

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## WORKSHEET: A Country of Immigrants, More or Less

### Worksheet 1

Directions: From the list below, select statements that, in your mind, describe citizenship education. Then in the space provided below, explain your choices.

Citizenship education...

- is optional for students and teachers
- is about indoctrination
- follows a particular political agenda
- covers issues of personal, social, and health education
- can be included as a part of the school curriculum
- is just about feelings and values
- is just about volunteering, charity, and doing good deeds
- solely about what goes on in schools
- is an entitlement for all young people
- is relevant to everyday concerns
- helps people think for themselves
- is about raising school standards and student achievement
- links school curriculum and culture to the wider community
- creates more effective partnerships between schools and communities
- is a lifelong process

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Worksheet 2

### ***New Residents in a New Country Have a Dream and a Helping Hand***

*(Excerpts from the article published by The New York Times, December 20, 2004)*

The seeds of Cheng Wei Wang's American dream were planted long before he was born, in 1920's Shanghai, when his mother was a child enchanted by a neighbor's tales of a faraway place called America.

"America is a beautiful land," the neighbor used to say. These were the words that Mr. Wang's mother repeated to him; the words that he would one day repeat to his wife; the words that eventually took them halfway around the world, from Shanghai to Queens.

Like Mr. Wang, millions of immigrants have spent their life's savings on one-way plane tickets to New York, arriving with little more than gratitude for the chance to pursue their version of that dream.

According to the 2000 census, more than 35 percent of New Yorkers were foreign-born, up from 28.4 percent 10 years earlier. Recent reports put the figure even higher, suggesting that about 40 of every 100 New Yorkers were born outside the United States - the highest figure since the early part of the 20th century. [...]

But while today's immigrants no longer have to sail on overcrowded ships to Ellis Island, they must still cope with many of the same hurdles that their predecessors encountered more than a century ago. [...]

"Even certain immigrants who are legally in the United States are no longer eligible for certain types of assistance," said Msgr. Kevin Sullivan of Catholic Charities, Archdiocese of New York. "And human need does not correlate with immigration status. So private funds, such as The New York Times Neediest Cases, enable us to focus on the genuine needs of immigrants and their families."

For Mr. Wang and his wife, Yu Xian Gu, even expressing their needs is problematic. Like all immigrants, they know that not being able to read or speak English is prohibitive. They feel alienated and limited, unable to pursue careers or to even ask where a bathroom is. This is not for lack of trying. Mr. Wang, 70, and Ms. Gu, 62, who speak Mandarin and Shanghainese, attend free English classes [...].

But writing words in a classroom and speaking them on the streets of New York are entirely different experiences. "You cannot even shop," Mr. Wang said, explaining the complexity of buying groceries without being able to read English labels.[...]

"We came for freedom and liberty; for a better life," said Mr. Wang, who arrived in New York with his wife in 1995. "People can elect a president of their own free will. In China ... "

Mr. Wang stopped as he thought. Instead of finishing his sentence, he broke into laughter. Ms. Gu accompanied him with her own high-pitched giggle.

The couple's combined yearly salary is \$14,000, though they say they are happy to be working at all. Retirement in Shanghai is compulsory, usually at age 60 for men and 55 for women.

A few years ago Mr. Wang, an office assistant, was able to work only part time because he was visiting his ailing mother in a nursing home each day. In the months before her death, his mother suffered from heart problems, emphysema and dementia. Mr. Wang, on the other hand, suffered from the most painful consequence of his language barrier: the inability to communicate with his mother's English-speaking doctors. [...]

Unable to ask questions and advocate for his mother, Mr. Wang became frustrated and depressed. Though many immigrants never seek medical help at a hospital or nursing home at all. Instead, they visit clinics where doctors speak their native tongue. [...]

In addition to offering free language classes, Selfhelp also found Mr. Wang and Ms. Gu public housing in Queensbridge, where the rent is \$421, and provided them with \$1,200 from the Neediest Cases for a couch and an air-conditioner.

Mr. Wang and Ms. Gu moved into the new apartment in September, and now that they are finally able to pay their rent, they plan to focus on their English studies. [...]

