GEIST, MEGHAN ELIZABETH, M.A. MAY 2022   POLITICAL SCIENCE

IMMIGRATION AND BORDER CRISES: GERMANY AND THE UNITED STATES'
RESPONSES TO CRISIS AT THEIR BORDERS (43 pp.)

Thesis Advisor: Dr. Daniel E. Chand

Immigration is at the forefront of political debates. Opposing sides have been arguing for more immigrant restrictions or less restrictions and this tension has helped stir the question of whether more open or more closed border policies are effective in regulating mass migration. This paper is a comparative case study between the United States' immigration policies, post-September 11, 2001, and Germany's "Welcome Culture" (or Willkommenskultur). I discuss what makes a policy effective in relation to immigration and how this perceived effectiveness can help to argue for more closed or open borders. I also discuss the political and social repercussions that these policies have had on culture in the United States and Germany – specifically the rise of the far-right and the recent role these groups have played in immigration policies. Between these two countries, I argue that Germany's more open border policies, derived from Angela Merkel and the Welcome Culture, were more effective in controlling mass migration during the Migrant Crisis in 2014-15, than the United States' more closed border policies in controlling migration at the southern border (United States-Mexico border) in 2019-20.

IMMIGRATION AND BORDER CRISES: GERMANY AND THE UNITED STATES'
RESPONSES TO CRISIS AT THEIR BORDERS

A thesis submitted

To Kent State University in partial

Fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of Master of Arts

by

Meghan E. Geist

May 2022

Thesis written by

Meghan E. Geist

B.A., Kent State University, 2020

M.A., Kent State University, 2022

Approved by

<u>Dr. Daniel Chand</u>, Advisor

<u>Dr. Anthony Molina</u>, Chair, Department of Political Science

<u>Dr. Mandy Munro-Stasiuk</u>, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

TABLE OF CONTENTS

AKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without efforts and support of a number of people. First and foremost, my advisor, Dr. Daniel Chand, who has supported me through the process and provided insightful guidance. In addition to my advisor, I would like to thank the rest of my thesis committee, Dr. Anthony Molina and Dr. Daniel Hawes, for their feedback and support. I am deeply indebted to all of the faculty members at Kent State University who have been role models and mentors for me.

Thank you to my friends and family for their support and encouragement during this process. A special thanks to the other political science graduate students for their feedback and encouragement throughout the process. Finally, thank you to my parents. I would not be where I am now without their endless love and support.

"Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free."

"The New Colossus," Emma Lazarus (1883)

Introduction

Immigration is at the forefront of domestic and international political debates. Liberals, arguing for less restrictions, and conservatives, arguing for certain types of restrictions, have created a tension that has helped stir the question of whether more open or more closed border policies are effective in regulating mass migration. Some people see immigration as a way for their nation to experience cultural exchange, economic growth, and increased global influence; while others view immigration as a threat to their culture, economic stability, and way of life (Mangum and Block, 2018; Ackleson, 2005). Regardless of how someone views the topic of immigration, it is not new and is not going away. Between climate change, economic inequality, and civil and international wars, the number of immigration and refugee resettlements across the globe will likely remain on the forefront of people's minds.

The United States teaches their children that it is a nation of immigrants, almost all its citizens today have either had ancestors that immigrated or immigrated themselves to the United States. The United States is not alone in having a large demographic of immigrants, the European Union has seen unprecedented immigration in the past. Since the 1989 fall of the Berlin Wall, Europe has been much easier to navigate, and has shown that immigration has shaped and continues to reshape the lines of contemporary borders and politics. A border is not as simple as a line in the sand or an arbitrary map, instead it is something complex and often contested.

During the 2016 United States presidential election, political rhetoric and news coverage by the media revolved around immigration, and often portrayed the negative implications of it.

1

At the same time in Europe, an unprecedented influx of displaced persons and migrants rapidly changed the demographics of the region and triggered a cultural backlash of far-right parties such as Germany's Alternative for Deutschland (AfD), the Netherlands' Party for Freedom (PVV), the Italian Lega, and the French National Front (FN) (Kislev, 2016). This cultural backlash in countries has created mixed and often polarized feelings among citizens and politicians of the European Union and United States as to whether accepting immigrants is a good thing, and if so, how many states are obligated to take (Kislev, 2016).

This paper is a comparative case study between the United States and Germany and uses a historical approach by applying primary and secondary sources to give a historical context and a political analysis. Throughout the paper, I look at the United States' immigration policies, post-September 11, 2001, and Germany's "Welcome Culture" (or Willkommenskultur). I discuss what makes a policy effective in relation to immigration and how this perceived effectiveness can help to argue for more closed or open borders. I also discuss the political and social repercussions that these policies have had on culture in the United States and Germany – specifically the rise of the far-right and the recent role these groups have played in immigration policies. Between these two countries, I argue that Germany's more open border policies, derived from Angela Merkel and the Welcome Culture, were more effective in controlling mass migration during the Migrant Crisis in 2014-15, than the United States' more closed border policies in controlling migration at the southern border (United States-Mexico border) in 2019-20.

Literature

Terms

While it is true that humans have always been on the move, in the last 50 years, international immigration has more than tripled and we have seen drastic, large-scale movement to cross borders (Banulescu-Bogdan et al., 2021). Many people move in search of work and economic opportunities, to join families, or to attend school; however, many others are forced to escape conflict, persecution, climate change, and human rights violations. Although the international community uses the term *migrant* as an umbrella term for everyone leaving one place for another, there are other, more accurate terms: such as immigrant (legal or illegal), refugee (economic or environmental), asylum-seekers, or internally displaced people (IDPs). In such a globalized world, the words we use matter more than ever. For instance, people in destination countries (such as those in Europe, the United States, or Canada) are more likely to support admitting people described as "refugees" than those described as "immigrants" (Banulescu-Bogdan et al., 2021).

While all refugees are migrants, not all migrants are refugees. These two terms have been used interchangeably by the international news media during waves of mass movements – such as the European Migrant Crisis. The term *refugee* is often used to refer to all people, whether processed and assessed for formal refugee status or not, but the term has a very concrete legal definition (The 1951 Refugee Convention, 1951; Hamlin, 2022). The 1951 Refugee Convention stated that this term is only available to individuals who can prove they fled their home country "due to a well-founded fear of persecution because of their race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion."

For the purposes of this paper, I will refrain from using the term *refugee* unless specifically referring to a person who has filed and been assessed for refugee status. Instead, I have opted to use the terms *migrant* and *immigrant* to discuss people leaving their home country and that have arrived at their destination country. There is often a misunderstanding using the term "criminalizing" or "criminalization" to describe unauthorized immigrants. The blurriness between United States law enforcement and immigration policies are civil and federal issues not a criminal offense (Chand, 2020: Wong, 2012). Due to this distinction, I will not use the term *illegal* when describing a person in a destination country without authorization (Motomura, 2013). In addition, Elie Wiesel once said, "no human being is illegal," and in that spirit, unless directly quoting from a source, I will use the term *unauthorized*.

Open and Closed Borders

In the latter part of the 20th century, open borders seemed like a true possibility: the Berlin Wall fell, the Soviet Union collapsed, and several European checkpoints were removed. After the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, building borders, walls, and fences became normalized and countries across the globe were making plans to build or had already built up their borders. This spike in borders included investing in more border guards, more sophisticated technologies, more detention centers to hold more unwanted migrants, and implementing stricter visa requirements and passport practices. Although there are a number of compelling arguments for more closed border policies, these arguments against the free movement of people rely on "partial or inaccurate data or on selective reading" (Jones, 2019, p. 12).

Borders and walls are justified in different ways now than before globalization. This is because the increased flow of people and goods are perceived to be more of a risk to identities

and economies. The biggest reasons behind justifying a physical border include preventing

unauthorized immigration (57%), terrorism (27.7%), and smuggling (23.6%), (Vallet, 2019, p.

158-9). Vallet (2019) states that these reasons are often intertwined with the current political

atmosphere and are used as a series of overarching arguments that elected officials and

bureaucrats use to serve their own purposes. This directly shows that borders exist to address

domestic or geographical uncertainty before it is actually solving a specific physical border issue

(Jones, 2019; Vallet, 2019).

The first closed border argument is economic. The idea is that noncitizens coming into a

state will steal jobs away from citizens and damage the local economy, but there is evidence to

show that this is not the case. Enchautegui and Segarra (2017) have showed that less educated

migrant and native workers found jobs in different parts of the economy. Native workers found

jobs in service-oriented fields – such as cashiers, drivers, and janitors – while migrant workers

often took jobs that required "less-advanced language skills" – such as housekeeper/maid, cook,

or farm worker (Segarra et al., 2017, p. 7). There is a grain of truth within this mindset, wages

will go down. The argument is often made that this is due to a massive number of workers

flooding the market, but this is not true. Rather, this is due to a number of workers that are less

likely to complain about working conditions, low wages, or injuries (Huemer, 2010; Jones,

2019). This is especially true of unauthorized migrants, rather than alert government officials to

themselves and their status, they will often take very hard, labor-intensive, or low-paying

positions (Jones, 2019; Segarra et al., 2017).

