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This thesis is an exploration of the changing relationship between immigration and
security in the post-9/11 United States. When it comes to immigration before 9/11,
security was not the overarching concern in the United States. The focus was on
economic interest, skilled and unskilled labor, and family reunification. However,
immediately after 9/11, security became indisputably prioritized. September 11 changed
the way Americans started to look at security. Immigration continues to make significant
contributions to the US economy, whether in terms of manual labor from Mexico and
Central America or in terms of more skilled labor mainly from Asia. September 11, led to
a recalibration of the balance between economic needs and security needs in the United States. The pendulum swings from one extreme (security needs) to the other (economic needs). This research examines the swinging national security-economic growth pendulum concerning integration policy.
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## Abbreviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BTS</td>
<td>Border and Transportation Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBP</td>
<td>U.S. Customs and Border Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAIMS</td>
<td>Computer Linked Application Information Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>Department of Homeland Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D&amp;R</td>
<td>Detention and Removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOS</td>
<td>U.S. Department of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI</td>
<td>Federal Bureau of Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE</td>
<td>U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDC</td>
<td>Immigration Data Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIIS</td>
<td>Non-Immigrant Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIS</td>
<td>Office of Immigration Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMB</td>
<td>Office of Management and Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAS</td>
<td>Performance Analysis System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USCIS</td>
<td>U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-VISIT</td>
<td>United States Visitor and Immigration Status Indicator Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Background

“America is a nation of immigrants.” We are all familiar with this cliche. It is a sentiment close to the core of America’s self-image. The statement is formally true—more than 99 percent of the current U.S. population can at least theoretically trace its ancestry back to the people who came here from other parts of the world (Spickard 2007). In this sense, American history is inevitably the history of immigration. The same dreams of freedom and opportunity that galvanized people to cross the ocean years ago (for those who came voluntarily) draw people to America today. Immigration has enabled America’s growth and prosperity, and has helped shape the American society. In an age of globalization, America’s openness to immigrants is also an important foreign policy asset. Nevertheless, just as it has been a vital ingredient in America’s economic and cultural success, immigration generates changes that can be unsettling and often divisive.

The long-term historical overview of U.S. immigration policy demonstrates that four major elements figure prominently in the formulation of such policy: economic, racial, nationalistic, and foreign policy considerations. These four elements of immigration policy occasionally worked in harmony with one another, reinforcing each
other in their impact on policy. At other times they worked in conflict with each other. But, in each case, the policy enacted reflected the then current “balance” between and among these four key elements at any given moment (LeMay 1987).

Immigration is essential to advancing vital American interests in the 21st century. However, to maximize the benefits and mitigate the strains caused by immigration, the United States needs a new immigration policy and system for the new era. U.S. immigration policy in fact reflects the perceived needs of this nation at any given moment in history since those needs shift in response to changing economic conditions. The United States had historically experienced “peak cyclonic periods” of large-scale immigration that coincided with transformative economic change. The first wave of immigration that lasted from 1820 to 1880 (Open-Door Era), witnessed over 10 million immigrants entering the United States. The next major wave, which, since the time of the Dillingham Commission, has been commonly referred to as the “new” immigrants, occurred from 1880 to 1920 (Door-Ajar Era). A third wave (Pet-Door Era), lasting from 1920 to 1950, saw the total number of immigrants dropping from 23.5 million to 5.5 million. The fourth wave, from 1950 to 1980 (Dutch-Door Era), shows a renewed increase in total immigration, nearly doubling to almost 10 million in the thirty-year period (LeMay 1987). Immigration flows increased through most of the early and mid-1990s but to a limited extent and very gradually—growing from slightly more than one million annually in 1992 to about 1.2 million in 1997. At the turn of the 21st century, immigration levels increased dramatically. This spike took the total inflow to more than 1.5 million in 1999 and 2000—a level about 35% higher than in the middle of the decade.
This peak proved to be short-lived, though. Today, the nation is living through a fifth peak period as globalization prompts the United States to complete the transformation from a manufacturing to a knowledge-based economy. Scholars refer this as the (Revolving-Door Era). Since 2000, inflows of immigrants have decreased by about 25% to roughly the levels of the mid-1990s, returning to 1.1 million in 2003. The most recent data show a slight uptake in the flow to more than 1.2 million in 2004 (Passel 2005). Although with over 14 million newcomers, legal and illegal, the 1990s ranks numerically as the highest immigration decade in American history. Experts are expecting the current decade will almost certainly surpass it (Pew Hispanic Center 2006).

As with previous peak periods, immigration is helping the United States respond to shifting economic realities, while also enriching American society. At the same time, communities across the country are experiencing rapid change and new challenges in integrating diverse new populations. When it comes to immigration, before 9/11, security was not the major concern or at least not tied to the economic needs in the United States, but after 9/11, security became the overarching priority. For example, when the Immigration and Reform Control Act (IRCA) was passed in 1986, under Ronald Reagan, about 2.8 million illegal immigrations got the opportunity to change their status. This act not only forgave their acts of illegal immigration and other related illegal acts such as driving and working with false documents, but due to amnesty a large number of foreigners were rewarded with legal status. This shows that the focus of the U.S. immigration policy in the pre-9/11 United States was on economics over national security. However, September 11 changed the way policymakers look at security issues.
Immigration policies are being scrutinized at least partially through the lens of security. In particular, the United States is faced with an unprecedented level of illegal immigration, significant economic turmoil, and security concerns today. This study is an application of world systems theory as portrayed by Douglas S. Massey (1993) in *Theories of International Migration: A Review and Appraisal*. Application of this theoretical framework provides insight into how a core hegemonic power struggles to structure its immigration policy in the contemporary world.

The organization of this thesis is as follows. The next chapter presents a literature review, where the use of world systems theory is discussed to understand as well as formulate problem-solving models. I adopted the world systems theory out of reasons similar to Wallerstein’s views on social change. It is not the bifurcation of the labor market; it is the structure of the world market. Migration is a “natural outgrowth of disruptions and dislocations,” all part of capitalist development in sending/receiving countries. New circuits of capital are generated as land, raw materials, and labor within “peripheral regions” come under the influence and control of markets (Sassen 2006). This thesis also briefly discusses the influence of raw materials, labor, and other material links on low skilled and high skilled/educated natives who refuse bottom-level jobs.

Chapter 3 presents the methodology I have used. Quantitative, and qualitative analyses have been conducted to explore the immigration-security-economy tripod debate. Chapter 4 focuses on specific issues such as: how the tripod can be balanced more
effectively. The final chapter provides a brief summary of main points, provides an overall conclusion before recommendations and finally draws an overall conclusion.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

This study aims to explore shifts in immigration policy and to reach a new balance between national security and economic needs. Immigration engenders significant contribution to the U.S. economy, whether in terms of manual labor mainly from Mexico and Central America, or in terms of skilled labor mainly from Asia. September 11, however, changed the way Americans look at security issues. Henceforth, immigration policies are likely to be scrutinized more intensely through the lens of security. In fact, security concerns since September 11, 2001 have led to a thickening of the economic needs in the United States. Some of the emerging thinking towards this recalibration is to encourage comprehensive reform policies to overcome the security, immigration, and economic crisis.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

“Our growth as a nation has been achieved, in large measure, through the genius and industry of immigrants of every race and from every quarter of the world. The story of their pursuit of happiness is the saga of America. Their brains and their brawn helped to settle our land, to advance our agriculture, to build our industries, to develop our commerce, to produce new inventions and, in general, to make us the leading nation that we now are.”

Commission on Immigration and Naturalization, 1953
Immigration offers the United States unique benefits that allow her to be a more productive, competitive, and successful nation in the 21st century. Despite these substantial benefits, America’s immigration system has been overwhelmed by myriad challenges. Many of these challenges are tied to security concerns after 9/11, which in turn affect the economic needs in the United States. The 9/11 catastrophe not only had global ramifications, but it has also transformed the landscape of the entire global security arrangement. The depiction of international migration as a security threat in the West brought Samuel Huntington’s notion of *A Clash of Civilizations* into sharp relief (Huntington 1995). In fact, September 11 has reinforced the securitization of migration and integration policies and politics in major immigration countries. This connection between international migration, on the one hand, and human and state security, on the other, is termed the migration-security nexus (Brandt 2004). The question cannot simply be how international population movements contribute to conflicts within and between states. Instead, it is also important to ask why migration has increasingly become a matter of security. To put it boldly, why has the migration-security nexus developed? And what are the consequences for immigration and immigrant assimilation? It has to be kept in mind that the U.S. strength and prosperity, which is a key component of U.S. national security, depend on America’s openness to the foreign-born and, even more, on America’s adherence to its values.

