

OpenVoiceNews Pakistan

Transparent. Unbiased. Yours.

Matthew Goodwin Argues Economic Justification for Mass Immigration Is Crumbling

August 4, 2025

– Categories: *Breaking News*



Political scientist and commentator Matthew Goodwin has reignited national debate over immigration policy, arguing that the long-standing economic case for mass immigration is no longer supported by key indicators. In a series of posts on X (formerly Twitter) and a detailed article on his Substack, Goodwin claims that current immigration levels are undermining economic productivity, holding down wages for lower-income workers, and placing unsustainable pressure on public systems.

Goodwin's main argument is that mass immigration, especially involving low-skilled labor, has not delivered the economic benefits once anticipated. He points to key indicators such as stagnant Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita, weak productivity growth, and rising net migration. According to Goodwin, the country is importing a growing demand without a matching increase in output or living standards. "Despite record levels of immigration, productivity has remained flat and real wages have barely moved," he wrote.

He emphasizes that while immigration can raise overall GDP, it does not necessarily raise the average citizen's quality of life. "Immigration is justified by its supposed economic upside," he noted, "but wages and productivity have been stagnant for a decade as cheap labor has filled low-wage sectors." Goodwin argues that this dynamic has particularly impacted domestic workers in industries such as construction, caregiving, hospitality, and logistics, sectors now increasingly dependent on foreign labor.

In his Substack article titled *The Economic Case for Mass Immigration is COLLAPSING*, Goodwin challenges politicians and analysts who continue to defend high immigration levels. While acknowledging that migrants may generate tax revenue, he argues that these gains are offset by the rising costs of housing, healthcare, education, and social services.

Goodwin's concerns are echoed by think tanks such as Migration Watch United Kingdom (UK), which contend that current immigration patterns are contributing to wage suppression, worsening housing shortages, and overburdening public infrastructure. The group states that repeated promises to reduce net migration have not been fulfilled, limiting the nation's ability to manage new arrivals without adverse effects on the economy and public services.

Some economists challenge Goodwin's conclusions, saying that immigration can still be a net benefit, particularly when filling labor shortages or when migrants contribute to entrepreneurship and local economic activity. Others argue that aging populations in developed countries create a need for younger, often migrant, workers to support the labor force. However, Goodwin and others maintain that these arguments overlook broader structural problems. "Productivity isn't something you fix by simply increasing the number of people," he wrote, suggesting that deeper issues require investment in innovation, education, and higher-value industries.

Although critics accuse him of fueling division, Goodwin maintains that his position is based on publicly available economic data and observable trends. "It's no longer

controversial to say this model isn't working for many working- and middle-class citizens," he said.

As public concern over immigration grows, Goodwin's analysis appears to be resonating with many who feel that the economic realities of mass immigration have been downplayed. Whether these concerns will lead to policy changes remains uncertain, but the debate over immigration's true economic impact is gaining renewed attention and serious scrutiny.