Due to these lower wages, many migrants use government assistance programs to help

with the cost of living. Borjas (1994; 2000) found that in the United States, unlike previous

waves of immigrants before the 1970s, immigrants post 1990 are more likely than native

5

households to participate in the welfare system. In 1970, only 5.5% of immigrants that had been in the United States for less than 5 years received welfare, compared to native households at 6.0%. Yet, by 1990, 8.3% of newly arrived immigrants received public assistance, compared to the 7.4% of native households (Borjas, 1994). Concerned about the increase in first- and second-generation immigrants, the United States passed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, where the government sharply reduced the availability of welfare benefits to immigrants. With this act, children of immigrants are still eligible for benefits, however it was anticipated to save approximately $56 billion over a 5-year period (Borjas, 2000).

Often politicians, scholars, and the media argue that if we allow more highly educated workers into the United States, that there would be no need for its citizens to fear losing their jobs. Most countries, like the United States, already do prefer migrants with more education and "college graduates are more prevalent among recent immigrant adults than among all adults in 90 of the 100 largest metropolitan areas" in the United States (Hoban, 2017). Hoban's colleague at the Brookings Institute, Dany Bahar, agrees and further argues that immigrants are a boost to the economy because they are entrepreneurs. These entrepreneurs immigrating into the United States start businesses and therefore employ many workers. Immigrant entrepreneurs account for approximately a quarter of all entrepreneurs and a quarter of investors in the United States (Bahar, 2017). These business practices and entrepreneurship produce more jobs and therefore more money flowing through the local and national economy.

In addition to the economic arguments for a closed border, there are also the perceived cultural and political impacts. To many people, migration is a threat (Ackleson, 2005). This desire to keep the "other" people out results in a narrative of grouping – that there is an *us* vs

them. This mindset often leads to the belief that migrants bring in higher crime rates (Jones, 2019; Vallet, 2019). These arguments are based on nativist and supremacist ideals of power and wealth. A border is a two-way street – it stops people from coming in and stops others from leaving. If a border is set up, and the groups within it are diverse and conflicting, the people have been placed into political space that is rife for conflict. Another argument against open borders is that states do not have to provide for or care about noncitizens. Jones (2019) suggests that there is a "moral obligation to treat migrants the same as citizens" because there is not a natural social order, all humans are of equal worth because they are human, and if "there are restrictions on the freedom of some humans, there must be a moral justification for those limits" (p. 12).

Although a completely borderless world would not be perfect, wealthy and more privileged societies have many internal problems that would benefit from reducing harsher border policies. First, the thousands of dollars spent on smugglers to transport migrants would be spent on transportation systems that would contribute to a formal economy (Miller, 2019; Vallet, 2019). Second, the number of deaths at borders across the globe would practically disappear overnight. Next, opening borders would encourage a moving labor migration rather than a permanent labor force, which would have a significant impact on GDPs across the globe. Finally, the millions, or billions, of dollars spent on border infrastructure could be repurposed to social programs or schools.

Extremism

In addition to securitizing the borders, the recent rise of isolationist and nationalist sentiment has grown in a number of powerful countries. From Boris Johnson's" Brexit" movement in the United Kingdom to Donald Trump's campaign to "Build the Wall," leaders of

more developed countries have been implementing policies, withdrawing from international treaties, and creating stricter passport and visa practices in an attempt to limit migrants and practically close their countries' borders (Schain, 2017; 2018).

The political atmosphere in both Germany and the United States has been prime for extremism. Between the 2016 and 2020 federal elections the country has witnessed a significant shift in the Republican Party. This began in Donald Trump's 2016 election campaign where he focused on immigration. Based on his rhetoric and numerous posts on Twitter, he created an "us vs them" narrative and again promised his followers to keep jobs in the United States by reducing immigrants stealing their jobs and pulling out of international treaties. What was more disturbing than his rhetoric online, was his call to action in the first Presidential Debate in 2020 (CSPAN, 2020). About an hour and a half into the debate, President Donald Trump was asked to renounce the acts of far-right groups and to request them to stand down in the event of a failed reelection campaign. Instead of renouncing their actions, he called for them "to stand by" (CSPAN, 2020). The number of lone wolf and individual actor attacks drastically rose during his presidency, and with this response, he not only acknowledged their violent acts but gave them support for their violence (Ware, 2020).

Other Republican congressional leaders followed President Trump's example and ran their campaigns on a "Pro-Trump," anti-immigration platforms, and used the slogan "Keeping (Making) America Great Again." During the Trump Administration, immigration became a key policy reform, and although it has always been a sensitive topic, immigration has grown to become heated with the help of news coverage and societal reactions (Schain, 2017). The 2022 U.S. Senate race in Ohio displays the current repercussions of Trump's anti-immigrant platform. Jane Timken, the former Ohio GOP chair, is running under Trump's "America First" platform,

where she takes a strong stance against immigration (Mayorquin, 2022). Her competitor J.D. Vance, the candidate endorsed by Trump, has promised to continue Trump's fight of "alleged voter fraud and illegal immigration" (McDaniel, 2022).

In both the Obama and Trump administrations, the idea that the refugees were "others" and did not belong in the United States grew (Sackey-Ansah, 2021). Similar to the United States' growing anti-immigrant attitudes and rhetoric within the Republican Party, across the European continent, we have seen coalitions form. These form between the often one ticket, short-lived, far-right parties (such as the original Green parties and immigration focused parties) and longer-lasting center-right parties. These coalitions are done in order to increase electoral popularity (Schain, 2017). This process is known as deradicalization and is done to produce more voter turnout, reach a broader range of citizens, and, ultimately, longer-lived political parties. This is clearly shown in European elections. Immigration was a key turning point for Germany's far-right party, the Alternative for Deutschland (AfD), when in 2017, the party obtained higher than the German 5% electoral threshold and obtained seats in the Bundestag. Since this election, their political victories have dropped and coalitions with center-right parties, who also focus on issues beyond immigration, have been able to help the party stay relevant (Schain, 2017).

A similar effect is happening across Europe and the AfD is mirroring these groups to stay more relevant. An example is the French National Front (FN). After taking small steps to deradicalize their far-right party, the French National Front's Marine Le Pen gained 34% of the vote in the 2017 French national election. While this was a record for the National Front, it proved that the deradicalization process and coalition creating process was not successful enough to break down center-left opposition.

Immigration

Immigration has become an increasingly important issue across Europe and North America, and arguably across the globe. The universal understanding that we, as humans, are free to move, is not as simple as stepping outside your home. When a migrant is forced to leave, due to economic, political, or environmental turmoil – or is searching to provide themselves with a better life – the reaction is opposite what many people in the United States and Europe experience day-to-day (McGahern, 2019). The topic of immigration has dominated the Western world and will not go away. Between climate change, internal violence and war, and economic inequality, refugees and migrants will be looking to use their right as a human to move and find safe havens in the more industrialized world.

The United States has a long history of deportation, exclusion, and enforcement. Schuck (1984) outlines his idea of a "classical basis of U.S. immigration law" (p. 3). This was a seminal legal work that discusses the line between citizens and non-citizens and where immigrants' legal rights become ambiguous. Schuck (1984) does this by discussing the distinct rights-privileges in U.S. immigration law through two key components: first, that the courts must defer unconditionally to lawmakers with matters of non-citizens and their attempts to enter or reside in the country and, second, that non-citizens have restricted access to the courts when they are in contact with immigration authorities. He claims that immigrants in the United States are caught between the legal system and the larger political system where lawfully admitted aliens do not vote, have little to no access to healthcare or the welfare system, and even lose their rights to due process – see *Shaughnessy v. United States ex rel. Mezei* (1952) for one example of lack of due process.

Furthering Schuck's (1984) argument of classical immigration law, Coleman (2012) argues that there is a "neo-classical regime" that has resulted in a hardening of immigration enforcement between the geopolitical and the legal territorial borders in the United States (Coleman, 2012). This increased enforcement has amplified the restrictions placed on due process for non-citizens. This phenomenon of hardened borders and increased enforcement can also be seen across Europe. In his 2016 documentary, *Fire at Sea*, director Gianfranco Rosi captured the long and deadly journey that migrants took to reach the shores of Europe during the Migrant Crisis. There were many obstacles before the migrants could reach the shores of Europe. Many were lucky to not be stopped before reaching Italian waters and be returned to Libya, while others were lucky to live through the journey (Rosi, 2016; Urbina, 2021).

This externalization of borders has become a more common practice with the growth of security technology. By showing the Italian and Libyan governments interactions to prevent migrants from reaching Europe, Rosi was able to display the idea "co-bordering" (Longo, 2017; Rosi, 2016). The theory of co-bordering argues that sovereign states lose a bit of their sovereignty to allow another state to have the technology to screen or monitor people entering and leaving their border – thus sharing the data received (Longo, 2017). Security technology, immigration, and geo-political scholars have all been asking variations of the same question "post-globalization, where or what is a border?"

