

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA
MINISTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF MOHAMED BOUDIAF - M'SILA

FACULTY OF LETTERS AND FOREIGN LANGUAGES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

N°:



DOMAIN: FOREIGN LANGUAGES

STREAM: ENGLISH LANGUAGE

OPTION: LITERATURE & CIVILIZATION

**U.S. Immigration Policy under President Donald Trump:
Departure and Continuity**

**Dissertation Submitted to the Department of English in Partial fulfilment of
the Requirements for the Master's Degree**

Submitted by:

Supervisor:

➤ **BOUABDALLAH Lamya**

Mrs LAOUIDJI Karima

➤ **MADI Hamida**

Miss. Benia Amel	President	UNIVERSITY OF MOHAMED BOUDIAF - M'SILA
Mrs. Laouidji Karima	Supervisor	UNIVERSITY OF MOHAMED BOUDIAF - M'SILA
Mrs. Hamouma chahrazad	Examiner	UNIVERSITY OF MOHAMED BOUDIAF - M'SILA

Academic year: 2018 /2019

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this work,

To my beloved family, thanks God for giving me the most wonderful family ever.

*To my sweetheart mother, without you I would not be here, thanks for your encouragement,
kindness, endless love, and your precious efforts.*

*To my dearest father, I owe you to all what you have done for me, thanks a lot for your love,
care, and support.*

*To my lovely sisters, Amel, Nadia, Radhia, Sarah, and Imane, there are no words that can
appreciate how much you mean to me.*

*To my darling brothers, Samir, Faysal, and Halim, whose encouragements and ambitious
words helped me to achieve my potential.*

*To those who have special place in my heart, Thanks God for sending you in my life, I am so
grateful for every moment you live it with me.*

*To my best friends, Rima, Hayat, and Hanane, thanks for your support, loyalty, friendship,
and being with me in every obstacle that I have faced in my life.*

BOUABDALLAH Lamya

Dedication

I dedicate this humble work to

the precious people in my life, to my parents who first give me all tenderness, love and then provide me with encouragement and support. May Allah protect and bless both of you.

My sincere thanks go to my dear husband for his constant love, care, patience and encouragement.

My great thanks go to my beloved, dear brothers and sisters.

To all my lovely nieces and nephews.

Special thanks to my parents-in-law, and their daughters and sons

My final thanks to my families Madi and Ghadbane and to all my friends at E.N.S

Laghouat and university of M'sila.

MADI Hamida

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, thank you ALLAH, for giving us the strength to finish this work, without your help it would be so hard.

This work would not have come to light without the help of our supervisor Mrs Laouidji Karima, who gave us a lot of encouragements, priceless instructions, valuable advice during writing this dissertation, and especially for giving us her time to better this work.

Words are not enough to thank the inspector of English Middle School Athmani Rachid, for his support and encouragement to complete our work as teacher and my Master's Thesis at the same time.

We are sincerely thankful to all our teachers of English department of M'sila University, and teachers at the department of English (ENSL)

Thank you all!

Abstract

This dissertation seeks to investigate whether the President Trump has followed other presidents' immigration policies or has enhanced a new distinct policy. It presents the primary focus of the Trump's administration to find a way to take out immigrants from U.S. through enacting restrictive legislations. In a way examining the historical and the current immigration trends during the late nineteenth to the twenty first centuries, as well as determining the main facts behind the arrival of the newcomers. In this case, the descriptive analytical approach is considered as an appropriate methodology to analyze the urgent need for the implementation of the restrictions with regard to the Americans' attitudes toward the immigration issue. Therefore, the research is made up of two main chapters. The first chapter explores the immigration policies from the late nineteenth to the twentieth centuries. The second chapter represents the core of the study in which Trump's major immigration enforcements are applied. This study argues, based on Trump's administrative restrictions toward immigrants that his policy has another stream with regard to other previous policies.

Keywords: Trump's enforcement, Restriction, Immigration policies, Americans' attitudes.

Table of Contents

Dedication	I
Dedication	II
Acknowledgments	III
Abstract	IV
Table of Content	V
General Introduction	01

Chapter One

Brief History of American Immigration policies from the 1882s to the 2014

Introduction	07
1.1. The Growth of Immigration	07
1.1.1. The Second Wave of Immigration from the 1820s to the 1890s.....	07
1.1.2. The Third Wave of Immigration from the 1890s to the 1930s	09
1.1.3. The fourth wave: 1965 to the present.....	10
1.2. The Impact of Immigration	11
1.2.1. The Impact of Immigration on the US Economy	11
1.2.2. The Impact of Immigration on the US Society	13
1.2.3. The Impact of Immigration on Politics	15
1.2.4. The Impact of Immigration on Religion.....	16
1.3. The Negative Impact of Immigration.....	17
1.4. Immigration Restrictions from the 1882 to the 1945	19
1.4.1. The Chinese Exclusion Act.....	19
1.4.2. The Gentlemen’s Agreement	21
1.4.3. The Asiatic Barred Zone	22
1.4.4. The Emergency Quota Act.....	23

