

# OpenVoiceNews India

Transparent. Unbiased. Yours.

## Matthew Goodwin Asserts Economic Justification for Mass Immigration Is Breaking Down

August 4, 2025

– Categories: *Breaking News*



Political scientist and commentator Matthew Goodwin has sparked renewed debate over immigration policy, claiming the long-standing economic rationale for mass immigration no longer stands up to scrutiny. In a series of posts on X (formerly known as Twitter) and a detailed essay on his Substack newsletter, Goodwin argues that rising immigration levels are failing to deliver economic gains while placing increasing pressure on wages, productivity, and public resources.

At the core of Goodwin's argument is that mass immigration, particularly involving low-skilled labor, has not produced the economic benefits it was once believed to offer. Citing flat productivity growth and stagnant Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita, he contends that the country is importing higher demand without corresponding improvements in output or living standards. "Despite record levels of immigration, productivity has remained flat and real wages have barely moved for much of the workforce," Goodwin wrote.

He explains that while immigration may increase total GDP, this does not necessarily translate into higher income or improved living conditions for citizens. "Immigration is often defended as a tool for economic growth," he said. "But for over a decade, productivity and wages have been stuck, even as cheap labor flows into low-wage sectors." Goodwin points to industries such as construction, caregiving, hospitality, and logistics, which he says have grown dependent on foreign workers, contributing to suppressed wage growth for native employees.

In his article titled "*The Economic Case for Mass Immigration Is Collapsing*," Goodwin criticizes politicians and economists who continue to promote high immigration levels based on outdated or misleading assumptions. He argues that while immigrants do contribute to tax revenues, these benefits are offset by increased demands on housing, healthcare, education, and welfare systems. He adds that higher migration levels have not resolved labor shortages but have instead reinforced a low-wage, low-productivity economic model.

Goodwin's position is supported by Migration Watch UK, a policy group that has long raised concerns about the scale and impact of immigration. The organization asserts that high levels of net migration, defined as the difference between people entering and leaving the country, have led to wage stagnation, overwhelmed infrastructure, and worsened housing shortages. They argue that repeated pledges to reduce migration have not been fulfilled, eroding public confidence in the system.

Some economists and commentators disagree with Goodwin's conclusions, noting that immigration helps fill critical labor gaps and supports aging populations. They highlight the entrepreneurial contributions of migrants and argue that their presence boosts overall economic activity. However, Goodwin and his supporters caution that immigration alone cannot solve deeper structural issues like low productivity and weak investment in workforce development.

Although critics have accused him of inflaming tensions, Goodwin maintains that his analysis is based on publicly available data and economic performance indicators. “It’s not controversial anymore to say this model isn’t working,” he stated. “We need to start questioning whether the promises made about immigration’s benefits still hold true.”

As the debate continues, Goodwin’s perspective is resonating with voters who feel economic concerns tied to immigration have been downplayed or ignored. Whether these arguments will influence future policy remains uncertain, but the conversation around the economic impact of mass immigration is drawing more attention and scrutiny than it has in years.