A major objective is to determine the ways in which security-related measures have transformed virtually all U.S. immigration procedures, and also whether immigration has become captive to security. In the name of national security, the
executive branch took extraordinary measures after 9/11 to grab more power from Congress. Several security-related changes likewise occurred in the issuance of visas and the admission of non-citizens. On January 11, 2002, the U.S. Department of State (DOS) began to require all visa applicants between the ages of 16 and 45 at select consular posts to fill out a supplemental form that required detailed, security-relevant information (Stock 2006). In July 2003, DOS even mandated that consular officials should conduct face-to-face interviews with most visa applicants. The Intelligence Reform and Terrorist Prevention Act 2004 formalized this policy.

This study suggests recalibrating the tripod of immigration, security and the economy. Pick up any newspaper and there will be opinions or debates concerning immigration as it has emerged as a major force for change around the world. This recalibration is very important today in order to overcome not only the economic hardship, but also to redefine the concept of security and immigration after 9/11. The threat of catastrophic terrorism, coupled with the vulnerabilities exposed by the September 11 attacks, demand that the U.S. immigration system be integrated into a comprehensive national security plan.

1.4 Significance of the Study

There are few issues of such significance to civilization as immigration. The movement of people between nation-states has been a constant feature of history, but the recent pace and breadth of mobility have changed the face of the United States, bringing
challenges and opportunities that the U.S. has scarcely begun to address. The global experience of immigration may be long-standing, but few countries are able to manage it well. As Randall Hansen describes in his historical overview, “immigration is a history of unforeseen developments and unintended consequences.”

My attention to this issue grew out of my being a foreign student witnessing the heated rhetoric in popular media (radio, television, and print). The significant contribution of the current study is the heightened understanding of how immigration, security and the economy could be harmonized, since each one not only affects the other two but U.S. national interests in the broadest sense. The American people are conflicted about whether immigration helps or hurts the country. Citizens recognize the imperative for change, but they often give contradictory answers when asked to choose among various policy options (Pew 2006). Legislative action has mirrored this division. The House of Representatives passed a bill in December 2005 that focused on tough new enforcement measures at the border and in the interior of the country. The Senate again passed a bill in May 2006 that complements stringent enforcement measures with substantially expanded opportunities for legal immigration and earned legal status with a “path to citizenship” for unauthorized immigrants.

From the knowledge generated by this study, other scholars may derive propositions—in addition to the ones that the author formulates—for further and more systematic empirical research and theoretical refinement.
1.5 Scope of the Study

A diverse literature exists on the important subject of the immigration-security-economy tripod in the United States. Examples include statistical data from the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), the Office of Immigration Statistics (OIS) and, of course, from the scholarly works as well as NGOs. As for scholarly monographs and articles, a large section of the literature focuses on the discussion of policy. Like this section, another section of the literature focuses on policy critiques and formulations. This particular study is different from other studies for the following reasons.

First, although often viewed as synonymous with protection from physical harm, the term “national security” rightly deserves a more expansive meaning, and goes well beyond mere physical protection. National security encompasses the protection of vital economic and political interests; the loss of either could threaten the fundamental values and vitality of the state. Second, this broader sense of security not only recognizes how economic and political interests serve as a touchstone of state power, but also the fact that economic viability and strength contribute directly to security. National security in a sense is rooted in national values. Because “national security” policies and strategies in a democracy depend on public support, they must reflect “basic public values” (Jordan 1993).

The secondary reason for selecting this topic stems from the heated debate as to the contexts in which and the extent to which immigrants help or harm the economy. In the 1990s, half of the growth in the U.S. labor force came from new immigrants (Spencer
That share is projected to grow. This demand for foreign labor is evident across the skills spectrum. At a time when Japan and most European countries are less competitive and face mounting social welfare costs due largely to declining working-age populations, infusions of young taxpaying immigrants are helping the United States overcome worker, skills, and entitlement program shortfalls.

In other words, without immigration, it will be difficult to sustain the growth and prosperity to which the United States has become accustomed. Nevertheless, there is a growing concern regarding the perceived impact of immigration on wages and working conditions, particularly from those advocating increased restrictions. Americans fear that the influx of newcomers will damage U.S. culture, social mores, and politics. This sentiment is expressed by the likes of Samuel P. Huntington (2005) in his book *Who Are We?* Fearful of the growing influence of Hispanic immigrants, Huntington thinks that the United States will soon become a bicultural, bilingual society. In Huntington's view, this exceptionalism is based in "culture," a shared sense of community and common mores (Huntington 2005). Huntington argues that a nation “comes and goes," and a strong sense of "national consciousness" is surely critical to a nation’s success or failure. America is different from other countries.

There is also the recurring concern over the method by which immigrants should be screened. Advocates of change may suggest new methods: from “excluded categories” containing groups with certain undesirable physical or mental characteristics to a “literacy test” to the development of an elaborate “system of preferences.” However,
what is consistent throughout is that each shift is associated with the advocacy of some new “method” (LeMay 1987).

As for the timeframe, this study covers the most recent period, essentially the time period of post-9/11 United States. I became curious about the continued balancing and recalibrating of the immigration-security-economy tripod in the United States. What solidified my interest was an article that appeared in Bepress Legal (2006) series titled “National Security and Immigration Policy: Reclaiming Terms, Measuring Success, and Setting Priorities.” That article gave attention to evaluating immigration-related security measures and tactics. Later, as I got involved I began to analyze whether and how the measures or strategies relate to security goals. As my curiosity escalated even further, I found the economy playing an important role and thus the notion of a tripod of immigration-security-economy became my focus (Stock 2006).
Chapter 2

Literature Review

Sociologists and other social scientists have identified a few major theories concerning how newly arrived immigrants integrate themselves into American society. Over time, all new immigrants adopt many aspects of American culture and add something new. One prevailing theory on this subject is the melting pot theory, which maintains that people from various cultures come to America and contribute aspects of their homeland culture to create a new, unique American culture. The result is that contributions from many cultures are indistinguishable from one another and are effectively "melted" together into a single dish. A competing theory, pluralism, suggests the salad bowl metaphor; hence, according to the pluralist paradigm, new immigrants do not lose their unique cultural aspects as suggested by the melting pot model. Pluralists maintain that the unique characteristics of each culture are still identifiable within the larger American society, much like the ingredients in a salad are still identifiable. Nevertheless, they contribute to the overall make up of the “replenished” salad bowl.

Perhaps, President Jimmy Carter characterized the nature of the United States when he stated that
“We become not a melting pot but a beautiful mosaic. Different people, different beliefs, different yearnings, different hopes, different dreams.”

At the end of the 20th century, nearly all developed nations had become countries of immigration, absorbing a growing number of immigrants not only from developed regions, but also increasingly from nations in the periphery. Although international migration has come to play a central role in the social, economic, and demographic dynamics of both immigrant-sending and immigrant-receiving countries, social scientists have been slow to construct a comprehensive theory to explain it. Efforts at theoretical explanation have been fragmented by disciplinary, geographic, theoretical and methodological boundaries. The following research is the product of a selective review of the literature on the immigration-security-economy tripod in the United States.

Literature included in my research spanned various disciplines, including public policy, law, sociology, and economics. This initial review provided me with a foundational understanding of relevant issues, as well as led me to papers, books, and other key sources of information. Due to the shifting demographics of immigrant populations, the evolving challenges faced by newcomers, the need for continued
migration, and the changing policies affecting immigrants living in the United States, this research is not intended to be timeless or conclusive. Rather, it is intended to be a work-in-progress that can help government officials and bureaucrats develop a better understanding of the relationships of immigration, national security and the economy they will increasingly confront in their work. With this enhanced understanding, policymakers and researchers may be able to more effectively address the diverse and ever changing needs of immigrants and national security. In light of the continued growth and influx of immigrant populations into the United States and the growing dependence of the U.S. economy on immigrant labor, the future physical and economic health of the nation depends on the ability of administrators to effectively address the issue of immigration. My purpose is to explore some of these issues and determine pathways to understanding. My research is primarily based on government and scholarly documents, and other information gathered from secondary sources. In this chapter I would like to discuss a few sources that helped to frame my research hypothesis, and at the same time gave me the opportunity to view this issue from a broader and critical perspective.

2.1 Literature on Immigration and Security

Immigrants and refugees are an increasingly substantial subset of the U.S. population. The Current Population Survey (CPS) documented the number of immigrants living in the United States from 1995 through 2007. Between March 1995 and March 2000, the foreign-born population grew by 5.7 million, or about 1.1 million a year, while between 2000 and 2007 the immigrant population grew 7.3 million, or 1.04 million a
year. The growth was significantly larger between 2006 to 2007 at 1.6 million. This shows that the growth between 1995 to 2007 among the foreign-born has been very high despite changes in the economy over this time period (Camarota 2007). By 2050, U.S. Census estimates indicate that the foreign-born population will top 15% of the nation’s population, a historic high that has not been reached since the immigration boom of the early 1900s. The growth rate of the young immigrant population is particularly marked; the population of children in immigrant families has grown nearly seven times faster than the population of children of US-born parents.

