



**Connecting Mexico and the Hoosier Heartland:
Ten Principles for Clear and Innovative Thinking about
Immigration in Indiana
By John Clark
October 10, 2006**

Editor's Note: In July 2006, Sagamore Institute for Policy Research published a major study detailing the impact of Mexican immigration into Indiana, "Connecting Mexico and the Hoosier Heartland." Co-authored by Senior Fellow John Clark and Associate Fellow Justin Heet, the data-rich report offered a compelling portrait of the benefits, challenges and opportunities posed by immigration. The following is a companion to that initial report, offering Dr. Clark's recommendations for Indiana's community, civic, business and political leaders as they grapple with immigration. To read the full study, visit www.sipr.org.

1. Indiana can't wait for the politicians in D.C. to act.

The realities of immigrants in Indiana are shaped by American federalism. The Constitution gives Congress responsibilities for setting the rules for naturalization of new citizens, which seems to indicate that Indiana and other states are helpless in the current controversies. Congress is constrained by other provisions of the Constitution. The Fourteenth Amendment states that everyone born in the United States is a citizen, regardless of the documented status of his or her parents. The Constitution also clearly defines the Bill of Rights to apply to all *persons*, not only to citizens. (Only a tiny number of rights are explicitly restricted to citizens, mostly relating to holding office in Congress or the White House.) The Supreme Court has consistently ruled that the wide range of rights and protections guaranteed in the Constitution apply to non-citizens as well as citizens, and to undocumented immigrants as well as legal permanent resident aliens. This was seen most clearly in 1982, when it ruled that the state has a responsibility to provide free education to non-citizen children, regardless of their parents' legal status.

Another aspect of federalism is that state and local governments have broad responsibilities for enforcement and wide latitude for deciding how or even whether to enforce immigration laws. Two powerful forces are particularly influential. From the one side, state and local officials are accountable to local voters, and thus if they wish to keep their jobs they must take their constituents' preferences into account. From the other, state and local government officials face tight resource constraints that force painful trade-offs: Aggressively enforcing immigration law diverts police and judicial resources from other uses. In fact, many contend that aggressively enforcing immigration law could drain local government resources even more by driving away businesses that depend on undocumented workers. Aggressive enforcement could also signal a local climate that is inhospitable to immigrants in general, and thus deter legal skilled immigrants from taking up residence.

Much of the debate over immigration that is taking place in Indiana and around the country is preoccupied with Congress and immigration reform. The contours of debate are too well-known to require much space here. The House of Representatives passed a rather punitive package of measures. The Senate passed a more accommodating bill. Indiana Congressman Mike Pence put forward a possible compromise that would enable individuals who are in the US without proper documentation to leave the country in order to legalize their status.

From the perspective of Indiana and communities across the state, the problem is that it can be unnerving to depend on legislation coming out of Washington. Rhetoric in D.C. is shrill and divisive: politicians, think tanks, and news personalities have learned that to attract attention it pays (often handsomely) to repeat simplistic messages very loudly. Moreover, D.C. is paralyzed by a particularly partisan political climate. A bold willingness to reform immigration law that might have been mobilized before 9/11 is today a dim memory. The tight discipline that President Bush wielded over Republicans in the past has frayed, in part because he is nearing his last two years in office, and perhaps even more because the divisions over the issue of immigration are driving his party into a fratricidal frenzy.

The bad news for Indiana is that D.C. is still far from adopting comprehensive immigration reform, just at a time when Hoosiers are confronting challenges that require immediate action. Making matters even worse is that the harsh rhetoric coming from Washington may make local problems worse by poisoning perceptions of the threat posed by immigration, both legal and illegal.

The good news for Indiana is that Hoosiers actually are responding to the challenges they face, regardless of Washington politicians' inaction, overreaction and/or divisiveness. Churches are offering English lessons, businesses are providing their employees classes in business skills, clinics are offering free medical care and legal advice. In short, there is an outpouring of support for newcomers who would otherwise find assimilation and acculturation difficult. We are seeing civil society in action.

