

Globalization and its Effect on National Security

Anna D. Simmons, Anne Arundel Community College, Criminal Justice & Homeland Security, Institute for Criminal Justice, Legal Studies and Public Service

Abstract

World migration has been going on for millennia. However, due to the impact of two great World Wars, numerous colonization struggles, civil wars, and geopolitical and ethnic divisions during the 20th century, mass global migration has reached an unprecedented magnitude, facilitated by the ease of movement between Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and the Western nations. This vast movement of immigrants into the more industrialized nations has caused a great strain on the economy as well as the national security of the host countries. The composition of the present mass migration involves migrants whose cultures are more disparate from the host country, even to the extent of imposing a threat to the security of that country. In order for the national security of a host country to be less jeopardized, its government must focus much more on the human aspects of the immigrant societies: their language, history, culture, religious affiliation norms, family and/or tribal affiliations, as well as the international and internal relations of the country from which the migrants come. The primary purpose of this paper is the explication of the problems posed by this compositional change in global migration, particularly on its effects on National Security.

Introduction

There has been much criticism, complaint, argument, and finding fault with national policies of past and present. That is easy to do. But the past cannot be changed. It can only be taken as lessons for the future, which *can* be changed. Innovative, logical, and reasonable ideas for effective solutions to the world problems posed by global migration and its effects on national sovereignty, global terrorism, human rights, environmental deterioration, and national and international security must be sought.

Mistakes have been made in regard to immigration laws and policies. But laws are never written and formed until something has occurred that requires legal attention. Comparing the present time with the world 50 or 100 years ago, it is clear that major changes have taken place in world population, world migration movements, trade, technology, and the membership of the United Nations. Each of these changing factors has brought us to the world we have today.

National security is not simply securing a nation's borders and maintaining the power of its military, but also includes protecting and maintaining a nation's infrastructure, the workability of its foreign policies, investments, economy and technology, the civil rights of its citizens, trade and work availability, healthful environmental conditions, suitable laws and policies regarding immigrants, asylum and refugee seekers and, of course, its national sovereignty. The interrelationship of these factors and others such as human trafficking, terrorism, globalization, and global poverty entails deep analysis and concentration for scholars and governments in the 21st Century.

Two very strong factors predominate and have global significance to national security in the 21st Century. The first is the demographic movement of people and the second is the great increase the global world is experiencing in threats and attacks by various extremists, particularly those termed “threats from within a nation”. The extremists take advantage of large scale demographic movements and use (abuse) the immigration policies and laws established by the United Nations and individual nation states. The debate facing the world today is how to counter terrorism, have a pliable national and international security system, legal and workable immigration laws and policies, and still protect the rights of the community as well as that of the immigrants.

Unfortunately, measures to enhance national security are indiscriminately decried by politicians, immigrants, and activists as threats against human rights and civil liberties. Such concerns have validity and must be discussed. But wrong decisions can have serious consequences. It is clear from the 9/11 attacks and the worldwide threats that terrorists have imposed that not only the intelligence system, but also the immigration policies and laws are an integral part of our national security plans and, in fact, of global security. One of the disturbing things we learned from 9/11 and the 9/11 Commission report is that there was practically no communication between the security system and the immigration department nor did either party know anything substantial about the other’s policies and laws. The protection of our civil liberties requires the communication of information and interaction between not only federal, but also state and local systems.

Global Migration/Demographic Movements and national security

Kofi Annan, in his address as the outgoing Secretary General to the United Nations General Assembly on 6 June 2006 made the following statement in reference to the “Role of Governments in a world of Global Migration.”

We are in the midst of a new migration era. Given the large-scale movement of people in the 20th Century and into the 21st Century around the world, how should governments maintain a national security unity out of such diversity? (UN 2006)

According to Kofi Annan’s message and the United Nations Statistics Report, international migration numbered 191 million in 2005 – more than twice the amount recorded in 1970. About one third of the migrants live in Europe and approximately one quarter live in North America.

Forum on Public Policy

Between 1990 and 2005 Germany and Spain received more than 4 million foreign born residents. International migrants make up over 20 percent of the population of host countries in the world. Annan proclaimed in his address on 18 May 2006 to the United Nations General Assembly that international migration is highly beneficial to both the sending and the receiving societies, but he conceded:

We must all be aware of the social and cultural tensions that have arisen in many countries where there are large and recently established population of foreign origin....Given the large-scale movement of people, a trend that will surely continue in the coming decades – how should governments manage the new diversity in the population? How can countries create national unity out of diversity? (UN 2006)

When the United Nations was formed after WWII there were only 52 countries which signed the charter and were working nations within the world. In 2007 there are 192 member nations of the UN. Where did they come from? Primarily they were nations that had been part of larger independent nations that were members of the UN. For example the five Central Asian Countries (Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan) were all part of the Soviet Union until 1991, when they claimed their independence.

Many critics say that globalization has widened the gap between the rich and the poor. This may be true, yet because of globalization many doors have been opened for individuals and countries leading to advanced communication, travel, trade, investments, foreign policies, migration, etc. Because of globalization new nation states have been formed and many new human rights issues have developed in the international sector, such as the right to better health care, the international fight against AIDs, women's rights, female circumcision, child labor, refugee and asylum rights, genocide and various other issues that without globalization would never have become an international issue. The immigration laws and policies that the United States and other nations use today have been formulated because of globalization, as has the establishment of human rights monitoring organizations.

Historically some form of globalization has been taking place since the beginning of formed nation states – from the conquest of empires and the movements of tribes and ethnic groups to the formation of towns, cities, industry and technology. The great trade routes in the Far and

Middle East are examples of globalization and the movement found in migration. Globalization involves political, economical and social activities that have increased the impact of human activities that span national boundaries.

