act, states often take the initiative to craft their own legislation. States cannot offer any citizenship rights, but states like Illinois, California, and Maryland have passed legislation offering unauthorized students greater access to higher education. Maryland’s legislation provoked so much controversy that it will be put to a public referendum in 2012, while other states like Arizona, Wisconsin, and Indiana have passed legislation limiting unauthorized students access to state financial support for college or K-12 education.

### Conclusion

The studies reviewed show there are no easy answers when it comes to measuring the economic dimensions of immigration. Some studies focus on the benefits to our overall economy from immigrants’ contributions as taxpayers, consumers, workers, and entrepreneurs. Others highlight the fiscal costs associated with providing public services such as education, health care, and welfare assistance to unauthorized immigrants and their families. Few, if any, try to calculate a net effect, leaving readers wondering how to compare apples and oranges and make sense of the results.

What is clear to the authors (none of whom is an expert in the field of immigration economics) is that there are two compelling sides to this story, and the public dialogue rarely addresses both. Immigration opponents tend to focus on the fiscal costs of unauthorized immigration, ignoring the valuable economic contributions from the larger group of authorized immigrants and foreign-born U.S. citizens. Immigration supporters, on the other hand, tout the global competitive advantages of the immigrant “brain gain” while dismissing some of the very real challenges of unauthorized immigration. Such one-sided arguments have only polarized the debate in this country.

It is also clear that the benefits and costs of immigration appear to be relatively modest in the context of a $14 trillion U.S. economy.
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more workers to the United States in times of economic growth while reducing the numbers during periods of high unemployment. Finally, to deal with the distributional effects of immigration on vulnerable groups such as low-skilled workers, policymakers could extend benefit and retraining programs to people directly affected by immigration the way they have for workers who have lost jobs to off-shore manufacturing.

As a self-proclaimed nation of immigrants, America built the world’s largest economy on a mix of U.S. and foreign-born workers. Certainly we should be able to agree that it is worth taking the time to study and understand the economic arguments for and against immigration as we look to compete in the global economy of the twenty-first century.

Chapter II
U.S. Immigration Policy and National Security

By Sean Casten, Lillian Daniel, John McGovern, and Brent Neiman

From the Pakistan/Afghanistan border to the Kurdish regions in Iraq and Turkey, from conflict in the Democratic Republic of Congo to the recent shootings in Norway, headlines are filled with stories of nations struggling with national identity, ethnic heterogeneity, and contested borders. In recent times, immigration policies have also become tied to national security in the United States. Part of this has to do with a fear that foreign nationals are entering the United States with the intent to harm the country, as they did on September 11, 2001. Another part is the fear that increased immigration is leading to a rise in domestic criminal activity and drug-related crime.

These two concerns are generally conflated under the rubric of national security, but are actually related to very different foreign populations and routes of entry and therefore require careful parsing and analysis. A close examination of these issues suggests that most immigration policies may be less relevant for national security than headlines would have us believe.

Estimates suggest the majority of foreigners who enter the United States do so legally as short-term visitors rather than as permanent or unauthorized immigrants. Further, most recorded terrorist attacks on the United States were committed by native-born citizens, not immigrants. As such, policies aiming to reduce unauthorized or permanent immigration are unlikely to do much to reduce the terrorist threat faced by the United States.

With respect to domestic crime, several studies suggest a weak, and at times negative, correlation between immigration status and propensity to commit crime. In fact, there is some evidence that strict, enforcement-heavy policies towards unauthorized residents may actually lead to an increase in crime.

This chapter expands upon these data and arguments in an effort to clarify the relationships between immigration and security, including both terrorism and domestic crime.
Emerging Leaders Perspectives

**Immigration and Terrorism**

In the United States the link between immigration and domestic security became a major issue on September 11, 2001. On that day foreigners who had entered the United States under false pretenses committed unimaginable acts of terror that killed thousands and triggered a chain of domestic and international events that cost trillions of dollars and tens (if not hundreds) of thousands of lives around the world. This led to an intensified focus on immigrants and a national discussion on policies involving profiling.

Of the many types of immigration policies, some are in fact quite important in our defense against terrorists. For example, smart policies governing the entry of short-term visitors, including foreign tourists and businesspeople visiting for a limited period of time, have the potential to thwart or deter attacks. After all, many of the 9/11 terrorists and other would-be foreign attackers entered the country on a short-term basis, either on visas or without the legal need for them. Policies relating to permanent (or long-term) authorized and unauthorized immigrants, however, play a smaller role in our defense against terror.

Further, not all terrorists enter the country as immigrants. In fact, most terrorists who have committed acts on U.S. soil have been native born and are neither foreigners nor immigrants such as Timothy McVeigh, who bombed the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City in 1995.

**Short-Term Entry Policies Are Most Relevant for Antiterror Border Security**

Consider the case of Mohammed Atta, one of the main figures in the 9/11 attacks. Not only did he enter the country legally, but his B-1/B-2 visa was expedited by the fact that he had previously been a student in Germany and had letters of recommendation from his professors there. His was a carefully planned entry, designed to stay under the radar of U.S. officials by not breaking the law and looking like the type of high-skilled temporary visa entrant that U.S. policy has generally sought to encourage. Farouk Abdulmutallab, who was charged with trying to detonate a bomb placed in his shoes while flying to the United States from the United Kingdom, did not require a visa.

Other subsequent terrorists entered the country legally without visas under the auspices of the visa-waiver program. Richard Reid, who tried to detonate a bomb placed in his shoes while flying to the United States, did not require a visa.

This suggests that American policies governing short-term entries (including short-term visa policies) can be quite important for national security, but it says little about current policies toward permanent authorized and unauthorized immigrants, which play far more central roles in the current national immigration debate.31

**Terrorist Attacks in the United States Have Been Committed by Both U.S. Nationals and Foreigners**

The worst terrorist attack in modern history on U.S. soil occurred on September 11, 2001, when foreign terrorists living in the United States and sponsored by the terrorist network al-Qaeda hijacked and crashed four commercial airplanes into the World Trade Towers in New York, the Pentagon building outside Washington, D.C., and a field near Shanksville, PA, killing almost 3,000 people.

The sheer volume of fatalities and the level of destruction resulting from the 9/11 attacks no doubt continue to impact U.S. foreign and domestic policy as well as the nation’s consciousness. Both dramatic and jarring, these attacks deserve a vigilant and continued response by the federal government to protect our borders and our citizens from future threats. At the same time, the 9/11 attacks were unusual from a historic perspective, as most previous terrorist incidents involved the actions of domestic citizens.

The University of Maryland maintains a Global Terrorism Database of 87,000 terror incidents broken down by perpetrator, country, target, and date.32 The database generally relies on a definition of a terrorist event as “the threatened or actual use of illegal force and violence by a nonstate actor to attain a political, economic, religious, or social goal through fear, coercion, or intimidation.” The definition is somewhat flexible, however, given the situational and political slipperiness of the term. (Consider the difficulty of...

---

31. Following the attacks on September 11, 2001, the Department of Homeland Security and the State Department made a number of changes impacting short-term foreign visitors. These tighter restrictions on the short-term entry of foreign visitors may indeed make sense and strengthen national security. Some activists, however, including Tom Ridge, the first secretary of Homeland Security, have publicly voiced concern that some post-9/11 travel-related security policies have unnecessarily aggravated foreign citizens wishing to travel to the United States and cost the United States considerably in terms of its ability to attract the world’s talent and economic activity.

using this definition to classify Ted Kaczynski, also known as the Unabomber, who sent sixteen bombs through the mail from 1978 to 1995; James Earl Ray, who assassinated Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. in 1968; or the two students in Columbine, Colorado, who committed the worst massacre ever at an American high school, killing fifteen people in all.)

Of the 87,000 incidents taking place between 1970 and 2008, 2,264 were committed on U.S. soil. These acts were committed largely by domestic groups with domestic agendas, including twenty-seven by the Ku Klux Klan, twenty-eight by the Animal Liberation Front, twenty-three by various Aryan organizations, and thirty-nine by the Earth Liberation Front. September 11–style attacks led by foreign nationals are the exception, not the rule. The overwhelming majority of terrorist attacks on U.S. soil are perpetrated by U.S. nationals with a domestic agenda. Several of the post-9/11 terror attacks and/or foiled attempts have been led by U.S. citizens (e.g., the foiled dirty-bomber plot by Brooklyn-born Jose Padilla and the Fort Hood shootings alleged to have been committed by Virginia-born Nidal Malik Hasan). The ability of transnational actors to recruit, train, and direct U.S. nationals to commit terrorist attacks is a serious issue, but it results from the international flow of ideas and resources and generally not from the flow of immigrants or from immigration policy per se.

In sum, immigration and antiterror policies are not as closely linked as many perceive. Permanent or unauthorized immigrants can, of course, commit acts of terror. But most terrorists have easily skirted long-term immigration issues because they either enter the United States on a short-term basis among tourists and business travelers or because they are native-born citizens.

**Immigration and Crime**

In addition to concerns over terrorism, many fear that immigration increases local, nonpolitically motivated criminal activity. This in part reflects the rise of transnational gangs that increasingly drive the U.S. drug trade and has been furthered by groups like the U.S.-based Minuteman Project who have led efforts in Arizona and elsewhere to “observe, report, and deter an overwhelming incursion into Arizona by criminal drug and illegal alien smuggling cartels.”

The U.S. House Committee on Homeland Security gave a frightening depiction of the situation in its 2006 report *A Line in the Sand: Confronting the Threat at the Southwest Border*. The report points out that:

> “The U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration reports that the Mexican drug syndicates operating today along our Nation’s Southwest border are far more sophisticated and dangerous than any of the other organized criminal groups in America’s law enforcement history. Indeed, these powerful drug cartels, and the human smuggling networks and gangs they leverage, have immense control over the routes into the United States and continue to pose formidable challenges to our efforts to secure the Southwest border.”

Similar concerns have been raised by regulatory agencies. For example, the North Carolina Governor’s Crime Commission reported that 90 percent of the MS-13 gang members are unauthorized immigrants who depend on smuggling operations on the Mexico-Texas border to support their operations. Law enforcement agencies throughout the country are warily watching increasing violence in the El Paso-Ciudad Juárez region, fearing that such activity could bleed north, following Mexican migration patterns. Because of its position as a transshipment point, the city of Chicago today sees narcotics and drug-related cash seizures on a par with border states.

**Immigration Status and Criminality**

Notwithstanding the fears outlined above, there seems to be a weak (and in some studies a negative) correlation between immigration and crime. The Immigration Policy Center points out that from 1994 to 2005, the population of unauthorized immigrants in the United States increased by 76 percent, but the growth in violent crime was 11 percent, and the growth in property crime was 8 percent. Similarly, the National Research Council and the Justice Department’s Bureau of Justice Statistics have concluded that the number of crime reports involving immigrants is no higher than that involving native-born citizens. There is also evidence that unauthorized immigrants contributed to a decrease in crime. Young unauthorized immigrants living in the United States between 1990 and 2000 had a lower crime rate than native-born young adults.

33. Hasan has been charged but not yet convicted for the shootings. Padilla was convicted in 2007.


36. Also known as Mara Salvatrucha, a gang with roots in El Salvador that has established a large presence in many U.S. cities.

37. Personal communication with senior Chicago Police Department officials.
United States doubled to about 12 million, while the violent crime rate declined by 34 percent and the property crime rate fell by 26 percent. This trend was national, but was also present in border regions with proportionally larger immigrant communities. This corresponds to a more general trend towards lower crime rates during the same period that has been ascribed to everything from better policing strategies to domestic policy decisions.

The Immigration Policy Center also notes that the native-born population in the United States is five times as likely to be incarcerated as the foreign-born population. The Public Policy Institute of California has found that these incarceration trends are even more pronounced in that state, which has the highest number of unauthorized and authorized immigrants in the country. This further corroborates the argument that the link between immigration and crime is not as strong as is often believed. Various academic papers come to similar conclusions.

Given these findings, some researchers are asking whether the correlation between immigration and crime might actually be negative: Might greater immigration lead to greater public safety? A key observation in these studies is that the propensity to commit violent crime appears to increase with the number of generations a family has been inside the United States, with first-generation and second-generation immigrants 45 percent and 22 percent less likely, respectively, to commit such crimes than third-generation immigrants. Again, causality is hard to prove. It may be that given higher rates of marriage for many first-generation immigrant groups and the higher propensity for crime by unmarried males, this data is more about the benefits of marriage rather than immigration. Nonetheless, the studies suggest that the link between immigration and crime is weaker than is often presented.

It Is Unclear Whether Tougher Enforcement Increases or Reduces Overall Crime

If the above discussion suggests that the link between immigration and crime is weaker than it often appears at first glance, the below suggests that it is unclear if tougher enforcement against unauthorized workers increases or decreases crime. Some law enforcement agencies (including some in the Chicago Police Department interviewed for this paper) have concluded that aggressively pursuing immigration offenses actually reduces the effectiveness of community-based policing strategies because aggressive enforcements makes unauthorized immigrants more hesitant to report criminal activity to the police because of a heightened risk of deportation.

The rise of the aforementioned MS-13 gang highlights yet other limits of enforcement-driven, deportation-based policies. MS-13
was initially a relatively small gang with a strong base among unauthorized immigrants to the United States from El Salvador. When members were arrested and deported, they went back to a country with few job prospects and comparatively little law enforcement—but with other fellow deportees providing a community.

The Foreign Policy Research Institute (FPRI), a think tank based in Philadelphia, has suggested that the consequences of deportation-driven policies may be even more pernicious, as it contributes to “transnational crime.” FPRI observes that as criminals are deported to countries with fewer economic opportunities and weaker police forces, criminal syndicates tend not only to expand in size, but also in the scope of their activities. Further, reducing this risk may require a proportionally increased focus on rehabilitation of criminals and reintegration into civil society.\footnote{Robert Killebrew, “The New Threat: Transnational Crime,” Foreign Policy Research Institute E-Notes (April 2011), http://www.fpri.org/enotes/201104.killebrew.transnational_crime.html.}

For obvious reasons, these actions are jurisdictionally impossible when arrest is followed by deportation. Such actions raise difficult questions about the United States’ obligations to rehabilitating foreign criminals, but it seems wise not to simplistically treat deportation as a costless solution to transnational crime.

The U.S. Illegal Drug Trade Predates Immigration Concerns and Is Not Limited to Latin America

Given geography and U.S. drug policy, Mexico has long played a role in the supply and distribution of illegal drugs for U.S. markets and has thus assumed a central place in the discussion of U.S. criminal drug activity. Indeed, ever since the Harrison Narcotics Tax Act of 1914, which regulated and taxed the opiate industry,\footnote{For a fascinating history of U.S. drug policy and how it shaped the rise of Mexican drug and alcohol syndicates, see Gabriela Recio, “Drugs and Alcohol: U.S. Prohibition and the Origins of the Drug Trade in Mexico, 1910–1930,” \textit{Journal of Latin American Studies} 34, no. 1 (February 2002).} U.S. demand for drugs has been served in part via illegal shipments from Mexico.