1.4.5. The Immigration Act of 1924.....	24
1.4.6. The Bracero Program	25
1.5. The Immigration Policies from the 1965 to the 2014	26
1.5.1. The Immigration and Nationality Act	26
1.5.2. The Indochina Migration and Refugee Assistance Act.....	28
1.5.3. The Refugee Act.....	30
1.5.4. Immigration Reform and Control Act	31
1.5.5. The Immigration Act of 1990.....	32
1.5.6. The USA Patriot Act	33
1.5.7. The Real ID Act	34
1.5.8. The Border Protection, Anti-terrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act	35
1.5.9. The Secure Fence Act	35
1.5.10. Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program (DACA.....	36
1.5.11. Deferred Action for Parents Program (DAPA	37
Conclusion.....	38

Chapter Two

Trump Administration and Immigration Enforcement

Introduction	40
2.1. The Trump’s View of Immigration as Security and Economic Threat	40
2.2. Trump’s Major Immigration Reforms	42
2.2.1. Build the Border Wall	42
2.2.2. End Catch-and-Release	43
2.2.3. Curbs on Legal Immigration	46
2.2.4. Ending the DACA, DAPA and Temporary Protected Status.....	47
2.2.5. Zero-Tolerance for Unauthorized Immigrants	49

2.2.6. Ending Refugee Resettlement	50
2.2.7. Pursuit Illegal Immigration Criminals	52
2.2.8. Immigrants and Nonimmigrant Visa.....	54
2.2.9. Expansion of R-Verify Program	56
2.3. The Effects of Expectancy and Fears	57
2.4. Congressional Reaction to Trump Immigration Reforms	59
2.5. The Courts Role	60
2.6. Trump Administration Enforcement and the Precedent Enforcements	61
Conclusion.....	64
General Conclusion	66
Works Cited.....	70

General Introduction

The United States was perceived as a place that attracted everyone's eyes from the very long immigration history to present day; it was a dream land to all over the world. Particularly, there were driving forces that pushed people to left their homeland, and fled to America. They came to American shores in order to get free from economic misery, political oppression, and religious persecution. The immigration was the best solution over different epochs, millions of immigrants unified under main purposes, such as searching for their new life, their liberty, and their identity. The new comers' integrations in the new country affected the natives' lives from all aspects of life.

Because there were many American concerns about the large numbers of immigrants and refugees, Congress made serious changes to the U.S. immigration system. It urged to make a lot of efforts in order to create a well-organized and protected system over the borders of American's nation. Some Americans believed that immigration restrictions sought to protect American citizens from poverty, because immigration contributed in reducing native wages and decreasing supply of labor, and it was harmful to American culture as well. Therefore, immigration became and still a current issue that Americans were worried about. President Trump passes new legislations in order to adjust previous policies, protect Americans borders, execute law enforcement, and limit the undocumented immigrants. His policy stands under a system that unifies American nations, and protects human rights, economy, security, and other matters.

The process of the immigration in the U.S. witnessed huge changes in different political relations between America and other countries within different epochs. In regard to the expansion of immigrant's integration in the new country, immigration became contagious among a lot of countries in the 21st century, and this peril urged President Trump to make new legislations instead of the previous immigration policies, in order to secure American

borders, and put limit to the large number of immigrants. This issue began to pay scholars' attentions, and to be significant subject of American Civilization.

For instance, Gèrald François Dumont's article was about *Trump: a new immigration policy in the United States*. Gèrald is giving more importance to the pledges of Trump's immigration policy. He states that even there are two directions, some people believed that Trump's policy appears ambiguous and confused, while others thought that Trump's continuity to put every plan that he promises into the use is something more significant in the American history. He also claims that the purpose behind Trump immigration policy was to decrease the number of family immigration, and put an end to other countries from entering the U.S. by the way stands on the enforcement in applying existing legislation especially for the illegal immigrants.

The changes that Trump declares against Mexican and Muslims refugees provoked other scholars, and it have been discussed by Sarah Torrico in her work *Trump's Immigration Policy*. The writer claims that Trump restricted refugees who were from Iraq, Iran, Syria, Libya, Yemen, Somalia, and Sudan. While other Muslim countries were not concerned with this ban, because America had benefited from them. The enacting of the executive order caused a lot of debates, which led Trump to assert that his policy was similar to Obama, who passed a legislation that prohibited Iraq refugees for six months from entering the United States. In fact, America did not apply any order in the previous years that were similar to Trump's orders today. In contrary, the 1965 act granted that people brought their visas without took the consideration to their places of birth, their race or nationality. It banned any legislation that discriminated between one country to another.