There is a definite relationship between national security problems and the global demographic changes taking place in the world. It was estimated that about seven percent of the world population in 2000 was 65 or older. Japan, China, Western European countries, Australia etc. are becoming countries that are dominated by an older group of citizens. China has recently increased the birth rate for couples from one child to two children because of this very reason.

The birth rate in developing countries has declined while the birth rate in underdeveloped countries has risen greatly in the past 15 to 20 years. High unemployment of these largely unskilled youth is a major factor in their desire to move into urban areas where they hope to have greater opportunities. It has been predicted by the United Nations that by 2015 more than half of the world's population will be urban dwellers. The pressures of the rural to urban demographic movement by itself have placed great strains on the involved countries.

This high unemployment has also induced many of these youth to emigrate to more industrialized nations. Moreover, the number of these immigrants who enter illegally is increasing, causing a strain on the developed country's ability to provide safety, health care, social services, education, work, etc. This movement of youth has also fueled riots and violence such as France experienced in October and November of 2005. Two hundred and seventy four French towns were affected, resulting in property damage estimated at 200 million francs, with 2,888 people arrested and one death and the injury of 126 police and firefighters. (CBC News 2005).

The French Parliament reacted to these difficulties by passing a strong immigration bill, as referenced in the article "*French Immigration Bill Approved*" printed Saturday, 17 June 2006, (BBC News 2006):

Wednesday, the French National Assembly voted overwhelmingly (361 votes to 164) to approve the controversial new immigration bill. The bill makes it more difficult for unskilled workers to gain access to the country since a 'skills and talents: requirement' is necessary to get a residency permit. The measure also eliminates the right of illegal immigrants to automatically stay in France after

living there for 10 years and mandates that migrants must learn French and sign a contract promising to respect the French way of life.

The French Interior Minister, Mr. Nicholas Sarkozy, (Youch 2005), who is the son of a Hungarian immigrant, strongly supported this “French Immigration Bill”.

The world’s globalization and the concept of living as a minority in a new nation, whereas in their home nation they were a majority, has become an issue with which 1st and 2nd generation nationals are struggling all over the world. The various cultural, ritual, religious norms etc. of their home nation are not found in their destination nation. They want the freedom and the money that the western nations can offer them, but they want it without having to make any adjustments or changes from their previous lives. The conflicts and frictions which France and other European nations are facing today are related to the demographic movement of large groups of people from one nation moving into and demanding the right to live as they did in their home nation. Peter Costello, Treasurer of Australia informed the Muslim community in their country *“that if you can’t agree with parliamentary law, independent courts, democracy, and would prefer Sharia law, ... then go to another country which practices it.”* (Lateline 2005)

The Netherlands, like the French and other member nations of the European Union, must stay within the guidelines and laws of the EU. The EU requires that all member states accept workers, visa holders and nationals from other member states. This limits how effectively the individual member state can enforce their immigration policies and laws. A good example of this is that 94 percent of the asylum seekers who travel to Norway carry no form of identification. This route has been used by terrorists in order to evade detection within the EU security system.

Table I reveals the movement of individuals from one nation and the host countries into which they are migrating.

Table I. Demographic Movements in Global Migration

DEMOGRAPHIC MOVEMENTS IN GLOBAL MIGRATION	
<u>HOST COUNTRY</u>	<u>COUNTRIES OF ORIGIN OF LARGEST GROUP OF IMMIGRANTS</u>
Australia	South Asia
Belgium	Morocco & Turkey
Britain	India, Pakistan & Bangladesh
Denmark	Turkey
France	North Africa
Germany	Turkey
Italy	North Africa
Netherlands	Morocco & Turkey
Norway	Pakistan
Spain	Morocco
Sweden	Iraq and Iran
Switzerland	Turkey & Balkans
Thailand	Cambodia & Laos
United States	Latin America

Note that the countries of origin to the host countries from Europe are from predominantly Muslim nations, which can pose special problems specific to their religion.

An example is the recent brutal execution slaying of Theo van Gogh, a Dutch citizen born in the Netherlands, by a young Moroccan who was *also* born in the Netherlands. Mohammed Bouyeri, the murderer, stated that he executed van Gogh because he was practicing a “*shari’a*” duty that required him to kill infidels. Bouyeri attached a letter to van Gogh’s slain body which included the phrase “*You o Europe will meet with disaster.*” (Contemporary Review 2007) This letter made clear that Bouyeri believed his loyalty and identity was not founded in the culture and laws of the Netherlands, but rather to his interpretation of the Islamic laws of his religion.

The Dutch media (VDARE 2007) reported that the three day anti-immigration riots in Utrecht were by native Dutch citizens who were rioting because their neighborhood was being terrorized, their citizens being attacked and robbed by Muslim youth. They were distressed that the police were not protecting them nor stopping the incidents.

As to why the Muslim community in the United States have not posed a similar security problem, Sheik reda Shata, Imam masjid-al-Aman at the Mosque in Brookline, New York, while on the Charlie Rose show on the 4th of July 2007 (PBS 2007) stated that there is a difference between the Muslims who have migrated to the United States and those who have migrated to Europe. Sheik reda Shata pointed out that the Muslims who have migrated to the United States were highly educated professionals seeking justice and freedom for their lives and their families, whereas the migrant Muslims who have sought refuge in Europe were primarily the lower skilled Muslims from poor and isolated communities who are more easily influenced and who in many cases do not seek freedom and justice as much as financial assistance through the many government monetary assistance programs found in the Western world.

Sheikh reda Shata, Imam masjid-al-Aman during the same interview made the following comment about Muslim immigrants to the United States: When asked by Charlie Rose “*Why do the Muslims come to the United States?*” the Imam replied:

Because they recognize that the United States provides security and justice they feel a sense of security here and the safety, the education and the social attitude of the United States as the protector of justice and freedom.