Many of today’s Mexican drug gangs trace their roots to this era and therefore in odd ways owe their existence in part to U.S. drug policy, highlighting the potential for unintended consequences from enforcement-heavy, unilateral U.S. policies to constrain the cross-border flows. The Foreign Policy Research Institute has suggested that Arizona’s immigration laws may be repeating this mistake:

“The Mexican state of Sonora now maintains a caustic and temperamental attitude towards Arizona, which has reduced security cooperation between state officials. Although intelligence sharing and operational partnership were once robust, cooperation became less effective when Sonora’s government protested Arizona’s controversial illegal immigration law. This development is a setback for everyone except drug cartels, who continue to fight over control of Ciudad Juarez and the surrounding regions.”\footnote{David Danelo, “Time for a New Approach to Mexico,” Foreign Policy Research Institute E-Notes (December 2010), http://www.fpri.org/enotes/201012.danelo.mexico.html.}

However, the illegal U.S. drug supply does not come exclusively through Mexico. The U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration tracks seizures for cocaine, heroin, marijuana, methamphetamine, and hal-
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Lucinogens. Of the five, only cocaine comes predominantly through Mexico, and even that is a relatively recent phenomenon, resulting in part from U.S. success in clamping down on Colombian production and distribution networks. Heroin is sourced from Colombia, Mexico, and Asia. Marijuana is produced globally, and the balance tends to come from northern Europe (MDMA) or domestic labs (LSD, PCP, methamphetamines).46

We should assume that drug supply and distribution channels will be fluid, moving quickly to identify the path of least resistance into the United States. A former CIA official interviewed for this report described the current Mexican drug war as an intelligence failure—specifically, as a failure to anticipate what would happen if we were successful in our efforts to clamp down on the Colombian syndicates in the 1980s/1990s. She went on to suggest that in spite of this history, there is very little proactive effort under way to plan for success in Mexico.

This official suggested that drug-related gang violence is generally addressed most effectively at the state rather than the national level. She observed that the states would likely take the lead in establishing these relationships but for the confounding issue of immigration policy, which has tended to nationalize the discussion, often at the expense of law enforcement effectiveness.

The Data Are Open to Considerable Interpretation and Hard to Collect, Especially in Chicago

As the previous chapter showed, data are often used selectively in the immigration debate. One example of this in terms crime and national security is the difficulty in assessing the actual costs of law enforcement associated with unauthorized immigrants.

Increasing law enforcement costs are often associated with criminal activities related to unauthorized immigrant populations. But, increasing costs may reflect shifts in enforcement priorities rather than an increase in crime. Mark Lopez, associate director of the Washington, D.C.–based Pew Hispanic Center, estimates that from 1991 to 2007 immigration offenses increased from 7 to 24 percent of all federal convictions in large part because of changes in law enforcement priorities and not simply an increase in crime.47

An objective statistical analysis would therefore need to adjust arrest records to account for shifting enforcement priorities to isolate the propensity for criminal activity by the immigrant population. Regardless of this link, it is unclear if crime rates would increase or decrease with stricter enforcement against unauthorized immigration offenses.

In Chicago the data on the role of immigrants is even harder to come by than in many other areas of the country because of its status as a “sanctuary city,” referenced in the introductory chapter. This law has had many consequences, but one very important one is that it makes data collection on Chicago’s immigrant population very difficult.

As a practical matter, the law has precluded those dispensing city services from allocating services on the basis of immigration status. While controversial on many levels, members of the police department interviewed for this report indicated that one practical result of this law is that the city does not have any data relating to the criminal activity of the immigrant population. This makes it effectively impossible to fully judge the costs and benefits of the law. However, they did emphasize that the law has enhanced the efficiency of community-based policing by making immigrants more willing to share information with the police. They also noted that the law has freed up resources that otherwise would have to be deployed in the pursuit and prosecution of immigration violations.

Conclusion

This chapter has reviewed the relationship between immigration, terrorism, and domestic crime. While we agree that unauthorized immigration and permanent immigration can be contributing factors to potentially devastating terrorist attacks like 9/11, these issues appear largely unrelated to the majority of terrorism attempts and incidents because they have involved short-term entrants or domestic actors. Further, immigration and domestic crime are not as closely linked as many believe—the evidence is mixed and controversial and potentially even demonstrates a negative correlation. Tough enforcement of laws against unauthorized immigrants,

46. Data on drug flows in this paragraph all come from the U.S. Drug Enforcement Agency, “Drug Trafficking in the United States,” May 2004. Methamphetamine production is also growing in Mexico and Burma (Myanmar).

whether via deportations or stringent laws such as those discussed in Arizona, may have the perverse effect of increasing other forms of crime and drug-related violence. Finally, though Chicago’s status as a sanctuary city prevents researchers from obtaining data useful for a more quantitative assessment, interviews suggest that Chicago’s approach on enforcement against unauthorized immigrants may reduce crime involving the overall immigrant populations.

Chapter III
From Melting Pot to Mosaic: The Cultural Opportunities and Challenges of Immigration

By Jeanne Gang, Barbara Higgins, Richard L. Rodriguez, Anthony Simpkins, and Melissa Megliola Zaikos

At its essence, immigration involves the interaction of human beings, with all of their individual and collective perceptions, prejudices, motivations, and aspirations. These interactions take place between those who have been voluntarily or involuntarily uprooted from their home country and the members of the societies that become their new home. Both must face some measure of adjustment to the unfamiliar and figure out how to successfully integrate for the benefit of everyone. The incorporation of newcomers into this nation and the management of the growing diversity they bring to American society are integral aspects of the immigration process.

The Civil Rights Movement, globalization, and the changing demographics of America have dramatically changed the face of immigration in the United States in the last five decades. In fact, immigration has become a major source of the growing racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity in the United States. This has fueled the objection of many that immigration threatens to erode our own “American culture.” America’s growing diversity and the challenges of globalization may require Americans to change the traditional ways in which we think about and approach immigration and how immigrants become part of our societal landscape to accommodate a new twenty-first-century context for what it means to be not only an immigrant, but an American. Far from being a threat to our cultural integrity, immigration and the diversity that it contributes to America have become critical to the United States’ ability to retain its status as a global leader in the modern era.

The Changing Face of Immigration

The Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s forced changes in America’s racially discriminatory social and legal institutions, including those
### III. From Melting Pot to Mosaic: The Cultural Opportunities and Challenges of Immigration

#### Figure 10 - Three Great Waves of Immigration to the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Era &amp; Country</th>
<th>Total (thousands)</th>
<th>Share of immigrants (%)</th>
<th>Immigrants per 1,000 population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modern Era (1965 to 2008)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39,847</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>11,468</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1,782</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1,696</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>1,203</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>1,189</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former USSR</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>20,013</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South &amp; East Asia</td>
<td>10,048</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe &amp; Canada</td>
<td>5,621</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mideast (Asia &amp; Africa)</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southern/Eastern Europe Wave (1890-1919)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18,244</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>3,764</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria-Hungary</td>
<td>3,690</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian &amp; Poland</td>
<td>3,166</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Northern Europe</td>
<td>1,581</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other South-Eastern Europe</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Europe Wave (1840-1889)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14,314</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>4,282</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>3,209</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>2,586</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Northern Europe</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-Eastern Europe</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Persons from Puerto Rico not included. China includes Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Macao. Data for 1965-2008 include legal and unauthorized immigrants. Data for 1840-1919 include only legal admissions. Immigrants per 1,000 population is estimated separately for each five-year period in the interval. The figure is the numeric average of the five-year rates.


related to immigration. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 outlawed discrimination in employment and public accommodations, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 outlawed poll taxes, literacy tests, racial gerrymandering, and other impediments to voting by African Americans. As part of these racial reforms, the 1965 Hart Celler Immigration Act (79 Stat. 911) abolished the national origins quota system of immigration, “to eliminate discrimination in immigration to this nation composed of descendants of immigrants.”

Under the national origins quota system prior to 1965, 70 percent of all immigration slots were reserved for Britain, Germany, and Ireland. The new immigration regime was based upon the principles of family reunification and employment preferences rather than national origin. Greater preference was given to relatives of U.S. citizens and permanent resident aliens; skilled and unskilled laborers in occupations for which there was an insufficient labor supply; and artists, scientists, and highly skilled professionals. More than eighteen million immigrants entered the United States in the thirty years after the law was passed, nearly three times as many as in the thirty years prior. They included unprecedented numbers of immigrants

49. Ibid.
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from Mexico and Latin America, Africa, Asia, and the Middle East, fundamentally changing the character of immigration in America.

Since the passing of the 1965 Immigration Act, immigration has continued to grow in the United States. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, immigrants (foreign-born residents) represented about 6.2 percent of the U.S. population (14.1 million) in 1980. By 1990 the percentage of immigrants in the U.S. population had risen to 7.9 percent (19.8 million), and by the 2000 census it had risen to 11.1 percent of the U.S. population (31.1 million).50 As of 2009, foreign-born residents made up about 12 percent of the U.S. population (36.75 million), with 11.5 million of them arriving between 2000 and 2009. It is estimated that by 2050, the U.S. population will grow by 87 million, to 394 million, and that 75 percent of that increase will be attributable to immigrants.51 Despite these increases, immigrants today make up a smaller percentage of the population than they did during the mass immigration waves of the late nineteenth century.

The changing “complexion” of immigrants has mirrored, and in part driven, larger demographic changes in the United States. Nearly 35 percent of the 2009 U.S. population was nonwhite, and the percentage has been growing annually.52 It is projected that by 2042, whites will no longer be the majority of the U.S. population, outnumbered by minority groups, including Hispanics and Asians, who represent the fastest-growing ethnic populations in the country.53 In addition, a larger number of people are self-identifying as multiracial. As much as 2.9 percent of the U.S. population, in fact, reported being multiracial in 2010.54 Through immigration, America is becoming a far more racially and ethnically diverse country than it was in the past.

Post-1965 immigration has also included a dramatic increase in the number of immigrants to the United States with faith traditions (Muslim, Hindu, Sikh, Yoruba, among others) very different from the most common American religious traditions. This has increased the perception among some Americans that many immigrants represent people in cultural opposition to traditional American culture and values. Some faith and cultural traditions, for example, have very different ideas about male and female roles in family, society, and law, and therefore may offend American concepts of gender equality. While language can be a barrier to integration, cultural and religious differences can also impede social integration and acceptance of—as well as delivery of—services to immigrants. This has become more salient in recent decades as more African, Asian, and Middle-Eastern immigrants have arrived in the United States.55 When immigrants share religious affiliations and other cultural factors with the host community, integration into their new community can be easier.56 Cultural differences, however, can create barriers to acceptance and integration, especially in an atmosphere of generally heightened mistrust of immigrants among many Americans.

There is another critical difference in the nature of immigration in recent decades. As the introductory chapter pointed out, Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, San Francisco, and other old U.S. industrial urban centers have been gateway cities for immigrants for over a century. Out of necessity these cities have become practiced in receiving newcomers, with long histories of absorbing waves of immigrants. Chicago and other gateway cities have become rich, diverse, metropolitan centers as a result of the contributions of these immigrants. But as mentioned, the 2009 American Community Survey from the U.S. Census Bureau revealed that today less than 600,000 of the more than 1.6 million immigrants in the Chicago metropolitan area live in the city proper. Yet suburban areas are often less equipped to manage tough integration issues. For example, the United African Organization, a Chicago-based immigrant-services association, was recently asked to provide assistance to a group of Congolese refugees who had settled in a small town outside of Springfield, Illinois, (about 150 miles from Chicago) to work at a chicken-processing


53. Spenser P. Boyer, Learning from Each Other: The Integration of Immigrant and Minority Groups in the United States and Europe (Washington, DC: Center for American Progress, April 2009).


55. See Dianna J. Shandy and Katherine Fennelly, “A Comparison of the Integration Experiences of Two African Immigrant Populations in a Rural Community,” Social Thought 45, no.1 (2006) for a discussion of the experience of Muslim and Christian Somali and Sudanese refugees that settled in two rural communities in Minnesota, noting that the refugees that shared a Christian religious affiliation with the native residents found integrating into their new community easier than their Muslim compatriots.

56. Ibid.
plant. Local institutions and organizations simply did not have the experience or capacity to properly assist this new and totally unfamiliar wave of immigrants. In 2000 approximately 75 percent of the more than 2,700 counties in the United States were defined as nonmetropolitan. From 1990 to 2000 about 15 percent (297) saw their populations of foreign-born residents increase by 5 percent or more.\(^{57}\) Monroe County, Pennsylvania, which is about eighty miles outside of New York City, for example, experienced an increase in its immigration population of over 50 percent (from 2,259 to 5,805) during the 1990s. The immigrant population in Cass County, Illinois, grew from 41 to 1,049 during the same period, as immigrants arrived to assume jobs at the local chemical, pallet, and hardwood-drying plants.\(^{58}\) Small, heretofore homogenous towns and rural communities are now coming face-to-face with immigration, and they are ill-prepared to handle it. More Americans are now directly confronted with immigration in their own communities, and smaller communities are being thrust into new diverse environments. This has made immigration a salient issue to a much broader swath of the nation’s population. Although immigration is driving the revitalization of many shrinking towns and villages, it is also spreading fear and discomfort in areas ill-equipped to deal with rapid cultural and ethnic change.

**Benefits of Cultural Diversity**

The end of the Cold War was transformational not just politically, but also economically as the world’s commercial borders have become more indistinct. Globalization is characterized by the increasing speed in which goods, capital, people, and ideas flow across borders. In this far more integrated global marketplace, the United States will be more relevant if its population reflects the character and diversity of the rest of the world. Immigration and diversity, if managed well, are important assets to America’s ability to succeed in the global economy and to influence outcomes. As former U.S. President Bill Clinton observed:

“Our ability to exercise world leadership for peace, for freedom, for prosperity in a world that is both smaller and more closely


58. Ibid., 18-19.

Cultural diversity adds to the richness of an urban center by providing to a wide array of populations both the familiar and the comfortable and new things to explore and experience. This accessibility attracts talented people and businesses, increasing the perceived quality of life. Two of the five criteria for a “global city” in the 2010 *Global Cities Index* published by A. T. Kearney, the Chicago Council on Global Affairs, and *Foreign Policy* magazine, relate to diversity: attracting diverse groups of people and talent (e.g., the presence of international schools) and diversity of attractions (e.g., ethnic cuisine) for international residents and travelers.\(^{60}\) In rating the top livable cities in the world, the London-based Economist Intelligence Unit assigns 25 percent of its total ranking to culture and environment. Within the category, the survey assesses the best living conditions with indicators such as availability of broad and diverse cultural offerings as well as food and drink offerings. It assigns lower scores to cities with social or religious restrictions, suggesting that the most livable cities are those that embrace diversity.\(^{61}\) The benefits of being a global city are further explored by our colleagues in Chapter VI.

Diversity has other benefits. Scott Page, an economist at the University of Michigan, evaluated a number of cases and concluded that diversity could be shown to improve performance on almost any task. His findings showed that when different ways of thinking are brought to bear upon a specific issue, a higher quality result is achieved and generally in much less time than what is produced by homogeneous groups. While Page’s findings are mostly intended to show that diversity could be shown to improve performance on almost any task. His findings showed that when different ways of thinking are brought to bear upon a specific issue, a higher quality result is achieved and generally in much less time than what is produced by homogeneous groups. While Page’s findings are mostly intended to highlight the importance of different ways of thinking, his research cites statistics showing that ethnicity, race, gender, and age heavily influence ways of thinking.\(^{62}\) This independent research further rein-


forces the notion that increased diversity brought about by immigration can positively affect a community—whether in its educational system, in business, or in civic matters. For similar reasons, Amy Chua, a researcher and professor at Yale University, argues that cultures that support tolerance and multiculturalism tend to be the wealthiest and strongest. This argument is developed in even greater depth in Chapter VI of this report.

The Debate over American Culture

The current economic environment has exacerbated the fear of cultural erosion that has been expressed by many Americans. The new face of immigration and growing globalization have exploded this fear into a polarizing debate. To better understand this issue, the authors of this chapter interviewed a number of individuals who were critical of U.S. immigration and enforcement policies. They included representatives from the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR), members of the Illinois Minutemen, and political leaders who ran for office on an anti-immigration platform. A recurrent theme we found among these critics of immigration policy was that immigrants represent a threat to American “culture” and to the American “way of life.” This perception was generally attributed to, among others, a failure and lack of motivation to learn English and to otherwise assimilate into the American culture. This view that a lack of assimilation is an important aspect of what’s wrong with immigration is not isolated to activists and politicians. The 2010 Public Opinion Study conducted by The Chicago Council on Global Affairs showed that 83 percent of Americans would favor an immigration reform package that would require unauthorized immigrants to either leave the country or pay back taxes and learn English (see Figure 11).

