Why do Americans consider Mexican Immigrants a Problem?

The United States has always been a nation of immigrants. The first “Americans,” that came from the Mayflower in 1620, were immigrants themselves that sought to escape persecution from the British Monarch. Since then, the United States has become increasingly diverse in race and beliefs with a focus on equality for all. With this in mind, it is counterintuitive to think that the United States would persecute any group of people. Nevertheless, it is becoming increasingly difficult to disagree that this nation of immigrants is deliberately persecuting Mexican immigrants. The most prevalent example of this notion can be seen in Donald Trump’s remark, from his nationally broadcasted presidential announcement speech on June 16, 2015 at Trump Tower, that Mexico is “sending people that have lots of problems, and they’re bringing those problems with us” (TIME Staff). Whether this remark was seen live on television, or online, it is impossible to ignore the galvanized crowd at Trump Tower and the anti-Mexican immigration sentiment that would continue to fuel his campaign.

By this point it is important to note that the United States has had a history of embellishing immigrants and viewing immigrants as criminals. During World War II, the United States criminalized thousands of innocent Japanese immigrants from the West coast by forcing them in to internment camps. The United States also has numerous holidays such as Cinco de Mayo, St. Patrick’s Day, and Mardi Gras that millions of
Americans eagerly participate and celebrate the foreign cultures they stem from. This gives reason to believe that the current view of immigration is not entirely new.

Nevertheless, when we consider that Donald Trump has consistently remained as the top nominee for the Republican Party in the 2016 general election, despite his malicious comments over immigrants, it becomes necessary to question why his ideals are so favorable. Moreover, it becomes necessary to question why Americans view Mexican immigrants as a problem.

Many scholars such as Michael B. Katz, a historian and social theorist, have already taken a comprehensive approach to the Mexican immigration debate evident today. In the article “The Mexican Immigrant Debate: A View from History,” Katz et al illustrate the striking resemblance between the experiences of the Mexican immigration wave and older immigrant group waves. Katz identifies the particularly strong resemblance in the economic experience with the Polish and Italian waves. These groups migrated to the United States due to the increase globalization of the labor market and usually took dangerous, low-wage jobs. However, the children and grandchildren of the earlier immigrant groups experienced extensive aid from the government that allowed them to achieve better jobs and eventually reach a standard of living comparable to more settled Americans. Katz research shows that society has a tendency to overestimate the success of previous immigrants groups and underestimate the success of Mexican immigrants today. Moreover, it is important to note that although the Mexican immigration debate has similarities to previous waves of immigration, the issue with Mexican immigrants is exposed to unique challenges today. Primarily, factors such as the
media have increased in magnitude and led Americans to become increasingly exposed to the idea of a Mexican immigration debate.

Considering Donald Trump’s relative success in the 2016 general election, as well as the extensive attention the media has given him, it is practical to consider his recent remarks over Mexican immigration for the purpose of this paper. These remarks can serve as a tentative example of the popular opinion Americans have towards Mexican immigrants today. Therefore, in this paper I will begin by evaluating two notable remarks about Mexicans, from Donald Trump, that brings to light the unjust perception of Mexican immigrants. In addition, I will discuss general aversion about immigrants that lead Americans to view Mexican immigrants as a problem. This will be followed by a third discussion about more specific factors that lead Americans to view Mexican immigrants as a problem.

**Donald Trump’s Remarks on Mexican immigrants**

**We Need to Send Mexican immigrants Back to Mexico**

The first remark from Donald Trump I will evaluate stems from the misconception that we need to send Mexican immigrants back to Mexico. On November 10 Donald Trump appeared on the Fox Business/Wall Street Journal 2015 GOP primary debate, along with 11 other candidates, in order to advocate to the American public why they are the best candidates. When the debate moved toward the topic of immigration, Donald Trump arguably left the lasting impression when asked if this nation can send 5 million people back with no effect on the economy. While other candidates such as John Kasich touched on the subject with a humanitarian perspective by saying, “think of the families,” Donald Trump expressed the opposite by claiming, “You are going to have to send
people out… Dwight Eisenhower, a great president, moved 1.5 million illegal immigrants out of this country, moved them just beyond the border… we have no choice.” As if that was not enough to instill a sense of urgency over immigration flow, Donald Trump further instigated the situation, at the Fox Business/Wall Street Journal 2015 GOP primary debate, by proclaiming, “We need borders. We will have a wall [on the Mexican border]. The wall will be built. The wall will be successful.” Fortunately, there is more to the issue than Donald Trump leads the American public to believe.