Olivier Roy, (Roy 2004) in the “*Muslim in the West*” chapter of his book *Globalized Islam: The Search for a New Ummah* elevates this point further in his statement:

In Europe Muslims predominate among the economic migrants, but in the United States they are outnumbered by Hispanics and Asians. US Muslims have higher than average incomes. They tend to live in more or less 'ethnic' neighborhoods in Europe, but in the United States are more scattered. In Europe most Muslims come from specific areas with historical ties to the host country while the United States has no colonial past with any Muslim country.

Both Sheikh reda Shata and Oliver Roy's statements support the theory that demographic global migration is having a tremendous impact on the national security within the host nations and their immigration laws and policies. In many cases these mass demographic immigrants are forming and moving into large ethnic communities throughout Europe specific to their country of origin (Pakistani, Turkish, Iraqi, Moroccan, etc.). This is having an impact on assimilation and deterritorialization of the host country and its ability to form laws and policy's to protect both the immigrants and its citizens.

The demographic pattern of the migration has affected not only Europe and the United States, but also several major Gulf nations of the Middle East. Andrzej Kapiszewski (Georgetown Journal, 2007) reported riot demonstrations in Kuwait, Bahrain and Qatar, in 2005 by Asian workers who were protesting not only their low salaries but also their irregular payment. The Gulf region like the rest of the world is experiencing a great change in the number of immigrants in their nations total population growth over the past few years. (Georgetown Journal, 2007)

The combined population in the Gulf monarchies grew from four million in 1950 to forty million in 2006 – one of the highest rates of population growth in the world. ... toward the end of 2004 up to 12.5 million foreigners lived in the Gulf monarchies, a full 37 percent of the region's total population.

Ibn Khaldun (734/1332-808/1406) a famous Arab historian, historiographer and social philosopher is considered by many Western scholars to be the "Father" of sociology and social history and was the first theorist in the history of mankind to write on civilizations. He believed that every civilization was based on the awareness of itself as expressed in *Asabiyya*, a social solidarity based on values and norms and a related worldview, which constituted the identity of

each civilization. He argues that civilizations are strong only when they are based on a strong *Asabiyya*. (Ibn Khaldun 1967)

In Europe an attempt is being made to create a union in which nations have no limitations, not even boundaries attached to a definite civilization, and yet composed of countries with significantly different cultures and history. This is similar to having huge cultural enclaves within a single nation. Ibn Khaldun would have considered this a diminution of their “*Asabiyya*”, which would lead to a decline of their civilization. To complicate this further, there is in Europe a great inflow of immigrants who have refused to integrate into the culture and civilization of the nation into which they have moved.

After WWI & WWII the flow of immigrants coming into the United States came almost entirely from Europe. Therefore their ability and desire to integrate into the American culture was very prominent. Today the primary immigrants flowing into the United States are from Latin America and they tend to migrate into large ethnic enclaves. When the ethnic enclaves become large enough the process of integration into the host country society is substantially weakened.

Many of the immigrants are undocumented, uneducated, poor individuals some of whom have been very successful in exploiting the generosity of the Western welfare states. In order for any government to properly provide and maintain a safe environment for today’s and future generations, both the character of the immigration demographic movements as well as the immigrant’s desire to integrate into their host society must be considered.

There is no doubt that the mass of migrating individuals has placed a tremendous burden not only on the sending communities and the host nation but also on immigrants themselves. This burden at times seems to show that not only the United States government but also other governments of the world are incapable of fully controlling the inflow of a mass migration movement and the problems that come with it. Over 200 million people today live outside the country of their birth.

In the book *The Muqaddimah – An Introduction to History*, Ibn Khaldun goes into great detail regarding the requirement of human civilizations for political leadership in any organization as well as the obligations of its citizens.

People in any social organization must have someone who exercises a restraining influence and rules them and to whom recourse may be had.....This rule is based upon rational politics.... Man is a child of the customs and the things he has

become used to.....The power of a group is one of natural power.....Therefore, it is necessary to have a reference to ordained political norms, which are accepted by the mass and to whose laws it submits. A nation that does not have a policy based on such norms cannot fully succeed in establishing the supremacy of its rule. ... To exercise political authority means to cause the masses to act as required by intellectual (rational) insight into the means of furthering their worldly interest and avoiding anything that is harmful in that respect. (Ibn Khaldun 1967)

Without some form of rule or organized rules to be followed and adhered to, he stressed that a civilization will have a greater adherence to crime and violence. This has been very evident with the growth in gangs and terrorist organizations in the 21st Century.

Paul Kennedy, in his book *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers* (Kennedy 1987) makes the following comment:

Although the United States is at present still in a class of its own economically and perhaps even militarily, it cannot avoid confronting the two great tests which challenge the longevity of every major power that occupies the “number one” position in the world affairs: whether, in the military/strategic realm, it can preserve a reasonable balance between the nation’s perceived defense requirements and the means it possesses to maintain those commitments; and whether, as a intimately related point, it can preserve the technological and economic bases of its power from relative erosion in the face of the ever shifting patterns of global production and migration.

Up until 9/11 the United States as well as European nations and Australia have had a very *laissez-faire* attitude in reference to global migration and its effect on the security within their boundaries. But 9/11 and the subsequent bombings and threats have created an increased fear among individual nation states and the world as a community and brought about a shift in attitude and an acknowledgement by a nation’s leadership of the necessity for changes in the laws and policies needed to provide security for their citizens and their home land.

Global migration and threats within a nation

The second factor is the global significance of the great increase in threats and attacks by various extremists, particularly those termed “*threats coming from within a nation*”. Contrary to the assumption by many people that the 9/11 terrorist attacks, with a death toll of nearly 3,000 people, affected only U.S. citizens, it actually involved victims from 90 different countries and included quite a few Muslims. Bombings have occurred throughout the world in such countries as Spain, Great Britain, Egypt, France, Jordan, Kenya, Malaysia, Bali, Saudi Arabia just to name a few. It is not just a U.S. national security problem, but a global problem touching the entire world.