Any attempt to understand, much less fashion a set of policies to address the current U.S. immigration debate must consider these perceptions of American culture under siege and the importance of how America integrates newcomers into our society as part of the immigration process.

Those who decry the erosion of American culture reflect one side of an historic debate in this country about who we are as a people and a nation. Ross Douthat of The New York Times described this debate as two Americas. In the “First America”:

It doesn’t matter what language you speak, what god you worship, or how deep your New World roots run. An America where allegiance to the Constitution trumps ethnic differences, language barriers, and religious divides. An America where the newest arrival to our shores is no less American than the ever-so-great granddaughter of the Pilgrims.
In the “Second America,” this country is not “just a set of political propositions” but represents a “distinctive culture”:

This America speaks English, not Spanish or Chinese or Arabic. It looks back to a particular religious heritage: Protestantism originally, and then a Judeo-Christian consensus that accommodated Jews and Catholics as well. It draws its social norms from the mores of the Anglo-Saxon diaspora—and it expects new arrivals to assimilate themselves to these norms, and quickly.  

Many of the loudest critics of America’s immigration policy tend to live in this Second America.

Ross Douthat concludes that “these two understandings of America, one constitutional and one cultural, have been in tension throughout our history,” and he suggests that aspects of both are needed to craft sensible immigration policy.

Other conservative thinkers, on the other hand, are not as sure. In one of his last articles before his death, the eminent conservative political science professor Samuel Huntington argued that immigration from a mix of European countries has given way to immigration from one dominant source: Mexico. He saw this as threatening to American culture. Huntington argued that increased flows from Mexico posed this risk because of the sheer numbers of Mexican immigrants and their proximity to their home country. This puts the United States at risk of losing its core culture and becoming more like Mexico, rather than Mexican immigrants becoming more American.

For Huntington, an Anglo-Protestant culture is the key to American national identity. The chief elements of that culture include “the English language; Christianity; religious commitment; English concepts of the rule of law, including the responsibility of rulers and the rights of individuals; and dissenting Protestant values of individualism, the work ethic.” Historically, says Huntington, “immigrants were attracted to the United States because of this culture and the economic opportunities and political liberties it made possible. Contributions from immigrant cultures modified and enriched the Anglo-Protestant culture of the founding settlers. The essentials of that founding culture remained the bedrock of U.S. identity, however, at least until the last decades of the twentieth century.”

In the last decades, according to Huntington, the culture of the founding fathers has come under attack by multicultural elites, a disproportionate number of immigrants coming from Mexico, and “the forces of globalization.”

But navigating today’s global political, cultural, and economic landscape requires new tools that Huntington seemed to downplay, or overlook. In fact, the legacy of the U.S. Civil Rights Movement, globalization and international economic integration, and the changing demographics of American society together offer a basis upon which to rethink not only our immigration policy but also how we view the “culture versus constitution” debate, which may have now become antiquated and possibly irrelevant. The concept of American cultural identity—whether based upon Judeo-Christian and Anglo-Saxon culture or upon our constitutional principles and institutions—is evolving from the traditional rubric in which newcomers shed their own culture, adopt an American cultural identity, and become absorbed into the American “melting pot.” Modern trends in immigration suggest that immigrants are retaining key aspects of their own foreign culture and are contributing to an American cultural “mosaic,” wholly American but consisting of diverse cultures. This paradigm shift may be both the most important and the most difficult component of the immigration debate. It may also be exactly the shift in mindset that America needs to adopt if it is to succeed in a fast-moving, globalized, intensely diverse political and economic landscape.

Americans will need to move beyond twentieth-century thinking and embrace evolving twenty-first century concepts of diversity, pluralism, and citizenship in order to manage our growing diversity, compete in the global marketplace, and lead in a world where countries like Brazil, China, Indonesia, and Turkey are rising. America is becoming a more culturally and ethnically diverse society in a more globally integrated world, and to maintain a position of leadership in the new world order, our attitudes, our understanding, and our policies must reflect that reality.

Developing an “American Identity”

Globalization and diversity are here to stay. America is a more diverse society and the world is more economically integrated. There is no going back, only devising strategies to maintain America’s competitiveness in the face of these changes. In order for the growing number and diversity of immigrants coming to America’s shores to be an
Emerging Trends in Mexican Migration

In a July 6, 2011, report, *The New York Times* described a new phenomenon that may be the start of a fundamental shift in Mexican immigration. Better social and economic opportunities in Mexico, fewer opportunities and more risk in the United States, and an increasingly expensive and dangerous border crossing have combined to dramatically slow the flow of unauthorized Mexicans into the United States. Once an “inevitable rite of passage” for many, especially young adult males, crossing the border is no longer the best or only option for many Mexicans. The Mexican Migration Project at Princeton University showed that “for the first time in sixty years, the net traffic [of unauthorized immigrants] has gone to zero and is probably a little bit negative.” As conditions in Mexico change, patterns of unauthorized immigration may correspond. Whether decreasing immigration from Mexico will have a positive or negative impact on the future of American competitiveness remains an open question.

**Figure 12 - An Estimate: Percent of Mexicans Entering the United States Illegally for the First Time**

The annual estimates are based on a long-term academic study that has surveyed 800 to 1,000 Mexican households each year since 1982. The survey includes questions about historical migration, which are used to generate the estimates for years before 1982.

- **1979** Beginning of Mexican oil boom.
- **1982** Mexican debt crisis.
- **1989** Reforms by President Carlos Salinas start to improve the Mexican economy.
- **1994** Peso crisis begins.
- **2000** The election of President Vicente Fox ends 71 years of one-party rule.
- **2009** The only year in which none of the thousands surveyed made a first illegal trip to the US.

**Source:** Mexican Migration Project, Princeton University

asset for the country, America must ensure that these immigrants be fully incorporated as members of our society. The diverse needs of the new immigrant populations require shifts in our thinking about and approach to immigration in order to nurture a sense of “identity” and “belonging” among newcomers.

Fostering this sense of belonging—of having a personal stake and place in this country—is an integral part of the immigration pro-
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ing to pinpoint causes for the youth riots in an immigrant ghetto of Paris in 2005, researchers found clues in the symbols that protesters employed. Instead of creating banners or burning French flags, the young protesters, children of immigrants but French citizens themselves, often flashed their government-issued French ID cards to television cameras, signaling their uncomfortable predicament of being simultaneously permitted and ignored.67

Alienation can lead to the very isolation and radicalization that many fear. By contrast, engaging immigrant groups in our institutions and public spaces facilitates more complete integration, external acceptance, and self-identification of immigrants as fully American.

Integration is at the core of Chicago’s relative success in managing immigration. Chicago’s welcoming atmosphere, which celebrates its diversity as a “city of neighborhoods” and status as a sanctuary city allows for an organic integration of newcomers and diverse cultures into the city’s social and economic fabric. This has made immigration a net asset for Chicago and can be a model for other urban centers in the country and in the world.

**Kiss Me, I’m Nigerian: A New Understanding of Identity**

Many immigrants are redefining the traditional notion of both integration and assimilation into the American “melting pot,” neither fully reflective of Ross Douthat’s First America, or “constitutional” concept of citizenship, nor Sam Huntington’s concept of an historically pure “cultural” America. Some social scientists have referred to this new process as “segmented assimilation,” in which different immigrant groups and individuals follow different paths toward incorporation in American society.68 With increased numbers and modern communication technology and transportation available to them, many recent immigrants actively hold onto their own cultural identities and maintain close ties with their countries of birth. New immigrants are developing a nuanced concept of identity that incorporates what is culturally unique to their ethnic and national backgrounds into the social, cultural, and political norms of their new home to create something new and authentically American. As the political scientist Robert Putnam has eloquently stated:

A society will more easily reap the benefits of immigration, and overcome the challenges, if immigration policy focuses on the reconstruction of ethnic identities, reducing their social salience without eliminating their personal syncretic, ‘hyphenated’ identities; identities that enable previously separate groups to see themselves, in part, as members of a shared group with a shared identity.69

Throughout history, various immigrant groups have arrived at America’s shores and faced the challenges of becoming fully incorporated and socially integrated into society. Each of these groups became wholly American, but proudly associated with their individual ethnic origins as well. We are all familiar with the buttons worn on St. Patrick’s Day that invite everyone to “Kiss me, I’m Irish.” This kind of “hyphenated” identity is nothing new and is even more essential in the modern global context in which we live.

Supporting programs and organizations that provide assistance to new immigrants and help them navigate and engage with their new society—and embracing the more cosmopolitan form of American identity occasioned by globalization—is an approach to immigration that is true to the very essence of our particular national experiment, built from its inception upon (voluntary and involuntary) immigration. Notwithstanding Huntington’s arguments, the essence of America is not just democracy or diversity, but pluralism. For Huntington a “pure” American culture has produced America’s political institutions. For others, the political institutions established by America’s founders have promoted and protected a pluralist American culture, a culture that has been welcoming to immigrants. As Harvard Professor Diana Eck has written:

All of America’s diversity, old and new, does not add up to pluralism. ‘Pluralism’ and ‘diversity’ are sometimes used as if they were synonyms, but diversity is just plurality, plain and simple—splendid, colorful, and perhaps threatening. Pluralism is the engagement that creates a common society from all that plurality. In Silver Spring, Maryland, the Vietnamese Catholic church, the Cambodian Buddhist temple, the Ukrainian Orthodox church, the Muslim Community Center, the Disciples of Christ church, and the Mangal Mandir Hindu temple are all located in the same

---

neighborhood. This is certainly diversity, but without any engagement or relationship with one another it may not be an instance of pluralism.\textsuperscript{70}

This concept of pluralism encompasses an engaged diversity. It is through engagement among and between immigrants and native-born Americans that true integration of newcomers can be achieved. Engagement fosters understanding and trust, creates a sense of identity and ownership, and gives immigrants and natives a stake in local institutions and their communities. In short, it fosters true integration of immigrants and eliminates many of the fears of immigration opponents. Engagement nurtures a process by which we truly “become one people.”\textsuperscript{71}

The first federal immigration law, the Naturalization Act of 1790 (1 Stat. 103), restricted naturalization to “any alien, being a free white person.” While we have come a long way in our concept of citizenship since that time, even the framers embraced the concept of birthright citizenship. During this time of economic and geopolitical uncertainty and fear, there is no better time to revisit this time-tested right. This may no longer be the same America that was once familiar, but it is no less America. And it is an America that is probably better positioned to thrive and lead in a diverse political landscape and a globalized economy. Our competitiveness in the world is in part due to the diverse cultures than enable us to interpret information faster, understand cultures better, and act more quickly in a globally integrated world.

At the beginning of this chapter we suggested that immigration, at its essence, was a process of social interaction. Tanya Menon, in the next chapter, shows us that to a great extent, citizenship is a psychological and social construct. As part of managing this changing social construct—to allow immigrants to successfully and fully integrate into American society for the benefit of immigrants, natives, and the country as a whole—Americans have to construct, embrace, and engage a modern, nuanced, and more cosmopolitan concept of what it means to be “American.” To sustain this competitive advantage brought by our diverse population, we need to support this engagement by all who call our country home.


\begin{quote}
Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door!\textsuperscript{72}
\end{quote}

Emma Lazarus’ famous 1883 poem emblazoned on the Statue of Liberty represents one attitude toward immigrants, welcoming anyone to America. However, people’s actual attitudes toward immigrants are more complex. Throughout the country’s history, people have welcomed certain types of immigrants more than others. This is the key question of this chapter: who comes to be seen as an “insider,” who can readily pass through national boundaries, and who gets relegated to the “outside,” inspiring resentment and perhaps protest? This question is central to the topic of immigration because it underlies our basic emotional reactions to the various people who flow into the country, dynamically reshaping our national complexion. Why might some types of immigrants bother us, while we celebrate others?

The immigration issue is important to the discussion of American identity more generally because it highlights how people define what it means to be an American. Immigrants are diverse outsiders with different languages, beliefs, and traditions, who blur our taken-for-granted assumptions about what it means to be an American. But all societies contain members, even if they are technically insiders, who may violate people’s sensibilities and whose legitimacy is somehow questioned. The immigration debate thus puts the spotlight on diversity and tests how people tolerate violations of taken-for-granted standards of group membership. As examined

in the previous chapter, the immigration debate leads us to ask the question: Who do we perceive as a “true American,” i.e., a legitimate member of our society, and why do we confer that status on them? Even if people talk about countries as if they were clear entities and they assume that citizenship is an unambiguous, legalistic term, I argue that national boundaries are cognitive constructions. The process by which people define who is in and who is out of the groups they call their own is psychological. Thus, if boundaries are cognitive constructions, the key problem that emerges is that different people may draw the boundaries of the country and who is or is not a true member on very different bases. As such, this cognitive construction is often contested, leading to the social and political tension we are embroiled in today.

These issues reverberate in two national debates. First, the question of President Obama’s “legitimacy” as president turns on the issue of whether he is a “true” American. Is the child of an African immigrant father and White mother a “true” American? And even if he’s certifiably a U.S.-born citizen, does he “think” and “act” as people expect a “real” American to, or is he instead an apologizing elitist who secretly harbors distaste towards the American social and economic way of life?

Second, whereas Obama is at the pinnacle of America’s organizational chart, the immigration debate reveals how these same issues are playing out in all social strata. To whom should we open our boundaries? Should we allow more foreigners to claim good American jobs when Americans are struggling to find good work themselves? And should we embrace our unauthorized farm workers, busboys, and nannies as Americans?

What follows below are two simple thought exercises to reveal how we answer such questions. I’ve articulated various composites of people who occasionally emerge in our national discourse because they deviate from group membership in specific ways. The question for you is simple: Ask yourself which you feel is the true American. Rate it on a scale of 1 to 10 (1 is not a true American at all, 10 is quintessential American).

1. An Asian engineer who becomes a U.S. citizen at the age of 35
2. An Arab woman (who is an American citizen) who wears a veil and full burka
3. A healthy American citizen who has never been steadily employed
4. An unauthorized Mexican immigrant who has lived in America for decades, working on farms, while his son (an American citizen) is fighting in Iraq.
5. A high-level executive who has been caught for tax evasion.
6. A twenty-five-year-old American who doesn’t bother voting or performing jury duty
7. A White American professor who has dedicated his career to criticizing and exposing United States policy abroad.
8. A White American who believes that America would be better off without ethnic/religious minorities and immigrants
9. An American who has lived in Asia for the past few decades because he got a good job there.
10. An American who has always preferred the French way of life, who married a French spouse, and has decided to live and retire there.

Some of these characters are immigrants to America, some are Americans entering other countries, and some are simply Americans in their home country. What unites them all is that they blur the boundaries of group membership, violating what certain people might see as the standards of group membership. By seeing who you let in and who you keep out of your cognitive construction of America, you can see the bases on which you mentally define the boundaries of the country. Looking back at the ten characters, consider what you saw as the fundamental bases of membership and what kinds of transgressions bothered you. Did you assume that:

Moving Forward: The Immigration Debate and Chicago's Experience

IV. How We Psychologically Define National Boundaries: Seeing ‘Insiders’ and ‘Outsiders’ in Our Midst

1. Being American was about birth?
2. Being American was about way of life, i.e., artifacts of cultural assimilation?
3. Being American was about economic contribution?
4. Being American was a legal status?
5. Being American was about following the laws of the land?
6. Being American was about civic duty/social contribution?
7. Being American was about public loyalty to U.S. policies?
8. Being American was about tolerance of our diversity?
9. Being American was about physical location?
10. Being American was a personally chosen identity?