Besides, Colleen K. Vesely, Diamond Y. Bravo, and Mariana T. Guzzardo view Trump's policy from another prescriptive as turning point in American history in their article

Immigrant Families Across the Life Course: Policy Impacts on Physical and Mental Health, where they explained the way Trump builds his policy under America is first, even if these harsh policies harm immigrants' families. The authors assert that the changes and the new orders of immigration policy stressed on enforcement and decreasing immigration to U.S, which led to affect negatively the U.S. citizens. In fact, Trump's criminal policy separate family members from one to another, and put children's lives in danger instead of protecting their wellbeing.

The previous studies have discussed a bunch amount of data about immigration policy, which enable the reader to understand immigration restrictions from Trump's election to present day. They serve to enrich the reader's knowledge about different policies, which President Trump implemented with regard to secure U.S. borders and the nation's interests without taking the consideration to immigrants' families. This work was shedding the light on the Trump's criminal immigration policy against immigrants and refugees and their effects on the United States. However, the implementation of the substantial legislations programs has deeply discussed in this work in accordance to the social, political, and economic conditions, which granted U.S. sovereignty and security among American citizens.

This work will be conducted by the following research questions:

- Why U.S. government urged to restrict immigration?
- Are restrictions the only way to solve the problem of immigration issue?
- What steps does Trump follow to take out immigrants from the U.S?

This work presents the immigration restriction issue, which was perceived as primarily focus of the American government. With the election of President Donald Trump, series of changes passed to the U.S. immigration system. Because the immigration issue was considered as a peril that threatened Americans human rights, economy, environment,

security, the government urged to secure the national borders, decreasing in refugees' admission, broadening immigration enforcement, and limiting in the protection for the noncitizens. This work hypothesizes that Trump's pledges to Americans toward the immigration policy were partially executed in reality, and they were not just promises in papers. For instance, Trump restricts seven countries from entering U.S. city under a purpose to secure Americans' borders against any terrorist.

This study provides an overview on the American attitudes towards the immigration issue, which has constructed the understanding of the important role of the restrictions through descriptive analysis approach. The aim of this study is describing the period that America started to pass new legislations in the 21 century, and determining the factors behind the immigration policy by stressing on the new laws that Trump posed to limit the number of immigrants.

In fact, the present work consists of two main chapters. The first chapter entitles *Brief History of American Immigration policies from the 1882s to the 2014* provides an overview of the American immigration policy in terms of devoting the second, the third, and the fourth trends of immigrants. It treats the main facts that led a large numbers of new immigrants fled to the United States. Then it discusses the immigrants' positive and negative impact on politics, economy, religion, and on the American society. It also portrays the Americans natives' attitudes toward them. This chapter deals with previous immigration restrictions that started from the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1882 and lasted to Obama policy in 2014.

The second chapter entitles *Trump Administration and Immigration Enforcement* explores the current immigration policy to the United States that starts from the election of President Trump to present day. It presents Trump point of view about the current immigration policy regarding to the previous policies, and it moves on to a discussion of

Trump's major immigration reforms through enacting executive orders. In which he promises to make severe changes against immigrants and refugees. Then it reflects the effects of expectancy and fears among the immigrants' families, and the reaction of Congress toward Trump policy. This chapter ends with stressing on the idea that the pledges that Trump has been realized serve America first.

Chapter One

Brief History of American Immigration Policies from 1882 to 2014

Introduction

The United States had passed through various immigration policies started from its founding to present day, and it followed by restrictions that made America as “an open arm policy”. It put an end to those who hope to live in the United States; millions of immigrants were seeking a new life. Because most of them were suffering from social, political, religious factors, all these bad conditions derived and encouraged them to immigrate to the dream land “America”. They wanted to be free from the depressed economy, political instability, religious creeds, and searching for their identity and building their culture. In contrast, American government limited the number of immigration through enacting several restrictions, and some provisions that secure its borders against any terrorist.