It is clear from the past that the knowledge of how to conduct an attack can be developed in one country and that knowledge combined with the raw materials, personnel, and training available in another country, which may be the target country itself, to construct the actual weapon. In fact, the creation of a weapon within the target country itself is done more and more frequently today. The devastating attack that left innocent people dead and/or wounded on 9/11 in the U.S. and the bombings in the London and Madrid were each created and implemented using this very approach. Ownership of any given attack today can easily be claimed by contributors who are distributed around the world. The governments in all three of these countries have thwarted several such bombing attempts in the past few years.

The attempted terrorist attacks in Great Britain on June 29th and 30th of 2007 are examples of *Threats within a Nation*. British authorities announced that several of the individuals arrested in connection with the London and Glasgow airport bombings were foreigners recruited into Britain’s National Health Service (NHS) as physicians. The NHS reported that over the last three years they have recruited more than 22,000 foreign doctors, primarily from the Middle East. The NHS also reported that the physicians recruited have only been vetted for professional competence but not for any political affiliation. These terrorist physicians were recruited under the British Immigration System and the International Immigration laws. (*The Christian Science Monitor* 2007) Clearly there is a need for Great Britain, and other nation states as well, to make changes in the laws and policies regarding global migration and the recruitment of immigrants. Any changes must take into account the restrictions and requirements placed by the citizens who live within that nation relating to their own safety and individual human rights.

In the past a nation could at least intercept terrorist weapons at its borders. This is no longer the case. With this new age of manufacturing weapons in the target country, there are no

materials to intercept at a nation's borders. The 7 July 2005 suicide bombings in London's transport system were carried out by men born and raised within an immigrant community in Great Britain. One of the known terrorists was a naturalized British citizen who was granted asylum under both the International Immigration laws and the immigration laws of Great Britain. No longer is any country's defense only about stopping foreign enemies from entering by its borders, but rather fear of a 1st, 2nd, and even 3rd generation of home grown fundamentalists and terrorists who see war primarily as a guerilla function. No country is exempt from this type of warfare. In the 21st Century the United States and other world nation states cannot divide their threats and their enemies into neat little packets nor into domestic and/or foreign or into military and/or civil operations.

It would be a mistake to conclude that the "global war on terrorism" and "national security" has nothing to do with migration. Migration control, asylum and admission to citizenship, family reunification, and the development of migrant enclaves have all intensified the security issues for a country to protect its own citizens. The new term used in national security today – "*Home Grown Terrorist*" – has put a new meaning on the efficiency of both national and international security.

For a country's national security organization to be effective requires that it focus on the human aspects of society, the languages, history, culture, religious affiliations, norms, extended family ties and both their internal and external relationships.

This new trend within a country's national security has become a global issue because the insurgent enemy we are fighting today consists of a network of groups who are ideologically rather than territorially based. They are stateless individuals with a fundamentalist ideology! In a recent seminar Mohammed Hafez (CSPAN 2007) has termed them "*Terrorists without borders*".

A number of aspects of immigration debated since 9/11 are issues that relate directly to national security and a nation's abilities to deter foreign terrorism on their soil and the willingness of citizens to help their own government protect them. *The 9/11 Commission Report* concluded:

That the U.S. Immigration authorities prior to 9/11 were not focused on security. Instead, their primary concern was preventing people from entering the United States and seeking unauthorized employment. (9/11 Commission Report, 2004)

The facilities and citizens as well as the armed forces of the United States have been attacked many times outside their national borders, but it took the attack of 11 September 2001 to establish that an attack could originate within the nation itself. The perpetrators could be legal or illegal immigrants, refugees and/or asylum seekers, foreign students studying within the country on visas, tourists, and from later incidents, even its own citizens. From these many possible sources, how is a government to preserve the physical safety and security of its citizens and their property?

Visa and passports-INA201 and 148 The terrorists had obtained visas under false pretense and had fraudulent passports. Two of these terrorists were known and being watched in the intelligence world but this type of information was not something that prior to 9/11 was ever shared with the U.S. immigration officials. The 9/11 Commission ascertained in their investigation that *“15 of the 19 hijackers could have been intercepted by immigration authorities had those authorities been part of the counter terrorism program.”*

The **Visa Waiver Program (VWP)(INA212 (a)(n)(b)(i))** program, by which nationals from certain countries can enter the United States for business and or pleasure without documentation, has been viewed by our intelligence community as a suspect source of entry.(Library of Congress 2007)

In-country adjustments of Status for Illegal Aliens-INA section 245 (i)

There are various circumstances that allow a nonimmigrant or an illegal alien to become a legal resident, for example through marriage to a U.S. citizen. Under the Immigration section 245(i) illegal aliens can adjust their status without going through proper background checks. (INA report) This completely short-circuits the national security progress against foreign criminals and/or terrorists. EU countries, Australia, Thailand and other countries are facing the same problem. (Asylum seekers INA 201(a)(5) (Library of Congress, 2007)

Monitoring Foreign Students (CIPRIS) – (Library of Congress, 1977, 2005) Within the U.S. there are roughly 500,000 foreign students studying in our colleges and universities. Statistics have shown that some states sponsoring terrorism have been funding students to come to the United States. The U.S., Great Britain and other countries found that these students were studying primarily in fields that could contribute to weapons programs. Following 9/11 the U.S. had no idea how many students were in our country and how many were illegal. (In the 9/11 attacks, one of the suspects was admitted as a foreign student to study at a San Francisco college.

But he never showed up there, and the college did not report that to the INS as unusual, since it was assumed that his visa had been denied.) In 1977, the U.S. government had created a system designed for tracking foreign students called the Coordinated Interagency Partnership Regulating International Students (CIPRIS, 1977). Because of the objection by colleges and universities to this program, it was not put into effect. Implementation of the system was re-instituted in 2005, but many colleges are still not reporting as required by the law.