As you think about your answers, first imagine how they might have been different if each of the prototypes was associated with a different race. Race shapes people’s perceptions too—as much as we might deny it. In a famous paper, Thierry Devos and Mazharin Banaji (2005) showed that people considered famous Asian Americans (like Connie Chung—raised in Maryland) as “less American” than various famous white people (e.g., Hugh Grant, who is actually British).75

Second, think about how other people in America might have answered the same questions. How might their age or race have shaped their answers? And perhaps most interesting, how might political affiliation affect who people see as the true Americans? People within a country such as Republicans and Democrats have fundamentally different ideas about how we should define and control the boundaries of this country, and the immigration debate underscores this struggle.

Third, consider how the various types of threats we face today might make particular bases of citizenship matter more. If it was September 11, 2001, again, might that Arab woman in a burka seem even more threatening than she does today, ten years later when the image of the smoking tower has receded in importance? If it was a time when the economic situation looked less grim, would the American who is an economic burden on the rest of us or that engineer who is taking our good jobs seem a little less threatening? While we imagine that our beliefs are stable and persistent, psychological research suggests that situational factors cause dramatic moment-to-moment shifts in our beliefs. In my own research I’ve shown how threats affect the way we think about corporate boundaries and how we see our networks. As situations shift, so do the threats that we feel and the boundaries of our groups.

Finally, consider the inverse of each prototype, a person who represents each base of group membership perfectly rather than violating them as above. The inverse of the immigrant might be someone who has Mayflower ancestors. The inverse of the welfare recipient might be the self-made millionaire who seems to be the ultimate social and economic contributor to America. Politicians can make or break their careers by embodying what the public imagines a true American should look like. Perhaps it is the African/White bicultural who bridges America’s racial divide; or the plain-speaking, religious, frontier woman; or the billionaire real-estate tycoon who embodies the quintessential American. The person who best captures the public’s image of a “true American” at a particular moment captures our hearts and minds and political power too.

Let me close with a final thought. I’ve been describing how our notions of country and group membership are cognitive constructions—images we are creating, that are in flux and in contestation. It might appear that I’m suggesting that boundaries aren’t real—they are a mere product of our psychology. But let’s consider a final thought experiment. Imagine a world without real boundaries. What if we loosened up boundaries such that anyone could go anywhere? Forget visas and consulates. If America needed farm laborers, people who wanted farm jobs could simply enter. If companies needed employees, they could simply hire the best from anywhere in the world without additional costs or worries about laws or labor unions. And if you preferred to collect social services, you could just go to the country that best served your economic interests.

It feels fundamentally threatening to imagine this world. This world suggests a redefined economic hierarchy. If it were a truly free market for jobs, how would our personal position within it change? It feels less comfortable as we imagine those people who are hungrier and perhaps willing to work a little harder to move up. Would

people flow to the right places as efficiently as capital should? Or would their primordial connections to land keep them put, and worse, keep newcomers out so that this would be impossible in practice even if laws were loosened? And how should we rethink our tolerance of inequality? Our political debates now are dominated by arguments of equality—the struggles of the American middle class in the current economic turmoil and how to redistribute income to maintain their standard of living. But these debates are remarkably silent about poor people throughout the world, some of whom would sell us a kidney for a week’s worth of food. This world of open borders would force us to confront our tolerance for poverty worldwide and rethink how we distribute social services.

The point of this rather threatening thought experiment is that boundaries have and will have enduring power. But at the same time, boundaries are dynamic and shifting as people come to terms with others that push those boundaries in various ways and provoke ambiguities. Indeed, the more boundaries are blurred in practice, the more people are psychologically motivated to sharpen them because they find that ambiguity stressful. To understand how boundaries shift and how we negotiate them, we must understand the underlying forces that affect who we deem the “insiders” and “outsiders” in our midst.

Part of influencing the debate on immigration is to influence how people perceive these boundaries—to remind people of who and what defines an American. This includes hardworking immigrants who have come here to find a better life and make valuable contributions to our society. We can only take advantage of their talents if we welcome them and make their integration into society easier rather than obstruct their development by casting them as “outsiders.”

Chapter V:
Human and Moral Dimensions of the Immigration Debate

By William D. Burns, Paul Christensen, and Lillian Daniel

On June 22, 2011, Pulitzer prize-winning journalist Jose Antonio Vargas revealed his status as an unauthorized immigrant in a New York Times Magazine editorial.\(^{76}\) Vargas was sent to the United States as a young child by his mother without proper documentation to live with his grandparents so that he would have a better life than she could provide for him in the Philippines. He did not know about his unauthorized status until years later when he tried to obtain a driver’s license, and the only country he ever knew as home was the United States. He was forced to live his adult life using forged documents in order to study and work, always believing that if he were successful, the rest would work itself out. His story captured the nation’s attention when he wrote about the psychological effects of being labeled an “illegal” and never feeling like he completely belonged. When his story was published, he did not know if he would be forced to return to the country of his birth with the ten-year ban that forbids him from returning to the United States or applying for a visa, or if he would be able to stay.

Then there is the story recently reported in The New York Times about the Polish immigrant couple in Chicago, Janina and Tony Wasilewski, who both came to the United States on valid visas. They met and were married in the United States, opened a cleaning business, and had a son. Although Tony eventually naturalized and became a U.S. citizen, Janina’s original visa (for political asylum since she was a former Solidarity movement activist in communist Poland) expired. Since she was no longer in the United States seeking political asylum, immigration authorities deemed her status unauthorized and required her to return to Poland, respecting the ten-year ban on being able to return or apply for a Green Card.\(^{77}\) She and her son returned to Poland, fighting the legal battles for over four years from overseas before she was surprisingly allowed to


return. The story captured the nation’s attention about how current deportation laws tear families apart, even when they think they are doing everything right.

Another recent story in the Chicago Tribune told the heartbreaking and morally complex story of a young Mexican laborer who had fallen from a roof and lost the ability to speak, breathe, or move most parts of his body. After months of care in the Advocate Health Care system, twenty-year-old Quelino Ojeda Jimenez, who was in the United States without authorization, was loaded onto an air ambulance and flown to Oaxaca, capital of the Mexican state where he was born, in a process euphemistically called “hospital repatriation.” Mexicans living in Chicago who had rallied to his aid during his long hospitalization were shocked at his treatment. They and the Mexican Consulate begged that he be allowed to stay in this country, where he could receive the care he needed, but Ojeda was rolled away on a gurney, dressed in a hospital gown, crying. “They threw him out like he was a piece of garbage,” said Horacio Esparza, a disability rights advocate who runs the Progress Center for Independent Living in Forest Park. Ojeda was admitted to a Mexican hospital that reuses filters for the breathing machine needed to keep him alive. Advocate Health Care—the largest hospital network in Illinois—acknowledged it never obtained Ojeda’s permission to transfer him to Mexico, but spent about $650,000 on his medical care and $60,000 to transport him to Mexico.

The Moral Community

These stories reflect the complexity of the immigration issue, including its human impact. While legal and economic debates go on and we struggle as a nation with concerns over immigration, real people are suffering. And when the nation gets stuck, it falls to states and to cities like Chicago to define what it means to be a moral community. Surely we agree that morality and ethical concerns shape us, but who is a member of one’s moral community? As Chicago seeks to be a global city, its residents must face ethical questions that highlight the tension between nationalism and cosmopolitanism.

It is difficult to have a dispassionate conversation about immigration today. On all sides of the debate, people make moral and emotional claims. As early chapters showed, the facts are often elusive and open to interpretation. Moral and emotional claims tap into deep beliefs and anxieties, some of which have little to do with immigration, but reflect our larger anxieties about a changing world. A number of myths, positive and negative, cloud our thinking. Since undisputed factual evidence is hard to come by, other factors come into play. In this chapter we build upon the work of our colleagues, who examined the economic, political, and cultural aspects of the immigration debate, and focus on the moral and emotional drivers in order to continue to explore why this issue—which touches on such areas as national security, social services and health care, the economy, and employment and worker exploitation—is so charged.

Americans have a sense of their country as being a haven for the oppressed and a land of opportunity, where anyone who follows the rules and is willing to work hard and take risks can succeed. We pride ourselves on a fluid class structure. While many diverse groups have contributed to American history, these ideals tap into the iconic story of the early Pilgrims’ fleeing religious oppression and seeking economic prosperity. This history is emotionally freighted, and like many of the touchstones in the immigration debate, it may more accurately reflect what we wish we had been and what we aspire to be rather than what actually happened. In fact, upon their arrival, the Pilgrims set up systems in which only white, male, landowning church members could vote. And their history was just another layer on top of other histories, including that of those who were here long before. Our complex histories and the demands of the day have always been in tension.

Most Americans have an immigration story in their own family tree of which they are proud. Many Americans take great pleasure in our nation’s diversity and celebrate it. On a superficial level we are delighted that Thai food is now available in small towns across America. On a deeper level, we are committed to being a society that rejects racism, profiling, and stereotyping, while admitting that this too may be more aspirational than descriptive.

Immigration Raises Complex Emotions

But complex and deep emotions are also at work on the other side in this debate. Some Americans grieve the loss of a single language. They imagine that other immigrants from the past, many from their own families, assimilated more quickly. Subjectivity reigns in these assumptions and is difficult to address logically. Our colleagues dis-
cussed this in greater detail in Chapter III, when they explored the culture versus constitution debate.

In the past, one might have escaped being faced with immigrants by moving to certain enclaves or parts of the country. But now, as stated in the introduction, immigrants are living in more diverse areas—rural, urban, and suburban—and work in all sectors of the economy, sometimes competing for jobs or willing to work for lower pay and standards than native-born workers. For many working-class Americans, immigration has become the scapegoat, or at least a way to explain what they see as their lost way of life.

In the aftermath of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the immigration issue became another trigger for fear. Americans understand that there are people around the world who hate us and are willing to pay the ultimate cost in order to cause us pain. For some Americans, that fear has spread to include immigrants, who are no longer seen as hardworking folks in search of opportunity, but as potential enemies—and are treated as such. Last summer’s national debate over the location of Park 51 or the “ground zero mosque,” represented this fear.

People with these national security fears find the unquestioning or unconditional welcoming stance of their neighbors to be naïve and baffling, just as those who see immigrants as people like themselves in search of opportunity are puzzled by the fact that immigrants can be viewed as terrorist sympathizers.

While not everyone assumes that immigrants are more likely than others to be terrorists, many Americans seem to assume that most immigrants are here without authorization. According to a 2011 German Marshall Fund survey reported in Time Magazine, 58 percent of the Americans polled said that most immigrants did not have legal residency. But most of the nearly 38 million foreign-born residents in the United States—nearly three-quarters of them—are here legally as naturalized citizens or legal permanent residents, according to figures from the U.S. Census Bureau. The Department of Homeland Security and Pew Hispanic Center estimate that there are approximately eleven million unauthorized immigrants living in the United States, or less than 30 percent of the total foreign-born population. But the fact that unauthorized workers cannot be counted adds to a sense of fear and conspiracy in those who oppose the idea of their being allowed to work here unpunished.

The Hardship of Immigration

Often forgotten in the debate is the fact that five million of the estimated eleven million unauthorized immigrants are children. Children born here are citizens, but if their parents are unauthorized, the adults can be deported and the families broken up. When a mother is deported, she faces a moral dilemma in the middle of her legal troubles: Should she take her child with her, or allow the child to stay here and be raised by others? While some might not approve, most can understand why a mother in that situation would come back into the country again and again and again, risking everything to be with the child she wants to raise with a better life.

Some faces of immigration are those of hard-working persons who succeed in America and add to the social capital of the country. There are so many inspirational stories, from leaders in Chicago who came here as young unauthorized immigrants to the corporate executives who lead major Fortune 500 companies.

Other faces of immigration are those of suffering—the face of a sick man being deported, a father being forced to decide whether to leave his wife and child, indeed, the child itself, who has no decision-making power at all. With the failure of the DREAM Act, teenagers who grew up in the United States but were brought to the country illegally as children get to the point where they want to go to college but do not have access to financial aid. They can get stuck in low-wage jobs, unable to make it to the next level through education.

Unauthorized Immigrants Pay Taxes

Each individual in the United States, regardless of citizenship or legal status, pays sales tax and contributes to property taxes, even if they are renting from a landlord who pays property tax. Beyond that, the amount in taxes an unauthorized immigrant pays depends largely on whether or not that person uses an illegitimate Social Security number, which can be bought on the black market or fabricated. Federal, state, and local taxes are withheld from their paychecks as they are with any citizen or legal resident, but they cannot collect the benefits. The Institute for Taxation and Economic Policy, based on estimates of each state’s unauthorized population, calculated that households headed by unauthorized immigrants paid over $11 billion in state and local taxes, including $499.2 million in Illinois. The Social Security Administration keeps the “earnings suspense file” for taxes submitted with invalid Social Security Numbers. The New York Times reports that since the 1986 passing of stricter penalties for employers of unauthorized immigrants, the file has grown rapidly, adding over $150 billion from 2000 to 2002.

Some are deported and sent to countries they have no memory of, as out of place there as any foreigner would be.

The stories of Jose Antonio Vargas, Janina and Tony Wasilewski, and Quelino Ojeda Jimenez illuminate the moral issues associated with the burdens that unauthorized immigration places on social services and health care. Opponents of immigration claim that unauthorized immigrants are a drain on programs like Medicare and Social Security. But in fact, many unauthorized workers pay taxes, as our colleagues showed in Chapter I. And if they use fake Social Security numbers, they won't receive benefits from that program or Medicare. When given the opportunity, many workers who cannot get a Social Security number request a tax identification number because they want to pay into the system.

The American economy depends heavily on unauthorized workers, creating a moral quandary for small business owners. Farmers across the country rallied to fight a bill that would force them and all other employers to verify the legal immigration status of their workers, a move some said could imperil future harvests, according to a July 2011 New York Times article.60 One Michigan cherry orchard farmer noted in The Voice of Agriculture newsletter that although he tried to hire local employees to work on his farm, “the lack of work experience and skills by many was disturbing; propositions to receive payment ‘under the table’ so they could continue to receive unemployment benefits was appalling; and each left me scrambling to find qualified replacements when they left.”61 Amidst the turnover, he has found that the mobile migrant workforce is “essential to the success of each year’s crop.” He concluded by saying: “They aren’t the cause of the financial dismay our country is facing. In fact, I could argue that by moving around the country to stay employed, seasonal laborers are a model of work ethic and entrepreneurship.”

A related moral issue concerns the problem of how to protect native-born workers from the competition posed by immigrants who are willing to work for less. Competition for jobs comes not only from unauthorized immigrants but also from the so-called guest worker, who receives a visa to enter the United States to work in a particular place. Such a worker does not have full protection under U.S. labor laws and is therefore more reluctant to complain about mistreatment and substandard working conditions. If such guest worker positions did not exist, might these jobs become better full-time jobs that included benefits?

The religious community has taken on the immigration issue in Chicago and around the country, and this has made for some strange bedfellows. Some Christians who might be divided on such issues as marriage equality and abortion find themselves working together on immigration issues that affect church members. While most mainline Protestant denominations as well as Jews and Muslims have long histories of being concerned with the rights of immigrants, evangelicals are increasingly worried about the justice issues faced by the people in their pews. The three Abrahamic faiths all have sacred scriptures that place a high premium on hospitality to the stranger. They also share a belief in the dignity of the human being, which has led many religious leaders and congregants to tackle such issues as substandard working conditions and lower wages for immigrants. The Chicago-based national organization Interfaith Worker Justice, for example, has pulled together a vast collection of interfaith resources so that congregations can engage the immigration issue in their worship and in study through the lens of worker justice.

The path to citizenship is another area where moral questions arise. So often people will say, “I have nothing against immigrants, I just want them to come into the country legally.” It is only natural for law-abiding citizens to wonder why others shouldn’t follow the laws. But in our research we have seen what it takes for a Mexican to enter the United States legally and gain citizenship, let alone someone from Syria or Pakistan, where different levels of scrutiny may be applied. There is the smallest chance it will happen, even if you do everything right and win the lottery system, as the introductory story showed.