Donald Trump’s remarks, over the flow of Mexican immigrants, are ignorant to say the least. Comments such as these are problematic considering that his popularity, and loud presence, has the potential to lead Americans to take his word as fact and ignore the credible research that shows this is issue is being overblown. While Donald Trump played with the idea that Dwight Eisenhower successfully moved 1.5 million immigrants out, the Pew Research center, a highly reputable think tank, provides us with a more concrete source to evaluate his argument. In the report “More Mexicans Leaving than Coming to the U.S.,” Ana Gonzalez-Barrera, a research associate at the Pew Research center, measures the migration flow between Mexico and the United States using two national censuses from Mexico, a national household survey from Mexico, and two national surveys from the United States. With this data, it was found that “from 2009 to 2014, 1 million Mexicans and their families left the U.S. for Mexico… [and] an estimated 870,000 Mexican nationals left Mexico to come to the U.S., a smaller number than the flow of families from the U.S. to Mexico” (5). The report also notes that since 2004 the net flow of Mexican immigrants to the United States has been steadily decreasing to the point that the net flow is now negative and is expected to continue. Subsequently, it is
reasonable to believe that Donald Trump’s remarks are an attempt to instill a false sense of urgency over the flow of Mexican immigrants into the United States.

In addition to the report by the Pew research center I would also like to bring attention to *The World of Mexican Immigrants: The Rock and the Hard Place* by Judith Hellman, a professor at York University in the Department of political science. Hellman’s research covers ground that Donald Trump is clearly ignoring when he believes that we can simply deport 5 million Mexican immigrants and expect no effect on the economy. Hellman’s book provides a humanizing perspective, based on 5-years of in-depth interviews, on the lives of Mexican immigrants in the United Sates. The details covered range from how Mexicans in Mexico think of the US, the journey Mexican immigrants took, and the return home that many of them are making. In all of this, Hellman brings to light the case that “Americans recognize that they may find themselves surrounded by Mexicans precisely because Mexicans have, in fact, become indispensible to the successful functioning of the US service economy, to the production of food, and increasingly to the manufacturing economy as well” (Hellman 9). Once again this research leads me to believe Trump’s remarks are an attempt to instill a sense of urgency, which is increasingly problematic now that we understand that wishing away Mexican immigrants can be detrimental to the United Sates economy.

As I stated before, Donald Trump is not a representation of the American mind. Nevertheless, his fame does have a considerable influence on the way Americans perceive this issue. With this in mind, Donald Trump’s remarks show us that a significant amount of the US population believes, although not as extreme, that something has to be done with Mexican immigrants. Moreover, the idea that we can simply deport millions of
Mexican immigrants is also an idea on the minds of Americans. Through all of this it is important to note that ideas such as Donald Trump, over the nature of the issue, are largely overblown and that these claims are lacking in credible research.

Association of Crime with Immigration

In light of the misconception previously discussed, I would also like to shed light on the that notion that Mexican immigrants entering the United States are criminals and discuss how it is supported by research to be unfair and untrue. The previous remark made by Donald Trump is arguably a continuum of the anti-immigration tone he had set in his presidential announcement speech on June 16, 2015 at Trump Tower. The beginning of Trump’s campaign was marked with his claim that Mexico is “sending people that have lots of problems, and they're bringing those problems. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists.” Adding to the fire, Trump made a similar claim on august 6, 2015, at the Fox News/Facebook Top Ten First Tier debate. Where he iterates that the “Mexican government is much smarter, much sharper, much more cunning. And they send the bad ones over because they don't want to pay for them.” Once again, this claim is anything but the truth.

Trump’s claim, although untrue, does deserve strict scrutiny over the matter considering that if crime and immigration are connected then action needs to be taken. For that reason, Dr. Michael Mears, Professor and Principal investigator at Florida State University’s College of Criminology and Criminal Justice, examines this matter in his article “Crime and Immigration: What is the Connection?” Dr. Mears argues that the connection between crime and immigration is unjust. Moreover, Dr. Mears begins his discussion by pointing out that previous research on this topic has relied on the least
accurate research available. Ironically, however, the research that is often cited shows that immigrants are less criminal than non-immigrant groups of the same age and that there really is no correlation between crime and immigration rates in that data. Dr. Mears goes on to discuss how there is a wide notion there exist an “immigration-crime” nexus yet there is no wide understand on whether this nexus is referring to legal vs. illegal, type of crime, immigrant vs. non immigrants, or various other dimensions. Through all of this, Dr. Mears points out a significant aspect of the link between crime and immigration which is that “during periods of concern about immigration and crime, these data are cited as demonstration of a link and during periods when concern turns to other social problems, these data are ignored, as if their probative value were no longer self-evident” (288).