Exit Entry Controls-section 10 IRIRA 1996 and INA262 (Library of Congress, 2007) This act required the INS (Immigration and Naturalization System) to set up within two years a database to track information on visitors and/or workers who come to the United States as a “nonimmigrant for a limited period of time”. Without entry-exit controls the United States has no way of determining whether a nonimmigrant overstays his visa in violation of immigration laws. In the absence of such system, enemies of our national security can more easily enter the United States and remain to threaten our country from within. Due to the objection from the tourism industry and others, full implementation has been delayed. (Lipton, 2005)

Driver’s Licenses – (Library of Congress, 2007) There is a movement within our country to move away from proof-of-identity requirements for driver’s license applicants. Proponents admit that the reason is to make a driver’s licenses accessible to undocumented (illegal) aliens. Due to the heavy reliance on driver’s licenses as proof of identity, this basically allows them the opportunity to pass themselves off as legal residents of the United States. Of the 19 hijackers in 9/11 thirteen (13) had easily managed to acquire Florida and Virginia driver’s licenses, which masked the illegality of their presence in the U.S.

Local Police Cooperation-INA Sec. 133 (Library of Congress, 2007) This order requires that all law enforcement agencies work together toward an integrated national security system. Local and State authorities must be able to work with and have access to the federal information on illegal immigrants. The night before 9/11 a Florida police officer actually ticketed one of the terrorists for driving without a driver’s license. But because the officer did not have access to the Immigration and Naturalization Service’s “Watch List” for terrorists he released the suspect.

Classified Evidence-INA Section 240(a)(3)(2000) & INA 504 (Library of Congress 2007) In some immigration trials the prosecution has to use classified evidence, gathered through our nation’s intelligence network, to prove that the alien in question should be removed or constitutes a danger to the United States. In some cases to release this information to the public

court would threaten national security. But lawyers for illegal aliens and the ACLU have stated that calling any evidence “secret evidence” is a violation of ones civil rights. If 9/11 has shown us anything it is how very important our intelligence network is in defending our country against another terrorist attack. Other foreign intelligence organizations cite this as a reason not to share their intelligence with the U.S.

Amnesty for Illegal Aliens -INA Section 245 (i) (Library of Congress, 2007) Led by Mexico’s Ex-President Vincente Fox, a movement for granting amnesty to illegal aliens in the United States has been building in recent months. Giving amnesty allows millions of illegal aliens to sidestep this important means of screening out people who pose a threat to our national security. Before legal immigrants are admitted to our country, the U.S. consular officials abroad could check whether the applicant has a criminal record or other background issues within their home country. Amnesty prevents this from happening. Those illegitimately seeking asylum will destroy their identity papers before arriving at their destination.

Family Reunification- INA Section 245 (i)208 (b)(3)235 (Library of Congress, 2007) Under the immigration laws of most western nations, if you are a citizen or permanent resident, then your foreign spouse, children, mother, father and other family members may enter the host country and live with you. This has become over the years a mass migration within itself. The problem being that they may enter without going through the immigration process. Therefore, there is no check and balance on the individual’s affiliations, past criminal records, etc.

September 11, 2001 proved to the United States government and its citizens how individuals can take advantage of and exploit a country’s immigration policies and its national security weaknesses. It is also critical to our nation’s security to recognize how many millions of individuals come into this country a year, legally, illegally, as refugees, or seeking asylum.

Professor Bo Cooper in his Chapter “Immigration Law and National Security” (*National Security Law, Second Edition* 2005) makes the following statement in regards to this very issue.

But there is also a debate that goes far beyond what has been so far undertaken in this country over the extent to which this country should, or even could, clamp shut its immigration process to the extent necessary to truly guard against the possibility that persons from other countries could come into this one to cause harm.

Forum on Public Policy

In consideration of the above known areas of which immigration laws and policies were severally abused, it is clear that immigration laws play an intrinsic role in the National Security regime (Moore and Turner 2005). A U.S. immigration officer might in the course of a day have to consider with each individual investigated the following partial list of questions: Is this person holding a visitor's visa the individual he claims to be, did he acquire this visa legally or illegally, will he be a political risk for our country, is he or she affiliated with a terrorist organization or an organization which has tried to take over their home country's government, does he have a previous criminal record in either his own country or in ours, what is the purpose of his visit, where will he reside while in this country, does he have relatives or friends within this country and are they guilty of any support or affiliation with a terrorist organization within this country or abroad ,etc., all questions which will enter in the determination as to whether the individual can legally immigrate into the United States.

It is a known fact that immigration, perhaps even more than any social, political, and/or economical growth has shaped the United States and formed the 'Melting Pot' by which we are known throughout the world. Our immigration picture has greatly changed since the formation of our country - the demographic cultural transformation continues on into the 21st Century and therefore the policies and laws that govern who can and who cannot enter the United States will have to change also.

Policy makers throughout the world have struggled with the challenge of balancing humanitarian obligations with public demands for security within their borders, and to do this it is necessary to promote legal immigration and deter illegal immigrants. Not only would this enhance national security but it would also protect the lives of immigrants themselves. The mortality rate among the illegal immigrants is very much higher than among the legal immigrants, refugees, and the asylum seekers. This is a human rights issue that needs to be addressed by all governments in the world.

In reference to the United States, Peter C. Meilaender expressed this in ethical terms:

How do we carry forward the American achievement of incorporating immigrants while preserving both liberal democracy and the national culture that sustains it? How do we do justice to all our obligations, to both citizens and strangers? That is the ethical dimension of immigration. (Meilaender, 2007)

Conclusion:

To regard various laws and policies that restrict immigration as merely a self-centered attempt for a nation to escape its moral obligations is very narrow minded. Do the various laws and policies reflect what the citizens within that nation desire? They are requesting and often demanding that their government protect its borders, its workers and their jobs, its economy, its environment, its health programs etc., all of which are issues that comprise and make up “National Security”. Even if the major potential of migration were *only* a force to reduce poverty in the world, then it has clearly failed; however, if the greater issues are the impact that migration has on the receiving communities, the sending communities and on the migrants themselves, then we are immediately immersed in national security issues.