People will often say that America is a nation of laws and that we have to respect the laws that we have in place or everything will unravel. They apply this principle to immigration, saying that there is no excuse to break the law and enter the country illegally. Inherent in that point of view is the unstated assumption that our immigration laws are just and worth following—that our immigration policies are fair and worthy of that respect.

### Inequality Is Rooted in America’s History

If you look at our history of immigration as a nation, it gives a much-needed perspective on what the American people were capable of accepting as fair and just in their laws related to this complex topic.
Take, for example, the Indian Removal Act of 1838 that resulted in the “Trail of Tears,” where 70,000 Native Americans were uprooted from their homes and their land at gunpoint. That was the law. There was the Slave Fugitive Act of 1850, where helping a slave find his or her way to freedom was a violation of the law. If you helped a slave, you were violating a law that, clearly, the majority of Americans accepted as just and fair.

The Page Law of 1875 prohibited Asian women from immigrating to the United States. Why wouldn’t you want Asian women, specifically, to come to the United States? The economy was riding on the backs of male Chinese workers who were building the railroad for very low wages, but our government did not want these men to be able to settle here, form families, and have roots. When the country did not need these Asian male workers anymore, the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 was passed, which barred any Chinese people from immigrating to America. That was repealed as late as 1943 under pressure from the new American relationship with the Chinese during World War II.

Meanwhile, the Executive Order 9066, signed in 1942, gave the U.S. Army the power to arrest every Japanese-American on the West Coast. In that time period 120,000 men, women, and children of Japanese descent were sent to internment camps in isolated regions and kept under armed guard in one of the saddest stories in American history.

Many of our laws from the past appear unjust and cruel in hindsight, which might lead us to ask ourselves where our own blind spots are today.

The Power of the Human Spirit

So often our laws are shaped by political concerns rather than humanitarian ones. The get-tough immigration law that Arizona enacted in 2010 energized the national debate on that subject and made states realize that they may have to be the ones to make moral and ethical decisions about immigration rather than a deeply divided federal government. By examining some of these issues in this chapter, we hope to advance the possibilities for a civil discourse that does not drown itself in emotion, but takes the human being into account. When a paraplegic man is flown out of the country he knows to one where he cannot be adequately cared for, whatever side we are on, we must take note of the tear in his eye and understand the human cost of our decisions. And in the enormous contributions that immigrants make to our communities and for the businesses that depend upon them, we can be inspired by the courage of people who are willing to venture into a new country in order to give their children something better. The same power of the human spirit that compelled a young Englishman to sign up for duty as a cabin boy and cross the ocean for a better life in 1630 on the Mayflower is the same spirit that compels a college graduate from Mexico to work as a hotel housekeeper, cleaning toilets and making beds, to send money back to her family. Both of these people were at that moment emerging leaders themselves, taking risks to move ahead.

That mighty human spirit is distributed equally and without partiality in the hearts of all humanity. It will always triumph, ultimately, over cruelty and division, as long as we who believe in it are willing to stand up, not just for ourselves, but for our brothers and our sisters, for their dreams, for their families, no matter the the town of their birth or the road they have travelled. Chicago is the place where we can do this, and have done it before, when people of good will work together for the dignity of all people, motivated by hope, not fear.
Chapter VI
Immigrants Are Key to Chicago’s Global Competitiveness

By William D. Burns, Evelyn Diaz, Barbara Higgins, John Murray, and Jim O’Connor

Since Chicago first attracted the attention of French explorers Louis Jolliet and Jacques Marquette and the first settler, Haitian-born Jean Baptiste Point du Sable, waves of immigrants from China, Italy, Ireland, Mexico, Poland, and other countries have shaped Chicago into the city we know today.\(^{82}\) We have examined the impact of immigration on the United States population as a whole. Looking locally, nearly 20 percent of the Chicago region’s residents are foreign born, according to the Illinois Council for Immigrant and Refugee Rights. From 1990 to 2006 the foreign-born population in Illinois rose 86 percent. Chicago derives great strengths from the diversity created by immigration: a talented and varied workforce, unique cultural institutions, restaurants of every kind, attractive ethnic neighborhoods, and a vast array of leading international businesses providing goods, services, and jobs.

Because of our history as an immigrant-friendly city, we believe that our future success as a top-tier global city remains inexorably tied to immigration. While immigrants have contributed to Chicago’s rich cultural history, their diversity physically and culturally shaping the city, they have also been indispensible to its economic life. This chapter examines the characteristics that make cities globally competitive and argues that immigrants have played and will continue to play a critical role in each of the key dimensions required to make Chicago competitive.

Chicago Needs to Be a Global City to Thrive in the Twenty-First-Century Global Economy

According to the United Nations, for the first time in history more people around the world now live in urban centers than in rural areas. This number is projected to increase at an accelerated pace, with demographers expecting that 70 percent of the world’s population will live in cities by 2050 (see Figure 13).\(^{83}\) As cities respond to their increasing importance in the global economy and the pressures that these new populations place on their social and physical infrastructure, they compete for resources to sustain growth in this fierce environment. The cities that rise above the rest, the peaks amidst the valleys, are the drivers of the global economy, the hubs of information and activity, and the source of the movement of people, goods, and capital.

We now live in a globalized world in which cities compete not just against their regional or national peers but against cities in other countries. Chicago no longer primarily competes against Cleveland, Detroit, or Pittsburgh as it did in the industrial age. It now also competes against Mumbai, Paris, São Paulo, and Shanghai for fiscal and human resources. Cities need to assert their influence in the global economy to succeed and thrive in this new global order. In order for Chicagoans to afford the educational success, safety, and city ser-

\(^{82}\) This chapter refers to Chicago’s metropolitan region as defined by the U.S. Census, which includes Cook, DuPage, Kane, Kendall, Lake, McHenry, and Will counties.
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All of these studies use similar criteria to rank the level of influence of urban areas and metropolises around the world. Each of these well-respected studies presents a similar argument: To compete in the twenty-first-century global economy, cities must possess more than just a strategic geographic location, natural resources, or dense populations. They must be:

- economically successful;
- a destination for the world’s leading human capital and talent pool;
- culturally diverse, offering an exceptional quality of life; and
- globally connected and engaged.

As previous chapters in this report have noted, specific quantifiable data on the net economic value of immigrants is difficult to obtain. But it is our belief, our conviction, that immigrants play an integral role in each of the dimensions that make a city globally competitive and are therefore key to Chicago’s future as a top-tier global city. For too long the debate around immigration reform has been focused less on the contributions that immigrants make to our cities and our nation and more on the costs they impose on society. It is our hope that by looking at immigration through the lens of how it has benefited Chicago’s past and can benefit Chicago’s future, local leaders will be provided with the tools needed to influence national policy on this important issue.

Immigrants Contribute to Chicago’s Economic Vitality

Chicago’s position as a central hub for U.S. business is steeped in history and has seen growth over a period of a hundred years. Immigrants first were drawn to the region because of the factories and steel mills and jobs available in the manufacturing industry. Although that industry has declined, Chicago has reinvented itself as an exporter of services rather than steel, as a trading post for ideas and innovation. It is once again a magnet for immigrants.

Chicago has maintained a strong, increasingly high-tech industrial profile; is a center for wholesale and retail trade, distribution, and industrial and commercial exhibitions; has a huge presence in publishing; and is one of the leading centers of finance, banking, and

---

insurance in the United States. Many of these industries that contribute to Chicago's economic vitality rely heavily on immigrants for success. Immigrants play a role in the city's business activity, both with existing multinational corporations as well as with new business formation.

For many suburbs in the Chicagoland metropolitan area facing economic decline after jobs associated with manufacturing declined, immigrants have helped revitalize local municipalities. Immigrants also account for a significant portion of the population growth in the Chicago region. Bob Iger, chairman and CEO of Walt Disney Company and cochair of the Partnership for a New American Economy described in the Introduction, has said: “This country is built on the contributions of immigrants, whose different perspectives and ideas create new possibilities for all Americans.”88 We believe this is true not only for the nation, but for Chicago as well.

**Business Activity**

Chicago, long a hub of international business activity, is home to over 1,500 foreign-based companies. And with more than $40 billion in foreign direct investment, the city has been cited as having one of the top foreign direct investment strategies among major cities around the world.89 From 2004 to 2009 total international trade in the Chicago area increased from $95 billion to more than $128 billion. Global exports, led by medical and optical instruments, industrial machinery, and pharmaceutical products, totaled $32 billion, while imports, including electric machinery, industrial machinery, and mineral fuel, totaled $97 billion. The city’s major trade partners in 2009 were China ($31.4 billion), Canada ($14.6 billion), Japan ($13.7 billion), Korea ($8.6 billion), and Germany ($7.9 billion).90

The Partnership for a New American Economy released a report on “The New American Fortune 500” to explore the impact that immigrants have on our national economic development. Twenty-seven Fortune 500 companies are headquartered in Chicago. These are multinational companies with offices in countries ranging from India and Germany to Brazil and Australia that rely on talented, multilingual, multicultural employees to execute and lead their activities. Some of these companies’ top executives are foreign-born immigrants. Kraft Foods’ executive vice president, one of the most sought-after corporate leaders in the nation, is an immigrant from India who began his career “selling soap off a handcart in the countryside of India.”91 Motorola Mobility’s CEO, also an Indian immigrant, was featured in *Bloomberg Businessweek’s* “World’s Most Successful Immigrants” in 2009.92

Immigrants are also instrumental to new business formation, which leads to economic growth. The Kauffman Foundation, a Kansas City–based research and philanthropic foundation devoted to entrepreneurship and innovation, found in their Kauffman Index of Entrepreneurial Activity that immigrants create new companies in America at greater rates than native-born Americans.93 In their 2007 report, *America's New Immigrant Entrepreneurs*, the foundation found that immigrants have become a significant driving force in the creation of new businesses and intellectual property in the United States—and that their contributions have increased over the past decade. There was at least one immigrant key founder in 25.3 percent of all engineering and technology companies established in the United States between 1995 and 2005.94

Chicago is home to some of the leading technology firms in the nation. *Crain’s Chicago Business* featured an article in 2009 about how immigrant entrepreneurs spark the Illinois economy through start-ups and innovation.95 It cited a Latino Technology Alliance study showing that nearly 28 percent of Illinois’ engineering and technology companies were founded by immigrants. As the *Chicago Sun-Times* reported in 2010, “While Groupon is the undisputed tech story of the year in Chicago (if not the world), [it] is not the only game in town. . . . There are very positive signs that point to a larger trend. . . . Chicago is a great place to start up and incubate a tech-

---
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A Ukrainian immigrant created Chicago-based Invenergy LLC, the largest developer of wind energy in the country. A Greek immigrant, founder of Grecian Delight Foods Inc., invented the vertical broiler that enables hundreds of fast-food restaurants to sell gyros. Local immigrants argue that perhaps the struggle of moving to a foreign land and to a different culture is an experience that inspires them and their counterparts to be more entrepreneurial.

Economic Development

Chicago neighborhoods and suburban towns that are experiencing economic destitution sometimes look toward new immigrants to revitalize the neighborhoods. Mayor Laurent Gilbert of Lewiston, Maine, is quoted in the Partnership for a New American Economy as saying that “immigrants have been absolutely essential to the revitalization of our city. . . . When a new Somali population started to move in, people didn’t know what to think. They have become part of our community, opened businesses, and helped rekindle population and job growth.”

This trend is true for the Chicago region as well. Mayor Donald Peloquin of Blue Island, Illinois, emphasized in the 2006 Chicago Council Task Force Report A Shared Future: The Economic Engagement of Greater Chicago and Its Mexican Community that his town relies heavily on the contribution of its large immigrant population to thrive. The old railroad and industrial town suffered significant job losses over the past decades as plants moved out and small businesses closed down because shopping malls were erected. With more than half of the 23,500 residents of Blue Island being of Mexican descent, the mayor worked to engage the community by appointing Latinos to service boards and establishing new partnerships with the high schools and community colleges to increase economic activity. He said that “the work ethic and family values Latinos bring to Blue Island are the building blocks of a diverse community with a vibrant citizenry.”

The predominately Mexican neighborhood of Chicago known as Little Village is a thriving commercial area with more than a thousand businesses. The main street of the community is 26th Street, and it has been said that this shopping district is only second to posh Michigan Avenue in the amount of sales revenue it generates in Chicago. A report by the Center for Urban Economic Development at the University of Illinois at Chicago found that immigrant consumers create new jobs by increasing demand for the products and services produced by current and aspiring middle-class workers. In the Chicago metropolitan area alone, unauthorized immigrants spend $2.89 billion on goods and services, creating an additional 31,908 jobs in the local economy.

For years immigrants were credited with keeping Chicago’s housing market booming, a key driver of global investments to Chicago. As the value and volume of commercial real estate transactions rose worldwide in 2010, the flow of foreign capital into the Chicago property market jumped 80.4 percent to $2.1 billion, according to a Jones
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Population Replacement

Finally, immigrants play a critical role in maintaining and even increasing Chicago’s population. Population loss is a serious problem for cities because as people leave, so do the taxes they pay into the local government. The housing market and local businesses struggle with fewer people to support them. Local infrastructure suffers from lack of funding available to maintain the investments. And the burden to maintain what is left of the city is spread across the few people that continue to live there, oftentimes through increased taxes and fewer resources in return.

In a 2006 Chicago Federal Reserve Bank newsletter, economist Bill Testa noted that “owing to immigration, the Chicago area’s population growth has exceeded the surrounding region since the 1990s, and the Chicago metro area ranked fifth nationally in the proportion of foreign-born population, adding 537,000 people between 1990 and 2000.” In May 2011 The Chicago Community Trust released a report about what the 2010 U.S. Census tells us about metropolitan Chicago, finding that while the number of white and African-American residents declined in the region, much of the regional population growth was derived from the increase in Asian and Latino residents (see Figure 16).

This increase in population helps Chicago confront the struggles of other shrinking cities in the Midwest region. Cleveland, for example, has seen its population fall by roughly 50 percent since 1950, in part because it has lost its former status as a destination for immigrants. It was once 50 percent foreign-born. Today, only 4 percent of its population is foreign-born. As the Cleveland Plain Dealer argued in 2009, “If Cleveland is going to be a serious participant in the global economy, if it is going to attract the talent that fuels growth, and if it is going to give its battered neighborhoods an energy infusion, it needs a talent-attraction strategy that sees immigration as one of its cornerstones.”

As we discuss in the next section, immigrants provide not only population growth, but a workforce base and the human capital needed to keep industries thriving in the local economy.

Immigrants Strengthen Chicago’s Human Capital and Talent Pool

All of the studies referenced above that evaluate a city’s global competitiveness argue that one of the key elements needed in the global era is strong and diverse human capital, the pool of talent that will supply the workforce, keep the industries moving, be creative, and reinvest in communities. Once again, the 2010 Global Cities Index provides some perspective, finding that cities thrive and prosper through continued investment in human capital. The Index found

---
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that Chicago ranked fourth out of sixty-five cities around the world in the human capital category (see Figure 17). Some of the metrics used to measure this dimension include the number of international students studying at local universities and the size of the foreign-born population.

Amid the immigration reform debate, not enough attention is given to the value of the foreign-born students, inventors, entrepreneurs, and workers who contribute to our nation’s success. Both high-skilled and low-skilled immigrants present unique opportunities for Chicago’s global competitiveness, and Chicago is a destination for immigrants of all skill levels (see Figure 18).

In Chapter I, our colleagues explored the economic benefits of immigration through job and wealth creation in the United States overall. We explore the benefits to Chicago in this section.

High-Skilled Immigrants

A European regional analysis of the correlation between human capital development and economic growth concluded that the real key to economic growth is continuous development of highly skilled human capital. Global cities are magnets for diverse groups of people and talent, and Chicago has been attracting talent from around the world through both its universities and its businesses.