## Worksheet 3

### Symposium- Control of immigration

*(Insight on the News, March 11, 2002)*

*(Abridged)*

**Q: should Washington stem the tide of both legal and illegal immigration?**

**Yes: *Immigration will double the population of the United States within the next 60 years.***

By Dirk Chase Eldridge

The United States will double its population in the next 60 years unless we take prompt, aggressive action. The doubling will be caused almost entirely by immigration; more than 90 percent of our population growth since 1970 has come from recent immigrants and their children born here. Only Congress and the president can prevent this calamity, but so far neither has taken preventive action. Like Nero, they are fiddling while Rome burns.

To exacerbate matters, Congress legalized nearly 3 million illegal immigrants with amnesties in 1962, 1986 and 1997. Another is being considered for the 8 million to 11 million illegals we now host. This must be stopped.

In 1981, the Rev. Theodore Hesburgh, then-president of Notre Dame University, chaired a congressional commission to study immigration policy. The commission told President Ronald Reagan that our population was 200 million, which it labeled "already ecologically unsustainable," and recommended an immediate freeze on immigration. [...] The study was reported more than 20 years ago, yet nothing has been done to halt population growth or reduce the dramatic effects of chain immigration. From the "ecologically unsustainable" 200 million in 1981, our population now is 281 million -- and growing. [...]

Excessive immigration, both legal and illegal, resulting from the amendments of 1965, has exacted a tremendous price from the American people, paid in the coin of overcrowded schools, congested highways, deteriorating ecology and lagging infrastructure. California, for instance, would require the completion of one new school each day to keep pace with the growth of the student populations. Of course, no state is able to finance and build schools that rapidly. This shortfall causes increasingly crowded classrooms and a deteriorating quality of education. Nor is the problem limited to California. Other high-immigration states such as New York, Florida and Texas face similar demands. [...]

Recently we have experienced power shortages resulting in brownouts and rolling blackouts caused by too many people using a sometimes inadequate power supply. Because in today's politically correct climate it would be considered career suicide, no political leader has admitted that excessive immigration is a major contributor to these problems.

On the ecological front, in spite of impressive progress in some areas, 40 percent of Americans live in cities where the Environmental Protection Agency deems air quality substandard. Thirty-five of our states are withdrawing groundwater faster than it's being replenished. Forty percent of our lakes and streams are unfit for fishing or swimming. Our shortage of convenient open space is a national tragedy. Americans need tranquility more than ever, as overcrowding in our nation's population centers makes the mere absence of cell-phone babble a luxury.

The numbers tell why the United States suffers from immigration indigestion. During the 1960s we were absorbing 300,000 immigrants annually. Resulting from the aforementioned amendments to our immigration laws, the inflow of immigrants by the 1990s had ballooned to an average of more than 1 million per year. The dramatic change in the rate and ethnic composition of immigration brought fundamental changes to our nation, with failure of assimilation being the most profound.

The United States has a proud tradition of assimilating immigrants into the mainstream of our variegated population. Today, however, balkanization has replaced assimilation. Increasingly in America we see ethnic enclaves of recent immigrants making no effort to assimilate. Mexicans are the slowest to assimilate, perhaps because of their homeland's proximity. Alejandro Carrillo Castro, a former Mexican consul general in Chicago, says Mexicans in the United States are especially slow to naturalize, the ultimate act of assimilation. On average they take 22 years; others take seven. [...]

The Houston Chronicle reported a jarring example of non-assimilation: "At a soccer game against Mexico in February [1988], the American national team listened in frustration as a chorus of boos erupted during 'The Star-Spangled Banner.' Thousands of fans threw cups and bottles at the U.S. players, often striking them. They also attacked someone in the stands who tried to unfurl an American flag. The match didn't take place in Mexico City but in Los Angeles."

Failure of assimilation weakens America's social fabric and makes it difficult for immigrants to succeed here by participating fully in our economy. When immigration takes place at a reasonable rate, assimilation is more likely to occur. Adding to the problem of nonassimilation are more affordable airfares between the United States and immigrants' homelands, and such conveniences as reasonable long-distance telephone rates. In 1965 it cost \$10.59 to call the Dominican Republic for three minutes and \$15 to call India; now those rates are \$1.71 and \$3.66 respectively.