Massey developed a comprehensive theory of international migration for the new century. In Worlds in Motion (1998), Massey explained the various propositions and hypotheses of his theory and others, and identified areas of complementarities and conflicts. Massey also surveyed specific studies to evaluate the fundamental propositions of neoclassical economics, the new economics of labor migration, network theory, segmented labor market theory, world systems theory, and the social capital theory. Theories used in his study are also tested by applying them to the relationship between international migration and economic development. Although certain theories seem to function more effectively in certain systems, all contain propositions supported by empirical research (Massey 1998). My task is to identify which theories are most effective in accounting for international migration in the world today, and what regional and national circumstances lead to a predominance of one theoretical mechanism over another.
Massey demonstrates the fact that international migration is not necessarily rooted in poverty or rapid population growth, but in the expansion and consolidation of global markets. As nations are structurally transformed by their incorporation into global markets, people are being displaced from their traditional livelihoods and becoming international migrants. In seeking to work abroad, they do not necessarily move to the closest or richest destination, but to places already connected to their countries of origin socially, economically, and politically. In recent years, professional migration brokers have become increasingly common. Periphery nations generally benefit from international migration because migrant savings and remittances provide foreign earnings to finance balance of payment deficits and make productive investments. Patterson (2006) and others have discussed how some periphery nations follow a migration development model that involves diasporas working instrumentally with their homeland state to develop their homeland economy.

Some developing nations have gone even so far so as to establish programs or ministries dedicated to the export of workers. In the Philippines this is known as the Overseas Workers Welfare Administration (OWWA). The OWWA facilitates the export of female workers from Philippines to core and semi-periphery countries. This has become a lucrative business, and is also among the most profitable ways of global trading as it reflects less capital investment and risks on the part of the sending periphery country yet offers the expectation of high returns in the form of remittances. According to Philippine economic indicators, the remittances of Overseas Filipino Workers (OFWs) exceed foreign direct investment into the country. Remittances per annum in recent years
amounted to about US$12-14 billion, which only includes those working legally abroad, whereas many OFWs working in domestic and other service work are undocumented (Olaer 2007).

Over time, receiving nations have gravitated toward a similar set of restrictive policies, yielding undocumented migration as a worldwide phenomenon. Globalization also creates infrastructures of transportation, communication, and social networks to put core societies within reach of the periphery. In the former, ageing populations and segmenting markets create a persistent demand for immigrant workers. All these trends are likely to intensify in the coming years to make immigration policy a highly debated and a key political issue.

This thesis is based on the theoretical framework of world systems theory, which argues that the penetration of capitalist economic relations into non-capitalist or pre-capitalist societies creates migration (Massey et. al 1998). It is out of the pursuit of greater wealth that core nations penetrate the periphery in search of land, raw materials, labor, and consumer markets. Massey’s work maintains that as these peripheral regions come under the grip and control of global markets, migration flow increases. World systems theory argues that international migration follows the political and economic organization of an expanding global market. The theory also specifies that not only does international migration flow from periphery to core along paths of capital investment, but also that immigration is directed to certain “global cities” that control foreign investment and production. However, understanding the current complex, multifaceted trends in
international migration requires a sophisticated theory that incorporates a variety of labor demands (Massey et al. 1998). Some of Massey’s hypotheses are presented below: international migration is a natural consequence of capitalist market formation in the periphery and semi-periphery; the international flow of labor follows international flows of goods and capital, but in the opposite direction; international migration is especially likely between past colonial powers and their former colony, thereby leading to the formation of specific transnational markets and cultural systems; international migration stems from the globalization of market economies; refugee movements directed to particular core countries constitute another form of international migration; and finally international Migration follows from the dynamics of market creation and the political structure of the global economy.

It’s important to note that satisfactory theoretical accounts of international migration should have a few basic elements such as: the structural forces that promote emigration from peripheral countries; characterization of structural forces that attract immigrants into core countries; consideration of the goals, motivations, and aspirations of the people who respond to these structural forces; and finally a treatment of the social and economic structures that connect areas of out-and in-migration. There are other sources as well that engendered my understanding of the tripod and gave me the direction to take a definitive position of where I stand in terms of the tripod debate. Appendices included in this thesis have informed my research project with information such as whether the number of immigrants have increased or decreased following the 9/11 catastrophes, or to find out from which part of the world most immigrants came to the United States. Table 1
shows the total number of immigrants who came to the United States from different regions before and after 9/11. Table 2 shows the number of immigrants coming from Middle Eastern countries. Here, I have tried to explore whether the number of immigrants coming from Middle Eastern countries have declined due to the perceived heightened security threats from those countries following the 9/11 catastrophes (Immigration Statistics 2005).

The article “National Security and Immigration Policy: Reclaiming Terms, Measuring Success, and Setting Priorities” by Margaret Stock (2006) provides valuable information for evaluating immigration related security measures and tactics. Stock’s article is important in this respect because it provides clarity and guidance for serious discussion concerning the role of the U.S. immigration system in a coordinated national security strategy. Again, the Willy Brandt Series of Working Papers are also key for anyone addressing issues concerning immigration, security, and the economy. Three propositions emerge from the working papers. First, the end of the Cold War has opened political space for focusing on diffuse and hard-to-grasp security threats that do not emanate from sovereign states but from non-state actors. Second, security policies such as stepped-up border controls and stricter internal surveillance of immigrants produce unintended effects. Third, 9/11 entails ambiguous consequences for immigrant integration (Brandt 2004). Clearly, the levels of harassment against immigrants from the Middle East increased considerably, at least in the short term. However, the article has largely failed to offer solutions to the rising threat posed by international migration. Overall, the emphasis was on the growing importance of non-state actors in the world.
The Migration Policy Institute (2006) is another important source of data and insight for my research. MPI produced an important report on an “Independent Task Force on Immigration and America's Future.” What the report articulates was a vision that promotes U.S. global competitiveness in the context of post-9/11 security imperatives on the one hand, and also addressing the dilemmas of illegal immigration on the other. What impressed me most about the report was the attempt to reconcile the need to meet strong economic and social demands for legal immigration with the imperative to strengthen, enforce, and safeguard national security. Besides, the article, “Bearers of Global Jihad?; Immigration and National Security after 9/11,” by Robert Leiken (2004) helped me to examine the connection between immigration and national security in the wake of the September 11, 2001 attack. Leiken examines the transnational and asymmetric character of such new conflicts (e.g. 9/11), and demands that a coordination of national security with smart and effective immigration and foreign policies is of utmost necessity.

Portes’s article “Immigration Theory for a New Century: Some Problems and Opportunities” (1997) examined some of the pitfalls in contemporary immigration theory, and also reviewed some of the most promising developments in this field. In this article, he identifies a few of the common pitfalls that need to be understood in order to develop theory. What my research tries to portray in particularly is the suggestion of balancing the need for a sense of national security while maintaining the positive features of current immigration policy. This is helpful in terms of providing recommendations toward balancing of possibly competing interests.
The 9/11 Commission Report (2004) takes up the subject of U.S. immigration and national security following the 9/11 attacks on the United States. The Report identifies various immigration vulnerabilities that terrorists exploited. The hijackers used fraudulent passports, obtained visas on false pretenses, and violated the terms of their visas. The intelligence communities knew the names of two of the hijackers and were being tracked intensely; but this information was not shared with U.S. immigration officials. The Commission even concluded that fifteen of the nineteen hijackers could have been intercepted by immigration authorities had these authorities been aware of and put in place measures to counter the terrorists’ travel tactics. This paved the way for tightening security measures and viewing immigration even at least partially through the national security lens. The Report also concluded that U.S. authorities missed abundant opportunities for these and other reasons to intercept and arrest the terrorists prior to the attacks. In response to the question “why were the terrorists not intercepted?” the Commission concluded that U.S. immigration authorities, prior to 9/11, were not principally focused on national security. Instead, their primary concern was preventing people from entering the United States and seeking unauthorized employment. Because the terrorists did not appear to have any interest in working illegally in the United States, they were not perceived to be threatening according to U.S. immigration officials and were thereby allowed into the United States. After 9/11, however, national security became a major priority for the United States, which engendered a sharp crackdown on the immigration system.
2.2 Literature on Immigration and Economy

Pia M. Orrenius, in his article “U.S. Immigration and Economic Growth: Putting Policy on Hold” (2003), discusses immigrants’ economic contributions and how these recent changes impact both the foreign-born population already living here and those trying to enter the United States. Despite the common perception that 9/11 triggered a crackdown on immigration (e.g. the enactment of the USA Patriot Act, the reorganization of the Immigration and Naturalization Service into Homeland Security), many pre-9/11 immigration policies continue unabated. Orrenius maintains that pre-9/11 policies actually constituted a much more substantive effort in this direction. He argues that the pace of recent U.S. economic growth would have been impossible without immigration. Since 1990, immigrants have contributed to job growth in three main ways: they fill an overall increasing share of jobs, they take jobs in labor-scarce regions, and they fill the types of jobs native workers often shun. Hence, the foreign-born make up 11.3 percent of the U.S. population and 14 percent of the labor force.