Popescu (2012) discusses the shifted flows of migrants after globalization. The first shift is the speed in which people can move through a space. For the United States, the process to apply for a visiting or permanent visa often begins in the origin country, and the theory of co-bordering explains that through biometrics, the internet, or transportation networks, the border has shifted international or online. This is done to regulate the movement of people into a

11

country and can even prevent them from arriving (Popescu, 2012). The second shift is that societies have become more populated and more diverse than previous centuries. This diversity has created an economic global flow of goods and ideas that has shifted from previous, state-centered trade and economies to internationally linked economies and relationships (Popescu, 2012). While this change of flow does not mean that the state has become irrelevant (states still have the ability to regulate the society, economy, politics, and culture), Urbina (2021) argues that it has produced more problems of accountability, as shown through the international economy, the environment, human rights violations, and transnational terrorism.

Policy Effectiveness

Politics is the conflict over the allocation or decision of resources and who gets what, when, and how (Anderson, 2015; Stone, 2012). Anderson (2003) defines *policy* as the "relatively stable, purposive course of action followed by an actor or set of actors in dealing with a problem or matter of concern" (p. 2). This definition identifies three main implications of public policies. First, public policies emerge as a response to demands of "action or inaction on some public issues made by other actors … upon government officials and agencies" (Anderson, 2003, p. 3). These demands can be made by private citizens, lobbying groups, or group representatives. In regard to immigration policies, there are a number of interest groups that are at the forefront of the policy debates at the state and federal level, such as the Migration Policy Institute, Immigration Policy Center, and the International Institute.

The second implication of public policies that Anderson (2003) identifies is that policies are not random behaviors among political actors. Therefore, policies have a purposeful or goal-oriented action. These specified goals are intended to produce definite results and are a series of specific actions or steps to achieve a particular goal (Anderson, 2003). Nevertheless, because

many policies intentionally use vague or abstract language, measuring or evaluating public policies can often be very difficult because the ambiguous language is used as a way to reduce conflict and promote compromise among policy makers (Anderson, 2003; Kautz et al., 1997).

In order to better measure a policy, Congress passed the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) of 1993. This was Congress' attempt to become business-like and require goals, strategies, and objectives to all federal agencies. The GPRA addressed the absence of goals, objectives, and outcomes by requiring federal agencies to set performance objectives that are attainable by measurable outcomes. The strategic and performance plan must be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and Congress. In this submitted plan, it must include a list of goals and objectives for major operations and functions of the agency that are "quantifiable and measurable," strategies for obtaining these goals and objectives, a description of the program evaluation that was used to establish or revise the goals and objectives, and provide a basis for comparing program results with performance goals (Kautz et al., 1997). It should be noted though that this process is not done through Congress but instead delegated to bureaucratic agencies to turn the vague legislation into something specific in a process known as rule making (Anderson, 2003).

The final implication of public policy that Anderson (2003) identifies is that policies consist of patterns of actions taken over time. A policy does not just include the decision to adopt a law or make a rule on a topic, but also on the subsequent decisions that enforce or implement the rule or law (Anderson, 2003; 2015). For example, immigration policies have been enacted by previous laws, but are enforced or guided through Presidential Executive Orders and court cases. These administrative rules help elaborate, interpret, and apply or not apply an act to certain situations. As an important part of a policy, this evaluation is necessary to assess the

13

performance and impacts of a specific policy, or series of policies. This assessment can be done by scholars, politicians, news media, and other political actors such as nongovernmental organizations.

Stone (2012) defines efficiency as "getting the most output for a given input" (p. 67). This vagueness, like written policies, gives way to many interpretations. An "effective" policy is one that achieves the goals laid out within the policy itself; however, it is difficult when the policies' objectives change. There is no fixed method to measuring policy effectiveness, however one good method to measure efficiency is to analyze the cost and benefit of a policy. While scholars, politicians, and other evaluators have different and opposing ideas on the cost and benefit of immigration, it can be a good starting point to ask where the most value for the money is in a specific policy.

An example is the United States' 1993-4 Operation Gatekeeper. Former President Clinton expanded funding for border protection and new technologies to help prevent unauthorized immigration in San Diego, and the administration later claimed that helped reduce unauthorized entries by 75% (Young, 1997). When this policy was evaluated by the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) these claims were shown to be inconclusive because it was unclear if the overall flows of migrants diminished because of the security put in place or from less migration in general (United States General Accounting Office, 1997). Was this portion of the Clinton administration's immigration policy effective? Yes and no. Yes because one can argue that the funding did reduce the number of unauthorized entries into the United States, whether there was migrants attempting to enter or not; no because the money spent on further funding border guards and new technology did not show to have actually helped reduce entries.

When studying immigration policies, scholars often analyze the policies through economic theories and the economic impact; however, this is not the only way to measure an effective policy. Scholars, politicians, and the news media tends to ask questions about society as a whole, such as how immigrants affect citizens in the United States – often in relation to jobs or healthcare. For example, there are a number of competing or inconclusive articles, books, newspapers, and research institutes that discuss the economic impact of immigrants within the United States job market.[1] This discrepancy among influential organizations and people fuels the many arguments for appropriate border policies. While economic analysis is useful to an overall policy's effectiveness, it cannot answer whether a policy is reaching the people it is intended to help, and if the policy is not reaching this intended population, then is it actually effective?

This paper utilizes a historical approach to a case study, applying primary and secondary sources to provide a historical context and a political analysis. Political science and history have a long and intertwined past that has helped to shape modern-day political institutions (Thies, 2002). Most political scientists today have forgotten that political science was often encompassed by its historical roots. As Oren (2016) states, political scientists often stop short of reflecting on the "discourse of their own emerging discipline" and how that has or may have been embedded in the changing history they were theorizing (p. 311). The use of historical, qualitative work, that is often found in case studies, helps to paint a fuller picture of immigration policies in the United States and Germany.

---

[1] See Albert, 2021; Enchautegui, 2013; Griswold, 2018; Jones, 2019; Kiguchi and Mountford, 2017 as just a few examples of the competing articles and research publications.

Immigration in the United States

The United States is a country of immigrants. At a young age we teach our children that the United States is the great melting pot of cultures. Currently, there are more than 40 million people in the United States that were born in another country, which accounts for approximately one-fifth of the world's migrants (Budiman, 2020; Griswold, 2018). The 1800s saw a mass migration from Eastern and Western Europe; however, by the mid-1800s, there was a large influx of Chinese immigrants (United States General Accounting Office, n.d.). In the 1900s, migration from South America, Central America, and Mexico increased, and most recently, there has been a steady increase in immigrants from Mexico but also India and China (Budiman, 2020). Between climate change, economic inequality, and civil and international wars, the growing number of immigrants and refugees across the globe will likely remain in the forefront for politicians, elections, and the news media's coverage.

During the first half of the United States' history, it was relatively easy to migrate, but in order to be a citizen you had to be white (Batalova et al., 2021). Immigration in the latter half of the United States has a long history of exclusion and closed border policies. The September 11, 2001 attacks drastically increased the tension for immigrants and refugees. In 2019, immigrants within the United States made up almost 14% of the total population, approximately 50 million; however, this is not the historic high.[2] Between 1890 and 1910 the total immigrant population was almost 15% (Batalova et al., 2021). Recently, Congress has been unable to reach an agreement on broad immigration reforms (see H.R.1177 - U.S. Citizenship Act or S.264 - Dream

---

[2] See statistics provided from the Migration Policy Institute at https://www.migrationpolicy.org/programs/data-hub/us-immigration-trends

Act of 2021) and instead presidents have enacted executive orders to control the flow of migrants.

Pre-September 11, 2001

In the last century, the United States' restrictive border policies began with the establishment of the U.S. Border Patrol in 1924. Even before its official creation, there were unofficial mounted watchmen and guards that patrolled and defended the southern border. The United States' border patrol did not expand until World War I and II, when the Department of Justice (DOJ) doubled the officers employed to patrol the southern border, man "alien detention camps," and arrest "illegal" migrants (United States Customs and Border Protection, 2020). This role of protecting the border has continued to expand quickly. In the 1950s, the United States started utilizing special taskforces of select border patrol agents that worked directly under the U.S. Attorney General. In these taskforces, the agents were given the ability to gather and expel unauthorized migrants, but also given the ability to track suspected flights and prevent them from landing in the United States (United States Customs and Border Protection, 2020).

In 1986, the Immigration Reform and Control Act was signed into law by former President Ronald Reagan. This bill made it unlawful for businesses to hire undocumented immigrants and established both a verification and enforcement system. In addition, it granted temporary legal status for migrants who entered the United States, without authorization, before 1982. This controversial, so-called "blanket amnesty bill" was passed due to powerful lobbyists invested in the business community to ensure the flow of low-wage workers. While controversial among congressional leaders, because immigration was not a major issue during presidential or congressional elections at this time, there was perceived to be a more centered balance between liberals and conservatives (Kamarck and Stenglein, 2019).