The major issues are the obligations which citizens require of their government as well as the obligations citizens have to bequeath to future generations – both a political order that has nurtured liberty and one which has always sustained and absorbed large number of immigrants.

In the coming decades, the number of potential illegal immigrants is likely to swell, driven by the number of young adults living today in low income/poverty countries. Immigration is made easier today and more affordable because of the increase in income. If laws and policies in the recipient nations remain as “*laissez faire*” as they are today, the increase in migration will place great strains on the present traditional laws and policies. What will the result be if we ignore the present and future rise in immigration and its effect on the host country?

If the nation’s officials, activists and citizens are requiring (and even demanding) that their government guarantee them the freedom provided to them by their nation’s constitution and their government’s laws and policies, then the main issue is protecting the country from urgent and direct threats to its physical safety and security. Because once a country loses this ability, it can no longer support and provide for the broad range issues – including improving schools, improving and providing health care and services to the disadvantaged and the elderly, offering transportation within and without its borders, nor the freedom and human rights issues which many of us take for granted and are very important to us and our ability to function. Every free nation in the world today is struggling with these same security problems, as well as gaining international legitimacy for any new rules and policies they believe are needed to provide for the citizens within their country and to ensure their country’s ability to survive as a nation.

It would be a mistake for us to conclude that the July 7th and July 21st bombings in London or the recent failed bombing attempts in London and Glasgow had nothing to do with migration. The attack on 9/11 turned our attention to our own immigration laws and policies and how they were or were not enforced. In fact, migration control, asylum and admission to citizenship were all scrutinized more intensely as security issues in the aftermath of each of these attacks. One could add as well the bombing of the Bali night club, the Jordanian hotel in Amman, and various other bombings that have taken place throughout the world.

Every country in the world today is facing stateless terrorist attacks and the problems coming from global migration. These problems will be the major issues that every nation in the world must address in providing physical safety and security for its nationals.

However, it is necessary to consider not simply the deterring of threats to our national security and to international security as it is now, but also about dealing with the situations that have given rise to this threat. We cannot allow ourselves to be placed in a small box in building a case for action. We need to analyze and attack each argument separately and it will be easier to accomplish something positive if we look at the various issues within their context and try to understand the threat and how we might establish some type of solution. There has been some amply deserved resentment over how certain aspects of the American National Security system has handled various issues on global migration and it is critically important to keep in mind that we have survived as a nation of many national origins by having one government and a set of rules for all to follow.

Where the problem seems to fall is that the major flow of global migration in the 21st Century is outside the policies set forth in international and national law. A few of these issues were discussed earlier in regards to the 19 terrorists of 9/11 and how they misused our immigration law, the bombings in London by first generation and asylum seekers, the riots in France and Kuwait, Bahrain, Qatar, and the murder of Theo van Gogh.

A major challenge for governments today is deciding where to focus their efforts as they strive to make the necessary decisions and conditions for growth and stability. Strategies for national security have to be determined not only within each nation state but also as an international community with clear capabilities within each state. However, assessments need to be focused on the essential issues first. Surely the main concern is keeping a nation safe from current and longer-term security threats – threats that are not going away. Yet no government can

successfully push ahead effectively on all of the on-going issues at the same time. There are troubling issues in identifying the most critical areas and in the development of a sequence of steps and procedures appropriate to the particular country. It is going to be a great challenge.

A consensus within the international community on such issues as global migration and its effect on the economy, government subsidies, human rights, education and health benefits, foreign affairs, technology/ trade, safety and justice and the protection of its infrastructure as well as its sovereignty can aid in providing a productive and global strategy for the present and future problems that mass global migration causes. Access to pertinent information will be crucial for any effective action, but without institutional mechanism and accountability, government *and* citizen accountability, there will not be the proper means to take action and make it work, since we cannot expect our government to take action and not as citizens be willing to accept our own responsibility in its implementation.

Mr. Kenneth Christie, a senior lecturer in the Department of Politics at the University of Natal in South Africa, affirmed in his published article (Christie 2000)

The world is witnessing a migration crisis of global proportion. Every year, millions of people are leaving their homes, crossing national boundaries out of fear of violence, discrimination or simply seeking employment. How does a State deal with these movements, and what are the consequences? ... The question arises whether it will still be possible for states to exercise control over their populations and to achieve control over their territory?

The questions that have been proposed to the readers each increase the tension existing in the present issues and emphasize the complexity of the many considerations involved in establishing the new policies and laws needed in the 21st century to control the effects of these immigration movements on both national and international security. This large scale movement of people, technology, culture, and information across geopolitical borders around the world is a trend that is certain to continue for decades. How should governments manage the new diversity which is and will continue to accompany it?

Jared Diamond, in Chapter 14 “*Why Societies end up destroying themselves through disastrous decisions?*” of his book *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed* has earmarked four key areas:

Forum on Public Policy

1. Failure to perceive a problem or failing to perceive that a problem has actually arrived.
2. Failure to anticipate the enormity of the problem due to the lack of prior experience or to reasoning by false analogy.
3. Psychological denial that there is a threat and/or a problem.
4. Clashes of the interest between the elite in power and that of the general population.

Does our nation fall under one or more of these four categories?