Dr. Mears is not alone on his perspective of crime and immigration. Ron Unz, a political activist and alumni from both Harvard and Stanford University, in his article “The Myth of Immigrant Crime,” examines a more specific link between crime and Hispanic immigrants. While Dr. Mears highlights the inconsistencies in which Americans perceive crime and immigration, Unz takes a more analytical approach by utilizing the FBI Uniform Crime Report, The Bureau of Justice Statistics report, and other federal reports to evaluate the incarceration and crime rate of Hispanic immigrants. The research conducted by Unz found that “the mass of statistical evidence constitutes strong support for the “null hypothesis,” namely that Hispanics have approximately the same crime rates as whites of the same age” (31). Unz goes a step further in his conclusion and notes that although the there is little evidence to suggest a link between crime and immigration, there is significant evidence in other areas of research that support a link between crime
and poverty. With this in mind, Unz suggest that as Hispanics become settled into the United States, and their standard living increases, then we should expect there to be less crime among Hispanics.

With consideration to both of Trump’s remark’s highlighted in this section, it should be clear that these ideas are anything but true. These ideas are supported by research to be untrue. More importantly, this section highlights that these ideas are unfair when we consider how much research has proven these claims to be untrue. With this understanding, it is only logical to progress into the next section and discuss general aversions about immigrants that lead Americans to believe that Mexican immigrants are a problem.

General Aversions about Immigrants that Lead Americans to View Mexican Immigrants as a Problem

Job Threat

A common ideology that leads Americans to perceive immigrants in an unfavorable manner is job threat. The United States is arguably the target destination for various immigrants groups due to the economic prospect that the American Dream leads them to believe. Katz brought attention to this idea when he claimed that the Polish, Italian, and Mexican immigrants groups “embodied the internationalization of labor markets that accompanied the first and second great waves of economic globalization in the modern industrial period” (181). However, the American Dream that many immigrant groups envisioned is not a dream that many Americans feel comfortable giving to recent immigrant groups. In the article “Determinants of Perceived immigrant Job Threat in the American States,” Michael Wallace, a professor of Sociology at the University of
Connecticut, evaluates the extent that perceived immigrant job threat is influenced by the traditional theories of prejudice, which are contact theory, group contact theory, and cultural theory. In addition, the author builds on these theories by including his own theories which are economic competition, labor market deregulation, and globalization. From this, it was found that “level of perceived immigrant job threat tend to increase in settings where there is economic stagnation, low minimum wage, labor unions are growing weaker, and where corporate restructuring has taken place” (603). From this it is evident that job threat plays a dynamic role in the way Americans perceive immigration.

Wallace’s claim has proved to be the case when we consider Donald Trump’s popularity in the 2016 general election. The article from the *New York Times*, “The Geography of Trumpism,” examines hundreds of economic and demographic variables from national census data, along with results from past elections, and compared it to the results in the 2016 General election in order to predict areas most favorable for Trump. This article found that the demographics of Trump voters is significantly skewed towards areas consisting of higher populations of whites without a high school diploma and working in fields such as manufacturing. Although the focus of this discussion is on immigrants, the demographics of Trump supporters provides insight on the factors that lead to American to perceive immigrants as a problem. Moreover, job threat can be expected to be a general aversion about immigrants on a local level in areas that are experiencing economic struggles and become widespread as economic struggle spreads nationally. In turn, it is evident that the general aversion of job threat, with respect to immigrants, is a notable force that leads Americans to perceive Mexican immigrants as a problem.
Another notable factor that leads Americans to have an unfavorable perception towards immigrants is the notion of assimilation threat. This notion stems from the idea that immigrants may be too different to fit in our society. Moreover, immigrants that are more similar to Americans generally experience a more welcoming attitude. Based on a study with 240 face to face interviews, the article “Talking about Immigration and Immigrants: A Qualitative Exploration of White Americans Attitudes,” explores the way Americans talk about immigration. Dr. Rochelle Parks-Yancy, a professor at Texas Southern University, along with Johanna Shih, Nancy DiTomaso, and Corrine Post, whom are all professors and doctorates in sociology, coauthored the article. The research performed by these scholars supports the understanding that when people talk about immigration, one of the primary concerns is whether the immigrants can assimilate into the American society.