In 1993-4, the Clinton Administration launched "Operation Gatekeeper" in San Diego, "Operation Safeguard" in Tucson, and "Operation Hold the Line" in El Paso. These operations were placed at crucial points along the border and were utilized to control and maintain responsibility of the border successfully from any lawlessness (Ackleson, 2005). Former President Bill Clinton's U.S. Attorney General Alan Bersin, also known as the "Border Czar," expressed the need to contain chaos and create order (United States Customs and Border Protection, 2020). The U.S. Customs and Border Protection (2020) argued that Operation Gatekeeper in San Diego helped reduce unauthorized entries by 75% (Young, 1997). The U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO)[3] issued a warning that these claims were inconclusive and that it was unclear if the overall flows of migrants diminished because of the security put in place, which just shifted the points of entry for migrants, or from less migration in general (Massey, 2013; Urbina and Peña, 2019; Young, 1997).

By the 1990s there was another increased investment at the border, which included increased manpower, better security technology, and operationalizing the new computer processing systems (Ackleson, 2005). The 1996 Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) is proof of this increased response to the perceived threat of migrants. The IIRIRA was considered a landmark act for border securitization, strengthened immigration laws, and added penalties for undocumented immigrants (Committee on the Judiciary, 1997). This act was directly against the Immigration Reform and Control Act (1986) and, in combination to the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act (AEDPA), the

---

[3] At this time the GAO was known as the General Accounting Office

IIRIRA's goals were to replace the former deportation and exclusion procedures with a singular removal process (Coleman, 2005).

The IIRIRA and AEDPA were designed to improve border control by "criminalizing" undocumented migrants, increasing enforcement within the United States, and securing hundreds of millions of dollars for border agents, new security systems, and fortifications – such as fencing and electronic sensors to deter unauthorized migration (Ackleson, 1999; Coleman, 2005; 2012). The IIRIRA was presented to the public as a success and paved the way for later closed border policies. The IIRIRA, and later the Secure Communities program (SComm) blurred the distinction between the traditional criminal justice policies and immigration status (Chand, 2020). This was done by using law enforcement agencies (such as police and sheriffs) to enforce an area, but because immigration is a civil matter that is meant to be enforced by federal immigration agents, state or local police have no power to arrest or detain someone for being an unauthorized migrant. The IIRIRA, specifically Sec. 289(g), created a role for law enforcement agencies to enforce immigration policies on behalf of the federal government (Chand, 2020).

Our modern-day view of immigration reform comes from the aftermath of September 11, 2001. Under former President George W. Bush, the Department of Homeland Security Act of 2002 was passed. This act created the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and was created with a vast mission to counter or prevent terrorism, secure the border, regulate immigration, and set up new immigration policies (Pope, 2020). In order to fulfill this mission, the DHS soon reorganized to create three new federal agencies: U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS), and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CPB). This bureaucratic creation and reorganization significantly changed the way these agencies did and still do business (Pope, 2020).

After September 11, 2001, the Bush administration drastically increased funding border security and immigration enforcement by 159% - from $4.8 billion in 2001 to $12.3 billion in 2008 (President Bush's Plan, 2007). This budgetary increase was used to expand the number of border patrol agents, to complete 370 miles of fencing along the U.S.-Mexico border, use Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS), and ended the "catch and release" policy in exchange for detaining an unauthorized immigrant until it was determined that they could be removed (President Bush's Plan, 2007). This administration set the stage for future administrations to significantly use and expand detention policies; further physical boundaries on the U.S.-Mexico border; the broad use of immigrant screening, interviewing, and enforcement initiatives; and the growth of state and local participation in immigration enforcement and policymaking (Mittlestadt et al., 2011).

Former President Barack Obama administration's policies on immigration are mixed: in one sense, he was able to create the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, but in another sense, removals under his administration spiked (President Obama's Legacy on Immigration, 2017). The DACA program was created in 2012, to allow people unlawfully brought into the United States as children (under eight years old) the temporary right to live, study, and work in the United States. By 2018, almost 800,000 "DREAMers" (the nickname for the people DACA was created to help) had been granted approval to remain in the United States under temporary status (American Immigration Council, 2021). Yet due to the continued failure of the Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors Act (DREAM), the DREAMers must reapply for temporary status every two years, with no pathway to citizenship (Ospina, 2019; President Obama's Legacy on Immigration, 2017).

The Obama administration took a number of steps to further immigration enforcement. In the United States, during the wave of mass migration to the southern border in 2014-15, Obama's administration presented a significant focus on tightening the U.S.-Mexican border and deportations spiked under his administration. Schreckenhise and Chand (2021) discuss the role the Obama-era Immigration and Custom Enforcement's (ICE) Secure Communities (SComm) program had in implementing Obama's policies. In this, they argue that the SComm program produced "substantial county-level variation in immigrant removals" (Schreckenhise and Chand, 2021, p. 1). This spike in deportations and use of programs through ICE (like SComm) gave Obama the nickname "Deporter in Chief" (Chishti, Pierce, and Bolter, 2015; Muzaffar, Pierce, and Bolter, 2017). This is inaccurate. Although it is perceived by media that more people were deported or removed under Obama, the likelihood to be deported was greater under the Bush and Trump administrations (Bennet, 2014; Law, 2014).

After the Secure Communities repeal in 2014, it was replaced with the Priority Enforcement Program (PEP). PEP was intended to focus on immigrants with serious criminal convictions and deport them. This new program was a rebranding of the Secure Communities program because it still targeted criminals through biometric data and removed those at the federal and state level but also still had a concentration of participation at the local level (Strengthening Enforcement, n.d.; Waslin, 2016). The program turned out to be a disappointment. With PEP, unlike Secure Communities, ICE was required to issue "requests" (Form I-247D) when an individual had a final order of removal, or when there was sufficient cause to remove them, however, in FY2016, 51% of I-274D requests were issued on people with no convictions, 25% were issued for Level 1 (serious) offenses, 6% for Level 2 offenses, and

18% for Level 3 (misdemeanors) offenses (Law Enforcement Immigration Task Force, 2021; Waslin, 2016).

During the European Migrant Crisis in 2014-15, Obama pledged to accept an additional 10,000 refugees and asylum seekers (Remarks by President Obama at Leaders Summit on Refugees, 2015).[4] According Harris, Sanger, and Herszenhorn (2015) many liberal congressional leaders applauded Obama's increase and called on him to accept an additional 65,000. Whereas many conservative leaders disagreed to take in the originally pledged refugees. Jeff Sessions, Republican Congressman from Alabama and former chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, had stated that the United States needed to help refugees return to their homes as quickly as possible, that he did "not favor every war zone turning into hundreds of thousands, even millions of refugees that flee the country to go to other countries that otherwise they would not meet the immigration standards" (Harris, Sanger, and Herszenhorn, 2015).

Although the Obama administration attempted to accrue some progress and update the immigration policies in the United States, by the 2016 Presidential Elections, Donald Trump still inherited an outdated system with a gridlocked Congress. Although some progress was achieved during Obama's administration (namely the DACA program), the incoming Trump Administration still needed to respond to the same questions surrounding DREAMers and their families, border enforcement, refugee flows, detentions, deportations or removals, and much more that were faced by both the Bush and Obama administrations (President Obama's Legacy on Immigration, 2017). The Trump administration's response to Congress' lack of action on

---

[4] This pledge is less than .01% of the total number of displaced peoples, migrants, and refugees in 2014 and 2015.

comprehensive immigration reform was a number of Executive Orders, including his infamous Executive Order 13,769, also known as the "Muslim Ban."

Comprehensive immigration reform was a key focus of former President Donald Trump's administration. During his four years as president, Trump was able to dismantle and reconstruct several elements of the United States immigration system that were not accomplished in previous decades. In his 2018 State of the Union address, Trump highlighted his plan for reform, which was broken down into four pillars: (1) a path to citizenship for DREAMers, (2) increased border security funding, (3) ending the diversity visa lottery, and (4) restrictions on family-based immigration (Kerr 2018). In 2017, Trump attempted to rescind the DACA program – this was later blocked by the Supreme Court of the United States (SCOTUS). After the Court's decision, Trump publicly declared his support for DREAMers that met certain criteria regarding education, "good moral character," and work requirements as well as a minimum length of time in the United States. (Pierce and Bolter, 2020, p. 52).

Increasing border security and enforcement was no surprise. The $25 billion was allocated to constructing a wall at the U.S.-Mexican border, increasing ICE and CBP officers as well as immigration judges, and further implementation of biometric and surveillance technology (Kerr, 2018). Although what garnered the most attention was the price to build a more solid wall at the southern border, this framework included hiring and subsequently paying more federal immigration judges to combat the constant growing backlog of immigrant cases (Pierce and Bolter, 2020). In regard to increased surveillance and enforcement, this budget also provided more cameras, sensors, and drones as well as more personnel to help combat unauthorized immigration and to stop migrants from reaching the physical border long before they enter the United States.