That important action regarding immigrants is emerging spontaneously from local nonprofit organizations and businesses, schools and universities, churches and civic groups should lead us to shift our focus, away from the strident language of D.C. and toward the pragmatic and creative approaches of Indiana cities and communities. Rather than

asking when Washington will act and what this action might be, we need to ask what is and is not working right now.

One effect of such a shift in focus could be to defuse the unproductive passions aroused on all sides by the debate over unauthorized immigration. It also should stimulate the search for creative coalitions that can help fulfill the promise of “glocalization.”

Finally, at a time when diplomatic relations between D.C. and Mexico City are growing testier, a focus on local initiatives can draw attention to citizen diplomacy and the creation of local-to-local partnerships between Indiana and Mexico.

2. Hoosiers must recognize that Indiana benefits from a prosperous Mexico.

The shrill and alarmist rhetoric about undocumented Mexican workers “stealing” American jobs at home is supplemented by resentful accusations that trade between the US and Mexico has led to American jobs moving to Mexico. Greedy multinational corporations lacking any moral or social ties to communities in Indiana and elsewhere, it is said, have relocated to take advantage of the cheaper workforce Mexico has to offer. In some cases this has been the case, although it is probably less common than many believe. (Besides, Mexico is losing jobs to competition from even cheaper labor in China. Is it not better to have those jobs in Mexico — America’s democratic friend and neighbor — than in China?) What is important to realize is that every job that offers a better living for Mexican workers in Mexico is a win for Indiana. Mexico is Indiana’s second biggest export market, and more money in the pockets of Mexicans likely means they will purchase even more of what Hoosiers produce.

Less obviously, Indiana and Mexico both win when the pressure is diminished for Mexican workers to cross illegally into the US in search of work. More decent-paying jobs in Mexico make it less urgent that Mexicans risk their lives making the dangerous trek across the border.

A prosperous Mexico offering its people plentiful opportunities to create a better life for themselves and their children can ease other pressures as well. Many Mexicans living without proper documentation in Indiana tell of how they came north at first intending only to work a while, save money, and return home. When they returned to Mexico, they say, they found few ways to invest their money productively, as in starting new businesses. They found limited opportunities to make use of the skills they had acquired in the US. And they often found themselves vulnerable to corrupt local government officials in Mexico who see returning migrants as potential sources of easy money.

As a result of the scarce job and investment opportunities they find when they go home, these Mexicans lose much of the money they had saved when they worked in the US, and are thus driven to return north. No longer are they sojourners in the US, intending to work hard and save money for the limited time they are in the country illegally. Instead, they become long-term or even permanent settlers in communities in Indiana and other states — but settlers for unfortunate reasons. Many Americans would welcome Mexicans (and others) as new citizens of the United States if the newcomers choose fully to embrace the civic values and culture of America, to join us

enthusiastically in this country’s grand political experiment. We find it troubling, however, to think of Mexicans who grudgingly accept American citizenship, who feel as though they are forced against their will to sacrifice their Mexican identity, not because they believe in the ideals and values of the United States but because they see no worthwhile economic prospects at home.

Shifting our perspective in this way to see the civic as well as economic benefits to Indiana from a prosperous Mexico will change the way we view job training for newcomers. It will change the way we think of Hoosier companies investing in Mexico and trading with Mexican counterparts. Consider how we could think differently about the issue of remittances. Indiana banks make a tidy profit transferring money from workers here to their families in Mexico. This is an important service and banks deserve to be compensated. But it could be possible for these banks to extend their services beyond money transfers, to provide the banking infrastructure rural Mexico needs to be able to provide more productive investment opportunities. Right now, without well-developed banking, buying a house and indulging in conspicuous consumption is the most rational use of money for many who return from the North.

But the benefits that Indiana derives from a prosperous Mexico should not give the impression that every Hoosier benefits equally, or even that every Hoosier benefits at all. Even a mutually beneficial economic relation between Indiana and Mexico will produce losers on both sides of the border. Mexican farmers are unable to compete with highly productive Indiana farmers: For instance, because the tortilla flour sold in Mexico is made of inexpensive white corn from Indiana, tens of thousands of Mexican peasants have lost their livelihood. (In a piece of unintended irony or karmic balance, many of these displaced farmers wind up in Indiana as illegal immigrants.)