Orrenius points out that pre-9/11 immigration policies were concerned with a crackdown on illegal immigration and a move to limit the rights of noncitizen immigrants. The Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA), passed in 1996, is considered by many as being instrumental in the crackdown on illegal immigration, whereas changes affecting immigration policy in the post-9/11 environment were more subtle and indirect. Three important acts were passed in the wake of September 11—the USA Patriot Act, Enhanced Border Security Act and Homeland Security Act of 2002. These statutes are designed to increase careful screening and
monitoring of foreigners who want to temporarily visit the United States. Issues such as: H1-B visa cap, background checks on foreign students, stricter requirements on universities and schools that admit them all have severe economic implications.

In another study “Policy Beat: USCIS Receives 163,000 H-1B Applications for Fiscal Year 2009” by Chishti and Bergeron (2008) showed how major business leaders, especially those in the high-tech industry, have been lobbying Congress for increases in the annual H-1B visa numbers. In his testimony before the House Science and Technology Committee in March, Microsoft Chairman Bill Gates stated that the shortage of H-1B visas was leaving high-tech jobs in the U.S. unfilled, forcing companies to move their operations abroad and creating a competitive disadvantage for U.S. employers. Congress first established an H-1 visa category for high-skilled foreign-born workers in 1952 when it passed the Immigration and Nationality Act. In 1989, Congress split the H-1 visa category into H-1A and H-1B subcategories; in 1990, the annual number of H-1B visas was capped at 65,000. During the high-tech boom of the late 1990s, Congress increased the annual H-1B visa cap to 115,000 for fiscal years 1999 and 2000. Congress increased the H-1B visa cap again in 2000 to 195,000 for fiscal years 2001 through 2003, but the legislation included a provision to automatically revert to the original 65,000 cap in fiscal year 2004.

In 2005, Congress created an "advanced degrees exemption" that allocates 20,000 additional visas for applicants who have received advanced degrees from U.S. universities. Thus, to address the H-1B visa shortage, several bills have been introduced
in Congress this year. On April 10, 2008, Senator John Cornyn introduced the Global Competitiveness Act of 2008, which would allow 115,000 H-1B visas for fiscal years 2009 through 2011 and would increase the number of visas for advanced degree holders to 30,000. Again, the Innovation Employment Act, sponsored by Representative Gabrielle Giffords on March 13, would exempt from the cap foreign-born students who received an MA or PhD degree in science, technology, math, or engineering. However, the outcome of these bills is uncertain. Since the failure to approve “comprehensive immigration” reform in June 2007, Congress has been reluctant to pass bills that expand immigration benefits. Other members of Congress have opposed the increase in H-1B workers out of concern that H-1B workers adversely affect the employment opportunities of native-born workers. This shows how the immigration-economic duo is tied together conceptually and politically.

In the U.S. constitutional system, core “public values” include respect for civil liberties and human rights. An expanded view of national security makes it more likely that strategies will be coherent and that the relevant government agencies and institutions will contribute to them (Stock 2006). Enhanced screening at ports-of-entry might appear to promote safety in the short-term, but more security measures could have economic consequences that would undermine the nation’s long-term security if the difficulties of getting people and goods into the United States were to cause multi-national corporations to do business elsewhere.
Both sides of the immigration debate find “rule of law” problems in the U.S. immigration system. Immigration restrictionists see the “rule of law” as the answer to a chaotic immigration system and a burgeoning “illegal” population. They argue that poor enforcement of migration violations contravenes the “rule of law.” Conversely, immigrant advocates focus on how the U.S. immigration system violates human rights and does not even serve appropriate “ends” such as predictable justice or equality under the law. Restructionists argue that the immigration system lacks the institutional attributes that characterize the rule of law (Stock 2006).
Chapter 3

Methods

Qualitative as well as quantitative methodology is used to capture the structured principal bodies of thought by academics and policymakers concerning the impact of security and immigration on the U.S. economy. My research involves a continuing interplay between data collection, analysis, and theory. In preparing this thesis, I have collected materials from sources such as: scholarly books and academic journals concentrating on immigration and security in the United States; data from the Department of Homeland Security; studies by think tanks and NGOs such as: Rand Corporation and Migration Policy Institute, major newspapers such as the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* and learned magazines such as *The Economist*; electronic media, various Internet sources, and working papers.

My study is based on understandings of different human and societal problems and opportunities that result from the impact of immigration. The theory that I employ in this study is the world systems theory in order to understand as well as formulate problem-solving models. At the same time, I employed propositions from the paradigm of “national security paradigm.” This paradigm aided my understanding of the relationship between different concepts involving security such as economic and physical security exclusively for my research. The national security paradigm, along with world
systems theory, helped me in analyzing the issues and the framing of the issues concerning immigration, security and the economy.

To supplement this piece of research, I have collected data from recent secondary sources, such as: books, journals, newspapers, the Internet, interviews as well as speeches by politicians and scholars. The secondary data utilized from these sources were informed by a historical-comparative methodology. I used this method to help generate an overarching qualitative research question, to reinterpret data, and also to challenge established explanations that are construed as facts. By asking this question, or finding new evidence, I question established yet flawed explanations. I have attempted to identify and formulate new explanations by interpreting the data in its cultural-historical context. In conducting a piece of historical-comparative research, I acquired an abundance of data concerning diverse social groups and thereby tried to gain an empathic understanding of people and events.

As I further explored, it became clear how the concern to security became an utmost priority immediately after 9/11. Although the overwhelming majority of migrants entering the United States do not represent a threat to national security, the officials agreed that borders must be the front line for security. In fact, in a post-9/11 environment, Americans became particularly concerned about terrorists crossing a permeable border or fraudulently gaining admittance into the country at legal ports of entry. In addition, increases in smuggling, dangerous border crossing patterns, and vigilantism all pose risks to migrants and border communities alike (Spencer 2003). My research of current trends
and history suggests that the major policy issue for international migration is not simply more immigration control, but the creation of a policy agenda that harmonizes security needs with new immigrants who help expand economic growth. Immigrants will continue to come in large numbers for the foreseeable future. If the borders are closed, they are likely to find clandestine ways of entry, since the economic incentives of both the sending and receiving societies are overwhelming. However, it is an open question whether the immigrants will be accepted as full members of the receiving society.

3.1 Definition of Concepts

I have defined some of the concepts pertaining to major types of aliens in the United States. All persons in the United States are either U.S. citizens or aliens, persons who are citizens of another country. There are four major types of aliens: immigrants, refugees, temporary legal migrants, and unauthorized foreigners.

Legal Immigrants are citizens of other countries who have been granted a visa that allows them to live and work permanently in the U.S. and generally after five years to become naturalized U.S. citizens.

Refugees and asylees are persons allowed to stay in the United States because of fear of persecution at home because of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion. Refugees are settled in the U.S. from abroad, often after leaving their respective countries and waiting in a third country until they are
admitted to the United States to begin a new life. Refugees and asylees may become permanent residents after a year in the United States.

Temporary Legal Migrants are foreigners in the United States for a specific purpose, such as visiting, working, or studying. For example, in the FY 2005 some 32 million temporary legal migrants were admitted. Almost 90 percent were temporary visitors for pleasure (tourists) or business visitors. However, these counts of arrivals do not include Mexicans with border crossing cards that allow shopping visits or Canadian visitors. Temporary migrants who enter and leave the United States several times a year are counted each time they enter. The United States has 25 types of nonimmigrant visas, such as F-visas for foreign students, H-visas for foreign workers. Visitors who are nationals of specific countries such as Canada and the UK are not required to have entry visas; however, most are included in the counts of arrivals. There are 27 such visa-waiver countries (Martin et. al 2006).

Unauthorized, undocumented, or illegal migrants are foreigners in the United States without valid visas. An estimated 11 million unauthorized foreigners were living in the United States in FY 2005, including 6 million unauthorized Mexicans.

America’s ability to effectively receive and take advantage of large-scale immigration in the face of a new menacing type of security challenge is the subject of this thesis. Will the U.S. be able to compete effectively? Will the United States be secure? Will the United States maintain its tradition of openness? I strongly believe that the
United States can answer each of these questions in the affirmative, but only if a comprehensive approach to immigration that harmonizes national security and economic needs is adopted.