The third pillar of Trump's immigration reform was to end the diversity visa lottery and replace it with a merit-based lottery. The diversity visa lottery system was put in place with the Immigration Act of 1990 (although not in operation until FY1995) and was intended to grant visas to immigrants that are from underrepresented countries in newly arrived immigrants for that fiscal year (Connor, 2018). In 2016, the countries chosen for the diversity visa lottery included Ghana, Uzbekistan, Iran, Ukraine, Egypt, Nepal, Ethiopia, and Sierra Leone. Starting in April 2019, the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) first conducted a lottery for the 65,000 general slots – this drawing *included* applicants with advanced degrees – then, it conducted a second lottery for 25,000 additional "master's cap" slots – only drawing from the remaining applicants that had advanced degrees. This resulted in an 11% increase in selecting applicants with a master's degree or higher in FY2020 over FY2019 (Pierce and Bolter, 2020).

The final pillar Trump described in his 2018 State of the Union was restrictions on family-based immigration. This sought to limit family immigration to only include spouses and minor children, rather than the previous law that families could sponsor parents, siblings, fiancées, children, minor children, and spouses (Kerr, 2018). USCIS plays a large role in implementing this rule, and under the new standards, officers will be able to evaluate based on an applicant's age, health, family status, education, skills, assets, and English-speaking ability (Pierce and Bolter, 2020). Using United States census data, the Migration Policy Institute found that this policy disproportionately excluded women, children, the elderly, and applicants from Mexico and Central America (Capps et al., 2018).

Current discussions surrounding the 2019-20 crisis at the U.S.-Mexico border boomerang between conservatives arguing to build a larger wall and not admit any new migrants, and liberals arguing for more humane practices and accepting more migrants. As the number of

migrants rise due to war, economic inequality, and climate change, the United States is still yo-yoing between further closing borders and not changing the status quo. Common themes between these administrations is the goal to lower immigration, often by further securing the border. The United States' more closed border policies since September 11, 2001, have shown to be relatively ineffective and stagnant: initial programs were replaced with similar programs; budget increases for manpower, larger barriers, and security continue to rise; and there is no permanent solution for unauthorized immigrants already within the United States. In addition, the administration's goals to lower immigration in the United States have also not been successful. Immigration into the United States has continued to rise, although it is well below other advanced nations (Batalova et al., 2021; Griswold, 2018).

After September 11, 2001, security at the United States borders was a big priority and closing the United States' borders – specifically the U.S.-Mexico border – became a major issue in congressional and presidential elections. Beyond doubling the annual security budget and the number of patrol agents on the southern border, the Bush administration also reinforced a barrier between Mexico and the United States. This Secure Fence Act (2006) was the start (1,100 km) of heavily guarded physical barrier, only growing larger (to 2,500 km) under the Obama administration (Ospina, 2019). Under the Obama administration, there was a substantially growing border patrol with more sophisticated technology and new drones to enhance security to match (President Obama's Legacy on Immigration, 2017; Ospina, 2019). Though often praised for his humanitarian speeches, Obama was very harsh on immigration. The Obama's leading immigration reform accomplishment, DACA, simply provided temporary remedies to an enduring problem rather than a permanent solution.

On multiple occasions Trump showed blatant racism and xenophobia, stating that "illegal" immigrants were violent rapists and murderers who were stealing jobs from hard-working Americans. Unlike Obama, Trump was publicly battered in the media, even though he was furthering many of Obama and Bush's policies, even reinstating the SComm program. Trump's Executive Order 13,767 on January 25, 2017 (entitled "Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States") restarted the SComm program and prioritized all undocumented immigrants – regardless of criminal status (American Immigration Council, 2017; Law Enforcement Immigration Task Force, 2021; Strengthening Enforcement, n.d.; Waslin, 2016). In addition, Trump increased the security budget to provide for a longer and larger barrier on the southern border, more security and enforcement, and, overall, more surveillance in both technological advances and in manpower (Law Enforcement Immigration Task Force, 2021; Pierce and Bolter, 2020; Ospina, 2019).

The Biden Administration has announced their comprehensive immigration reform; however, with the COVID-19 pandemic, the topic of immigration may yet again be stalled in Congress. In his first 100 days, President Joseph Biden has said he intends to provide a temporary suspension on deportations; to create a road map for legalization for the estimated 11 million unauthorized immigrants; to end separating families, the prolonged immigration detentions, and the Migrant Protection Protocols (also known as "Remain in Mexico") program; to reinstate the DACA program; to restore the Obama administration's immigration enforcement guidelines; and to repeal the Trump administration's travel ban on some Muslim-majority countries (Meissner and Mittelstadt, 2020). Ultimately, Biden's first 100 days were undoing previous executive orders and continuing the previous state of affairs while also not providing an answer or better solution to comprehensive immigration reform.

Vespa et al. (2020) has shown that the United States will be dealing with an aging population and a need for foreign workers within the next 40 years. In addition, statistics show that by 2030, one in every five U.S. citizens will be 65 years and older, thus placing a strain on the nation's social security. Although we should be relying on immigrants to help fill the inevitable job vacancies, with the restrictive border and immigration policies currently in place, there will not be enough people to fill these positions once the older generation retires (Vespa et al., 2020).

Immigration in Germany

Unlike the United States' closed border policies, and overall lack of progress, Germany since Word Wad II has rebuilt with more open border policies. After World War II, the world looked on as Germany was divided between the communist East and democratic West. The Berlin Wall was the spot where former President John F. Kennedy famously said, "Ich bin ein Berliner."[5] This statement provided hope to a number of East German citizens that were dying in attempts to escape the Soviet Union. After the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, there was a renewed sense of hope for, not only for the previously mentioned possibility of open borders, but for freedom and democracy. This was one of the first major waves of mass migration to Germany, and between 1950 and 1995, approximately 80% of the increase in the German population was from immigrants (Klusmeyer and Papademetriou, 2009). Today, more than 20% of the German population are either first- or second-generation immigrants (Kotzur et al., 2018)

The Basic Law of the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) was the constitution that took effect in 1949; within it, there is a provision to provide asylum to persons being persecuted on

---

[5] English translation, "I am a Berliner."

political grounds (Trejo, 2021). This idea to help to open their borders to people who needed help, would in theory, help mitigate the atrocities conducted by Hitler and the Nazi regime (Momin, 2017). This idea of coming to terms with and taking responsibility for their past is known as the *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*[6] (Conrad and Aðalsteinsdóttir, 2017). Although this idea is the basis for many of Germany's immigration policies, much of the society (both in the past and present) have contributed to a "supposedly new phenomenon" of *Ausländerfeindlichkeit*[7] (Alexopoulou, 2021).

In the 1960s and 1970s, there was a guest worker program that lured migrants to help rebuild a war-torn Germany. This program, *Gastarbeiterprogramm*, was an exclusionist immigration policy that was designed to fill in low-qualification job vacancies for a predetermined time frame (Zotti, 2021). The government's goal was to control the amount and overall make-up of the recruited workers to fill the demand for cheap labor (Prevezanos, 2011; Alexopoulou, 2021). The majority of the employed immigrants were Turkish and were sent to West Germany; although there was a separate program for East Germany, where these foreign workers were called "*Fremdarbeiter.*" This unfortunately common term among the populist far-right carries a negative connotation to Nazi era forced labor and is rarely used by centrists or the left (Forced Labor, 2011; Prevezanos, 2011). These Turkish migrants often stayed in Germany and were forced to assimilate into the German culture. To this day, many of these guest workers are viewed as Turkish rather than Turkish-German and do not "feel at home" (Ahmed, 2021). This is a large part of the German population, approximately 2.5 million people come from a Turkish background, and only approximately 700,000 of this population claim German

---

[6] Literally translated to "coping with the past" (translate.google.com)
[7] Translation is "xenophobia" (translate.google.com), but Alexopoulou (2021) provided the phrase "hostility to foreigners."

citizenship (Prevezanos, 2011). This guest worker program became the basis for a number of other Mediterranean countries: Italy, Spain, Greece, Turkey, Portugal, Tunisia, Morocco, and Yugoslavia (Zotti, 2021).

After German reunification in 1992, the Basic Law was amended to not guarantee asylum-seekers help on the basis of political persecution (Trejo, 2021). In addition, in 1992 the Maastricht Treaty created an important framework for developing European Union refugee and immigrant policies (Klusmeyer and Papademetriou, 2009). Following the Maastricht Treaty, the Schengen Agreement and Dublin Agreement were added to the EU immigration laws. The Dublin Agreement created an asylum processing procedure and the Schengen Agreement helped facilitate travel in the EU in regard to border entry (Klusmeyer and Papademetriou, 2009; Trejo, 2021).

Willkommenskultur

The German Welcome Culture – or *Willkommenskultur* – was a concept first discussed in 2005, when Angela Merkel took office. She made it a priority to reach an agreement on refugee and immigration reform in Germany (Trejo, 2021). With her insistence, Germany passed the 2005 Migration Act, where long-term residents were given integration help, but mainly this act led way to the Residence Act and Nationality Act, which allowed children born in Germany to foreign parents citizenship (Yavuzcehre, 2020). These acts were updated several more times and allowed for more integration opportunities (Klusmeyer and Papademetriou, 2009; Trejo, 2021). In 2010, Germany found themselves addressing an aging population that has put a strain on the pension system and a growing need for working immigrants (Conrad and Aðalsteinsdóttir, 2017; Zotti, 2021).