International students from all over the world come to Chicago to study in its top-ranking universities. The University of Chicago, for example, is ranked ninth in the nation according to the 2011 *U.S. News and World Report*. The school, which boasts twenty Nobel Prize laureates, including Milton Friedman (Economic Sciences, 1986) and Saul Bellow (Literature, 1976), takes pride in “reflecting the global diversity on its campus.” International students account


for 15 percent of the university’s undergraduate applicant pool and the university as a whole includes students from 110 countries outside of the United States. The university makes a concerted effort to attract “academically talented, intellectually ambitious candidates from around the globe who possess awareness of and curiosity about the world around them.”

There is appropriate and growing concern about the fact that ambitious foreign-born students graduating from American universities cannot easily obtain the visas necessary to stay and work in the United States. Nationwide, nearly 60,000 foreign students graduate with American degrees each year in technical fields such as science, technology, engineering, and math and then return to their home countries. A 2011 Wall Street Journal article cited a study that found that “for the first time, a majority of American-trained entrepreneurs who have returned to India and China believe they are doing better at home than they would be doing in the United States. The numbers weren’t even close: 72 percent of Indians and 81 percent of Chinese said economic opportunities were superior in their native countries.”

If Chicago continues to support its foreign-born population, encourage investment in international schools, and increase its recruitment and retention of international students and workers, it will arguably increase its ability to retain elements of this talent pool, further enabling the city to successfully compete in the global economy.

Low-Skilled Immigrants

Contrary to popular opinion, low-skilled immigrants are also an essential force behind Chicago’s economic vitality. Low-skilled immigrants typically have higher rates of employment and lower rates of household poverty than low-skilled U.S. citizens, according to a Brookings study. The U.S. Department of Labor predicts that the majority of jobs being created in the United States require only short-term on-the-job training. According to research conducted by Rob Paral & Associates, only a few of the major job sectors in Illinois that are being created demand high-skilled labor. The large percentage increase in new jobs is on the other extreme, requiring little formal education or certification or on-the-job training such as food preparation (20.6 percent), cleaning and maintenance (15.8 percent), construction (15.5 percent), and personal care (21.0 percent). These are industries where immigrants play a key role (see Figure 19).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Category</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>Percentage growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>19,876</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer and mathematical</td>
<td>-15,547</td>
<td>-10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health diagnosing and treating practitioners and other technical</td>
<td>20,662</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health technologies and technicians</td>
<td>15,492</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health-care support</td>
<td>17,245</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective service</td>
<td>16,128</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food preparation and serving related</td>
<td>52,689</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and grounds cleaning and maintenance</td>
<td>27,363</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal care and service</td>
<td>32,393</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and related</td>
<td>35,440</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office and administrative support</td>
<td>-54,526</td>
<td>-5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and extraction</td>
<td>42,580</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation, maintenance, and repair</td>
<td>-14,495</td>
<td>-7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>-64,506</td>
<td>-12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and material moving</td>
<td>18,084</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158,314</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Includes sectors with change of +/- 10,000 jobs


Immigrants Enrich Chicago’s Cultural Diversity and Quality of Life

Most studies that rank cities—whether in categories of most attractive, most livable, most successful, most global, most powerful, or
VI. Immigrants Are Key to Chicago’s Global Competitiveness

most influential—argue that the most successful cities are culturally rich and diverse and attract for newcomers for this reason. In the 2007 Chicago Council report The Global Edge: An Agenda for Chicago’s Global Future, the authors argued this point:

A global city needs the fine arts and popular culture, entertainment, good restaurants, athletic opportunities, and the other amenities that draw and keep creative people. It must be cosmopolitan, not provincial. It must be diverse, both ethnically and socially. A vibrant city thrives on differences and the clash of ideas and lifestyles. It is also a magnet for immigrants, who bring new blood, new ideas, and new money. A global city is not just tolerant of the unusual, but enthusiastic about embracing all that is new.

From its ethnic neighborhoods to its award-winning restaurants, from its world-renowned museums to its local festivals and parades, Chicago is a model of cultural diversity shaped by its many immigrant communities.

A City of Neighborhoods

Chicago’s moniker as “a city of neighborhoods” implicitly refers to the diverse mosaic of districts, each with its own character. Although the segregation of the city has led some to wonder about its ability to integrate, its distinct neighborhoods are considered some of the city’s most appealing qualities. For authentic cuisine, shops, and a taste of a foreign country, one only needs to travel to Greektown, Little Italy, or Chinatown in the surrounding neighborhoods of downtown Chicago. In addition, Middle Eastern fare is popular along Lawrence Avenue in the north, Polish traditions abound on the Northwest and Southwest sides, as does Mexican culture in Pilsen and Little Village, Vietnamese culture along Argyle Street, Korean customs along Lawrence Avenue, and Indo-Pakistani heritage on a stretch of Devon Avenue on the Far North Side. The diversity of Chicago is often promoted to locals and tourists alike, particularly on the city’s tourism website via the e-book Eat, Play, Love Our Neighborhoods.112

World-Renowned Assets

Chicago is also well known for its architecture, leading museums, and musical and theatrical performances. Its architectural reputation owes much to the presence of a wide variety of styles designed by both foreign-born and native-born architects. Many of the revered buildings that dot the city’s neighborhoods recall the faraway places from where their immigrant-populations hailed. Polish, German, and Russian churches, for example, are treasured buildings that in many cases serve as anchoring community centers to this day. They have remained important structures to neighborhoods long after the original immigrants that built them have moved away. The most influential architect of the twentieth century chose Chicago as his adopted city and home. Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, a German immigrant, pioneered modernism and helped build the city’s skyline, making Chicago the destination for architecture enthusiasts that it is today. Chicago’s openness and diversity in art and architecture are key factors in its reputation as both a livable and culturally diverse city. It is these qualities that simultaneously make it authentically American.

Chicago’s museums and cultural venues are world-renowned assets that increase Chicago’s reputation as a global city, but also reflect the talents and contributions of immigrants in the city. The Art Institute of Chicago, for example, is one of the leading art museums in the world, and it relies heavily on the support of donors to provide exhibits and bring new art to Chicago. A Chicago Tribune article in May 2011 recognized the important support of two Indian immigrants in Chicago who made possible an exhibit about Jaipur at the Museum.113 The Chicago Symphony Orchestra is one of the world’s most famous orchestras and has been led by international conductors for the past forty years. The Hungarian-born Sir Georg Solti, one of the greatest conductors of the second half of the twentieth century, led the orchestra from 1969 to 1991. Daniel Barenboim, born in Argentina, is regarded as one of the greatest musicians of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries and was music director of the orchestra from 1991 to 2006. And then there are all of the ethnic community cultural centers and heritage museums: the Swedish American Museum, the Chinese American Museum of Chicago, the Ukrainian National Museum, and the National Museum of Mexican Art, which is the largest Latino cultural organization in the country and the only Latino museum accredited by the American Association

112. Alan Solomon, Eat, Play, Love Our Neighborhoods (Chicago: City of Chicago Department of Cultural Affairs, 2010).

of Museums.\(^{114}\) Even public art around the city reflects the contributions of immigrants, as seen in the multitude of colorful murals by Latino artists in Pilsen and Little Village, hailing from Mexico, Cuba, and Puerto Rico.

**Immigrants Are Instrumental to Chicago's Global Engagement**

For Chicago to be a truly global city, it is not enough that it have economic vitality, the best human capital, and exceptional cultural diversity. It needs to be recognized by other global cities and leaders as a center of excellence and success, and it must engage with the world at all levels. Immigrants in Chicago play a vital role in not only representing Chicago's image overseas, but perhaps more importantly, in attracting international attention to the city. Through immigrant leadership in various organizations, media outlets, and with visiting delegations, Chicago is a place of global connectivity.

**Immigrants Help Create International Institutions in Chicago**

Some of the most important institutions that keep Chicago engaged with the rest of the world exist because of Chicago's immigrant populations. Chicago has twenty-eight International Sister Cities, about eighty consulates general, more than thirty international chambers of commerce, and over one hundred foreign-based trade organizations.\(^{115}\) The consulates general open offices in regions where they have large immigrant populations to represent, but they are also critical to keeping the host city linked with the respective country. Chicago has the second-largest number of consulates in the United States outside of New York due to the many immigrant communities that live here. Recently, the ambassador of Nigeria visited Chicago and said that his country was considering opening a consular office because of the increasing number of Nigerian immigrants in the region. Such developments are essential to Chicago's status as a global city because not only do they extend relations with new people and countries, they tap into new resources and open doors for new business opportunities and investments.
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**Chicago's Sister Cities and Consulates**

Since 1960, Chicago has signed Sister City agreements with Accra, Amman, Athens, Belgrade, Birmingham, Bogota, Busan, Casablanca, Delhi, Durban, Galway, Gothenburg, Hamburg, Kyiv, Lahore, Lucerne, Mexico City, Milan, Moscow, Osaka, Paris, Petach Tikva, Prague, Shanghai, Shenyang, Toronto, Vinci, and Warsaw.

Chicago has about eighty consulates general and honorary consuls, including from Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, The People's Republic of China, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Liberia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Netherlands, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Serbia, Singapore, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tanzania, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

The Sister Cities International Program is often chaired by an immigrant representing a partner country, and committee members consist of both immigrants and native-born Americans who share an interest in the country. Through people-to-people programs, festivals, and cultural exchanges, the program strengthens Chicago's civic, economic, and cultural ties and promotes greater cultural understanding. The chambers of commerce and trade offices enable member companies, firms, and executives to build important business relationships around the world. All of these institutions help strengthen and expand the city's global partnerships and therefore Chicago's global engagements. These institutions would not exist without the immigrant communities needed to create, lead, and attract them.

**Immigrants Help Draw International Visits to Chicago**

In addition to playing a vital role in building international institutions in Chicago, immigrants are key to attracting international attention to the city through visiting delegations and international conferences. Chicago has long been a leader in global conferences, offering a wide range of conventions and gatherings across a multitude of industries, from health care to manufacturing to nanotechnology, as well as hosting presidents and ambassadors of foreign countries interested in meeting with Chicago's leaders. But in recent years, Chicago has increased its stature from simply being a host city to being a city of action.
One of the most significant visits was that of the president of the People’s Republic of China, Hu Jintao, in January 2011, named the most powerful man in the world in 2010 by *Forbes*. Why he chose Chicago as the only other destination outside of Washington, D.C., during his visit to the United States is largely due to the role that the Chinese immigrant community has played in shaping our city. The *New Yorker* published an article examining why President Hu came to Chicago instead of Silicon Valley or New York, and highlighted a few obvious reasons such as Chicago being President Obama’s hometown and the headquarters of Boeing, which had recently sold China $19 billion in airplanes. But the article also went into the deeper reasons for the visit. These include the number of Chinese-based companies located in region; the Confucius Institute in Chicago, America’s largest Chinese-language education program through which 12,000 public school students learn Chinese; the fact that the city employs fifty-eight full-time Chinese-language teachers, and the desire to speak to the nearly 27,000 Chinese immigrants who chose to make Chicago their home. Importantly, these residents and businesses raise awareness of Chicago as a tourism destination to Chinese travelers, who spend on average $6,000 each when visiting the United States, more than twice that of UK visitors.

Such visits raise the profile of Chicago’s global stature and encourage other leading organizations and delegations to host events in Chicago, increasing its global connectivity. Most recently, it was announced that two major global summits, the G8 and NATO summits, will be held in Chicago in May 2012. If Chicago continues leveraging its immigrant communities to attract international attention, delegations, and conferences, it will someday move past being only a host city and move into being a city that shapes the world’s history.

**Immigrants Contribute to International Exposure on Chicago through the Media**

Global cities depend on their residents’ ability to quickly and easily access information, communicate with others, and be connected to the fabric of the global economy. A city’s information-exchange ranking depends not only on how “wired” it is, but also on the level of connection its residents have with the rest of the world. Which news outlets are available in a city depends on their ability to attract and retain readers. It is not surprising, then, that when such news outlets are located in the city, they reflect the interests of the population in their content and opinions. The *Wall Street Journal, Financial Times, Agence France-Presse, Reuters*, and *Xinhua* all have Chicago bureaus to cover the political and business news fostered by the city’s diverse population and business interests. A new Web site, “Chicago is the World,” launched by a former *Chicago Tribune* journalist, aims to showcase the value of Chicago’s ethnic media outlets and “to provide a wide audience to Chicago’s diverse ethnic community and culture, in addition to providing training and resources to ethnic journalists.”

Numerous studies have drawn a correlation between the cultural/ethnic mix of the population and the amount of coverage accorded to leading ethnic groups. Further, this correlation appears to trump geographic proximity to a foreign country as a driver of coverage for that country. If this “cultural proximity” is the primary driver of international coverage in newspapers, we can infer that a large foreign-born population will increase the amount of international coverage.

**Chicago’s Leaders Should Influence the Immigration Debate to Ensure the City’s Future Success**

Increasingly, business leaders, political leaders, and the general public are expressing their belief that the free movement of people is closely correlated with the free movement of capital. The opening of trade barriers across the globe has led to increased economic activity and impact, increasing the pressure on the United States to take action or risk falling behind.

Maintaining diversity is key to Chicago’s future global competitiveness, and a solution is needed that allows the city to continue to attract and welcome foreign-born workers and long-term residents. Chicago is not alone in facing this issue and cannot legislate national policy by fiat, but the city’s business and political leaders can take action to make their positions known and participate in (and perhaps lead) the national debate over immigration.

---


This chapter argued that the free flow of human capital, the non-physical assets of a person—such as skills or training—is positively correlated with increased economic activity and that Chicago has made strides to better position itself in the global economy. These efforts should be continued and built upon to ensure the city’s future global competitiveness. A concerted effort from Chicago’s business and political leadership will be instrumental in closing the gap with our international competition.

There are a number of actions that business and political leaders in Chicago can take to ensure the city’s competitiveness in the global economy.

- Business leaders should commit to actively supporting efforts to increase opportunities for foreign-born workers and entrepreneurs to gain employment and investment capital in order to stop the brain drain of talent.

- Business and civic leaders should support Mayor Emanuel’s push to expand upon the previous efforts of Mayor Richard M. Daley, World Business Chicago, the Chicagoland Chamber of Commerce, and The Chicago Council on Global Affairs to increase the reach of the city and attract talent and investment. The relationships that have been developed through International Sister Cities and the Chicago consular corps should be leveraged for these purposes.

- The city should continue to view immigration as a benefit and key contributor to its economic strength and diversity, and Mayor Emanuel should continue Chicago’s tradition as a sanctuary city for unauthorized immigrants.

The immigration reform debate needs to address the issue of economic impact and a city’s global competitiveness. It is critical that Chicago continue to attract the inventors, employees, and entrepreneurs that will create and fill the jobs of the next decade, provide the human capital needed for industries, enhance the city’s cultural diversity, and leverage Chicago’s global engagement. We believe that immigrants play an essential role in Chicago’s global future and short-sighted immigration policies can create barriers to Chicago’s potential to capitalize on the economic and human capital of its foreign-born population.

Chapter VII
Creative Policies and Bold Leadership: Two Tools for Cities and States to Shape the Immigration Debate

By Tony Davis, Jeanne Gang, Thomas M. Levinson, and Milena Novy-Marx

As stated in the Introduction, the locus of immigration activity is moving from the federal to the state and local levels. In the three years from 2007 to 2009, more than 4,300 immigration bills were introduced at the state level, up from just three hundred in 2005. As we write, the Obama administration is challenging a new Alabama law that would allow law enforcement agents to stop motorists on the suspicion that they are in the country illegally. The administration contends that Alabama’s state law conflicts with federal law. “You can only have one quarterback in a football game . . . and in immigration, the federal government is the quarterback,” argues the U.S. attorney for the Northern District of Alabama. This chapter will show that the struggle between federal and local jurisdiction is not a new one, but a constant theme in the American immigration debate. The chapter goes on to identify areas where local Chicago and Illinois political leaders and policies can and have made a meaningful difference.

