NEGATIVE: Open Immigration

By “Coach Vance” Trefethen

***Resolved:* *The United States federal government should substantially reduce its restrictions on legal immigration to the United States.***

AFF removes most or all restrictions on legal immigration, taking us back to the 1800’s when just about anyone could enter America and become part of our nation. This is bad because our nation today cannot handle a mass inflow of immigrants, which would probably lead to a US population of 1 billion at the end of the 21st century under an open immigration policy. The social and environmental consequences would be devastating.
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Negative: Open Immigration

COUNTERPLAN

Wait a couple years to allow time for a NEPA study and determine environmental impact first, then decide. Law requires it anyway!

Matthew Sussis 2018. (Assistant Director of Communications for the Center for Immigration Studies; master’s degree in political journalism and communications from Northwestern University’s Medill School of Journalism, and graduated Magna Cum Laude with a bachelor’s degree in political science from Duke University) 19 Nov 2018 “Five Ways Immigration-Driven Population Growth Impacts Our Environment” https://cis.org/Sussis/Five-Ways-ImmigrationDriven-Population-Growth-Impacts-Our-Environment

As outlined in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Endangered Species Act (ESA), federal agencies are supposed to weigh the environmental impact of any new policies they introduce. Strangely enough, federal agencies have [almost completely ignored](https://cis.org/Report/Dont-Leave-Immigration-Out-Our-Environmental-Laws) these laws when it comes to immigration, even though immigration-driven population growth has a huge impact on the environment.

DISADVANTAGES

1. Traffic congestion

Link: Immigration-driven population growth links to environmental degradation, congestion, species loss, resource depletion, lack of sustainability

Leon Kolankiewicz 2015. (environmental scientist and national natural resources planner. He has a B.S. in forestry and wildlife management from Virginia Tech and an M.S. in environmental planning and natural resources management from the University of British Columbia ) 17 Apr 2015 “Immigration, Population Growth, and the Environment “ https://cis.org/Report/Immigration-Population-Growth-and-Environment

As noted in a Center for Immigration Studies *Backgrounder*[7](https://cis.org/Report/Immigration-Population-Growth-and-Environment#7), immigration's preponderant role in driving American population growth has not been at the center of the nation's immigration debate, in spite of the fact that increasing the nation's total population is one of immigration's clearest and most direct effects on the country. Neither has it been a focus of concerted environmentalist angst or advocacy, in spite the spirited activism of a few diehard population activists, and regardless of the fact that, as noted above, population growth has important implications for environmental degradation, congestion, habitat and species loss, and resource depletion, even as it thwarts the pursuit of sustainability.

Link: Population = Traffic congestion – roads cannot expand fast enough to keep up

Leon Kolankiewicz 2015. (environmental scientist and national natural resources planner. He has a B.S. in forestry and wildlife management from Virginia Tech and an M.S. in environmental planning and natural resources management from the University of British Columbia ) 17 Apr 2015 “Immigration, Population Growth, and the Environment “ <https://cis.org/Report/Immigration-Population-Growth-and-Environment> (brackets added)

The degree of traffic congestion on American streets is a function of the populations of people and vehicles in comparison to roadway capacity. In recent decades, as urban populations and vehicle-miles-traveled (VMT to transportation planners) have grown faster than roadway capacity, congestion has worsened considerably. More and more motorists sit for longer and longer hours in gridlocked traffic breathing one another's fumes.

Brink: Roads are at the tipping point, can’t handle further population increases

Leon Kolankiewicz 2015. (environmental scientist and national natural resources planner. He has a B.S. in forestry and wildlife management from Virginia Tech and an M.S. in environmental planning and natural resources management from the University of British Columbia ) 17 Apr 2015 “Immigration, Population Growth, and the Environment “ https://cis.org/Report/Immigration-Population-Growth-and-Environment

On the other hand, some roads operating at capacity now may be pushed over the tipping point by further population increases and become chronically congested. The funds or space to improve such roads may be limited or not available. In these cases even a modest number of new drivers could result in significant increases in traffic congestion and wait times. Federal, state, and local governments as well as the private sector will surely respond to increased population density. In fact, they have. But these responses have not prevented traffic congestion from growing worse. It seems almost certain that adding 111 million people to the U.S. population over the next half century will worsen our already overcrowded roads and freeways.