Thomas Jefferson referred in his First Inaugural Address to freedom of religion, of the press, and of the person as “*the road which alone leads to peace, liberty and safety*”. (Jefferson, 1801)

However, at the same time Jefferson warned the congressional party that

A strict observance of the written laws is doubtless one of the high duties of a citizen, but it is not the highest....The laws of necessity, of self-preservation, of saving our country when in danger, are of higher obligation. To lose our country by a scrupulous adherence to written law, would be to lose the law itself, with life, liberty, property and all those who are enjoying them with us; thus absurdly sacrificing the end to the means. (Jefferson,1810)

As a closing thought, Winston Churchill’s counsel to his colleagues during World War II surely applies to us as well:

It is not enough to do one’s best. What is required is rather that one do what is necessary for success. (Martin, 2000)

References

- “*After Attack, Britain Eyes Foreign Doctors*”, 2007, *The Christian Science Monitor*, 5th of July 2007.
- Barnett, Thomas P.M., 2005. *The Pentagon’s Map: Blue Print for Action A Future Worth Creating*, Berkley Books.
- Bawer, Bruce, 2006. *While Europe Slept: How Radical Islam is Destroying the West from Within*, New York, Doubleday.
- Brubaker, William Rogers, 1992. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France & Germany*, Cambridge MA, Harvard University.
- Buergenthal, Thomas, Shelton, Dinah, Stewart, David, 2002. *International Human Rights*, 3rd Edition, West Group a Thomas Group.
- Campbell, Kurt M., O’Hanlon, Michael 2006. *Hard Power: The New Politics of National Security*, Basic Books.

Forum on Public Policy

- Christie, Kenneth, 1997. "Security and Forced Migration Concerns in South Africa", *African Surety Review*, Vol.6,NO.1,1997.
- Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006, (CIRA S2611) U.S. Senate bill introduced in 109th congress. Via http://wikepida.org/wiki/S._2611.*
- "Concise Report on World Population Monitoring", 1997. *International Migration & Development*. via. <http://www.itcilo.it/actrav-english/telearn/global/ilo/seura/migwod2.htm>
- Costello, Peter, interview with Tony Jones on "Lateline", Australia Broadcasting Corporation, 23 August, 2005. TV Transcript via <http://www.abc.net.au/lateline/content/2005/S/444603.htm>.
- Cotham Helen, 2004. *National Security: Opposing View Point*, Greenhouse Press: Thomas/Gale.
- Diamond, Jared. 2005. "Why do Some Societies Make Diastrous Decisions?", *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed*, Viking. Chapter 14.
- Doyle, Michael W. 2004. "The Challenge of worldwide Migration," *Journal of International Affairs*, March. Via. http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_go1857/is_200403/ai_n6399327.
- "Dutch Immigration Riots", 2007. *VDARE*, 15 March 2007. Via. <http://blog.vdare.com/archives/2007/03/15/dutch-anti-immigration-riots/>
- Elliot, Michael, 2003. "So, What Went Wrong." *Time*, October 6, 2003, PP.34-37.
- "French Immigration Bill Approved", 2006. *BBC News*, Via. [Http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/5089744.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/5089744.stm).
- Gilbert, Martin, 2000, *Churchill A Life*, Henry Holt & Company, LLC.
- Goldin, Ian and Reinert, Kenneth, 2006. *Globalization for Development*, World Bank and Palgrave MacMillan, Chapter 6, Table 6.2, and p.154.
- Groff, Alberto, January 2005. See Switzerland, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs.
- Hafez, Mohammed, 2007. "Terrorism Without Borders", *C-SPAN seminar*, 10, July 2007.
- Hampshire, James & Sagar, Shamit, (University of Sussex) 2006. "Migration Integration, & Security in the U.K, July 7th", *Migration Information Source*, March 1, 2006. Via. <http://www.migrationinformation.org/Feature/display.cfm?ID=383>.
- Harrison, Lawrence, Huntington, Samuel, 2000. *Culture Matters: How Values Shape Human Progress*, Basic Books.
- Hylarides, Peter C., 2005. "Multiculturalism in the Netherlands and the Murder of Theo van Gogh", *Contemporary Review*, February 2005, via http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m2242/is_1669_286/ai_n13661901.
- Human Rights Watch* 2003, "Population Statistic: Gulf Cooperation Council States", p 12-13. Via. <http://www/hrw.org/press/2003/04/gccst.ats.htm>
- Ibn Khaldun, 1967. *The Muqaddimah: An Introduction to History*, Franz Rosenthal-translator, Bollingen Series, Princeton University Press, p 26, 128, 154, 155, 256.

Forum on Public Policy

Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended, United States Government. 2000 hereinafter called the INA, Title 8 of the US Code of Federal Regulations, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Sections 113, 148, 207(a)(5)2006, 208(b)(3), 212.(a), 212(a)(n)(b)(i), 202 235, 240(a)(3)(2000, 245(i),262, 235, Washington, D.C., Library of Congress, 2007.

Immigration Reform & Immigration Responsibility Act 1996, United States Government, Section 1, Washington, D.C.

International Organization for Migration (IOM) 1992. “*Turner Fund Trafficking Project in Trafficking in Migrants*,” No.20, Geneva.

_____. 2003. “*World Migration 2003: Managing Migration – Challenges and Responses for People on the Move*”, Geneva.

Ishay, Micheline R. 2004. *The History of Human Rights: From Ancient Times to the Globalization Era*, University of California Press.

Jefferson, Thomas,1801. *First Inaugural Address*, Washington, D.C. 4 March 1801.

_____. 1810. Letter to John B. Calvin, September 20, 1810. Library of Congress.

Kapiszewski, Andrzej, 2007, “*De-Arabization in the Gulf – Foreign Labor and the Struggle for Local Culture*”, *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs, Summer/Fall 2007*, Vol. VIII, Number 3, Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Policy, p 82,84.

Kemp, Jack, 2006. “*America can be a Nation of Immigrants and a Nation of Laws*,”
Via. <http://www.townhall.com/columnists/Jack.kemp/2006/04/03>.

Kennedy, Paul, 1989. *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*, Vintage Books, Division of Random House.