A final concept to define is: “national security.” In this thesis, national security refers to the requirement to maintain the survival of the nation-state through the use of economic, military and political power and the exercise of diplomacy. National security interests include preserving US political identity, framework, and institutions fostering economic well being, and bolstering international order supporting the vital interests of the United States and its allies. Meeting the national security challenge has always been difficult, but having to do so while also promoting economic growth that requires continuous immigration at a time when terrorists are hoping to penetrate borders for nefarious reasons makes meeting the national security challenge all the more difficult in the 21st century.
Chapter 4
Findings and Analysis

4.1 Policy Changes: Pre and Post 9/11

My research interest focuses on finding a balanced approach to the immigration-security-economy tripod. The debate on immigration has been hampered by the paucity of experts who understand this immigration tripod. The threat of catastrophic terrorism, evinced by the vulnerabilities exposed by the September 11th attacks, and the immigrant contribution to the innovation of the U.S. economy have to be comprehensively incorporated into a national security, immigration, and economic growth plan. How much has "everything changed" since September 11? This question presents itself in almost every realm of our social, political, and cultural life. When it comes to immigration it is the 64-dollar question. According to Tamar Jacoby writing in The Weekly Standard on January 28, 2002:

*When Secretary of State Colin Powell and Mexican foreign minister Jorge Castaneda met in Washington on January 10, they resumed talks on a critical issue sidelined by September 11: immigration reform. It was bound to come back. For though the attacks raised security concerns that may make it harder now to reach a deal, they didn’t repeal geography or demography or the realities of American labor markets, and the contradictions in U.S. border policy haven’t gone away (Jacoby 2002).*
September 11 aggravated the U.S. recession, contracted labor markets, altered political geography, reformulated alliances, and transformed the texture of international relations. After September 11, "the most significant change," as Deborah Meyers and Demetrios Papademetriou (2002:1) of the Migration Policy Institute pointed out:

that immigration, as with all policy issues, is now viewed through a security lens. Security is the utmost priority and security-related issues have replaced all others at the top of Washington’s agenda. Any immigration proposals that resurface on the political agenda, such as regularization of status or issuance of student visas, will be geared toward this overriding policy concern. Given the personal and political capital that Presidents Bush and Fox have invested in the relationship between the two countries even prior to September 11, it is important to note that the United States has created an additional standard for friendship: the degree to which another state cooperates—in fact, partners—in the war against terrorism.

The pre-September 11 immigration policy debate centered on how many illegal immigrants would be legalized; how to safeguard the lives of those illegally crossing the U.S.-Mexican border; concern over Asian immigrants, which is 44 percent of the total compared to 11 percent from Mexico; and whether or when to "open" the U.S.-Mexican border entirely. Economic issues dominated immigration research and policy-making in the pre-9/11 years: did immigrants fill needed jobs or compete with less educated American workers? Did immigration reduce inflation or increase unemployment? Did immigrants raise the cost of government services or add to revenues? (Leiken 2002).

After September 11, immigration, like many areas of public life, was viewed through a security lens. The attack exposed startling cracks in the U.S. immigration system. In the wake of the attacks, efforts got underway to transform Mexican migration from the chaotic, dangerous, habitual, and illegal border crossing to border crossings that were regulated, safe, selective, and legal. In two national polls after September 11, at
least 80 percent of Americans concluded that the United States had made it very easy for foreigners to enter the country. While another, 77 percent felt that the government was not doing enough to control the border and screen people (Polman 2001).

Tom Ridge, the former Director of Homeland Security, has indicated that he regards America’s disorderly southern border as the most challenging one. The answer is not to "close down" that border, resulting in the junking of NAFTA and tipping the American southwest and Mexico into economic crisis. Rather, together with Mexico, the challenge is to fashion a "smart border" with pre-clearance for goods, fast lanes for frequent travelers, and modern detection devices that would keep America safe and economically strong. And in addition, Mexico would also accept shared responsibility for controlling the common border. Mexico does not see migration as a long-term answer to its economic woes, and the United States should not think controlling the border is the solution to illegal Mexican immigration. The final component of an immigration bargain with Mexico involves the economic development of what are now "sender" communities in central and southern Mexico, providing jobs at home for would-be migrants. (Jacoby 2002:1).

The U.S. has a strategic interest in seeing Mexico emerge as a prosperous and lawful buffer against unregulated migration. Before September 11 the attention of the INS was concentrated on the southern border. But INS statistics show that citizens from countries with majority Islamic populations seek to gain illegal entry to the United States much more frequently at the Canadian border than at the Mexican (Jacoby 2002). American agents detained 254 undocumented immigrants from 16 Middle Eastern
countries, Sudan, Pakistan, and Malaysia at Canadian border checkpoints, according to Immigration and Naturalization (INS) statistics. By contrast, at the Mexican border, agents detained only 90 undocumented immigrants last year from countries with majority Islamic populations: Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, and Pakistan. In January 2004, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) inaugurated a new system for tracking foreign visitors at ports of entry to the United States: the United States Visitor and Immigration Status Indicator Technology (US-VISIT) program. The rollout occurred at 115 air and 14 sea ports of entry (Ortiz et. al 2006). The technological aspects of US-VISIT include biometric visas, passports, scanning equipment, linked databases, and the recording of the arrival and departure of nonimmigrant aliens. Information about this program is derived from the information-sharing requirements among various public- and private-sector organizations.

4.2 Findings

Data released by the Department of Homeland Security in FY 2003 not only showed that legal immigration fell by 34 percent, but also showed a 50 percent decline in the percentage of permanent residents, and finally a decrease in naturalization by 19 percent.
Figure 1: Total Immigrants Admission 1991-2003


Figure 1 shows that the number of people admitted and granted legal permanent residence in the United States in FY 2003 dropped 34 percent. This included 358,000 new arrivals and 47,000 persons who adjusted their status. These figures are down significantly from the 1.06 million who became new legal permanent residents in FY 2002. The decline reflects that only half as many persons who were present in the United States adjusted their status as was done the year before (347,000 in FY 2003 compared to 680,000 in FY 2002). DHS officials attribute the processing slowdown to new requirements for additional background checks on applicants, as well as the shifting of adjudications staff assigned to the Special Registration program, leaving fewer officials available to process green cards.
Prior to 9/11 attacks, attitudes toward immigration in the United States were less antagonistic. For example, a Gallup poll conducted in June 2001 on a representative sample of Americans found that 62 percent of the respondents indicated that immigration is “a good thing” for the country today, while 75 percent indicated that immigration has been “a good thing” for the United States in the past. Additionally, 42 percent of Americans favored keeping immigration at its present level (Jones 2001). These levels of support for immigration compare favorably to those reported in the last 35 years, with the most positive perceptions reported in 1965 and in 1999–2001, while the most negative perceptions reported during the economic recession of the early-1990s (Jones 2001). In general, support for immigration tends to decrease in economic downturns, but in the wake of the attack, support for immigration plummeted.

While a sharp decline in support for immigration after the attack was understandable, if it goes too far it can pose wrenching problems for the nation’s economy. Richard Florida (2005) in The Flight of the Creative Class argues that global competition for creative talent is the defining economic issue of the 21st century. He argues that what made the United States an economic superpower was not its factories or raw materials or even its military might alone – but the people who were attracted to its shores from around the world. Now, in the wake of 9/11, there are ominous signs indicating that attractiveness may be waning. The end result is that the United States attracts fewer foreign graduate students, academics, and entrepreneurs. And according to him, this in turn will drive down U.S. competitiveness. He also explains how nations around the world are adapting to the global creative economy and welcoming talent.
Likewise, the United States should adopt strategies to regain its creative lead in the world economy.

### 4.3 Impact made by Immigrants

The United States takes pride in being a nation of immigrants. The American self-image is that immigrants come here, work hard, overcome adversity, and make a good life for themselves and their families. These ideals persist today as immigrants continue to contribute greatly to U.S. economic growth. However, the terrorist attack of September 11 reminds Americans that not everyone who comes to the United States arrives with such intentions. Therefore, three important acts were passed in the wake of September 11: the USA Patriot Act, Enhanced Border Security Act and Homeland Security Act of 2002. These acts do not speak to immigration per se but are directed at more carefully screening and monitoring of foreigners who want to temporarily visit the United States, the consequence of which is tighter security at ports of entry, stricter background checks on visa applicants, requirements for tamper-proof and machine-readable passports and visas, and a host of other changes, many of them yet to come. Still, there is no denying the fact that the economic contributions of immigrants are enormous.

A Duke University study points out that immigrant entrepreneurs founded 25.3 percent of the U.S. engineering and technology companies in the past decade. Even foreign nationals—who lives in the United States, but are not citizens—contributed an estimated 24.2 percent of international patent applications in 2006 (Duke University 2007). Indian immigrants founded almost 26 percent of all immigrant-founded companies
in the past 10 years. Immigrants from the United Kingdom, China, and Taiwan contribute to 7.1 percent, 6.9 percent, and 5.8 percent respectively (Duke University 2007). But U.S. companies are complaining that new procedures hamper their ability to compete for foreign business because they are unable to arrange for their customers to travel to the United States in a timely manner. This problem is particularly dysfunctional in fast growing markets in countries that require a U.S. visa, such as China, India and Russia (Duke University 2007). With immigrants filling such a significant share of job openings, it is clear that the pace of U.S. employment growth is closely tied to the pace of immigration.