Impacts: Traffic congestion = Pollution deaths and economic losses

Jonathan Levy, Jonathan Buonocore and Katherine von Stackelberg 2010 (Levy – with Department of Environmental Health, Boston University School of Public Health, Boston. Buonocore – with Department of Environmental Health, Harvard School of Public Health, Boston. Stackelberg - Harvard Center for Risk Analysis, Boston ) ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH JOURNAL Oct 2010 “Evaluation of the public health impacts of traffic congestion: a health risk assessment” https://ehjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1476-069X-9-65

We estimate that the monetized value of PM2.5-related mortality attributable to congestion in these 83 cities in 2000 was approximately $31 billion (2007 dollars), as compared with a value of time and fuel wasted of $60 billion. In future years, the economic impacts grow (to over $100 billion in 2030) while the public health impacts decrease to $13 billion in 2020 before increasing to $17 billion in 2030, given increasing population and congestion but lower emissions per vehicle. Across cities and years, the public health impacts range from more than an order of magnitude less to in excess of the economic impacts.  
Conclusions  
Our analyses indicate that the public health impacts of congestion may be significant enough in magnitude, at least in some urban areas, to be considered in future evaluations of the benefits of policies to mitigate congestion.

2. US overpopulation

Link: Open immigration would give the US a population of 1 billion by end of 21st century

Federation for American Immigration Reform 2016. (non-profit research & advocacy group) U.S. Immigration Environment AND THE Reduce Immigration-Driven U.S. Population Growth to Buy Time in the Race to Save the Environment, Sept 2016 https://fairus.org/issue/publications-resources/us-immigration-and-environment

 Immigration is the jet engine that drives U.S. population growth. About one in five of all immigrants on planet Earth live in the United States. The current 14 percent share of foreign-born in the U.S. is just shy of the record 15 percent set just after the turn of the 20th Century. Immigration generated a little more than half of U.S. population growth in the last 50 years, and will generate three-quarters of it in the next 50 years. Accepting all who want to move to the U.S. would immediately raise our population to almost a half-billion people, and perhaps one billion by the end of the century.

Impact: Decreased quality of life from city congestion

Matthew Sussis 2018. (Assistant Director of Communications for the Center for Immigration Studies; master’s degree in political journalism and communications from Northwestern University’s Medill School of Journalism, and graduated Magna Cum Laude with a bachelor’s degree in political science from Duke University) 19 Nov 2018 “Five Ways Immigration-Driven Population Growth Impacts Our Environment” https://cis.org/Sussis/Five-Ways-ImmigrationDriven-Population-Growth-Impacts-Our-Environment

While the overcrowding of cities could possibly be mitigated by more immigrants moving to rural areas, the reality is that for a whole host of cultural and economic reasons, most settle in or near cities. Indeed, according to the census, immigrants [are currently driving](https://www.citylab.com/equity/2017/03/what-keeps-most-american-cities-from-decline/520716/) the increased population in most American cities, and the foreign-born population is heavily concentrated [in the country's 10 largest metro areas](https://www.brookings.edu/research/immigrants-continue-to-disperse-with-fastest-growth-in-the-suburbs/). On top of the geographic expansion of cities, the actual number of residents in these urban areas will put growing levels of strain on public utilities such as trains. The effects of overcrowding are already particularly visible in New York City, which is amplified by the fact that Manhattan is an island. According to the New York Times, overcrowding is by far the largest cause of subway delays in Manhattan. There were approximately 20,000 average monthly delays in 2012, and more than 67,450 delays by mid-2017. That is partially due to the fact that the number of subway riders has risen to a 70-year high of six million riders per day. And of course, most Manhattanites cannot avoid the subway by taking a car instead. Just as the number of subway riders has grown, so too has the number of cars — a problem that led the New York City Council to [restrict the number of Uber and Lyft](https://www.npr.org/2018/08/09/637008474/new-york-city-temporarily-halts-more-uber-and-lyft-cars-on-the-road) cars on the road. As immigration continues to fuel population growth, more and more cities will feel the strain of overcrowding that New York City is already experiencing, making mass transportation far more arduous.