Although the Welcome Culture began in 2005, it became a household term for the world during the European Migrant Crisis where a majority of the immigrants and refugees were from Muslim-majority countries: specifically, from the Middle East and Northern Africa (MENA). Germany's response to the waves of the European Migrant Crisis was unprecedented. In 2014-15, Germany experienced a massive increase in immigrants and refugees, and especially after a long history of migrant and "short-term" workers, this change was a milestone in the German approach on migration. This is because for the first time, the German federal government was explicitly presenting immigration as a political goal (Trauner and Turton, 2017). This temporary positive attitude toward immigration was characterized by Chancellor Merkel's statement "Wir schaffen das,"[8] where Merkel suspended the Dublin procedure requirements and permitted migrants to file applications in Germany (Jäckle and König, 2016; Zotti, 2021). This open-door policy doubled the federal government's contribution to state and local governments to accommodate some meals, housing, and medical expenses (Zotti, 2021). A number of people and organizations acted in support of the masses of migrants, often volunteering or donating goods or money (Kotzur et al., 2018).

Unfortunately, because of these open-door policies, Germany's welcoming attitude alienated their European partners. Hungary's Prime Minister Orban declared the migrant crisis "a German problem," and began erecting a barrier between Hungary and Serbia and Croatia (Zotti, 2021). Domestically, this policy angered Germans and helped propel the vocal and xenophobic Alternative for Deutschland (AfD) (Conrad and Aðalsteinsdóttir, 2017). This polarization

---

[8] Translated to "We can do it" (translate.google.com)

between the German policy vision and the German public opinion grew until violence towards refugees and migrants became frequent occurrences (Knight, 2018; Ware, 2020).

In 2011, an extremist, neo-Nazi cell, known as the National Socialist Underground (NSU), was discovered. This underground gang was discovered by police after committing over 360 crimes that included violence, threats of violence, vandalism, and hate speech (Knight, 2018). It is believed that these crimes were politically and racially motivated since the NSU vandalized objects, buildings, and multiple burial sites of their victims, with "the NSU will get you next" (Conrad and Aðalsteinsdóttir, 2017). This series of attacks brought about a rising fear that Naziism was reemerging from the shadows in a modern-day Germany.

Germany's response to the waves of the European Migrant Crisis was unprecedented. These more open border policies created a major growth in the German economy. In 2015-16, there were almost 1.2 million people who applied for asylum in Germany. Once registered with the German government, in accordance with the Nationality and Residence Acts, the migrants took integration and language courses aimed to helping them enter the labor force (Dowling, 2019). The Federal Office for Migration and Refugees found that, of the refugees that arrived during the peak period of the crisis (summer 2015-16), 35% had become employed by October 2018 (Das Bundesamt in Zahlen, n.d.; Dowling, 2019). The combination of an aging population and a massive influx of workers was the perfect match for the country. Due to the increased costs for providing housing, medical expenses, and language and other integration courses, the German government is still spending more than receiving from taxes (Dowling, 2019). Research conducted has shown that Germany should begin to see a positive balance in 2021 (Bach et al., 2017; Dowling, 2019).

Structural Differences Between the United States and Germany

The United States and Germany are very different countries with distinct institutional styles of representational democracy, policies and laws, and people. The German system is much more favorable to multiple political parties as long as the party achieves more than five percent of votes in the federal elections. The parties not only pick their candidate but also pay for the majority of their candidates' election campaign. The parties raise money from individual membership dues, large corporations, and by the taxpayers (based on the party's representation in government). Due to this party focus, the representatives rarely vote on their conscience, and instead vote along party lines (Schain, 2018).

In contrast, the United States is a two-party system that is a winner-take-all system, technically known as Single Member District Plurality (SMDP) (Schain, 2018). This system has led to an increase in polarization in U.S. politics. This polarization has allowed for right-wing populists to achieve some electoral and governing success in the United States; while in Germany they are able to regulate these groups to minor roles until they are no longer popular with the countries' citizens (Schain, 2018). Since representatives in the United States are mainly funded through donations from wealthy individuals, members of Congress vote on their conscience and their donors' interests. Due to its nature, the German government is more representative of the people because they have multiple parties, and based on the number of votes, the parties are given more power in government. Discussing the differences in their election systems shows where the representatives' loyalties lie, and ultimately helps describe why certain laws or policies are passed while others are not in the two countries.

Discussion and Conclusion

As previously defined, efficiency is "getting the most output for a given input," and while there is no fixed method to measuring policy efficiency, a good method is to analyze the cost and benefit of a policy (Stone, 2012, p. 67). The United States has spent billions of dollars to increase security and enforcement along the border, as well as detain thousands of migrants, and yet has no permanent solution to help unauthorized migrants become citizens. All of which are goals laid out by previous administrations. Germany, with the use of more open border policies, has spent more money on integrating recent immigrants than what their taxes generated, yet Germans have seen a drastic increase in their working population and have been projected to see a profit after FY202. In addition, the migrants are filling the jobs left by the aging population.

In regards to the United States, immigration reform has become a major issue for most elections, yet there have been very little to no comprehensive reform laws passed in the last 20 years. As a result, several Presidents of the United States have taken it upon themselves to make reforms in the form of Executive Orders. As displayed above, this has resulted in a confusing mass of executive orders that are then repealed by later presidents or the courts. This menagerie of non-legislative, yet mandatory laws, have led to constant backpedaling after each presidential election, and ultimately, no comprehensive immigration reform despite immigration bills being introduced to Congress.

In contrast to the unending immigration loop in the United States, Germany has been able to pass laws regarding immigration for decades and even helps to lead the European Union against passing very restrictive immigration policies (Thym, 2021). Before the Migrant Crisis, legislators were able to pass laws and policies that helped prepare Germany for a large influx of migrants. Even after the 2015-16 crisis, Germany has continued to pass laws to help transition

33

and provide easier paths to citizenship. Thym (2021) states that Germany is the modern country of immigration and has shown to have success with integrating migrants into the country

Although both countries have seen an uptick in far-right political parties and ideas, Germany's more open border policies have been more effective in building the German economy. This is based on successfully completing goals laid out in their policies: to bring in immigrants to fill jobs, to offer integration and language courses to successfully incorporate migrants into the German society, and to see a projected positive profit from taxes. Whereas the United States' more closed border policies and executive orders have hindered immigration policies, a potential economic growth, as well as allowed hundreds of thousands of DREAMers to remain in a limbo state of non-citizenship. These closed border policies have created humanitarian crises at the U.S.-Mexico border and due to the lack of cooperation within Congress, it is likely to remain this way. In addition, the United States will be in the same position as Germany in 2015-16, with an aging population, no one to fill jobs, and a strained social security system.

This paper compared Germany and the United States' immigration policies. Between Germany and the United States, Germany's more open border policies, derived from Angela Merkel and the Welcome Culture, were more effective in controlling mass migration during the Migrant Crisis in 2014-15, than the United States' more closed border policies in controlling migration at the southern border (United States-Mexico border) in 2019-20. The topic of immigration is at the forefront of politics. In the United States, comprehensive immigration reform has stalled for decades, while a growing number of migrants are being detained at the border. Whereas in Germany, migrants and refugees have been granted access to a system that will provide them with integration and language courses to help them contribute to the state. The

United States will soon be in the same position as Germany was with an aging population and a strained social security system (Vespa et al., 2020). In this position, the United States government will need to ask themselves where the needed labor to continue to support this large economy and social systems will come from.

Bibliography

Ackleson, J. (1999). Discourses of identity and territoriality on the U.S.–Mexico Border. *Geopolitics*, 4(2), 155 – 179. https://doi.org/10.1080/14650049908407645 -155–179.

Ackleson, J. (2005). Constructing Security on the U.S.–Mexico Border. *Political Geography*, *24*(2), 165–184. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2004.09.017

Ahmed, S. (2021, October 11). *At 60, is the Turkish 'guest worker' in Germany still a guest?* TRT World. Retrieved December 16, 2021, from https://www.trtworld.com/magazine/at-60-is-the-turkish-guest-worker-in-germany-still-a-guest-5066

American Immigration Council. (2017, May 19). Summary of Executive Orders 'Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States. Retrieved April 11, 2022, from https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/immigration-interior-enforcement-executive-order

Alexopoulou, M. (2021). Ignoring Racism in the History of the German Immigration Society: Some Reflections on Comparison as an Epistemic Practice. *Journal for the History of Knowledge* 2(1), 1-13. http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/jhk.43.

Anderson, J. E. (2003). Public policymaking: An Introduction. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, pp. 1 – 34.