At a minimum, city and state leaders can determine whether immigration “works.” States vary considerably in their immigration profiles and in the ways the economic, social, and political dynamics of immigration play out. Nonetheless cities and states have at their disposal a number of tools for dealing with immigration and have used them repeatedly throughout recent history. This is demonstrated most explicitly in the battle between sanctuary and secure communities, discussed below. But before turning to this, consider the recent gubernatorial and mayoral races in Arizona and Illinois.

In Arizona candidates sparred over the issue of immigration, targeting immigrants as a source of crime and a drain on public resources. The vitriol was spurred in part by the state’s passing in

April of 2010 a law that criminalized the presence in Arizona of any foreign-born person without documentation and that called on state police to enforce federal immigration laws, ushering in what many have called a *de facto* system of racial profiling. In contrast, analysts observing the campaign season in Chicago and Illinois noted the surprising absence of immigration as a hot-button issue. Illinois is not a border state like Arizona, but it does have one of the country’s largest populations of foreign-born residents.

Why has Chicago—and Illinois, for that matter—remained free of much (though by no means all) of the tension that surrounds the issue of immigration in many parts of the country? This chapter lays out two of the most powerful tools at the disposal of local leaders—creative policy and bold political leadership. These tools have helped Chicago and Illinois integrate immigrants, who in turn have contrib-

---

**Georgia Passes Strict Immigration Law and Sees Immediate Effects**

In the summer of 2011 Georgia passed a law designed to significantly increase the state’s capacity to enforce immigration laws, as Arizona and other states have done since 2010. The impact of the controversial legislation on the low-skill labor supply began to appear soon after its passage in industries that rely on such workers. The agriculture industry in Georgia felt the impact of the labor shortage immediately; the intense heat during the summer harvest left the vacated positions difficult to fill and may have caused crops to spoil before harvest. Restaurants experienced similar labor shortages. Some cheer this as a necessary step in managing unauthorized immigration, while others raise concerns about negative economic consequences and creating a culture of fear. Supporters and critics must now wait to see if these labor shortages will have a negative long-term economic impact or will decrease the unemployment rate as citizens and legal immigrants fill the open positions.

---

**The Role of Leadership**

Political leaders can champion immigration, promoting its benefits and serving as voices of moderation and acceptance. Alternatively, they can use immigrants as scapegoats to deflect attention from other issues and create coalitions based on fear or hatred. A look around the world shows both approaches being used. The ban on Muslim face veils in France underscores the country’s fractious relationship with immigrants at a time when the country faces many other pressing economic and political challenges. By contrast, rather than succumb to the temptations of easy political gain, Sydney, Australia, and Toronto, Canada, have adopted policies aimed at integrating immigrants and celebrating diversity.

In Chicago the City Council responded in July 2010 to the anti-immigrant legislation passed in Arizona with the strongest City Council resolution ever passed in Illinois. The resolution, drafted in cooperation with business, civic, and immigrant leaders, spoke out against the legislation and called for a boycott of city-sponsored economic activity in Arizona. For his part, Mayor Richard M. Daley was seen as a champion of immigrants throughout his long tenure, helping to put in place many of the policies that make Chicago a national leader in this area, from bilingual education to strengthening sanctuary city status to promotion of multilingual city services. These policies, and the mayor’s support, embraced immigrants regardless of their legal status. The mayor consistently voiced support for Chicago’s sanctuary city policy on unauthorized immigrants, even when it came under fire from officials outside of the city. A closer look at that policy provides a portrait of bold political and civic leadership.

---

**Two Tools for Cities and States to Manage Immigration**

In the absence of meaningful federal immigration reform, cities and states have increasingly filled the void. Our analysis suggests that cities and states have two basic tools for managing immigration: creative policies and political leadership. Cities and states can shape and implement policies regarding the amount and quality of services offered to immigrants. These policies can help acclimate and integrate immigrants and foster an environment that helps new businesses compete and thrive. These policies can also help immigrants realize their potential to contribute economically and socially and to promote economic vitality and competitiveness.
VII. Creative Policies and Bold Leadership:
Two Tools for Cities and States to Shape the Immigration Debate

1. Creative Policies: Such Policies at the State and Local Levels Have Helped to Defuse Anti-Immigrant Sentiment.

State-Level Policies

While our primary focus is on Chicago, state policy sets the tone for cities in many arenas and can color how cities approach immigration and integration.

Illinois has generally established itself as an immigrant-welcoming state. While the increase in immigration over the past decade has triggered substantial challenges—from providing suitable educational and health-care services to facilitating cultural acclimation—the state has often responded, especially on issues implicating unauthorized state residents, in trailblazing ways.

In 2010 Illinois received the *E Pluribus Unum* award, national recognition for its efforts at immigrant integration in Chicago and throughout the state. This included recognition of the state’s New Americans Integration Initiative, “an innovative public-private partnership that makes immigrant integration a deliberate, strategic priority for the state.”

For nearly a decade, the initiative’s programs have helped 42,000 people become U.S. citizens, have created immigrant welcoming centers, and ensured that an array of training and other services are accessible to people with limited English proficiency.

More recently, the Illinois legislature has rejected thirteen anti-immigrant and Arizona-style pieces of legislation. In May 2011 after the DREAM Act failed at the federal level, the Illinois Senate passed a state DREAM Act by a vote of 45 to 11 to allow access to private scholarships through Illinois’s college funding programs for children of unauthorized immigrants. The bill, SB 2185, requires that high school counselors be trained to inform students who are children of unauthorized immigrants about resources available to them to acquire higher education. The corresponding bill in the Illinois House of Representatives, HB 2185, also eliminates the precondition that participants in the state’s college savings programs are Illinois and, by definition, U.S. citizens.

Also in May 2011 Illinois Governor Pat Quinn notified the U.S. Department of Homeland Security that the state was officially withdrawing from Secure Communities, a federal deportation program designed to target individuals convicted of serious criminal offenses. Illinois withdrew largely because the program, which allowed state police to share fingerprints and other information with federal authorities, was in fact frequently used against unauthorized immigrants who had committed misdemeanors. Quinn’s May 2011 letter cited data gathered by Immigration and Customs Enforcement indicating that almost one-third of unauthorized immigrants deported...
Language Instruction

Language is critical to the integration of immigrants, as it provides opportunities to improve the educational outcomes for native and immigrant students alike. Largely because of immigration, 109 languages are spoken within the Chicago Public Schools (CPS) system. Peterson Elementary on Chicago’s northwest side has students from over thirty countries. More than one hundred thousand CPS students participate in world- or foreign-language programs at 233 elementary schools throughout the city that employ 731 instructors. There are 125 world-language programs in CPS high schools. Following September 11, 2001, when many cities began turning inward, Chicago began increasing offerings in languages such as Arabic and Chinese. While having students learn such languages can provide considerable benefits to Chicago’s ability to engage the world, it also makes students more marketable to select universities and employers. According to U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan, “Communicating with our international neighbors not only promotes peaceful relations but also equips students for employment and to compete in a global marketplace.” To support such thinking, the U.S. Department of Education awarded $12.4 million to school systems to provide instruction in critical foreign languages such as Arabic, Chinese, and Russian in 2009. The ability to expand such programs depends largely on the availability of qualified teachers. Thus, Chicago benefits from having an immigrant population from which to help fill this pool of employees. In fact, Chicago has been referred to as a model city for developing teachers to provide Chinese-language instruction.

The diverse student population at schools like Peterson provides unparalleled opportunities for multicultural learning, which is necessary to succeed in a globalized world. Critical thinking, problem solving, accessing and analyzing information, and influencing others are often cited as skills that will be necessary for success in the twenty-first century. By participating in discussions on global issues with peers from varying cultural backgrounds, students can practice such skills in deep and meaningful ways. Many city public schools are actually designed around this objective. CPS has

---
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... with the International Baccalaureate organization, whose mission is to develop inquiring, knowledgeable, and caring young people who will help to create a better and more peaceful world through intercultural understanding and respect. In addition, International Nights and celebrations of ethnic holidays are deeply ingrained in the school culture as ways of celebrating diversity and honoring the traditions of many cultures.

Schools can also support non-English-language speakers through bilingual education and open-door policies for parents regardless of immigration status. In 2007 Chicago Public Schools convened the Bilingual Education and World Language Commission to better understand bilingual instruction and formulate strategies for closing the gap between English language learners and other students. This was crucial for a city where 170,000 of the 410,000 students in public schools, or 41 percent, enter speaking a language other than English. In its 2010 report, the Chicago Bilingual Education and World Language Commission commented on the benefits of language education and acquisition for all students. The commission based its recommendations for the city on several research findings, including the following, which demonstrate how non-English-speaking immigrant students can contribute to the learning of all students:

- Learning two languages well has significant cognitive, academic, and social benefits that can increase student achievement for all students.

- Proven instructional practices for English-language learners are also effective with monolingual students.

- Dual-language programs are the most effective language programs for developing bilingual and biliterate students and enhancing their academic achievement.127

Such programs go beyond traditional (or reductive) bilingual programs that simply transition children to English by helping to maintain fluency in the native language while also building English language fluency because of the important academic payoffs of doing so. According to the Commission, “additive bilingual education programs have the goal of bilingualism and biliteracy and include strong native language instruction.”

Acting on the recommendations of the Commission, Chicago Public Schools are revamping their K-12 language training, focusing on innovative, dual-language instruction. Dual-language programs in public schools can facilitate integration of students and foster better learning outcomes, contributing to the productivity of the future workforce and in turn attracting greater business investment. By working with institutions, cities can shape their citizens’ social networks and further support the bonds that connect diverse people.

Chicago Public Schools also have a history of welcoming the immigrant parents of their students. The Chicago School Reform Act of 1988 created Local School Councils endowed with significant power to approve how funds and resources are allocated, develop and monitor the annual school improvement plans, and evaluate and monitor school principals. Local School Councils are made up of the principal, teachers, parents, and community members and are open to parents regardless of immigration status. These Councils provide an avenue for civic engagement and participation by immigrant parents in the school community and foster greater participation by parents in their children’s education, a factor that is linked with improved educational outcomes.

Zoning

Even the seemingly mundane issue of city zoning can affect the ease or difficulty with which a city can absorb and integrate immigrants. Chicago’s gridded urban design, laid down by necessity after the devastating Chicago fire, enabled a more flexible, adaptable city open to change. The grid, as an urban framework, has allowed each subsequent group of inhabitants to claim territory as its own. Its neutrality offers a democratic field waiting to be enlivened by individual buildings, cultures, and ethnicities. At the same time, boundaries to each neighborhood that the grid provides are highly flexible, accommodating shrinkage, growth.

Zoning codes often dictate how a city's grid and housing stock is used. Many immigrants rely on networks of family and friends to find a first apartment, often moving into and sharing a dwelling until options become available. This creates households with diverse compositions. Through its current zoning regulations, Chicago permits diverse households within residential districts, thereby accommodating the needs of recent immigrants and easing their transition.

Many Chicago suburbs, on the other hand, as well as Chicago public housing, limit cohabitation to a single individual, a single parent or married parents with their own children, and one other blood relative, severely limiting immigrants’ means of adapting to a new city.

How local regulations define a family can affect immigrant integration. How local regulations govern neighborhood activities can also do this. For example, the ability to live and work in the same space is often important for a successful transition into the economic and cultural fabric of a city. The informal economy that supplies many recent immigrants with employment requires a different approach to zoning than neighborhoods dependent on the more established and formalized economy. Current code draws distinct boundaries between lower-density, residential zones and other land uses. In many of Chicago’s residential zones, places of work, including food preparation businesses in a dwelling and garages, are prohibited. Conversely, areas zoned for commercial and industrial use have restrictions on residential uses. Without obtaining a zoning variance, many immigrants are deprived of the ability to combine living and working (the way people who work on computers do). In public housing and virtually all financially assisted housing developments, no live/work setup is permitted.

Excessive requirements for licenses, permits, and other regulations can also have a detrimental effect on the immigrant’s ability to start a small business. Homes, housing developments, and neighborhoods could better accommodate the formation of “cottage industries” that provide entrepreneurial opportunities that are key to the economic success of low-to-moderate-income communities. Instead of helping immigrants transform into employed and integrated urbanites, many of these restrictions on the use of urban space effectively keep immigrants out of work. The zoning regulations are, of course, city-based and are not often considered factors in local immigration policy. But they are, and our leaders must be attentive to this issue.

Like state leaders, local leaders set the tone and the policy context for how well or poorly immigrants are integrated into society. Similar to Chicago’s mayors, New York City’s mayor Michael Bloomberg has spoken of the “economic power” of immigration,

while also calling for tolerance and embracing diversity, even in the face of sharp criticism. His impassioned support for diversity and for immigrants’ contributions to New York during a speech addressing the controversy over the proposed construction of a community center and mosque near Ground Zero were notable. In a speech at the height of the controversy, Bloomberg said, “Our doors are open to everyone—everyone with a dream and a willingness to work hard and play by the rules. New York City was built by immigrants, and it is sustained by immigrants—by people from more than a hundred different countries speaking more than two hundred different languages and professing every faith. And whether your parents were born here, or you came yesterday, you are a New Yorker.”

2. **Bold Leadership: Sanctuary Cities vs. Secure Communities and the Twenty-Five-Year Battle over Whether Cities or the Federal Government Define Local Immigration Policy**

Policies are not created in a vacuum. Chicago’s three decade-long leadership as a sanctuary city has set the tone for a number of other city policies that affect immigrants, from education to health care

---
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Chicago’s sanctuary status dates to the early 1980s upheaval in Latin America, and the massive refugee flows it created. Particularly in Guatemala and El Salvador, the United States was sending military aid to both governments, and refugees’ applications for political asylum were generally denied. During the first half of the 1980s, only about 2 to 3 percent of those applying from these two nations were granted asylum. Nonetheless, hundreds of thousands of refugees from those two countries sought entrance into the United States. The Sanctuary Movement began in the early 1980s to assist those seeking to immigrate to the United States. At its peak the movement included more than one thousand congregations representing Christian, Jewish, Quaker, and Mennonite traditions. These religious institutions gave direct sanctuary to unauthorized immigrants and applied political pressure to local leaders to create favorable laws to protect them. The movement started in New Mexico and Arizona but became strong in other cities, including Chicago. Under the Reagan administration, the Immigration and Naturalization Service opposed the efforts of the Sanctuary Movement and decided to prosecute leaders in high-profile trials in the mid-1980s.

Movement members were successful in lobbying Democrats nationally and, in particular, on the local level, culminating in Chicago mayor Harold Washington’s 1985 executive order declaring Chicago a sanctuary city. Since then the city has reaffirmed its sanctuary status, which is seen as fostering an environment in which immigrants are more likely to report crimes and cooperate with law enforcement, contributing to an atmosphere of security and respect for all.

In 1996 Congress outlawed sanctuary policies that banned local officials from cooperating with federal immigration agents. The Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act passed at that time required local governments to cooperate with the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), a precursor to the Department of Homeland Security’s Immigration and Customs Enforcement. But Chicago refused. Along with other sanctuary cities, Chicago continued to instruct its employees not to notify the federal government of the presence of unauthorized immigrants living in their communities or seeking city services.

The Chicago City Council reinforced the mayor’s 1985 order with an ordinance in 2006 making the policy official city law. In November 2009, when the Illinois State Police joined the Secure Communities program, it was put into effect in the counties surrounding Chicago. Again, Chicago did not join. Federal officials have viewed Chicago as a test case on whether federal law can be enforced regarding immigration. Chicago mayor Rahm Emanuel has pledged to continue the city’s existing policy, which is in line with the recent decision by Illinois to withdraw from the Secure Communities program.