The study placed an emphasis on the details include, or not included, as well as the logic used to formulate either an inclusive boundary or an exclusive boundary when Americans described immigrants and immigration. Based on the results it was found that “white Americans were much more elaborate in talking about whom the right kind of immigrant is, rather than the immigration levels per say” (300). Subsequently, it is reasonable to believe that Americans have a greater focus on their differences from the immigrants, and they base their opinions on how distinct these differences are. Earlier immigration groups from Western Europe are noticeably more similar in language, appearance, and culture to current Americans. Mexican immigrants are noticeable darker in skin tone, different in language and considerably different in culture. This leads to the
realization that American may have stronger objections to Mexican immigrants due to the fear that they cannot assimilate into the American culture.

A more developed understating of assimilation threat in respect to immigrants will benefit from understanding the factors that lead Americans to view immigrants in a more favorable manner. The article “Explaining Pro-Immigrant Sentiment in the US: Social Class, Cosmopolitanism, and Perception of Immigrants” by Jeannie Haubert and Elizabeth Fussell, whom are both University professors and doctorates in sociology, examine factors that lead to pro and anti-immigration perception. The study was based on data from the 1996 General Social Survey carried out by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago. With this, the article finds that there is a cosmopolitan effect that leads to more positive immigration sentiment. The cosmopolitan effect refers to highly educated, white-collar workers, who have lived abroad and reject fanatical patriotism. Consequently, the rise of a cosmopolitan worldview “will diminish negative stereotypes and encourage recognition of common experiences across nations” (504). In essence, it is inferred through this research that people whom are less educated, working class, and have little experience abroad are more likely to believe that immigrants are different from us. Moreover, people that have a cosmopolitan worldview are more likely to see that despite all the differences, immigrants are people just like us. When people realize that immigrants have a more unifying background, rather than distinct, then fear of assimilation becomes an ignorant thought. With this in mind, it is noticeable that Mexican immigrants tend to be viewed as a problem when people are less experienced and knowledgeable with the world around them.
More Specific Factors that Lead Americans to Perceive Mexican Immigrants as a Problem

Undocumented Immigrants

Despite the similar aversions with immigrants groups, it is apparent that notion of undocumented immigrants is a unique aspect to Mexican immigrants that leads American to view this immigrant group as a problem. The relationship and significance of undocumented immigrants and Mexican immigrants becomes clear when we consider the article “White Public Opinion Toward Undocumented Immigrants: Threat and Interpersonal Environment,” by Justin Allen Berg, a doctorate in sociology and a professor at the University of North Dakota. The study in this article was based on data provided by the 1996 and 2004 General Social survey, which is a survey conducted every other year by the National Opinion Research Center. The data from this survey was filtered into a total sample size of 2,081, self-identified white Americans, who responded to the question “How much do you agree or disagree with the following statement? America should take stronger measures to exclude illegal immigrants”(44). In turn, Berg assumes that those who said no were sympathetic to undocumented immigrants than those who agreed.

Berg suggests that in order to understand popular opinion about immigration we must understand the opinions about illegal immigrants. This suggestion is based on previous research, which identifies that the majority of Americans believe that the majority of recent immigrants entering the United States are illegal immigrants. It was initially believed by Berg that labor market competition would be the best indicator of perception towards illegal immigrants. This was the case up until 2004 when the major
indicator of popular opinion was the percentage of Latino residents in local regions. Conclusively, it was determined that “whites may associate this ethnic group with immigration, or the term immigrant with members of this ethnic group” (54). This shows that there is a significant association between Mexican immigrants and undocumented immigrants in the American mind. Moreover, when we consider the popularity of Donald Trump’s remarks, that we have to send people back to Mexico, it is clear that the association between Latinos and undocumented immigrants in the American mind is in respect to Mexican immigrants.