Brink: Climate change is already reducing fresh water supplies, shortages looming. Impact: Immigration = Water shortages

Matthew Sussis 2018. (Assistant Director of Communications for the Center for Immigration Studies; master’s degree in political journalism and communications from Northwestern University’s Medill School of Journalism, and graduated Magna Cum Laude with a bachelor’s degree in political science from Duke University) 19 Nov 2018 “Five Ways Immigration-Driven Population Growth Impacts Our Environment” https://cis.org/Sussis/Five-Ways-ImmigrationDriven-Population-Growth-Impacts-Our-Environment

 As immigration continues to drive the United States population higher, the demand for water continues to rise, yet the availability continues to decline. For example, a [study](https://www.biologicaldiversity.org/programs/population_and_sustainability/pdfs/Seager_etal_SE_2009.pdf) out of Columbia University found that massive droughts in the Southeastern United States in 2007-2008 were due to the region's exploding population, which posed "the root of the water supply problem." Georgia's population grew from 6.5 million in 1990 to 9.5 million in 2007, and has now reached 10.4 million. Nearly a quarter of total water use in Georgia is for public water supply, meaning a higher population puts a large strain on water availability. This problem goes beyond the Southeast, although it is especially visible there. Water managers in 40 states [expect water shortages](https://www.neefusa.org/nature/water/increasing-demand-and-decreasing-supply-water) in the next decade, according to the National Environmental Education Foundation. These problems will likely be amplified by climate change, as warming climates mean higher rates of evaporation and lower snowpack, leading to less freshwater.

3. Environmental damage

Link: Immigration increases threats to the environment, and ignoring immigration makes it harder to protect

Leon Kolankiewicz 2015. (environmental scientist and national natural resources planner. He has a B.S. in forestry and wildlife management from Virginia Tech and an M.S. in environmental planning and natural resources management from the University of British Columbia ) 17 Apr 2015 “Immigration, Population Growth, and the Environment “ https://cis.org/Report/Immigration-Population-Growth-and-Environment

As this paper shows, in many cases per capita reductions in resource use or environmental impact are offset, sometimes entirely, by population increase. Choosing to ignore the implications of population for the environment in the United States will make it much more difficult to effectively protect it. This paper also demonstrates the importance of population growth to the environment, particularly in the United States. Since the early 1970s American women have chosen to have about two children on average — roughly the number necessary to maintain the size of the U.S. population. However, federal immigration programs have added significantly to the American population by bringing in over a million legal immigrants annually and tolerating widespread illegal immigration. Of course, immigrants and their descendants are not fundamentally different from natives in their environmental impact. But legal immigration levels are set by elected officials, as is the level of effort devoted to controlling illegal immigration. High levels of immigration have added significantly to the number of human beings living in the United States, and this has environmental consequences.

Link: U.S. overpopulation promotes global warming and destruction of the environment

David McAlpin 2014. (with Progressives for Immigration Reform, a non-profit organization seeking to educate the public on the unintended consequences of mass migration ) 10 Sept 2014 “U.S. Population and Its Impact on the Environment: Why Curbing Per Capita Consumption Is Not Enough” https://progressivesforimmigrationreform.org/u-s-population-and-its-impact-on-the-environment-why-curbing-per-capita-consumption-is-not-enough/

The United States’ large and growing population puts the utmost strain on our environment, and unless an extraordinary technological innovation of a magnitude large enough to reverse climate change on a global scale happens in the near future, it will not matter how much the United States curbs its consumption. With an already unsustainable consumption pattern, every increase in population size would need to be met with an equal decrease in consumption in order to offset the damage done to the environment in continuing the present unsustainable path. Put simply, the U.S. would have to decrease its consumption indefinitely if the population size continues to grow. If we want to thwart global warming and the destruction of the environment, then we need to address overpopulation here in our country.

Impact: Sickness & Death

Dr. Steve Cohen 2017 (PhD; *Executive Director, The Earth Institute, Columbia University* ) “The Human and Financial Cost of Pollution” 23 Oct 2017 https://blogs.ei.columbia.edu/2017/10/23/the-human-and-financial-cost-of-pollution/

Last week, the [Lancet Commission on Pollution and Health](http://gahp.net/the-lancet-report-2/) issued its report on the global impact of environmental pollution. The results are straightforward:   
“In 2015, diseases caused by air, water and soil pollution were responsible for 9 million premature deaths, that is 16% of all global death. Exposures to contaminated air, water and soil kill more people than smoking, hunger, natural disasters, war, AIDS, or malaria.”   
 Nearly all of these deaths (92%) took place in poorer nations. In wealthier nations that have worked to reduce pollution, the benefits of pollution control far outweigh the costs. According to this Commission, the global financial costs of pollution are huge, totaling “$4.6 trillion per year—6.2% of global economic output”.