Potentially, immigration reforms, such as a guest-worker program or a higher H-1B visa cap, have been put on indefinite hold. States are attempting to tackle some immigration issues on their own, such as driver’s licenses and college tuition for undocumented residents. Immigration policy not only determines how effectively the United States can compete for foreign workers but also their socioeconomic progress after they have arrived. In fact, both aspects of immigration and security are important for determining future economic growth. Computer programmers from India and graduate students from Pakistan will face additional hurdles when attempting to obtain temporary residency in the United States. Foreign trade, foreign direct investment, and international migration all could grow less quickly than they did before the terrorist attacks.

Some observers of immigration take a decidedly negative view. Andrew Sum (2006), the director of labor market studies at Northeastern University in Boston, argues
that the large supply of immigrants has displaced low-skilled U.S.-born workers from jobs. "About 85.5 of every 100 new workers are new immigrants in this decade" (Isidore 2006:1). The only thing, he said, “I have argued is that we've ignored that illegal immigration has put a lot of young adults into economic jeopardy" (Isidore 2006:1). At the same time, Sum would concede that the U.S. economy is larger, and growing faster due to the supply of illegal immigrants, and that most Americans with higher job skills are better off for their presence. He contends that, "without the immigrants, we would have a decline in labor force of 3 to 4 percent, and couldn't have grown nearly as much as we did in the '90s if we didn't have immigrants. And in the last few years this growth would have been slower” (Isidore 2006:1). Sum's views point out the dichotomy that many economists see when looking at the impact of immigration on the economy.

Economists tend to agree that immigration is a net benefit to the U.S. economy. Immigrants fill jobs that U.S. citizens often reject, they help the U.S. economy maintain competitiveness in the global economy, and they stimulate job creation in depressed neighborhoods. But net benefits for the economy can conceal serious losses for vulnerable sectors of the U.S. population. It is no secret that many employers, ranging from small contractors to major corporations, would rather hire foreigners who are often perceived as hard working and accepting of lower wages and poorer working conditions. But even most of those who think it is good for the economy do see an impact on lower-skilled U.S.-born workers. Bernard Baumohl said, "Immigration is actually critical, and allows the U.S. economy to grow more rapidly without higher inflation pressures" (Isidore 2006:1). Some economists argue that not only do U.S. consumers benefit from
lower prices as a result of the lower wages most immigrants are paid, but that the availability of lower-wage labor helps create more work for higher-skilled, higher-paid workers who are generally native born.

Some economists say that if immigrant workers were not present, rather than native-born workers getting better wages to do the same jobs, many jobs done by immigrants might not get done at all. If immigration reform pushed wages higher for lower-skilled workers that would probably stop many average Americans from hiring household help they can now afford (Isidore 2006). The same is true for some manufacturers and service sector employers as well. "The average wage of the low-income American would be higher. But some of those jobs wouldn't get done at all and output would be lower," said David Wyss, chief economist for Standard & Poor's, if immigration reform reduces the low-wage labor pool (Isidore 2006:1).

4.4 Security and Immigration

The events of September 11 showed how obsolete the Cold War delimitation of a zone of stability (North America and Western Europe) and an "arc of conflict" (from North Africa to South Asia) had become. Western governments now must take into account the export of violence via migration. Al Qaeda and its affiliates depend on immigration to gain entry to the West in order to carry out terrorist plots (Leiken 2004). The transnational and asymmetric character of these new conflicts demands coordination of national and homeland security with immigration and foreign policies. Though most immigrants are not terrorists, most terrorists are immigrants (Leiken 2004). It is also the
conclusion of a leading authority on al Qaeda (Leiken 2004). Records of those implicated in terrorism in North America and Europe show that, with the exception of the rare local convert, they were all visitors or first- or second-generation immigrants. And even many of them are illegal by virtue of overstaying their visas or entering fraudulently. But that is not the last thing to be said on the relationship between immigration and terrorism; thus one should learn to distinguish between the vast majority of harmless immigrants and the few terrorists and terrorist-supporters among them (Leiken 2002).

American officials now view immigration in part through the somber lens of homeland security that barely registered before September 11. That is why 9/11 has soured public views on immigration. The American public did not dwell on the question of whether Muslim terrorists found their way to airports on permanent or on temporary visas, but of course, policy-makers must. After September 11 the parameters of political discourse on immigration narrowed. The prospect of a major immigration accord with Mexico receded and calls for “open borders” ceased abruptly as legislation was being viewed through the prism of security. As I have already mentioned, prominent immigration proponents like Papademetriou acknowledged immigration would be viewed now through a security lens. Immigrants were not only being asked, “do you have a job?” but also “do you present a risk?” A national security perspective caused the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and other border agencies to move to the new Department of Homeland Security (DHS), placing immigration in a new institutional, organizational, strategic and cultural framework.
At the same time, the State Department Bureau of Consular Services adopted new guidelines and now issues visas under the policy guidance of the DHS (Leiken 2004). But the broad agreement on immigration acquiring a national security component dissolved into disputes over specific policies. This is an attempt to shape that national security lens for immigration policy and to envision the role of immigration policy within national security. That means first being clear as to the threat posed and then devising policies to meet specific threats (Leiken 2004). The sharper the identification, the more targeted the policy. It is true that some of post-9/11 policies appear to have been motivated as much by politics and opinion polls as by national security. Moreover, law enforcement officials have made their share of mistakes in implementing those policies. But both sets of complaints (ethnic or religious profiling and ignoring illegals) miss the mark. The criticisms lose sight of the central goal of aligning immigration and national security policies to the challenge posed by Islamic terrorism. Both sorts of criticism divert attention from the main danger to the country and from the limited capacity to confront that danger at U.S. borders and within immigrant communities.

In the case of Muslim immigrants, religious ties have replaced homeland ties. In an age that Samuel Huntington describes as one, which “the most pervasive, important and dangerous conflicts will not be between social classes (or ideologies or superpowers)…but between people belonging to different cultural entities,” the perceived religious obligations of immigrants have become a powerful centrifugal force in part because of the claims of economic integration (Huntington 1995). Although, as a centuries-long nation of immigrants, the United States has enjoyed somewhat more success than Europeans in absorbing immigrants and their children, but after September
what most sets the United States apart from Europe is the provenance of newcomers in the United States. Recent reports suggest that European countries now have become the planet’s most fertile ground for Islamic recruitment (Leiken 2004).

The Visa Waiver Program (VWP) is another important border crossing device whereby tourist and business travelers from Western European and other Western countries are admitted to the United States for up to 90 days without obtaining a visa from an American consulate overseas as is required for most other visitors. VWP allows citizens of 27 countries who have been granted passports to enter the United States without any difficulty. Al Qaeda had always been on the lookout for light-skinned European Arabs and also recruiting Western converts. In 1999 a report by the Inspector General of the Justice Department (IG) found that terrorists had applied under the VWP because they believed that they would have a greater chance of entering successfully. The GAO in (2002) pointed out that the U.S. government has not systematically collected data on how frequently potential terrorists have entered the United States under the program. The accessibility of this program to English-speaking, passport-eligible Western European jihadists is a source of grave concern (Leiken 2004). How will immigration officials at ports of entry (POEs) begin to distinguish these European citizens with European passports and faces (Rotella 2003)? To be sure, an individual from a visa waiver country must still pass through the second gate in the U.S. system: inspection at the POE by an official of what used to be the INS but is now part of DHS, Customs and Border Protection (CBP). Under the U.S.A. Patriot Act, travelers from visa waiver countries were required to present machine-readable passports with biometric features by October 1 2003. The Department of Homeland Security granted 21 visa
waiver countries (including Western European countries excepting Belgium) a postponement until October 26, 2004. European countries have notified the United States that they cannot meet that deadline; some of these countries say they may need many more years. Thus, currently and for the foreseeable future, the US-VISIT program will not apply to visa waiver travelers (Leiken 2004).

In 1999, after such a finding by the Inspector General, the INS issued a new policy memorandum requiring inspectors to check passport numbers of all visa waiver applicants. But in a December 2001 “Follow-Up Report on the Visa Waiver Program,” the IG found that the new policy had “not been fully disseminated or uniformly implement by INS field personnel” and that “the passport number of each VWP applicant is not being consistently checked against the TECS/IBIS (Treasury Enforcement communications System/Inter-agency Border Inspections System) lookout system” (Leiken 2004). Later, the Center for Immigration Studies found that “the government still is not checking the names of all aliens from “visa waiver” countries against terrorist watchlists at ports of entry, though it was required to do so immediately upon enactment of the visa tracking law (Enhanced Border Security and Visa Entry Reform Act of 2002)” (Camarota 2003).