On the Indiana side, unskilled Hoosier workers lacking high school diplomas often find pressures on their jobs and wages when they compete with unskilled and much lower-cost workers from Mexico. How much downward pressure is exerted on the wages of these unskilled American workers is the subject of much debate among economists. But for the lowest-paid workers, any downward pressure at all is too much. These individuals are already marginalized and all too often politically voiceless, and they deserve better. We have an obligation to make sure that the benefits of closer integration between Mexico and Indiana reach as widely as possible.

3. Civic issues can’t be disconnected from economic issues.

Even though Sagamore Institute’s study, *Connecting Mexico to the Hoosier Heartland*, is an economic study, many of its supporters and critics seem to view it through political lenses. In part this is because today’s highly partisan environment makes even an exercise in counting — counting how many people from Mexico live in Indiana or how many Hoosier goods were sold to Mexico or how much taxes to Indiana governments were paid by people of Mexican descent — is unavoidably seen as serving a political end. Perhaps that political perception of economic research is a pity: It would be good for policymakers to have more access to objective and politically disinterested information. But at another level, a study such as this *ought* to be seen as political. When we think of policy recommendations, the basic unit of analysis is not the

firm or the aggregate economy, as it is in business or economic textbooks. The most important unit ought to be the community. The reality of the 21st century is that communities, defined by shared civic values and culture, will prosper and grow or will founder and decay.

This applies to Mexico as well as Indiana. Many analyses of the Mexican political and economic landscape identify corrupt and inefficient local government officials as sources of many important problems. They block local economic development initiatives that may threaten their power. They skew the allocation of resources. They skim off money that hard-working Mexicans earn in the US. Recall the stories told by Mexicans in Indiana who blame these local officials for the dearth of job and investment opportunities they find when they return home from working in the North.

Hoosiers can help. Mexicans who return to Mexico after working in Indiana bring with them many economically valuable skills: fluency in English, experience working in multicultural workplaces, perhaps experience with accounting or business management. Given the right opportunities in Mexico (and perhaps with the encouragement and assistance of their network of former co-workers and employers still in Indiana), they can use these business skills to create the more prosperous Mexico that will benefit Mexicans and Hoosiers.

They ought also to return to Mexico with a set of civic skills that can help strengthen communities in Mexico. We hope that when they are in Indiana, Mexicans learn what it means to deal with police who respect the rights of everyone, even undocumented immigrants. We hope that they see what it means for local officials to govern in a transparent manner, and to respond to the wishes of constituents. We hope they learn that they should expect more from officials, and should speak out when those in power shirk their duties. We expect those who choose to remain here to become US citizens to possess this sort of civic competence. But while they are temporarily part of our communities, we should try to help those sojourners who don't plan to remain permanently in the US acquire the civic skills that may transform Mexico even more dramatically than their business skills or accumulated wages.

4. Economic growth can be stimulated by local-to-local partnerships and by coalitions that cross borders.

Traditionally, foreign aid has been seen as a process of the US government collecting money from American taxpayers, then transferring this money to other governments, who are expected to distribute to their citizens who need assistance. It is an approach that often evokes confusion and resentment from Americans, who may feel they are being coerced into funding activities they don't support (or even know about), and who often assume that foreign aid is diverted to the bank accounts of distant despots before reaching its intended targets.

Indiana has been in the forefront of a new way of approaching international aid and economic development. Local private and nonprofit organizations from the state form direct and long-term partnerships with local organizations in other countries, bypassing the national governments in both countries. For an in-depth analysis of one of these partnerships, see the Sagamore Institute study of the thirteen-year relation between the Rotary Clubs of Indianapolis and of Savanna La Mar, Jamaica. Perhaps the most important example of this local-to-

local approach is the partnership between the medical schools of Indiana University and Moi University in Eldoret, Kenya. The IU-Moi partnership may be the single most important initiative addressing poverty and AIDS in Africa. Moreover, this partnership serves as a conduit for many other initiatives by Hoosiers seeking to help Kenyans address their country's many crises.