4. Climate change

Link: Immigration worsens climate change by bringing immigrants from low-carbon places to high-carbon US economy

Matthew Sussis 2018. (Assistant Director of Communications for the Center for Immigration Studies; master’s degree in political journalism and communications from Northwestern University’s Medill School of Journalism, and graduated Magna Cum Laude with a bachelor’s degree in political science from Duke University) 19 Nov 2018 “Five Ways Immigration-Driven Population Growth Impacts Our Environment” https://cis.org/Sussis/Five-Ways-ImmigrationDriven-Population-Growth-Impacts-Our-Environment

Immigration transfers populations of people from lower-polluting parts of the world to the United States, where CO2 emissions are far higher per person. According to a [CIS study](https://cis.org/Immigration-United-States-and-WorldWide-Greenhouse-Gas-Emissions-0), U.S. immigrants produce an estimated 637 million tons of CO2 annually, which is 482 million tons more than these immigrants would have produced had they remained in their home countries. Of course, this does not make immigrants responsible for global warming, nor does it mean that native-born Americans shouldn't do more to reduce their own footprints — in fact, the average immigrant in America emits 18 percent less CO2 than the average native-born American. However, it is dishonest to discuss large-scale immigration without considering the impact that immigration has on our climate.

Impact: Climate change damages human health

NOAA last updated Feb 2019. (National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration) “Climate change impacts” https://www.noaa.gov/education/resource-collections/climate-education-resources/climate-change-impacts

[Human health](https://www.niehs.nih.gov/research/programs/geh/climatechange/health_impacts/index.cfm) is vulnerable to climate change. The changing environment is expected to cause more heat stress, an increase in waterborne diseases, poor air quality,  and diseases transmitted by insects and rodents. Extreme weather events can compound many of these health threats.

5. Disparate impact on African Americans

Link: Higher immigration specifically harms blacks

John Judis 2018 (journalist) 1 Feb 2018 “The Two Sides of Immigration Policy” THE AMERICAN PROSPECT https://prospect.org/article/two-sides-immigration-policy

Democrats believe, of course, that in downplaying illegal immigration and insisting that immigration benefits everyone, they are standing up for their own constituents. They think that working-class Americans who backed Trump on this issue failed to understand their own interests. But Democrats are wrong in this case. While many American businesses and the well-to-do have clearly benefited from the massive influx of unskilled immigrants, many middle- and working-class Americans, including such key Democratic constituents as African Americans, have not.

Blacks specifically harder hit by immigration

John Judis 2018 (journalist) 1 Feb 2018 “The Two Sides of Immigration Policy” THE AMERICAN PROSPECT <https://prospect.org/article/two-sides-immigration-policy> (brackets added)

Many of the first-generation immigrants are Hispanic, and many of the high school dropouts, or those with only a high school degree, are African American. And there are studies showing that workers from these two groups have been hit hard by competition from immigrants. In a 2014 survey, sociologist Stephen Steinberg concluded that legal and illegal immigration had damaged opportunities for African Americans “in construction, light manufacturing, building maintenance, the hotel and leisure industry, the health care industry, and even public-sector jobs where one-third of blacks are employed.”

Impact: Racism. When we know in advance a policy will harm blacks by disparate impact, it’s discriminatory and racist

Dr. Jay Michaelson 2015 (legal affairs columnist at The Daily Beast; J.D. from Yale and a Ph.D. in Jewish Thought from Hebrew University) Supreme Court: Institutional Racism Is Real 25 June 2015 https://www.thedailybeast.com/supreme-court-institutional-racism-is-real

First, racists are usually not dumb enough to leave records of their prejudice. They find some other reason to fire the employee, or keep the family out of the neighborhood. Second, and more importantly, discrimination is often systemic and structural, not individual. Often, not only is there no smoking gun, but there’s often no individual “bad actor.” Even neutral requirements—a high-school diploma for employment, a family-size limit for housing—can have huge *de facto*discriminatory effects, which may or may not be intentional. That’s where “disparate impact” comes in. Under some civil rights laws, plaintiffs can prevail even without evidence of a specific discriminatory intention if they can show a disparate impact on the affected group.

Impact: Blacks’ civil rights gains of the last generation are reversed

John Judis 2018 (journalist) 1 Feb 2018 “The Two Sides of Immigration Policy” THE AMERICAN PROSPECT <https://prospect.org/article/two-sides-immigration-policy> (brackets added)

As [sociologist Stephen] Steinberg notes, one of the great ironies of our recent history is that immigration policy, which was partly inspired by the civil rights movement, has probably had a negative effect on African Americans at a time when African Americans might have been able to take advantage of the passage of civil rights acts outlawing employment discrimination.