Anderson, J. E. (2015). *Public Policymaking* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Bach, S., Brücker, H., Haan, P., Romiti, H., Deuverden, K., Weber, E. (2017). Refugee Integration: A Worthwhile Investment. *Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung Economic Bulletin*: 33–44.

Background to the Office of the Inspector General Investigation. Operation Gatekeeper. (n.d.)., from https://oig.justice.gov/sites/default/files/archive/special/9807/gkp01.html

Banulescu-Bogdan, N., Malka, H, & Culbertson, S. (2021). *How We Talk about Migration: The Link between Migration Narratives, Policy, and Power.* Migration Policy Institute. https://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/migration-narratives-policy-power

Batalova, J., Hanna, M., & Levesque, C. (2021, August 6). *Frequently Requested Statistics on Immigrants and Iimmigration in the United States.* Migration Policy Institute. Retrieved March 6, 2022, from https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/frequently-requested-statistics-immigrants-and-immigration-united-states-2020

Bennett, B. (2014, April 1). *High Deportation Figures are Misleading.* Los Angeles Times. Retrieved April 11 2022, from https://www.latimes.com/nation/la-na-obama-deportations-20140402-story.html

Borjas, G. J. (1994). The Economics of Immigration. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 32(4), 1667–1717. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2728791.pdf

Borjas, G. J. (2000). *Issues in the Economics of Immigration* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Budiman, A. (2020, September 22). *Key findings about U.S. Immigrants.* Pew Research Center. Retrieved February 23, 2022, from https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2020/08/20/key-findings-about-u-s-immigrants/

Capps, R., Greenberg, M., Fix, M., Zong J. (2018). *Gauging the Impact of DHS' Proposed Public-Charge Rule on U.S. Immigration.* Migration Policy Institute. https://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/impact-dhs-public-charge-rule-immigration

Chand, D. E. (2020). Is it Population or Personnel? The Effects of Diversity on Immigration Policy Implementation by Sheriff Offices. *Public Performance & Management Review*, *43*(2), 304–333. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/15309576.2019.1596821

Chishti, M., Pierce, S., & Bolter, J. (2017, January 26). *The Obama Record on Deportations: Deporter in Chief or Not?* Migration Policy Institute. Retrieved from https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/obama-record-deportations-deporter-chief-or-not

Coleman, M. (2005). U.S. Statecraft and the U.S.–Mexico Border as Security/Economy Nexus. *Political Geography*, *24*(2), 185–209. doi:10.1016/j.polgeo.2004.09.016

Coleman, M. (2012). Immigrant Il-Legality: Geopolitical and Legal Borders in the US, 1882-Present. *Geopolitics, 17*, 402-422 DOI:10.1080/14650045.2011.563155

Committee on the Judiciary. [Law], Implementation of title III of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996: Hearing before the Subcommittee on Immigration and claims of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, One Hundred Fifth Congress, First Session, February 11, 1997 (1997). Washington DC; U.S. G.P.O.

Comprehensive Immigration Reform. (2007). *The White House: President George W. Bush*. https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/infocus/immigration/

Connor, P. (2018). *Applications for U.S. Diversity Visa Lottery Remained Near Record in 2017.* Pew Research Center. Retireived from https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/08/23/applications-for-u-s-visa-lottery-more-than-doubled-since-2007/

Conrad, M. & Aðalsteinsdóttir, H. (2017). Understanding Germany's Short-lived "Culture of Welcome": Images of Refugees in Three Leading German Quality Newspapers. *German Politics & Society*, *35*(4), 1–21. https://www.jstor.org/stable/48561616

CSPAN. (2020). *First 2020 Presidential Debate between Donald Trump and Joe Biden.* [Video] YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wW1lY5jFNcQ

Das Bundesamt in Zahlen. (n.d.) *BAMF - Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge*.
https://www.bamf.de/DE/Themen/Statistik/Asylzahlen/BundesamtInZahlen/bundesamtin
zahlen-node.html

Dowling, S. (2019). *Germany Welcomed Refugees. Now It's Reaping the Economic Benefits*. Al
Jazeera. Retrieved from https://www.aljazeera.com/economy/2019/6/20/germany-
welcomed-refugees-now-its-reaping-the-economic-benefits

Forced Labor 1939 - 1945. (2011, October 10). Retrieved December 16, 2021, from
https://www.zwangsarbeit-archiv.de/en/zwangsarbeit/zwangsarbeit/zwangsarbeit-
begriffe/index.html

Griswold, D. (2018). *The Benefits of Immigration: Addressing Key Myths.* Mercatus Center.
Retrieved October 4, 2021, from https://www.mercatus.org/system/files/griswold_-
_policy_brief_-_myths_of_immigration_-_v1.pdf

Hamlin, R. (2022 March 18). *'Migrants'? 'Refugees'? Terminology Is Contested, Powerful, and
Evolving*. Migrant Policy Institute. Retrieved from
https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/terminology-migrants-refugees-illegal-
undocumented-evolving

Harris, G., Sanger, D. E., & Herszenhorn, D. M. (2015, September 10). *Obama Increases
Number of Syrian Refugees for U.S. Resettlement to 10,000.* New York Times. Retrieved
from https://www.nytimes.com/2015/09/11/world/middleeast/obama-directs-
administration-to-accept-10000-syrian-refugees.html

Huemer, M. (2010). Is There a Right to Immigrate? Social Theory and Practice, 36(3), 429–461.
http://www.jstor.org/stable/23562132

Jones, R. (2017). *Violent Borders: Refugees and the Right to Move*. Verso.

Jones, R. (2019). *Open Borders: In Defense of Free Movement.* UGA Press.

Jäckle, S., & König, P. D. (2016). The Dark Side of the German 'Welcome Culture':
Investigating the Causes Behind Attacks on Refugees in 2015. *West European Politics*,
40(2), 223–251. https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2016.1215614

Kautz, J. R., Netting, F. E., Huber, R., Borders, K., & Davis, T. S. (1997). "The Government
Performance and Results Act of 1993: Implications for Social Work Practice." *Social
Work*, 42(4), 364–373. doi:10.1093/sw/42.4.364

Kerr, A. (2018). *President Trump's Four Pillars for Immigration Reform*. The National Law
Review. Retrieved from https://www.natlawreview.com/article/president-trump-s-four-
pillars-immigration-reform.

Kislev, E. (2016). New Trends and Patterns in Western European Immigration to the United
States. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *669*(1),
168–189. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716216682692

Klusmeyer, D, & Papademetriou, D. G.. (2009). *Immigration Policy in the Federal Republic of Germany: Negotiating Membership and Remaking the Nation*. Oxford, England: Berghahn Books.

Knight, B. (2018, October 8) *Rise in Neo-Nazi Crimes: Legacy of the German NSU Terror Cell*. DW. Retrieved from https://www.dw.com/en/rise-in-neo-nazi-crimes-legacy-of-the-german-nsu-terror-cell/a-45040198

Kotzur, P. F., Tropp, L. R., & Wagner, U. (2018). Welcoming the Unwelcome: How Contact Shapes Contexts of Reception for New Immigrants in Germany and the United States. *The Journal of social issues* 74(4): 812–32. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/josi.12300.

Law, A. O. (2014, April 21). *Lies, Damned Lies, and Obama's Deportation Statistics.* The Washington Post. Retrieved March 9, 2020, from .https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2014/04/21/lies-damned-lies-and-obamas-deportation-statistics/

Law Enforcement Immigration Task Force. (2021). Comparison of the Obama, Trump, and Biden Administration Immigration Enforcement Priorities. *Law Enforcement Immigration Task Force*. Retrieved from https://leitf.org/2021/04/enforcement-priorities/

Longo, M. (2017). *The Politics of Borders*. Cambridge UP.

Mangum, M. & Block, R. (2018). Social Identity Theory and Public Opinion Towards Immigration. *Social Sciences* 7(3): 41. http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/socsci7030041.

Mayorquin, O. (2022, April 1). *What to know about Jane Timken, the ex-Ohio GOP chair running for Senate*. USA Today. Retrieved from https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2022/04/01/who-is-jane-timken-ohio-gop/7222395001/

McDaniel, E. (2022, April 15). *Trump endorses J.D. Vance, wading into Ohio's contentious Republican Senate primary.* NPR. Retrieved from https://www.npr.org/2022/04/15/1093148912/trump-endorses-j-d-vance-wading-into-ohios-contentious-republican-senate-primary

McGahern, U. (2019) "Making Space on the Run: Exercising the Right to Move in Jerusalem," *Mobilities*.

Meissner, D. (2019). *Rethinking U.S. Immigration Policy: New Realities Call for New Answers.* Migration Policy Institute. Retrieved from https://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/rethinking-us-immigration-policy-new-realities-call-new-answers.