Through concerned, engaged leadership, the United States can stem the tide of immigration and prevent the statistically inevitable doubling of our already-too-large population in the next 60 years. First, a 10-year moratorium for all immigration would provide time for us to assimilate and acculturate the torrent of immigrants of the last three decades. Second, it would give our underclass a chance to improve their incomes and working conditions absent the flood of cheap, immigrant labor with which they now compete for entry-level jobs. And, finally, it would give us time thoughtfully to plan future immigration policies. What

characteristics will we seek in future immigrants? What level of education, what skills, what ages and how many will we admit? The moratorium would provide time to develop a consensus on future immigration, supplanting today's "policy-by-pressure-group" approach.

For national-security and other reasons, our borders must be bolstered against today's silent invasion by illegal immigrants, 40 percent of whom enter with temporary visas and simply stay, melding into our society as did 13 of the Sept. 11 terrorists. Other illegals sneak across our porous borders and shorelines. [...]

We should put teeth into our laws by incarcerating apprehended illegals in military facilities made available in recent rounds of base closures; 90 days for the first offense, six months for the second and a year for the third.

It's also time to demagnetize the magnet drawing them here: jobs. By replacing the easily counterfeited Social Security card every working American now must have with one containing a biometric representation of the carrier's fingerprints, we could make it simple to determine who is legally in our country and who is eligible for welfare and unemployment. Sanctions on employers who hire illegals should be part of the new paradigm. [...]

"There is nothing so permanent as a temporary farm worker" is more than a clever turn of phrase; it is a truism. This should be recognized and such programs discontinued. They simply perpetuate economically unsound arrangements where U.S. farmers produce labor-intensive crops that cannot be grown and harvested profitably without cheap immigrant labor, the availability of which discourages development of automated methods. If we cannot grow such crops profitably, their production should be left to countries that can. That's how a free market, unfettered by a flow of unrealistically cheap labor, efficiently allocates its resources.

***NO: Immigrants have enriched American culture and enhanced our influence in the world.***

By Daniel T. Griswold

Immigration always has been controversial in the United States. More than two centuries ago, Benjamin Franklin worried that too many German immigrants would swamp America's predominantly British culture. In the mid-1800s, Irish immigrants were scorned as lazy drunks, not to mention Roman Catholics. At the turn of the century a wave of "new immigrants" -- Poles, Italians, Russian Jews -- were believed to be too different ever to assimilate into American life. Today the same fears are raised about immigrants from Latin America and Asia, but current critics of immigration are as wrong as their counterparts were in previous eras.

Immigration is not undermining the American experiment; it is an integral part of it. We are a nation of immigrants. Successive waves of immigrants have kept our country demographically young, enriched our culture and added to our productive capacity as a nation, enhancing our influence in the world.

Immigration gives the United States an economic edge in the world economy. Immigrants bring innovative ideas and entrepreneurial spirit to the U.S. economy. They provide business contacts to other markets, enhancing America's ability to trade and invest profitably in the global economy. They keep our economy flexible, allowing U.S. producers to keep prices down and to respond to changing consumer demands. An authoritative 1997 study by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) concluded that immigration delivered a "significant positive gain" to the U.S. economy. In testimony before Congress last year, Federal Reserve Board Chairman Alan Greenspan said, "I've always argued that this country has benefited immensely from the fact that we draw people from all over the world."

Contrary to popular myth, immigrants do not push Americans out of jobs. Immigrants tend to fill jobs that Americans cannot or will not fill, mostly at the high and low ends of the skill spectrum. Immigrants are disproportionately represented in such high-skilled fields as medicine, physics and computer science, but also in lower-skilled sectors such as hotels and restaurants, domestic service, construction and light manufacturing.[...]

Nowhere is the contribution of immigrants more apparent than in the high-technology and other knowledge-based sectors. Silicon Valley and other high-tech sectors would cease to function if we foolishly were to close our borders to skilled and educated immigrants. These immigrants represent human capital that can make our entire economy more productive. Immigrants have developed new products, such as the Java computer language, that have created employment opportunities for millions of Americans.