Berg’s discussion also brings up another important point, in respect to the significance of this association, which is that immigrant groups that are perceived to be present in large numbers without documentation experience the greatest amount of prejudice. Berg identifies the similar case of Mexican immigrants in the United States to North Africans in France as well as West Indians in Britain. Each of these groups experienced prejudice in the nations to which they migrated into due to the fact that the natives believed they were entering illegally in large numbers. Nevertheless, the association between Latinos and undocumented immigration is noted by Berg to be unique to the United States. Consequently, it is argued “if Americans associate undocumented immigrants with Latinos, then native-born Latinos and legal Latino immigrants may experience a similar form of subtle prejudice in the United States” (53). Moreover, since Americans believe more in the association between undocumented immigrants and Mexican immigrants, then it is reasonable to believe that native born Mexicans and legal Mexican immigrants are currently experiencing a unique form of prejudice than previous immigrant groups.
The Media

Another unique factor that is almost exclusively leading Americans to view Mexican immigrants as a problem is the media. Although the media has existed for centuries, in the form of print media, the media has evolved in recent time into a giant consisting of numerous forms of print and internet-based media. Even so, many of us may not be aware of the impact the media is having on Mexican immigrants. In the article “Perceptions of Threat, Demographic Diversity, and the Framing of Illegality: Explaining (Non) Participation in New York's 2006 Immigrant Protests,” Dr. Chris Zepada-Millan, a political scientist, analyzes the effect that public perception of immigration had on participation in the 2006 New York protest over a bill that would have increased the penalty of harboring, aiding, or being an undocumented immigrant from a civil violation to a federal felony (881). The primary source of data for this study was based on U.S. Census' 2006 American Community Survey along with in-depth interviews with 44 key individuals and organizations in this protest. In turn, Dr. Zepada-Millan’s research can be used to answer a very important question: In a land of immigrants, why do certain immigrant groups feel more affected by the immigration debate?

Dr. Zepada-Millan determined that participation/non-participation was dependent on the details of immigration policies disclosed by the media as well as whom they portrayed as being the most affected by it. Moreover, non-Latino immigrant groups limited their participation in the protest because they believe that the media’s focus on immigration policies, such as border militarization and guest worker programs, meant that the debate pertained to Mexicans only. Subsequently, Dr. Zepada-Millan found that,
despite the fact Mexican immigrants are among the smallest immigrant groups in New York, “more Mexicans participated in the protests than other foreign-born populations” (883). Through this we see that the response to the question posed is that the media’s portrayal of immigration has turned the battle of immigration into a battle with Mexican immigrants. Ultimately, in the midst of a country of immigrants, the media has proven to refine an all-encompassing issue into an almost exclusive issue of Mexican immigrants.

While cases such as the 2006 New York protest serve as a more obvious indicator of the media’s influence on Mexican immigrants, the media is also leading Americans to perceive Mexican immigrants through an inherent bias in the news construction process. Specifically, this bias is known as linguistic intergroup bias and it refers to the subconscious, or even deliberate, behavior of perpetuating positive in-group stereotypes and negative out-group stereotypes. The relevance of linguistic bias in the media, over coverage of Mexican immigration, is brought to light in the article “News Coverage of Immigration: The Influence of Exposure to Linguistic Bias in the News on Consumer Racial Ethnic cognitions,” by Dana Mastro, a professor at UC-Santa Barbara and a doctorate in communication. Maestro et al. based their study on 684 news articles, from 64 different newspapers, within the span of January 2005 to December 2005, which addressed the Minuteman Project. The Minuteman Project has received a fair amount of attention primarily due to its bold mission, which is the first thing noticed on MinutemanHQ.com, “to secure United States borders and coastal boundaries against unlawful and unauthorized entry of all individuals, contraband, and foreign military.” Subsequently, due to the Minutemen Project’s in-group status and clear objection against
a distinct class of Mexican immigrants, this group serves as a focal point for news 
construction process over the topic of Mexican immigration at the US-Mexico border.

Maestro et al’s study provides insight that the media has a tendency to perpetuate negative stereotypes over Mexican immigrants. The study found that “abstract language, (implying the stable, generalizable and representative characteristics) was most reflective of coverage addressing: (a) unfavorable and unsympathetic depictions of immigrants, and (b) constructive and advantageous representations of the minutemen” (143). Considering that the Minutemen have a notable presence at the US-Mexico border then it is fair to say that the news is perpetuating negative stereotypes over Mexican immigrants in these reports. This becomes increasingly problematic when we consider that the case of the 2006 New York protest proves that media has reported extensively on immigration as a Mexican immigrant problem. Subsequently, linguistic bias in the media is a viable aspect of the media that provides increasing challenges to Mexican immigrants that seems to be unparalleled in other large waves of immigrants. This is not to say that the news is systematically, and deliberately, constructing bias reports that are ruining Mexican immigrants. Moreover, I am suggesting that the media has a natural tendency, which should not be ignored, to portray Mexican immigrants as the out-group and characterize them in a biased manner. Ultimately, the media is a force that has proven to stimulate tension and stereotype the immigration debate in the United States as a Mexican immigrant problem.

