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Immigration to the United States
Foreign Born Population in the United States, 1860 to 2009

Immigration to the United States, by Region of Origin, 1970 and 2010

1970
- Europe: 59%
- North America: 8%
- Africa: 1%
- Other Mexico: 4%
- Other: 1%
- Other Latin America and Caribbean: 11%
- Asia: 9%

2010
- Mexico: 29%
- Other Latin America and Caribbean: 24%
- Europe: 4%
- Africa: 2%
- North America: 2%
- Other: 1%
- Asia: 28%
States with the Largest and Most Rapidly Growing Immigrant Populations, 1990 to 2009

Percent of Recent Immigrants Arriving to the South

Source: Monica McDermott, RSF Presentation July 27, 2010; US Census, Historical Census Data, Table 5.
Immigrants in Suburbs

![Graph showing size and share of foreign-born population by location, 1980-2007.](chart)

Numbers in bars represent proportion (of 100%) of U.S. foreign-born population living in that community type in the year denoted.

Source: Brookings analysis of decennial census and 2007 ACS data.
Changing Face of the Rural Plains

Growth in the population of Hispanics in the Great Plains — especially in rural areas, where even small growth can have an outsize impact — is filling some of the void left by a declining white population. The Hispanic population in the seven Great Plains states shown below has increased 75 percent, while the overall population has increased just 7 percent.
Population Growth in the US, 2000-2100

Percent of Total Population

White

Latino

Af-Am

Asian

White population growth from 2000 to 2100, with a decrease from 71.4% to 40.3%

Latino population growth from 2000 to 2100, with an increase from 11.8% to 33.3%

Af-Am population growth from 2000 to 2100, with an increase from 12.2% to 13%

Asian population growth from 2000 to 2100, with a slight increase from 3.9% to 13%
Areas that are now “majority minority”
Views on Immigration Restriction vs. Unemployment in the United States, 1987 to 2010

Source: Gallup, Immigration; Bureau of Economic Analysis.
Note: public opinion trend line indicates only years for which Gallup data is available.
Federal Enforcement Policies
Who has the authority to regulate immigration?

Role of the Federal government:

- Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution Congress has the power to “establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization.”

- Immigration powers as derivative of foreign policy powers.

Limits to what states can do:

- 14th Amendment: states cannot “deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”
Plenary power doctrine

Role of the Federal government:

- *Chae Chang Ping v. United States* (1889)

Congress can authorize the exclusion of individuals from entering into the U.S. on the basis of race.

- *Fong Yue Ting v. United States* (1893)

Congress can authorize the deportation of immigrants from the U.S. individuals on the basis of race.
ICE Alien Removals and Returns, FY 2000 to 2010

Fugitive Operations Team Arrests, 2003 to 2008

ICE Worksite Enforcement Arrests by Fiscal Year, 2002 to 2010

ICE Alien Removals and Returns, FY 2000 to 2010

State and Local Responses
Immigration-Related Legislation Introduced and Enacted at the State Level, 2005 to 2010

Types of Anti-Immigrant Ordinances Passed by Local Jurisdictions, 2000-2009
AZ SB 1070

- Would have required AZ police officers investigate the immigration status of all individuals they stop if the officers suspected that they were in the country unlawfully;

- Would have mandated detention of individuals who were arrested, even for minor offenses that would normally result in a ticket, if they could not verify that they were authorized to be in the U.S.;

- Would have imposed state criminal penalties for non-citizens failing to register with the Department of Homeland Security or failing to carry registration documents;

- Would have allowed for the warrantless arrest of individuals who were deemed by state or local police officers to be "removable" from the U.S.; and

- Would have made it a crime for alleged undocumented immigrants to work in the state of Arizona.
Widespread Approval of AZ SB 1070, with support across party lines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% approve</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Rep</th>
<th>Dem</th>
<th>Ind</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requiring people to produce documents verifying legal status</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing police to detain anyone unable to verify legal status</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing police to question Anyone they think may be in country illegally</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% approve of new Arizona law</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pew Research Center May 6-9 Q10a-c & Q11. Figures may not add to 100% because of rounding.
Positive Approaches at the State Level

- **Utah**: supports use of E-Verify, but also issued a ‘compact’ outlining the state’s commitment to the inclusion of all immigrants.

- **Alaska, Montana, New Mexico, and Oregon**: Explicitly reject the use of state resources for the purposes of immigration enforcement.

- **Illinois and New York**: reject cooperation with the federal government’s Secure Communities Program.

- **Maryland and ten other states**: allow immigrants to pay ‘in-state tuition’ in state universities as state residents.

- Two states still allow unauthorized migrants access to drivers’ licenses, though these programs have been disappearing post-9/11.
Positive Approaches at the Local Level

- San Francisco, California and New Haven, Connecticut: issued municipal ID cards to allow their residents, regardless of their legal status, access to both public and private services, ranging from health care to banking.

- Takoma Park, Maryland: allows non-citizen voting.

- Asheville, North Carolina and several dozen other municipalities in 23 states: enacted laws that seek to keep separate police and immigration enforcement. Include many of the nation’s largest immigrant receiving metro areas: New York City, Los Angeles, San Francisco, the District of Columbia, Chicago, Baltimore, Boston, Detroit, Minneapolis, St. Louis, Newark, Philadelphia, Austin, and Seattle.

- Nashville, Tennessee: rejected “English only ordinance”
Conclusion
Immigrant integration in the U.S. a very mixed bag. Historically laissez-faire—no real integration policy at the federal level. Since the failure of immigration reform efforts in 2007, however, there is increasingly variation in responses, particularly toward the undocumented, across states and localities.

Federal policy has focused on enforcement. While there have shifts under the Obama administration away from workplace raids, there has been an increased emphasis on the arrest and deportation of ‘criminal aliens’ and on the implementation of the Secure Communities program requiring local police agencies to check the identities of anyone they arrest.

There is substantial variation in state and local level responses, with states being both relatively welcoming and restrictive. The kind of response is highly correlated with party control of the state legislature and governorship: states with Republican majorities are much more likely to see restrictive legislation passed.