Immigrants are not a drain on government finances. The NAS study found that the typical immigrant and his or her offspring will pay a net \$80,000 more in taxes during their lifetimes than they collect in government services. For immigrants with college degrees, the net fiscal

return is \$198,000. It is true that low-skilled immigrants and refugees tend to use welfare more than the typical "native" household, but the 1996 Welfare Reform Act made it much more difficult for newcomers to collect welfare. As a result, immigrant use of welfare has declined in recent years along with overall welfare rolls.

Despite the claims of immigration opponents, today's flow is not out of proportion to historical levels. Immigration in the last decade has averaged about 1 million per year, high in absolute numbers, but the rate of 4 immigrants per year per 1,000 U.S. residents is less than half the rate during the Great Migration of 1890-1914. Today, about 10 percent of U.S. residents are foreign-born, an increase from 4.7 percent in 1970, but still far short of the 14.7 percent who were foreign-born in 1910.

Nor can immigrants fairly be blamed for causing "over-population." America's annual population growth of 1 percent is below our average growth rate of the last century. In fact, without immigration our labor force would begin to shrink within two decades. According to the 2000 Census, 22 percent of U.S. counties lost population between 1990 and 2000. Immigrants could help revitalize demographically declining areas of the country, just as they helped revitalize New York City and other previously declining urban centers.

Drastically reducing the number of foreigners who enter the United States each year only would compound the economic damage of Sept. 11 while doing nothing to enhance our security. The tourist industry, already reeling, would lose millions of foreign visitors, and American universities would lose hundreds of thousands of foreign students if our borders were closed.

Obviously the U.S. government should "control its borders" to keep out anyone who intends to commit terrorist acts. The problem is not that we are letting too many people into the United States but that the government has failed to keep the wrong people out.[...].

We must do whatever is necessary to stop potentially dangerous people at the border. Law-enforcement and intelligence agencies must work closely with the State Department, the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and U.S. Customs to share real-time information about potential terrorists. Computer systems must be upgraded and new technologies adopted to screen out the bad guys without causing intolerable delays at the border. More agents need to be posted at ports of entry to more thoroughly screen for high-risk travelers. We must bolster cooperation with our neighbors, Canada and Mexico, to ensure that terrorists cannot slip across our long land borders.

In the wake of Sept. 11, longtime critics of immigration have tried to exploit legitimate concerns about security to argue for drastic cuts in immigration. But border security and immigration are two separate matters. Immigrants are only a small subset of the total number of foreigners who enter the United States every year. Only about one of every 25 foreign nationals who enter the United States come here to immigrate. The rest are tourists, business travelers, students and Mexican and Canadians who cross the border for a



weekend to shop or visit family and then return home with no intention of settling permanently in the United States.[...]

To defend ourselves better against terrorism, our border-control system requires a reorientation of mission. For the last two decades, U.S. immigration policy has been obsessed with nabbing mostly Mexican-born workers whose only "crime" is their desire to earn an honest day's pay. Those workers pose no threat to national security.[...]

At a February 2000 hearing, former Sen. Slade Gorton (R-Wash.) warned that "understaffing at our northern border is jeopardizing the security of our nation, not to mention border personnel, while in at least some sections of the southern border, there are so many agents that there is not enough work to keep them all busy."

We should stop wasting scarce resources in a self-destructive quest to hunt down Mexican construction workers and raid restaurants and chicken-processing plants, and redirect those resources to track potential terrorists and smash their cells before they can blow up more buildings and kill more Americans.

For all these reasons, President George W. Bush's initiative to legalize and regularize the movement of workers across the U.S.-Mexican border makes sense in terms of national security as well as economics. It also is politically smart. [...]

It would be a national shame if, in the name of security, we closed the door to immigrants who come here to work, save and build a better life for themselves and their families. Immigrants come here to live the American Dream; terrorists come to destroy it. We should not allow America's tradition of welcoming immigrants to become yet another casualty of Sept. 11.

*The full text of the articles is available at*  
[http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_m1571/is\\_9\\_18/ai\\_83699666](http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1571/is_9_18/ai_83699666)