Meissner, D. (2020). *Rethinking the U.S.-Mexico Border Immigration Enforcement System: A Policy Road Map.* Migration Policy Institute. Retrieved from https://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/rethinking-us-mexico-border-immigration-enforcement

Meissner, D. & Mittelstadt, M. (2020). *At the Starting Gate: The Incoming Biden Administration's Immigration Plans*. Migration Policy Institute. Retrieved from https://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/starting-gate-biden-administration-immigration-plans

Mittelstadt, M., Meissner, D., & Muzaffar, C. (2011). *Through the Prism of National Security: Major Immigration Policy and Program Changes in the Decade since 9/11. The Migration Policy Institute:* 17. Retrieved from https://www.migrationpolicy.org/sites/default/files/publications/FS23_Post-9-11policy.pdf

Miller, T. (2019) *Empire of Borders: The Expansion of the US Border Around the World.* Verso.

Momin, S. (2017). A Human Rights Based Approach to Refugees: A Look At The Syrian Refugee Crisis And The Responses From Germany And The United States. *Duke Forum for Law & Social Change*, *9*(55), 55–79. Retrieved from https://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1066&context=dflsc

Motomura, H. (2013). The Discretion That Matters: Federal Immigration Enforcement, State and Local Arrests, and the Civil-Criminal Line. *UCLA: International Institute*. Retrieved from https://escholarship.org/uc/item/39r2f874

Muzaffar, C., Pierce, S, & Bolter, J. (2017). *Muscular Public Relations Strategy to Paint Immigrants and Immigration as Negatives Embedded Deep Within Trump Executive Orders.* Migration Policy Institute. Retrieved from https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/muscular-public-relations-strategy-paint-immigrants-and-immigration-negatives-embedded-deep

Oren, I. (2016). "Political Science as History." In D. Yanow and P. Schwartz-Shea, (Eds.). *Interpretation and Method*, second edition (pp. 309-321). M.E. Sharpe

Ospina, G. I., (2019). The Illegal Migration Flows to the United States of America. *Revista UNISCI* (Unidad de Investigación sobre Seguridad y Cooperación Internacional.), *17*(50), 169–189. doi:10.31439/unisci-54

Pierce, S. (2021). *Obscure but Powerful: Shaping U.S. Immigration Policy through Attorney General Referral and Review*. Migration Policy Institute. Retrieved from https://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/obscure-powerful-immigration-attorney-general-referral-review

Pierce, S. & Bolter, J (2020). *Dismantling and Reconstructing the U.S. Immigration System: A Catalog of Changes under the Trump Presidency.* Migration Policy Institute. Retrieved from https://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/us-immigration-system-changes-trump-presidency

Pope, A. (2020). *Immigration and U.S. National Security: The State of Play Since 9/11.* Migration Policy Institute. Retrieved

from https://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/immigration-us-national-security-since-911

Popescu, G. (2012). *Bordering and Ordering the Twenty-First Century: Understanding Borders*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

President Bush's Plan For Comprehensive Immigration Reform - State of the Union. (2007). The White House: President George W. Bush. Retrieved from https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/stateoftheunion/2007/initiatives/immigration.html

President Obama's Legacy on Immigration. (2017). Immigration Impact. Retrieved from https://immigrationimpact.com/2017/01/20/president-obamas-legacy-immigration/#.YkSL4-trumpfMLZs

Prevezanos, K. (2011, Oct. 30). *Turkish Guest Workers Transformed German Society.* DW. Retrieved from https://www.dw.com/en/turkish-guest-workers-transformed-german-society/a-15489210

Remarks by President Obama at Leaders Summit on Refugees. (2015, September 20). The White House: Office of the Press Secretary. Retrieved from https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2016/09/20/remarks-president-obama-leaders-summit-refugees.

Rosi, G. (2016). *Fire at Sea (Fuocoammare).* https://www.imdb.com/title/tt3652526/

Sackey-Ansah, A. (2021). Ethical Theories and Approaches to Immigration in the United States: A Focus on Undocumented Immigrants. *Transformation: An International Journal of Holistic Mission Studies.* https://doi.org/10.1177/0265378821994215

Schain, M. A. (2017, May 3). *A Historic But Unsurprising Election In France.* Foreign Affairs. Retrieved December 10, 2021, from https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/france/2017-04-24/historic-unsurprising-election-france?utm_medium=promo_email&utm_source=lo_flows&utm_campaign=registered_user_welcome&utm_term=email_1&utm_content=20211215

Schain, M. A. (2018). *Shifting Tides: Radical Right Populism and Immigration Policy in Europe and the United States.* Migration Policy Institute. Retrieved from https://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/radical-right-immigration-europe-united-states

Schreckhise, W. D., & Chand, D. E. (2021). Intergovernmental Implementation in A Time Of Uncooperative Federalism: Immigration Enforcement And Federal Secure Communities Program, 2011–14. *Policy Studies Journal*, *49*(4), 1160–1188. https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12426

Schuck, P. H. (1984). The Transformation of Immigration Law. Columbia Law Review, 84(1), 1. doi:10.2307/1122369

Segarra, E., Améstica, Cordero Nieves, Y., & Enchautegui, M. (2017). Final Report: Performance of the Evaluated Health Components. https://revistas.upr.edu/index.php/ap/article/view/16020

Stenglein, E. & Kamarck, C. (2019). *Can Immigration Reform Happen? A Look Back.* Brookings Institute. Retrieved from https://www.brookings.edu/blog/fixgov/2019/02/11/can-immigration-reform-happen-a-look-back/

Stone, D. (2012). *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making*. 3rd ed. New York, NY: WW Norton.

Strengthening Enforcement. *The White House: President Barack Obama*. Retrieved from https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/issues/immigration/strengthening-enforcement

Thies, C. G. (2002). A Pragmatic Guide To Qualitative Historical Analysis In The Study Of International Relations. *International Studies Perspectives*, 3, 351-372.

Thym, D. (2021). Germany as a 'modern Country of Immigration.' Projects of the New Government on Migration – EU Immigration and Asylum Law and Policy. *EU Migration Law*. Retrieved from https://eumigrationlawblog.eu/germany-as-a-modern-country-of-immigration-projects-of-the-new-government-on-migration/.

Trauner, F. & Turton, J. (2017). "Welcome Culture": The Emergence and Transformation of a Public Debate on Migration. *Österreichische Zeitschrift Für Politikwissenschaft*, *46*(1). https://doi.org/10.15203/ozp.1587.vol46iss1

Trejo, A. L. (2021). Global Refugee Crisis and System Reform: National Response Comparison of The United States and Germany. *Southern New Hampshire University*. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/10474/3646

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. The 1951 Refugee Convention. *UNHCR*. Retrieved from https://www.unhcr.org/en-us/1951-refugee-convention.html

United States Customs and Border Protection. (2020). Border patrol history. Retrieved from https://www.cbp.gov/border-security/along-us-borders/history

United States General Accounting Office. (1997). Illegal Immigration: Southwest Border Strategy Results Inconclusive; More Evaluation Needed. Retrieved from https://www.gao.gov/assets/ggd-98-21.pdf

Urbina, I. (2021). The Secretive Prisons That Keep Migrants out of Europe. *New Yorker (New York, N.Y.: 1925)*. Retrieved from https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2021/12/06/the-secretive-libyan-prisons-that-keep-migrants-out-of-europe

Urbina, M. G., & Peña, I. A. (2019). Crimmigration and Militarization: Policing Borders in the

Era of Social Control Profitability. *Sociology Compass*, 13(2), e12654.

Vallet, E. (2019). Border Walls and The Illusion of Deterrence. In *Open Borders: In Defense of Free Movement*, ed. Reece Jones. UGA Press, 156–68.

Vespa, J., Medina,L., & Armstrong, D.M. (2020). *Demographic Turning Points for the United States: Population Projections for 2020 to 2060*. United States Census Bureau

Ware, J. (2020). Testament to Murder: The Violent Far-Right's Increasing Use of Terrorist Manifestos. *International Centre for Counter-Terrorism - The Hague*. Retrieved from https://doi.org/DOI: 10.97812345/2020.4.2

Waslin, M. (2017). Immigration Enforcement Still Missing the Mark on Detainers. *Immigration Impact*. Retrieved from https://immigrationimpact.com/2016/08/17/immigration-enforcement-still-missing-mark-detainers/#.YkSSMOfMLZ

Wong, T. K. (2012). 287(g) and the Politics of Interior Immigration Control in the United States: Explaining Local Cooperation with Federal Immigration Authorities. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *38*(5), 737–756. doi:10.1080/1369183x.2012.667983

Yavuzcehre, P. S. & Yağmurlu, G. (2020). Comparison Of International Migration Policies Of Turkey And Germany. In *Comparison Of International Migration Policies Of Turkey And Germany*, London, England: Transnational Press London, 113–17.

Young, C. (1997). GGD-98-21 Illegal Immigration: Southwest Border Strategy Results Inconclusive; More Evaluation Needed. *Illegal Immigration*. Retrieved February 24, 2022, from https://www.gao.gov/assets/ggd-98-21.pdf

Zotti, A. (2021). Germany's 'Atypical' Leadership in the EU Migration System of Governance and Its Normative Dimension. In *The EU Migration System of Governance: Justice on the Move*, ed. Michela Ceccorulli Enrico Fassi Lucarelli. London, England: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 225–58. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53997-9