Indiana and Mexico are linked with many such local-to-local partnerships, with more forming every day. For years Juana Watson, Indiana Governor Mitch Daniels's adviser on Hispanic and Latino affairs, has led Hoosiers on several annual trips to her home village of Calnali in Mexico. Her organization, "Friends of Calnali," has built up partnerships between Indiana and Mexican schools, churches, police and fire departments, as well as with the Indiana University Schools of Nursing, Dentistry, and Medicine and Mexican counterparts. These partnerships promise to flourish even more as Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis (IUPUI) develops a "core strategic partnership" with Mexico.

5. Education goes both directions.

Almost every discussion with representatives of Mexican organizations in Indiana and with individual Mexicans working and living in Indiana eventually turns to education. The children of newcomers place great strain on school budgets. Yet education goes beyond children, and trying to meet the needs of the large number of immigrant workers will require changing the way adult education and training is delivered. Many people argue that the greatest challenge facing Mexican immigrants (legal and illegal) is their lack of educational attainment: A very large percentage did not complete high school in Mexico. And as many note, perhaps the most important form of education will be to teach newcomers our fundamental civic values, the "habits of the heart" that make Americans American, and that make residents of Indiana Hoosiers.

For those who are made anxious by unwanted changes in their society brought on by immigration, the idea of "education going both ways" may seem particularly unsettling. Many Americans worry that we will become a bilingual society in which a large minority of the country's population refuses to learn English — or worse, that we will become a society in which everyone has to know Spanish. But this implausible scenario should not be how we think about learning from newcomers.

The current wave of immigrants from Mexico and elsewhere in Latin America will probably not be the last one washing over Indiana in the 21st century. We are likely to experience large inflows of people from China and elsewhere in Asia, from Africa, and/or from countries such as Brazil. Handling the current flow of Mexicans and other Spanish speakers is testing the American people's character and civic foundations. And how we perform in this test will help determine how we do in future tests.

It pays to recall that for all the differences between immigrants and the Hoosier hosts, there are significant similarities. After all, most Mexicans coming to the US are, like most Americans and most Hoosiers, Christians. They have been thoroughly exposed to American culture before setting foot in the United States. And even though its political system is still taking

shape, Mexico is a democracy. In short, what we learn now will help prepare us for future waves of immigrants who are not so similar to those who already live here.

There is another sense in which education will go two directions. As anyone who has stood in front of a classroom can attest, the best way to learn is to teach. In the process of explaining to newcomers to our communities what it means to be an American, or a Hoosier, or a “true citizen” (one who exercises all the responsibilities of citizenship, who doesn’t just hold a US passport), we remind ourselves of important truths we might otherwise forget.

6. Indiana should want people, not laborers.

In the 1950s and 1960s, Germany recruited what it called *gastarbeiters*, “guest workers, from Turkey to do the jobs Germans didn’t want to do.” Finding better lives for themselves in Munich or Cologne, these *gastarbeiters* declined to return to Turkey and instead settled in Germany. Fifty years later, the Turkish and Kurdish grandchildren of the original guest workers are still seen as a challenge for assimilating into a German identity. “We wanted laborers,” say some Germans ruefully, “and we got people.”

Indiana should want the opposite, people rather than laborers. Laborers are like machines, useful but limited. People, by contrast, are smart and creative, they can learn and they can teach. Laborers make our lives easier, people make our lives better. Of course, people also can be unpredictable and unreliable, so attracting people rather than laborers is a risky proposition. As the Germans discovered of their *gastarbeiters*, sometimes people want to stay where they have made a comfortable life for themselves. But to derive the often surprising benefits of bringing smart and creative people into our communities, even temporarily, it is a risk that should pay off.