6. Unemployment.

Link: Most immigrants are unskilled and uneducated

John Judis 2018 (journalist) 1 Feb 2018 “The Two Sides of Immigration Policy” THE AMERICAN PROSPECT https://prospect.org/article/two-sides-immigration-policy

About one-third to one-half of the immigrants coming legally into the United States are unskilled or lower-skilled. According to a Brookings Institution study, almost one in three don’t even have a high school diploma. About half lack proficiency in the English language. Those percentages are considerably higher among undocumented immigrants. About 70 percent lack proficiency in English. As a result, the greatest percentages of immigrants find unskilled work in agriculture, construction, health care (as aides), maids and housekeeping, and food service.

Link: Immigration hurts unemployed Americans, and the effects ripple through the economy

Dan Cadman, 2017. (Fellow for the Center for Immigration Studies; retired INS / ICE official with thirty years of government experience; served as a senior supervisor and manager at headquarters, as well as at field offices both domestically and abroad.) “State-Based Visas: Unwise, Unworkable, and Constitutionally Dubious” May 9, 2017. https://cis.org/Cadman/StateBased-Visas-Unwise-Unworkable-and-Constitutionally-Dubious

Such schemes also do little to resolve the lingering problems of un- and under-employment, especially among those at the bottom of the economic ladder, a fact noted by Rev. Horace Sheffield III who, in response to the Michigan governor's proposal, told CNS News that even if it does not take a specific job away from native-born job-seekers, it makes immigrants "more marketable than educated current residents. ... What does that do to displace people who are born here and who don't have the education and are already competing for scarce jobs?" As the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) notes, when workers are unemployed, their families lose wages, and the nation as a whole loses their contribution to the economy in terms of the goods or services that could have been produced. Unemployed workers also lose their purchasing power, which can lead to unemployment for other workers, creating a cascading effect that ripples through the economy.

Impact: More work for no pay, negative mental health effects

Elvis Picardo, Updated 2018. (Portfolio Manager at HollisWealth®, a division of Scotia Capital Inc. Prior to joining HollisWealth, he was Vice-President Research and a Portfolio Manager at a leading independent investment dealer in Vancouver. He brings a global perspective to investment research and portfolio management, obtained through more than two decades of international capital markets experience in diverse disciplines; Chartered Financial Analyst® and Canadian Investment Manager designations, as well as degrees in engineering and management studies.) “How The Unemployment Rate Affects Everybody” Updated January 17, 2018. https://www.investopedia.com/articles/economics/10/unemployment-rate-get-real.asp#ixzz5H1JHfYrh

Unemployment even affects those who are still employed. When workers are let go, it increases the amount of work those who are still employed have to cover. And because unemployment usually increases when companies are trying to cut costs, those expected to pick up the slack are not receiving any additional compensation for extra hours worked. Unemployment can also have a negative mental effect on those who are still working. They may become more concerned about losing their own jobs or be hesitant to look for something better because they "are lucky" to be employed at all. They may even feel guilty about having a job when their co-workers are out of work.

A/T “Immigrants take jobs Americans won’t do” - Turn: The reason Americans won’t do those jobs is because immigration forced them out of those jobs

John Judis 2018 (journalist) 1 Feb 2018 “The Two Sides of Immigration Policy” THE AMERICAN PROSPECT https://prospect.org/article/two-sides-immigration-policy

Until 15 or 20 years ago, meatpacking plants in the United States were staffed by highly paid, unionized employees who earned about $18 an hour, adjusted for inflation. Today, the processing and packing plants are largely staffed by low-paid non-union workers from places like Mexico and Guatemala. Many of them start at $6 an hour. This didn’t happen because the people who worked in meatpacking plants decided they wanted to become computer programmers. The companies brought in immigrants, including undocumented immigrants, to undermine the unions and depress wages. Something similar has happened in construction and low-skilled services, where documented and undocumented immigrants were brought in to undermine unionization.

7. Social Inequality

Link: More immigration = poor get poorer, even if the total net economic effect is positive (the not-poor get richer)

John Judis 2018 (journalist) 1 Feb 2018 “The Two Sides of Immigration Policy” THE AMERICAN PROSPECT https://prospect.org/article/two-sides-immigration-policy

In 1997, the same year the Jordan Commission issued its findings, the National Academy of Sciences published a report on immigration. While lauding the overall effects of immigration, the report acknowledged that “almost one-half of the decline in real wages for native-born high school dropouts from 1980 to 1994 could be attributed to the adverse impact of unskilled foreign workers.” Last year, the National Academy of Sciences published a new extensive study of immigration. It found again that “to the extent that negative wage effects are found, prior immigrants—who are often the closest substitutes for new immigrants—are most likely to experience them, followed by native-born high school dropouts, who share job qualifications similar to the large share of low-skilled workers among immigrants to the United States.”