Moreover, the GAO reported in November 2002 that the INS had not yet implemented an automated nonimmigrant entry-exit control system to monitor aliens using the program as was mandated by the 1986 law that created the Visa Waiver Pilot Program. DHS officials have, however, assured the people that the visa waiver problem will be resolved at ports of entry. But the question became, if resources could be spent
better on improving the inspection process at POE, what is the need for the visa process at all? DHS involvement is now deemed essential for the visa process in capitals like Abu Dhabi, Cairo, Casablanca, Jakarta, Islamabad and Riyadh (and Jeddah), locations where DHS has recently opened law enforcement offices specifically to investigate visa applicants suspected of ties to al Qaeda and other terrorist groups (Shenon 2003).

My concern is why are they not necessary in Amsterdam, Brussels, London, Madrid, Paris and Rome, places where al Qaeda has specifically been recruiting Western-looking individuals, presumably for entrance into the United States? Is the United States failing to take into account that Western Europe also has become a zone of Islamic claim and conflict, terror acts, and terrorist organizations, propaganda and active recruiting? Rather than contemplating a wholesale termination of the VWP security agency should consider steps such as placing DHS agents at European airport check-ins for flights into the United States. One of their tasks would be to observe and when appropriate, interview and run background checks on VWP participants, assess the feasibility and effectiveness of combing the electronic passenger manifest systems now being tested with POE/DHS background checks, tighten and/or broaden criteria used in periodic reviews of VWP countries so as to take into account terrorist recruiting and passport-issuance procedures, and when necessary, reevaluate specific countries with the prospect of termination in specific cases.

These measures may help persuade Western European countries to increase security cooperation where necessary (Leiken 2004). Student visas are also distinctive because they make a series of demands on American schools, colleges and universities
for information and monitoring. They are also special because the new student visa system (SEVIS) has sparked complaints that new requirements are burdensome and are discouraging students to come to the United States. But the new system has also received criticism from those who consider it easy to game. Again, while the U.S. system has been relatively secure, terrorists have repeatedly abused the asylum system in Canada and Europe. In Canada, terrorists have availed themselves of the asylum system. “Cheat sheets” circulate giving advice and tips on how to cheat the refugee system (Bell 2003). In certain terror camps, coaching on how best to exploit European asylum policies has become part of the curriculum.

4.5 Analysis

What many favor today is "comprehensive immigration reform." For example, President Bush and Senator Kennedy are both convinced that far from being a threat or a crisis, immigration is a boon to the United States. Immigrants, in their estimation, bring a welcome vitality to United States, where openess and optimism are a critical part of the nation's character. Neither sees danger in the growing role immigrants play in the economy. Both believe that reform must go beyond reasserting existing law in the face of lawlessness, and go bringing into the immigration system more into line with the changing realities of a global society (Jacoby 2006). The most important of those new realities is the global integration of labor markets. Today's immigrant influx is the product of changing U.S. demographics, global development, and the increasingly easy international communications that are shrinking the planet for everyone, rich and poor. Between 2002 and 2012, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the U.S. economy is
expected to create some 56 million new jobs, half of which will require no more than a high school education (Jacoby 2006). More than 75 million baby boomers will retire in that period. And declining native-born fertility rates will be approaching replacement level. Native-born workers, meanwhile, are becoming more educated with every decade. Arguably, the most important statistics for anyone seeking to understand the immigration issue is this: in 1960, half of all American men dropped out of high school to look for unskilled work, whereas less than ten percent do so now (Jacoby 2006). The resulting shortfall of unskilled labor, estimated to run into hundreds of thousands of workers, is showing up in different sectors. The construction industry creates some 185,000 jobs annually, and although construction workers now earn between $30,000 and $50,000 a year, employers in trades such as masonry and dry-walling report that they cannot find enough young Americans to do the work (Jacoby 2006). The prospect for the restaurant business, which is the nation's largest private-sector area of employment, is even bleaker. With 12.5 million workers nationwide, their demand for labor is expected to grow by 15 percent between 2005 and 2015 (Jacoby 2006). But the native-born workforce will grow by only ten percent in that period, and the number of 16- to 24-year-old job seekers, the key demographic for the restaurant trade, will not expand at all. So without immigrants, the restaurant sector will have trouble growing through the next decade.

Although, critics of the comprehensive model dispute these fundamental economic assumptions, and raise questions such as: “Do immigrants lower American wages? Would Americans fill these jobs, at a higher wage, if foreigners were not available? Is it only employers who profit from the influx? Do the fiscal costs associated
with immigration outweigh any macroeconomic benefit?” And surely, if the answer to any of those questions were yes, then comprehensive reform would be far less compelling. My question is why change the law to accommodate a market reality if that reality is not a good national security measure for the United States? Another disputed and emotional aspect of the immigration debate is whether immigrants consume more in government benefits than they contribute in taxes. Much of the immigrant population is poor and unskilled, which inevitably reduces their tax contribution (Jacoby 2006). But most low-skilled immigrants pay as much to the government as comparable poor and unskilled native-born workers. According to estimates, two-thirds of illegal immigrants have income taxes withheld from their paychecks, and the Social Security Administration collects some $7 billion a year that goes unclaimed, most of it thought to come from unauthorized workers (Jacoby 2006).

Immigrants' contribution overall to U.S. economic growth is harder to measure, although there is no doubt among many economists that newcomers enlarge the economic pie. The companies where they work are more likely to stay in the United States, rather than move operations to another country where labor is cheaper. Readily available immigrant workers allow these businesses to expand, which keeps other Americans on the job and other U.S. businesses, upstream and downstream, afloat. Economists call this shifting the demand curve outward (Jacoby 2006). Just how much do immigrants expand the economy? One conventional way to measure this would be to calculate their spending power, but it is difficult to isolate immigrant purchases. Even if we could, it would not reflect the growth that occurs. Another way to quantify the immigrant contribution is to
look at the percentage of new jobs they have filled over the last decade. It is more than half of the total, and two-thirds in regions such as the Midwest and the Southwest, thereby making them effectively responsible for half of the nation's economic expansion in that period. But the critical question is whether growth makes life better for individual workers, augmenting their productivity and increasing their incomes.

According to most economists, this is what happens when immigrants complement rather than substitute for native-born workers. Complementarity also affects wage levels. Opponents of immigration ask why employers do not simply pay American workers more and avoid the need for foreign labor. But many industries cannot pay more, because they would be undercut by imports from abroad. Even in sectors such as construction and hospitality, where the work must be done in the United States, it hardly makes sense to lure an American to a less productive job that he or she is capable by paying more for less-skilled work. To express in the words of Edward P. Lazear, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers: "Our review of economic research finds immigrants not only help fuel the Nation's economic growth, but also have an overall positive effect on the income of native-born workers" (Jacoby 2006).

Perhaps the most telling way to assess the immigrant contribution is to ask what would happen if the influx stopped or if those already here left the country. Those who favor comprehensive reform believe this would be disastrous in some regions, since whole sectors of the economy could collapse. Restrictionists’ opponents counter by arguing that a cutoff would mean at most a temporary inconvenience for a few
employers, who would soon wean themselves from their dependence on foreign workers. Whether the nation benefits a great deal or just a modest amount, the newcomers still make life in the United States better not just with the work they do, but reinvigorate the country's spirit with their energy and hard work. Surely, it makes sense to find a better way to manage the immigrant influx so that Americans can reap more benefits but with fewer costs. Comprehensive reformers start with these assumptions about the economic benefits of immigration and build out from there to design policy. Their basic idea of comprehensive reform is that the U.S. immigration system should be market-based. For the past decade or so, market forces have brought some 1.5 million immigrants, skilled and unskilled, to work in the United States each year. But annual quotas admit only about a million, or two-thirds of the total (Jacoby 2006).

Enforcement of these limits is poor in part because the nation is ambivalent about how much it wants to control immigration and also because it is all but impossible to make unrealistic laws stick. As a result, some half a million foreign workers, most of them unskilled and from Latin America, breach the border every year or overstay their visas to remain on a job. The only plausible remedy is a more generous quota combined with more effective enforcement. The analogy is Prohibition: an unrealistic ban on alcohol was all but impossible to enforce. Realistic limits, in contrast, are relatively easy to implement. I believe that not only is such a reform the only way to restore the rule of law, but it is also one of the best ways of improving border security. Neither new quotas nor new enforcement will stick as long as there are 12 million illegal immigrants living and working in the country (Jacoby 2006).
The only practical solution is to give these unauthorized workers and their families the opportunity to earn their way onto the right side of the law. This should be done not just for their sake but also because it is the only way to restore the integrity of the immigration code, bring the underground economy onto the tax rolls, and eliminate the potential security threat posed by millions of illegal immigrants whose real names no one knows and who have never undergone security checks. At the current impasse, it may be hard to imagine that such a moment will ever come. But immigration is not and should not be thought of as an unsolvable issue. If the influx is good for the economy, the challenge is to find a way to manage it more effectively.