Under the eventual immigration reform that Congress will some day adopt, there will surely be provisions for guest workers to come legally to the United States. Moreover, given the demographics of the American workforce in the 21st century, Indiana companies will want to attract immigrant workers who will eventually return to Mexico or other countries from which they come. It will be tempting to view these aliens as temporary labor, hard-working sojourners doing the jobs we assign them and then going home. But we should want our guests to be *better* when they return home at the end of their sojourn in Indiana. We should want them to have more skills and better education. Perhaps more importantly, we should want them to take home with them the values and virtues that we ourselves hope we exhibit.

This may seem counter-intuitive, to worry about educating and training Mexicans who plan to take those skills and knowledge out of the community at the end of the day. It may seem like they are walking away with our investment. But once we recognize that Indiana prospers when Mexico prospers, it makes sense to invest in people even if they don’t plan to settle here. In so doing, we promote the economic development of Mexico, and we increase the chances of our former guests setting up businesses back home that could provide opportunities for their former employers and co-workers in Indiana. We want our former guests to send their smart children to Indiana colleges. In the “flat world” heralded incessantly by

Thomas Friedman, Indiana businesses can use these sorts of advantages.

Moreover, viewing our temporary immigrants as people rather than laborers could help avoid a danger no one wants: the emergence of disgruntled guest workers who feel they are being exploited just because they are poorer than Hoosiers. Viewing them as people can help them develop a sense of ownership in the communities in which they work, and in so doing might increase the chance that Hoosiers themselves come to value their own community.

Treating temporary immigrant workers as people rather than only laborers will be necessary to avoid the worst danger of even the most effective guest worker program. Guest workers can experience a cruel vulnerability to coercion, even though they voluntarily chose to enroll in the program. They are likely to be bound to the US employer that recruited them and paid for their visas, which means that short of returning home they lack the freedom to leave an unpleasant or abusive job for a better opportunity. (Needless to say, guest workers are unlikely to have the protections of labor unions.) Add to this the fact that right now almost no communities allow legal non-citizens to vote in local elections, which means that our most vulnerable and poorest paid workers will be disenfranchised. Workers have only a few ways to protect themselves: exit (finding another job), voice (expressing views through elections), and organization. We will all but deprive guest workers of all of those options. Emphasizing the humanity and dignity of temporary immigrant workers will be necessary for us to protect ourselves from becoming the sorts of abusive and exploitive people that Americans and Hoosiers profess to detest.

7. Indiana should bring the undocumented and unauthorized out of the shadows.

The passion over immigration today is fueled by the presence of some 12 million aliens in this country illegally, without proper documentation. By now there may be 50,000 unauthorized immigrants in Indiana, and the number tomorrow is sure to be higher. No one disagrees that this is a problem, but it is harder to agree why. Some find this situation an outrageous violation of American sovereignty that means that our country has been invaded by 12 million criminals. Others see millions of honest and hard-working families, not unlike past waves of immigrants, driven to the United States by desperate poverty and now forced unwillingly by unreasonable and impractical US immigration laws into a less than fully legal life. From two such starkly contrasting views of a large percentage of the residents of the United States comes our present impasse over immigration reform. Punish and expel these dangerous law-breakers, says one camp. Legalize and accommodate law-abiding neighbors, says the other.

A way out of this impasse is to think more clearly about what is untenable about this large population trying to live at a distance from the law. Truly dangerous criminals lurk in the shadows among those who really do want to avoid breaking the law. To use a biblical metaphor, we need to be able to separate the sheep from the goats. When people worry that a routine conversation with the authorities could cost them their jobs and homes, cost them access to the life they have built and bring about deportation from the country in which they live, they are unlikely to call the police when they are victims of crimes. This

situation provides a breeding ground for criminals who take advantage of the undocumented. To push the metaphor perhaps a bit too far, gangs of goats prey on sheep who are too frightened to call a shepherd.

The situation is made even worse because undocumented immigrants often need false documents and other services provided by genuine criminals. In other words, the sheep sometimes need goats. Thus, they sustain an infrastructure of genuine illegality that can support more criminals engaged in such activities as drug smuggling and the trafficking of humans.