Impact: Unhappiness, illness, and death are higher in societies with higher economic inequality

The Equality Trust, contextually dated to 2015. (The Equality Trust is a registered charity that works to improve the quality of life in the UK by reducing economic and social inequality. We catalyse the work of the public by informing individuals and local groups about the damage inequality does and then support and empower them to take action to address it.) “Health” No date given, but cited information from 2015. https://www.equalitytrust.org.uk/health

Overall levels of health are far worse in more economically unequal societies. Research suggests that life expectancy is longer and rates of adult mortality, infant mortality, mental illness and obesity are lower in more equal societies. The strength of the relationship between inequality and health varies according to the health outcome in focus.

Impact: Economic inequality = financial instability, debt, inflation, and crises

The Equality Trust, contextually dated to 2015. (The Equality Trust is a registered charity that works to improve the quality of life in the UK by reducing economic and social inequality. We catalyse the work of the public by informing individuals and local groups about the damage inequality does and then support and empower them to take action to address it.) “Economic” No date given, but cited information from 2015. https://www.equalitytrust.org.uk/economic

Increased inequality can lead to financial crises. High levels of income inequality are associated with economic instability and crises, whereas more equal societies tend to have longer periods of sustained growth. High levels of income inequality lead to higher levels of personal and institutional debt. There is substantial evidence to suggest that increased inequality was at least partially responsible for the increase in debt that precipitated the US financial crisis. Inequality may have played a role in the UK financial crisis by increasing debt and over-consumption, but these effects could also have been small. Increased inequality may increase rates of inflation.

8. Social welfare costs

Immigrants massively cost the US welfare system

Pedro Gonzalez 2018 (assistant editor of *American Greatness* and a Mount Vernon Fellow of the Center for American Greatness) 8 July 2018 ”America Is Not a Nation of Immigrants” https://amgreatness.com/2018/07/08/america-is-not-a-nation-of-immigrants/

To say that most of today’s immigrants do not have the qualities Moynihan adumbrated is not racist but rather an objective statement of facts, especially when [51 percent](https://cis.org/Report/Welfare-Use-Immigrant-and-Native-Households) of households headed by an immigrant—legal or illegal—use at least one welfare program per year, compared to 30 percent of native households. Immigrants from Central America and Mexico, the [bulk](http://v/) of today’s arrivals, have the highest rate of welfare use. Accordingly, the Left has shifted its politics to dangle a generous welfare-state before immigrants and illegal aliens. Indeed, in 2017 the combined cost of education, medical, justice, and welfare expenditures attributed to illegal aliens alone amounted to [$116 billion](https://www.fairus.org/issue/publications-resources/fiscal-burden-illegal-immigration-united-states-taxpayers)—up from $113 billion in 2013. That figure accounts for total taxes paid by illegal aliens. Moreover, it’s worth noting that amnesty for illegals would only exacerbate this problem, because amnesty would make available to them more forms of means-tested welfare benefits, and in turn increase the fiscal drain on American taxpayers.

9. Diversity

Diversity isn’t always an advantage, sometimes it’s a disadvantage. Really bad behavior comes into the country, and we have to accept it to get “diversity” – or else don’t accept it and not have open immigration

Phillippe Legrain 2018. (f*ounder of Open Political Economy Network (OPEN), a think-tank that defends liberal societies, and a senior visiting fellow at the London School of Economics. Previously he was economic advisor to European Commission President José Manuel Barroso, special adviser to World Trade Organisation Director-General Mike Moore a* ) “How to convince sceptics of the value of immigration?” https://www.economist.com/open-future/2018/06/01/how-to-convince-sceptics-of-the-value-of-immigration

Some require help to fit in. But what to do with those who do not want to? In particular, how far should a liberal society accommodate illiberal immigrants? A self-described liberal [points out](https://www.economist.com/comment/3578305#comment-3578305) that not all diversity is good. “I personally see no cultural richness in practices such as female circumcision or the uncanny views of some Muslims towards women and homosexuals.” [Catherine Shaw](https://www.economist.com/comment/3578155#comment-3578155) argues that we “need to defend the things we are good at in the west—rule of law, lower corruption, gender equality, sustainable birth rates and respect for the environment.”

Works Cited: Open Immigration