Kjos, Berit, 2006. “*The U.N. Plan for Global Migration*” *The Truth Will Triumph Dewy’s*, June 13, 2006. Via. <http://www.newswithviews.com/Beritkjos/kjos59.htm>

Koses, K., Van Hear, N., 2003. “*Asylum Migration & Implications for Countries of Origin*,”
World Institute for Development Economics Research (WIDER), Discussion Paper No. 2003/2004, United Nations University: Helsinki.

Lipton, E., 2005. “*Border Control Takes One Leap Forward*”, *New York Times*.

Malone, Linda A., 2003. *International Human Rights, Black Letter Series*, Thompson/West.

Martin, P. and Taylor, J. E., 1996. See OCED. “

Meilaender, Peter, C., 2007. *Immigration: Citizens & Strangers*”, *First Things*, Ignatius Press, May 2007, P12.

Moore, John Nortono, Turner, Robert T. 2005. *National Security Law, 2nd Edition*, Carolina Academic Press.

_____. “*U.S. Immigration Law Overview*”, Chapter 26, Bo Cooper, p1142.

Moore, John Norton, Roberts, Guy B., Turner, Robert F., 2006. *National Security Law Documents, 2nd Edition*, Carolina Academic Press.

Forum on Public Policy

Moss, Dana and Krieger, Zvika, 2007. "Tipping Point in Saudi Arabia, A", 2007. *The Christian Science Monitor*, The Christian Science Publishing Society, 15 August, 2007, p9.

National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, The. 2004. "The 9/11 Commission Report", W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., Chapter 13, p.224, 384.

Newby, Gordon D., 2002. *A Concise Encyclopedia of Islam*, Oneworld, Oxford.

Oxley, Mark, 2007, "After Attack, Britain Eyes Foreign Doctors", *The Christian Science Monitor*, The Christian Science Publishing Society, 5th of July, 2007. Pg.4

Organization for Economic Cooperation & Development (OCED), 1996, Martin, P. and Taylor, J.E., *The Anatomy of a Migration Hump.* " In *Development Strategy, Employment and Migration: Insights from Models*, edited by J. Edward Taylor, Paris :OCED. pp.43-62.

_____. 1996 *The Anatomy of a Migration Hump.* " In *Development Strategy, Employment and Migration: Insights from Models*, edited by J. Edward Taylor, pp.43-62.
Paris: OCED.

_____. 1996. *Trends in International Migration – Annual Report 1996 Edition.* Paris: OECD.

_____. 2003. *Trends in International Migration – Annual Report 2004 Edition.* Paris: OECD.

Roy, Oliver, 2004. "Muslim in the West", *Globalized Islam: The Search for a New Ummah*, Anthem Press., p.100.

Roy, Oliver, 2004. *Turkey Today: A European Country?*, Anthem Press.

Rothhope, David, 2004. "Running the World – The Inside Style of the National Security Council and the Architects of American Power", Public Affairs.

Sahlins, Marshall D., 1976. *Culture and Practical Reason.* Chicago: University of Chicago.

Schroner, M., 2004. "Migration: A Historical Perspective," BBC News on Line, March 23, 2004.
Via. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/3557163.stm>

Shata, Reda Sheikh, Interview by Charlie Rose, *The Charlie Rose Show*, PBS, July 4, 2007.

Stalker, P., 2001. *The No-Nonsense Guide to International Migration*, Oxford: New International Publication Office.

Sweeney, Joseph, Modeste, Oliver, Coney T., Leech, Naves E., 1981. *The International Legal System Cases & Materials-2nd Edition*, The Foundation Press, Inc.

Switzerland, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs 2005, Groff, Alberto, "Global Migration Perspectives: Migration Partnerships: New Tools in the International Migration Debate."
Via. <http://www.gcim.org>.

Tibi, Bassam, Winter 2007. "A Migration Story: From Muslim Immigrants to European "Citizens of the Heart", *The Fletcher Forum of World Affairs*, Vol.31:1.

United Nations Development Program (UNDP), 1991. "Human Development Report, New York", Oxford University Press.

United Nations General Assembly, 2006, "International and Development Report of the Secretary General", A/60/871, May 18, 2006.

Forum on Public Policy

<http://www.un.org/esa/population/hldmigration/Text/Report%20SG%June%2006%29English.pdf>

United States Government Commission on Immigration Reform, 1997. *“Becoming an American: Immigration & Immigrant Policy”*, Washington, D.C: U.S. Government Printing Office.

United States Government, 1977, CIPRIS – Coordinated Interagency Partnership Regulating International Students, Library of Congress.

United States Government Migration Policy Institute, 2007. *“US Immigration Policy”, “Migration Information Source,” “Looking Ahead” and “European Migration Management”*. Washington, D.C.

United States Department of Homeland Security, 2003. *“Yearbook of Immigration Statistics, 2002.”* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

United States Department of Justice, Office of the Inspector General, *“The September 11, Detainees: A Review of the Treatment of Aliens Held on Immigration Charges in Connection with the Investigation of the September 11, 2001 Attacks”*, April 2003.
Via. <<http://www.usdoj.gov/oig/special/0306/full.pdf>>

Vernez, George, 1996. *National Security & Migration: How Strong the Link*, Rand Corporation.

Weiner, Myron, 1959. *The Global Migration Crisis*, New York, Harper Collins.

World Bank, 2005. *“Global Monitoring Report”*, Washington D.C. , World Bank 2005.

Zuckerman, Mortimer, June 4, 2007. *“A Good Immigration Bill”*, U.S. News & World Report.

Youch, James, Jr., 2005. *“French Government Introducing Stricter Immigration Control After Riots”*, *JURIST-Legal News & Research*, University of Pittsburg School of Law, Tuesday, 29th November, 2005. Via. <http://juristlaw.pitt.edu/paperchase/2005/french-government-introducing-stricter.php>.

Published by the Forum on Public Policy

Copyright © The Forum on Public Policy. All Rights Reserved. 2006.