Undocumented workers can sustain another undesirable set of practices as well. It is no surprise that employers hire illegal workers because they are cheap. What is appalling is employers who hire illegal workers precisely because they are illegal, because the employers are confident that their workers will not report dangerous working conditions.

It seems sometimes as though the opponents of immigrants are channeling the dead voice of Winston Churchill: “We shall fight on the seas and oceans, we shall fight with growing confidence and growing strength in the air, we shall defend our Island, whatever the cost may be, we shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills.”

But perhaps in the struggle to separate sheep from goats, it would be better to shift our Churchillian point of reference. As a jingoistic reporter covering the war in South Africa, a young Winston Churchill was taken prisoner and escaped, returning to Britain as a hero. It came as a surprise to some in 1900, when he delivered his first speech to Parliament, that Churchill called for waging aggressive war against the armed Boers while empathizing with the grievances that led to the rebellion. He said he wanted “to make it easy and honorable for the Boers to surrender, and painful and perilous for them to continue in the field.” This ought to be the principle for bringing the safe undocumented out of the shadows, to make sure that those who remain in the shadows are there because they are up to no good.

In general, drawing people from the shadows requires voluntary rather than coercive measures. This presupposes the establishment of secure relations of trust between undocumented immigrants, mainstream communities and officials.

8. Indiana should focus on building trust.

We can identify one area in which solid relations of trust have been established between illegal immigrants and the official world of government and bureaucracy: K-12 education. Thanks to the Supreme Court’s decision, immigrant parents lacking documentation are willing to enroll their children in school, confident that school and other officials will not inquire into the parents’ or child’s legal status, and will not report any doubts about legality to immigration authorities.

As a result, even though rates of school enrolment and graduation for the children of undocumented immigrants are probably lower than for most other groups (because school officials refuse to check on immigration status of students, it is difficult to get exact figures), the reason is not because of immigrants’ lack of trust in the system. Not coincidentally, one

of the most frequent targets of immigration opponents is the provision of free public schooling to the children of undocumented aliens.

Besides schools, most of the organizations that are effective at building trust are not governmental. Churches, free clinics, ethnic associations, nonprofit groups and often employers tend to be best at cementing newcomers’ trust and loyalties to the local community. This is not to say government officials have no role to play in this regard. It could be enormously helpful for the governor or the mayor of a large city to make a public commitment to undocumented aliens that they have no need to fear arrest and deportation if they report crimes. As will be seen below when several possible policy options are considered and evaluated, sometimes trust-building initiatives can provoke a backlash that makes matters worse. But in general, more trust is better than less trust.

This will become an especially important issue if a version of the “Pence Plan” passes. Undocumented heads of households will be required to leave the US to legalize and regularize their family’s immigration status. For this plan to work, those leaving the country will have to trust government guarantees that they won’t be punished for having been in the US without full legal status, they won’t unfairly be denied reentry to the US, they won’t be separated from their jobs and families for an unreasonable amount of time, and so on. And if the plan works, it could mean that for a short period of time millions of individuals will leave the US to apply for legal status at brand new offices that will be following newly adopted rules and procedures. That sounds like a mess! Since many of the people now in the US without full legal status are in this position because they feel the process of following the existing rules was too uncertain or time-consuming or arbitrary, it seems reasonable to assume that many (even most) will not believe any promises from the American government for their applications to be processed in a timely, fair and secure fashion. They will opt to stay in the US and in the shadows.

Perhaps the only way a plan like this to regularize the status of currently illegal aliens can work will be for the social and civic organizations that have already established relations of trust to extend credible promises to help. It will be easier for an undocumented immigrant to make the necessary trip outside the US if she knows that any delay or confusion in her case will be aggressively argued, advocated and lobbied by a network Indiana of Indiana churches, clubs of law students, state and local government officials, and so on. “You are a valued member of the community,” the message will have to be articulated, “and we will fight to make sure you are treated fairly and can return to the community to which you belong.” This will be a very tough job, and if the groundwork is not laid in advance chaos is sure to ensue.