4.6 Key Findings and General Points

The Key Findings distilled from the analyses are as follows: on average, U.S. natives benefit from immigration; immigrants tend to complement (not substitute for) natives, thereby raising natives’ productivity and income; careful studies of the long-run fiscal effects of immigration conclude that it is likely to have a modest, positive influence; skilled immigrants are likely to be especially beneficial to natives; and finally in addition to contributions to innovation, they have a significant positive fiscal impact.

To sum up the General Points: First, immigrants are a critical part of the U.S. workforce and contribute to productivity growth and technological advancement. First, they make up 15 percent of all workers and even larger shares of certain occupations such as construction, food services and health care. Second, approximately 40 percent of Ph.D.
scientists working in the United States were born abroad. The Kauffman Foundation’s index of entrepreneurial activity is nearly 40% higher for immigrants than for natives. Third, immigrants and their children assimilate into U.S. culture. For example, although 72 percent of first-generation Latino immigrants use Spanish as their predominant language while only 7 percent of the second generation Latinos are Spanish-dominant. Fourth, immigrants have lower crime rates than natives. Among men aged 18 to 40, immigrants are much less likely to be incarcerated than natives. Immigrants slightly improve the solvency of pay-as-you-go entitlement programs such as Social Security and Medicare. Finally, the long-run impact of immigration on public budgets is likely to be positive; projections of future taxes and government spending are subject to uncertainty, but a careful study published by the National Research Council estimated that immigrants and their descendants would contribute approximately $80,000 more in taxes (in dollars) than they would receive in public services (Jacoby 2006).

Immigration is a difficult subject. Throughout its history, America has served as the destination point for a steady flow of immigrants. Today, immigrants arrive from all parts of the world. Although immigration provides one of the most colorful chapters in the U.S. history, it has also brought a host of problems, which have not been so easily resolved. For example, cultural differences and language barriers among different ethnic communities have frequently given rise to hostilities between social groups. Also, immigrants' inability to quickly assimilate themselves to the norms of mainstream American social life has often prevented them from realizing the economic advancement they sought when they left their homelands. It also raises hard moral choices about whom
should Americans let into the country, how long should we let them stay, or what means should the U.S. government use to control their entry? To answer these questions, it is essential to examine current policies in order to assess whether they best serve the interests of both American citizens and of those immigrants who arrive with the belief that opportunities for a good life will be available here. After all, the concern is whether the United States should continue with its longstanding policy of openness, or "close the gates" in order to protect the existing levels of prosperity that most American citizens enjoy.
Chapter 5

Conclusion

The United States has always prided itself on being a nation of immigrants, a "melting pot" where people from all over the world come to find freedom and a better life. But it has also been an issue of who enters and who does not. Americans have opened its doors for some immigrants and slammed it in the face of others. The arguments go on about whether immigration is an economic stimulant or a depressant. Immigration, perhaps more than any other social, political, or economic process, has shaped the United States over the past century. Immigration engenders significant contribution to the U.S. economy. A diverse population has been the hallmark of America from the early colonial times to the present. This study therefore tried to explore shifts in immigration policy in order to reach a new balanced between national security and economic needs.

The world systems theory argues that people migrate, legally or illegally, for obvious reasons (e.g. economic). Migrants emigrate to countries where they can afford to improve their economic and political prospects. The recipient countries, however, have always been ambivalent about these migrants. Migrants may fill needs for additional labor, either at the relatively unskilled level or in particular skilled niches. On the other hand, migrants bring in cultural habits that are different from those of the host society and
sometimes are reluctant to shed these habits. So, quite frequently in the host societies there is a backlash. Migrants are sometimes accused of taking away jobs from the native population or driving down wages. Sometimes they are social, such as engaging in cultural practices that are seen as abhorrent by the "natives" or increasing the crime rate.

There is always an element of popular pressure to enact legislation to limit entry into the country and somehow expel the migrants. We are now witnessing an episode of this dramatically in the United States. This backlash has been a political phenomenon of some importance in much of Europe as well. Those in favor of stringent state action against migrants often experience economic and social insecurity, particularly in the working and middle classes. This restrictionist group tends to favor building walls and expulsions of various kinds. Those opposed to stringent state action limiting immigration are comprised of quite different groups. One such group is comprised of business elites who welcome migrants in the belief that this enables them to keep wage rates down and therefore wants them to have the right to enter and to work.

Immigration is now a global issue and the United States is once again at the forefront of a new set of worldwide dynamics. Powerful global forces are the impetus behind the largest global migratory wave in history. Transnational labor recruiting networks, wage differentials, family reunification, war, and other disasters are behind new migratory practices that cannot be easily contained by the apparatus of the state (Leiken 2004). The recent immigration momentum is influenced by a panoply of economic forces, social practices, and cultural models that are not easily contained by
unilateral policy and regulatory initiatives. While transforming homeland countries, immigrants are changing host countries. While they make huge progress, there are serious concerns in regards to schooling, transition to the labor market, and long term patterns of adaptation in all advanced post-industrial democracies.

As Michael Walzer has written: “The members of a political community have a collective right to shape the resident population” (Walzer 1985:54). The process embodying that collective right is naturalization. This naturalization process is the final gate into America, not into American territory but into the American polity. But it is also a way of recognizing that the immigrant is more than “a sectoral player,” more than economic man; hence, a whole person (Leiken 2004). The immigration system needed today must be both preventive and welcoming.
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### Appendices

**Immigration Statistics in the US (1996-2005) by Region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>915,560</td>
<td>797,847</td>
<td>653,206</td>
<td>644,787</td>
<td>841,002</td>
<td>1,058,902</td>
<td>1,059,356</td>
<td>703,542</td>
<td>957,883</td>
<td>1,122,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>52,875</td>
<td>47,732</td>
<td>40,585</td>
<td>36,578</td>
<td>44,534</td>
<td>53,731</td>
<td>60,101</td>
<td>48,642</td>
<td>66,422</td>
<td>85,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>307,722</td>
<td>265,674</td>
<td>219,371</td>
<td>198,918</td>
<td>264,413</td>
<td>348,256</td>
<td>340,494</td>
<td>243,918</td>
<td>334,540</td>
<td>400,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>147,479</td>
<td>119,764</td>
<td>90,572</td>
<td>92,314</td>
<td>130,996</td>
<td>174,411</td>
<td>173,524</td>
<td>100,434</td>
<td>133,181</td>
<td>176,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>61,744</td>
<td>52,832</td>
<td>45,281</td>
<td>41,444</td>
<td>55,823</td>
<td>68,484</td>
<td>74,151</td>
<td>55,028</td>
<td>72,060</td>
<td>103,143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Immigrants from Middle-East: 365,152

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>6,186</td>
<td>5,029</td>
<td>4,826</td>
<td>4,421</td>
<td>4,450</td>
<td>5,159</td>
<td>4,852</td>
<td>3,348</td>
<td>5,522</td>
<td>7,905</td>
<td>51,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>5,479</td>
<td>3,243</td>
<td>2,217</td>
<td>3,360</td>
<td>5,087</td>
<td>4,965</td>
<td>5,174</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td>3,494</td>
<td>4,077</td>
<td>39,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>11,084</td>
<td>9,635</td>
<td>7,837</td>
<td>7,176</td>
<td>8,487</td>
<td>10,425</td>
<td>12,960</td>
<td>7,230</td>
<td>10,434</td>
<td>13,887</td>
<td>99,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>2,445</td>
<td>1,982</td>
<td>1,847</td>
<td>2,783</td>
<td>3,744</td>
<td>3,826</td>
<td>2,741</td>
<td>4,160</td>
<td>5,755</td>
<td>32,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>4,444</td>
<td>4,170</td>
<td>3,244</td>
<td>3,269</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>4,572</td>
<td>3,964</td>
<td>2,927</td>
<td>3,431</td>
<td>3,748</td>
<td>37,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>1,152</td>
<td>9,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>4,380</td>
<td>3,567</td>
<td>3,283</td>
<td>3,033</td>
<td>3,662</td>
<td>4,579</td>
<td>3,935</td>
<td>2,956</td>
<td>3,818</td>
<td>4,282</td>
<td>37,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>44,56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>2,209</td>
<td>1,661</td>
<td>1,857</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>1,789</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>1,227</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>3,366</td>
<td>18,018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2005 Yearbook of Immigration Statistics, Department of Homeland Security