Conclusion

Political leadership and the ability to determine policies on integration, zoning, starting a business, and access to education are tools that cities and states can use to manage immigration challenges. Though we are generally sanguine about the role of Chicago and Illinois as models in the immigration debate, we recognize that there is pressure to roll back innovative policies. Cities and states ultimately exist within the national context, and they rely on national policies—and resources—to operate effectively. Reform of the nation’s immigration system to provide a legal and effective way to manage future flows of immigrants in line with our economic needs, while also securing our borders and providing a path to legal residency for those here without authorization, are crucial to the economic and social development of our country over the long term. In the meantime states and cities around the country should consider the examples of creative policies and political leadership demonstrated in Chicago and Illinois, among others, in order to help foster immigrant integration and leverage the contributions of newcomers for the benefit of all residents.
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Conclusion

Nations around the world are struggling to resolve immigration challenges. The United States, long a leading destination for immigrants in search of a better life, is no exception. Security concerns sparked by the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, and a stubborn economy that is barely growing are compounding an already paralyzed political process. Most can agree that America’s immigration policy needs fixing. But a broadly supported plan for how to fix it remains elusive.

Advocacy groups and policymakers on all sides of the immigration debate have long been fighting to make progress at the national level, but to no avail. In the meantime, the public discourse on immigration often highlights the most extreme examples of jobs lost or families torn apart that only further polarize our communities and divide our nation. The United States can no longer afford to postpone immigration-related legislation. As growing challenges and opportunities are left unaddressed, the lives of individuals and communities are at stake as is the well-being of our nation.

Our exploration of this topic reveals a complex array of overlapping issues and opinions that make solutions difficult to find. Good, convincing data is hard to come by and is often used selectively to bolster individual agendas. The debate is therefore often addressed by those with previously held biases and preconceptions rather than with a comprehensive view of the multifaceted nature of immigration. To create better policies, citizens and policymakers alike must begin to consider the full scope of the issue in order to resolve the challenges that immigration can present while also taking advantage of its great potential to enrich our lives and our country’s competitiveness.

Specifically, we found that:

• Even though economic arguments are often cited in the case for or against immigration, estimates of the true costs and benefits of immigration remain tenuous. The data sets and methodologies used by researchers are often designed to serve the interest of a vested party. In addition, many of the arguments rely on fiscal measures of government expenditure and revenue collection rather than broader measures of economic output and national income. Even within the economic realm, the full picture is often not clear as many studies are one-sided, measuring benefits but not costs or vice versa. Furthermore, long-term impacts such as changes in native-worker productivity or the value of immigrant education—which can span generations—are often not accounted for due to the complexity of the issues. More accurate and reliable cost-benefit analyses of the economic impact of immigrants at the macro level are desperately needed.

• The face of immigration today is very different from what generations before us experienced. The pace of both authorized and unauthorized entry is faster, the origins of immigrants are broader, and the race and ethnicity of those immigrating are different. The diverse origins of today’s immigrants—from Africa, Latin America, the Middle East, South Asia and elsewhere—has revived concerns among some that traditional American culture is under siege and risks being changed to a greater degree than that of the newer cultures taking root. While we believe that in the long term America will continue to benefit from diversity, we recognize that the emotional, cultural, and psychological components of how people define “who is an American” and the fear this simple question stirs in many are just as important to the debate over immigration policy, if not more so, than the economic figures that economists and scholars present.

• Tension is growing between local/state and federal decision makers over who is responsible for immigration policy and enforcement. In the absence of federal policy and action, local leaders are themselves taking stands on issues they may not have been involved in previously. This is especially true in suburban and rural regions that are newer to the immigration experience. While some local laws are being directly challenged at the federal level, local and state governments can have an impact on immigration in ways that do not conflict with national policies. From shaping physical spaces to providing effective transportation, from providing educational opportunities to encouraging civic participation, local governments can implement initiatives to promote integration and economic growth that help unite communities rather than divide them.

• Immigration and enforcement policies have a very real impact on the economic competitiveness of our city, region, and nation. Their impact should therefore be considered as a com-
ponent of our overall economic policy. As globalization increases competition and access to limited resources and the emerging powers become more influential, the cities and countries that best minimize the costs and maximize the benefits of immigration will be the ones that thrive in the twenty-first century.

- The immigration debate can be seen through many different lenses, and this is one of the most important factors that makes the policy debate so challenging. These lenses include those explored in the chapters of this report: economic, security, cultural, psychological, moral, and local. While acknowledging that individuals tend to focus on their own concerns and preconceptions, it is important to understand immigration’s dimensions through all of these lenses. Policymakers and anyone who wants to understand why federal legislation to improve immigration policy has been so difficult to pass needs to account for, and consider the impact of, these multiple components.

In this time of growing international connectedness and economic constraints, immigration policy reform can no longer be delayed. Inspired by what we learned, we hope that our key findings published in this report can help our leaders make the smart decisions that will best benefit our city, our economy, our society, and our nation.
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William D. Burns
Alderman, 4th Ward
City of Chicago
William was elected alderman of Chicago’s 4th Ward in 2011. He previously served as an Illinois Representative and also serves as vice president of Conlon Public Strategies. Previously, he worked for the Office of the Senate President, the Chicago Urban League, and the Metropolitan Planning Council. He was named one of America’s thirty leaders of the future by Ebony Magazine in 2005 and was a American Marshall Memorial Fellow in 2001. He earned both his BA in law, letters, and society and his MA in social sciences from the University of Chicago.

Sean Casten
President and Chief Executive Officer
Recycled Energy Development, LLC
Prior to cofounding Recycled Energy Development LLC in 2007, Sean served as president and chief executive officer of Turbosteam Corporation. The 2007 chairman of the U.S. Clean Heat and Power Association and a board member of the Casten Family Foundation, Sean has published numerous articles and testified before Congress on clean energy policies and technology. He earned his BA in molecular biology and biochemistry from Middlebury College and his MS in biochemical engineering and masters of engineering management from the Dartmouth College Thayer School of Engineering.

Paul D. Christensen
Associate Dean; Executive Director, Global Programs; and Clinical Associate Professor of Finance
Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University
Prior to becoming a faculty member of the finance department at Northwestern University, Paul was the president and chief operating officer of ShoreCap Management, an international private equity company based in London. He also led Shorebank Enterprise Group, an economic development organization in Cleveland, and worked for McKinsey & Company in Pittsburgh. He earned his BA in economics from Dartmouth College, where he received the Rockefeller Prize in Economics, and his MBA with distinction from Cornell University.
Lillian Daniel
Senior Minister
First Congregational Church, United Church of Christ
Lillian became the senior minister of the First Congregational Church, United Church of Christ, in Glen Ellyn in 2004. She is also the cohost of “30 Good Minutes” on Channel 11, the author of the 2006 book *Tell It Like It Is: Reclaiming the Practice of Testimony*, and coauthor of *This Odd and Wondrous Calling: The Public and Private Lives of Two Ministers* (2009). She has taught preaching at three seminaries, is a trustee of the Chicago Theological Seminary, and board president of Arise (formerly Chicago Interfaith Committee for Worker Issues.) She earned her AB from Bryn Mawr College, her MDiv from Yale Divinity School, and her DMin from Hartford Seminary.

Tony Davis
Partner
Linden Capital Partners
Tony serves as a managing partner of Linden Capital Partners and has more than fifteen years of principle investing and consulting experience. He is a member of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), president of Americans United in Support of Democracy, and a member and former president of CityPAC. He earned his BA in philosophy and economics from Northwestern University and his MBA from the University of Chicago Graduate School of Business.

Evelyn J. Diaz
Commissioner, Department of Family & Support Services
City of Chicago
Evelyn was recently named commissioner of Chicago’s Department of Family and Support Services after serving as chief executive officer of the Chicago Workforce Investment Council. Previously, she was selected as deputy chief of staff to Chicago mayor Richard M. Daley in 2007, where she led the creation of the Chicago LEADS initiative, chaired the city’s Green Jobs Initiative, and oversaw health, human services, and employment investments. Prior to joining the Mayor’s office, she worked for the Chicago Jobs Council. She earned her BA in English literature from the University of Notre Dame and her MA in social service administration from the University of Chicago.

Prithvi S. Gandhi
Director of Corporate Development
Dover Corporation
Prithvi recently joined Dover Corporation, where he is responsible for corporate strategy, mergers and acquisitions, and strategic investments. He previously worked at Zebra Technologies and Morgan Stanley. Prithvi earned his BS in mathematics and economics from the University of California at Berkeley, his MA in international economics from Georgetown University, and his MBA from the Wharton School of Business.

Jeanne Gang
Principal and Founder
Studio Gang Architects
Jeanne, a 2011 MacArthur Fellow, is the principal architect of Studio Gang Architects, a Chicago-based firm that has been recognized internationally for its innovation in design. She also serves as an adjunct professor at the Illinois Institute of Technology and has been a visiting professor at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton. She received an Academy Award from the American Academy of Arts and Letters in 2006 and is a 2009 Fellow of the American Institute of Architects. She earned her BS in architecture from the University of Illinois, her master of architecture from the Harvard Graduate School of Design, and studied urban design in Switzerland.

Barbara A. Higgins
Senior Vice President, Customer Experience & Retention
Allstate Insurance Company
Previous to joining Allstate, Barbara was vice president of customer experience at United Airlines, where she led the global customer experience function and managed contact-center operations in nine countries. Barbara joined United Airlines in 2007 after a nineteen-year career working for the Walt Disney Company, most recently as the vice president for operations integration and planning at Disneyland Resort Paris. She is a member of the Lincoln Park Zoo board of directors and the Cornell Hotel Society. She earned her BS from Cornell University’s School of Hotel Administration and her MBA from the University of Florida.
Thomas M. Levinson
Attorney
Reed Smith LLP
Tom is a lawyer at Reed Smith, where he focuses on regulatory and complex commercial litigation. He also serves as counsel for Interfaith Youth Core. He authored the 2003 book All That’s Holy: A Young Guy, an Old Car, and the Search for God in America, has written numerous articles, and has been an on-air essayist on the Hallmark Channel on religion in America. He was a 2008 Leadership Greater Chicago Fellow. He earned his BA from Princeton University, his master’s in theological studies from the Harvard Divinity School, and his JD from the University of Chicago Law School.

Joseph McCluskey
Vice President, International Operations
Joseph first joined W.W. Grainger Inc. in 1990 and is responsible for developing and implementing international strategies in the Asia Pacific region for Grainger. He has significant international experience and has worked extensively in China, Japan, and South Korea. He earned his MBA from the Lake Forest Graduate School of Management.

John E. McGovern III
Executive Vice President
Resolute Consulting
John joined Resolute Consulting in 2007 focusing on strategic communications in the public policy arena and providing expertise in navigating complex decision-making processes in Illinois and Washington, D.C. He previously worked for U.S. House Speaker J. Dennis Hastert and served as the executive director of Keep Our Majority PAC. He also has extensive experience as a campaign manager and communications director. He is a board member of Boys & Girls Clubs of Chicago, the Field Museum’s President Leadership Council, Rush University Medical Center Associates, and the Next Generation Leadership Advisory Council for the Chicago 2016 Olympic Bid. He earned his AB in American history and American studies from Princeton University and his JD from Northwestern University School of Law.

Tanya Menon
Visiting Associate Professor, Kellogg School of Management
Northwestern University
Tanya joined the University of Chicago faculty in 2000 and has taught in France, India, Singapore, Italy, and Spain. She has won multiple teaching awards and has incorporated nonprofit consulting into her classes. Her articles on cross-cultural psychology have been sponsored by the Kauffman and Templeton foundations. She is associate editor for the journal Management Science and was an American Marshall Memorial Fellow in 2004. She earned her BA in sociology from Harvard University and her PhD in organizational behavior from the Stanford Graduate School of Business.

John J. Murray
Partner
Accenture - Management Consulting
John Murray is a partner in Accenture’s Management Consulting group, focused on its Chicago-area client base. Prior to joining Accenture in 2010, John spent three-and-a-half years as the chief bid officer for the Chicago 2016 Olympic bid, where he was part of the executive leadership team. John joined the bid after spending six years as a management consultant with McKinsey & Company, based in Chicago and serving clients globally. John also served five years in the U.S. Marine Corps. He holds an MBA in marketing and international business and a BS in political science, both from the University of Illinois. A life-long Chicagoan, John is deeply committed to supporting and strengthening the city’s global competitiveness. He chairs the advisory board for the Chicago Sports Commission and serves on the boards of World Sport Chicago and the American Ireland Fund.

Brent Neiman
Assistant Professor of Economics, Booth School of Business
University of Chicago
Brent joined the Booth School in 2008 and teaches a course in international financial policy. Previously, he served as staff economist for the White House Council of Economic Advisers and worked at the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago and at McKinsey & Company. He is a member of the auxiliary board for Teach for America in Chicago. He earned his BS in economics from the Wharton School, his bachelor of applied science from the School of Engineering at the University of Pennsylvania, his MSc in mathematical modelling from Oxford University, and his PhD in economics from Harvard University.
Milena Novy-Marx  
*Program Officer, Program on Global Security and Sustainability  
The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation*

Milena joined the foundation in 2003 and co-led a two-year effort to develop the foundation's Initiative on Global Migration and Human Mobility. She also manages the foundation's work on international development, where she has led an effort to create a new, interdisciplinary master's in development practice degree at universities worldwide. She previously worked for the World Bank, USAID, and as an economic consultant on antitrust issues. She is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and a former board member of the African Economic Research Consortium. A Fulbright Scholar, she earned her BA in political science from Yale University and her MPA in economic policy and her PhD with a focus on economics and development from Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs.

Jim O'Connor  
*Managing Director  
MVC Capital, Inc.*

Jim joined MVC capital as managing director in 2008 after nine years with Motorola, Inc. He was also a White House Fellow for the U.S. Treasury Department, worked for the Committee on Ways and Means at the U.S. House of Representatives, and a volunteer teacher in South Africa. He was named one of *American Ventures Magazine*'s “40 under 40” in 2006. He earned his BA in government and English from Georgetown University, his JD from the Georgetown University Law Center, and his master of management from Northwestern University's Kellogg Graduate School of Management.

Richard L. Rodriguez  
*Commissioner, Department of Energy & Environment  
City of Chicago*

Richard was named commissioner of the Department of Energy and Environment and deputy chief operations officer for the City of Chicago after serving as president of the Chicago Transit Authority and as commissioner of the City of Chicago's Department of Aviation. He was accepted as an American Marshall Memorial Fellow for 2009, was a Leadership Greater Chicago member in 2008, and was recognized by *Crain's* "40 under 40" in 2008. He sits on the advisory boards of DeVry, North Park, and Loyola universities. He earned his BA in sociology and communications from Loyola University Chicago and his J.D. from the Chicago-Kent College of Law.

Anthony E. Simpkins  
*Deputy Commissioner, Preservation Division  
Department of Housing and Economic Development  
City of Chicago*

Prior to joining the Department of Housing and Economic Development in 2007, Anthony was a senior counsel for buildings and land use litigation at the City of Chicago Law Department for ten years. He is a member of the editorial board of the *Journal of Islamic Law and Culture*, a board member of the Muslim Bar Association of Chicago, and author of a number of articles on housing-related issues. He earned his BA in political science from the University of Illinois, his MA in political science from Loyola University, and his JD from Loyola University Chicago School of Law.

Melissa Megliola Zaikos  
*Chief of Elementary Schools, Pershing Network  
Chicago Public Schools*

Melissa manages the Pershing Network of elementary schools within the Chicago Public Schools (CPS). She previously oversaw performance and management of over one hundred high-performing Autonomous Schools. She has also served as a Broad Resident, funded by the Broad Foundation, leading strategic projects at CPS, and a manager for Deloitte Consulting. She is a national advisor to current Broad Residents and sits on the executive committee of Cristo Rey Jesuit High School. She earned her BS in industrial engineering from Texas A&M University and her MBA from Harvard Business School.
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