9. Indiana should encourage the circulation *and* integration of newcomers.

An effective immigration policy ought to distinguish between sojourners and settlers. Sojourners are the vision of what *gastarbeiters* ought to be: They temporarily and legally move to a country to study or work, then return home. Settlers relocate permanently to a new country, ideally because they embrace the values and spirit of their new home. There should be both a circulation of sojourners moving in and out, and an integration of settlers who make the choice to adopt a new

citizenship. Today the US is experiencing a blockage of the circulation of sojourners, which is creating a large number of reluctant settlers who wish to remain in the United States, not because they have decided to embrace what the United States stands for, but rather because they feel they cannot return home without sacrificing too much of what they have worked to achieve.

Two factors blocking the natural circulation of sojourners have been discussed above: an absence of promising job prospects by those who return home after working in the North (made worse by corrupt local government officials); and fear that it will be difficult or even impossible to return to one's possessions, family and job in the US if one does go to the home country to visit.

If it works, a policy resembling the Pence Plan should restore a more natural flow of sojourners in and out of the US. Some predict that passage of this plan will lead to a massive influx of legally registered temporary immigrants into the United States by making it easier to gain legal entry. It seems at least as likely, however, that there will be a sharp reduction in the number of non-citizens in the US when sojourners who have unwillingly and unintentionally become settlers realize they can return to their home countries with a greater assurance that the trip will not be one way. It is difficult to predict which flow will be greater, the inflow of temporary immigrants who had before been unwilling to come to the US to work illegally or the outflow of workers who had not planned to stay indefinitely in the United States and now find it easier to leave. At any rate, this situation will be an improvement for almost everyone.

It might seem natural for communities in Indiana and elsewhere to treat sojourners and settlers differently. Settlers have made a conscious decision to join the community permanently. It makes sense for the community to invest resources in integrating settlers into the community, to help provide them with the language skills, business training, and civic competence they need to contribute productively to the economy and society — to help make them Americans and Hoosiers.

Likewise, it might seem to make sense for the community not to provide this investment for sojourners, who plan to stay in the community only temporarily, who intend even while in the community to remain outsiders. Investment in human and civic capital might seem misguided. In fact, insofar as efforts to integrate them into the community cause sojourners to change their plans, it might seem a bad policy (rather than merely misguided).

It would be a mistake to treat settlers and sojourners this way. Indiana benefits directly from a Mexico that is stable and prosperous; Indiana benefits indirectly from a Mexico that provides its people the opportunities to make a decent livelihood without risking one's life and breaking the law to come to work in the US illegally. Everyone benefits if democracy in Mexico is strengthened, and if Mexican government officials govern responsibly and transparently. Investments in Mexicans who are in temporarily Indiana can help bring about those developments.

Perhaps a better way to view our current circumstance is that both Mexicans and Hoosiers would benefit from being more closely integrated in the partnership that has been taking shape in the past decade or two. We want our guests to remain our friends even after they return home. We want them to be better people, not just richer people, as a result of spending time with Hoosiers in Indiana. And we would like it if we become better people as a result of being exposed to new ideas and new cultures.

10. Indiana should “expect more, invest more” — and help newcomers become Hoosiers.

Duke University professor and immigration expert Noah Pickus argues that because of the civic dimension of immigration policy, we Americans ought to have high expectations of newcomers — and we ought to be willing to pay for our expectations. “We must invest more in integrating immigrants and expect more from them,” according to Pickus. “We need to make explicit the bargain struck between immigrants and Americans by setting expectations for English acquisition, employment, progress toward citizenship and abiding by the law, and by expanding opportunities for immigrants to meet these expectations.”

It's a good idea, but it still expects us to wait for Congress to act. Moreover, the bargain Pickus envisions will probably be scuttled by an unwillingness to spend public money on a group that a significant minority of Americans doesn't really want here.

We are better off doing what we are doing in Indiana: working hard and quietly through nongovernmental channels as well as through local government offices to smooth the integration of newcomers, sufficiently confident of our Hoosier civic values not to feel threatened by foreigners, in fact self-confident of these values enough to believe that newcomers will want to join us rather than destroy us.