Conclusion

With Donald Trump, and his widely publicized remarks over Mexican immigrants, we can begin to see the consequences and the way that immigration has been
shaped in the United States. He blatantly accused Mexican immigrants of being criminals, rapist, drug dealers, and he has consistently instigated the notion that we need to deport Mexican immigrants. Other than the obvious, these remarks are flat out wrong when we consider that the research by the Pew Research center, Ron Unz, Dr. Michael Mears, and Judith Hellman deliberately notes the flaws in these arguments and provide us with concrete research that thoroughly illustrates ideas such as Trump’s are largely overblown. Despite the lack of truth in ideas such as Trump’s, these ideas are problematic considering that the Mexican immigration debate is dictated on these notions. In the process, many Americans may seem to forget that Mexican immigrants are indispensable to our economy. Additionally, these notions may lead Americans to turn a blind eye on the more prominent issues such as a struggling group of Mexican immigrants attempting to move beyond their impoverish state.

Unfortunately, moving Americans past their unfavorable sentiment towards Mexican immigrants does have several obstacles that need to be overcome. Understanding the history of immigration in the United States sheds light on the fact that most immigration groups face similar obstacles. Assimilation and job threat are among the most prominent factors. However, these factors do have a varying effect. Mexican immigrants are noticeably different in skin tone, language, and culture from the majority of white Americans. Dr. Rochelle Parks-Yancy and her colleagues provide the insight that that these distinct differences may lead Americans to believe that Mexican immigrants are not the right kind of immigrant more than other immigrant groups. Nevertheless, Jeannie Hubert and Elizabeth Fussel provide comfort that an increasingly globalizing world should help break down this barrier. Regardless, there is still the
notion of job threat. Fortunately, however, this also has a varying role, and for the most part, this fear seems to be centered around working-class and Americans with little education. This means that as long as there is no national recession, we should expect this factor be more manageable to overcome.

Despite this, there are still more prominent factors that are uniquely affecting Mexican immigrants. The most noticeable factor is the notion of undocumented immigrants. Berg’s article supports the notion that when Americans think of immigration, there is very little distinction between the terms immigration, Mexican immigrants, and undocumented immigrants. The consequence of this notion, supported by Berg, is that Mexican immigrants are experiencing the same subtle prejudice that other immigrant groups, with a similar notion of undocumented immigrants, have experienced throughout other nations. This is a factor that I believe will be difficult to overcome.

When we consider the media then it becomes clear that this issue facing another giant. The case of 2006 New York protest is a powerful indicator that when the media talks about immigration, the focus is on Mexican immigrants. Furthermore, Dana Maestro’s article provides the insight that the media has a tendency to perpetuate negative stereotypes over Mexican immigrants and undermine positive sentiment through an inherent linguistic bias in the news construction process. Whether or not it is a deliberate act, as a nation of immigrants, we should strive to be more self aware, and cautions, of expressing our sentiment over immigration in a way the distinguishes between an in-group and an out-group. Through the media and undocumented immigrants it is clear that the current Mexican immigration debate evident will need to
adapt and overcome the dominant effect that these factors are having on leading Americans to perceive Mexican immigrants as a problem.

As the child of Mexican immigrants, and a first generation American citizen, I have a notable passion for the Mexican immigration debate. I have witnessed firsthand, the hardships, hard work, and compassion that Mexican immigrants have. Sadly, I have also seen the life of crime that some Mexican immigrants turn. However, I have seen the hard work and hardship that numerous other cultures, ethnicities, and immigrant groups go through everyday as well the more villainous side of these groups. The moral of the story is that, I have seen the world through a fresh pair of eyes. Thorough all the differences, it is inevitable to note the more prevalent similarities we all have. After all, we are all humans with the same fundamental necessity for water, food, and shelter and that all equally deserve the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This leads me to say that in the midst of a Mexican immigration debate, we should not dehumanize Mexican immigrants and we should strive to praise the progress that comes from bringing “different” people together.
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