1.1.The Growth of Immigration

1.1.2 The Second Wave of Immigration from the 1820s to the 1890s

Immigration brought a huge growing population to the United States through two distinctive waves: old and new. Old immigrants were entered the United States across the Atlantic, they were Britons, Germans, and Scandinavian immigrants between 1820s and 1870s. Although they were mixed of Protestant, Jewish, and Catholics, they were fully integrated with American society. Instead, new immigrants were entered America between the 1870s and the beginning of 1900s; they were extremely different from the previous immigrants. Because of their bad social conditions and religious differences, they were unfamiliar with American culture. In the early 1800s, there was a great influx of Catholic immigrants, who were entering the United States from diverse countries. Thus, Catholics was a large part of American society, and another group came later was Jews between 1870s and 1920s. In this case, the American People had pushed the government to posed restrictions against the influx of immigrants. In 1882, the government took the consideration to people

demands, and prohibited the “undesirable” people, such as convict, lunatic, idiot, or disabled person from coming to America. Another restriction that Congress passed was the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 (Brackemyre). This act was banned Chinese laborers from coming to the United States. In other words, the second wave of immigration was considered as an “open-door” era, because of the flow of immigrants to the United States. These immigrants came due to several factors, such as war, famine, disease, abundance of opportunity, and religious freedom. This was caused social and political instability in American society (“Immigration in American History”).

Besides, between 1820s and 1840s, about 90% of immigrants were coming from Ireland and Germany. Irish people were the largest group of immigrants. Because of the Great Irish Famine, there were about one million Irish died of starvation, and another two million escaped from their country to the United States. The Irish Catholics increased the proportion of Catholicism, which was seen by the Americans as peril to democracy. In turns, the government benefited from the Irish votes at election, in exchange helping them to assimilate into American society, by giving them employment opportunities. Whilst the second large group of immigrants was Germans, they worked as farmers, and contributed in establishing industrial companies (“Irish and German immigration”). Another group was the Norwegians who immigrated to the Midwest of the United States; they sought to live there through building houses, and being landowners. These diverse groups of immigrants transformed America from being agricultural society to the industrial society (Rodgers).

In fact, there were some factors that derived these different groups from their homelands to come to the United States, many Germans Jews came because of the religious oppression. In addition, some Europeans moved because of the political instability, and others from northern and Western Europe immigrated for their economic circumstances. During this time, the industrial revolution and the international trade expanded from Britain to the United

States, and the huge numbers of people could not live in the countryside. Because that cities provided jobs opportunities, such as industrial work in shipping (Mauk and Oakland 55). About 60 million of immigrants moved to America between 1820s and 1930s, they went by ships and trains in order to looking for jobs, to improve their economic conditions, and for seeking a better life there. In turns, because of the industrial revolution, the United States benefited from immigrants both skilled and unskilled workers, and sent them to Europe to work with promising them a higher wages. This led to what was called the Homestead Act of 1862, and the finding of gold in California increased in the numbers of immigrants (Mauk and Oakland 56).

1.1.3 The Third Wave of Immigration from the 1890s to the 1930s

The United States became as dominant industrial nation in the world, and this progress lasted till the third wave, which was started from 1890s to the 1930s. During this time, a new different group of immigrants moved from Eastern and Southern European cities to the United States (Rodgers). Since many restrictions passed to decrease the number of Asian immigrants, more than 23 million new immigrants were coming from all over the world, and most of them were Europeans. For instance, the Chinese immigrants were banned from coming to America, because the native born Americans were worried from losing their jobs, and from racial, religious, and political differences. As the anti-immigrant sentiment increased among the American people, Congress passed a new restriction laws in the period between 1917 and 1924, such as the Immigration Act of 1917. It stopped the immigration mostly from Asia (Shirey). The new immigrants had the same purposes of seeking new life and to grant their children's life, such as the Eastern Europe who immigrated just because of religious freedom. Through a cheap travel the immigrants could immigrate very simply, this was caused a flow of number of newcomers. However, about 1890, the government locked all the borders, and

this decision urged to put an end to the era of government land-giveaways (Mauk and Oakland 58).

During the early 1900s, Congress enacted a series of acts to prohibit the immigration, the Emergency Quota Act, which decreased the annual number of European immigrants to 358,000, and represented the nationality quotas. One of the most significant was the act of 1924, when the Asian Exclusion Act limited all immigration from Asian countries, as well as to the European nations. Even those newcomers from non-quota act, like Mexico and US territories increased to 750,000 immigrants, that the government should take the consideration of its influence in the United States in the period 1960, and regulate the huge number according to the national origins quota (Mauk and Oakland 60). Besides, the immigration act of 1965 sought to restrict the annual immigration, and replaced the previous quota. It based on preferences system that reunifying families, and other visas for the skilled workers and refugees. It also had millions of illegal aliens that flourished a new wave, which contained largest nationality groups, and lasted till present day (Mauk and Oakland 61).

1.1.4. The fourth wave: 1965 to the present

After the US government welcomed by the foreigners from different countries, a large number of immigrants came to seek for their religious freedom, political stability, and flourished economy. There was a policy pushed to restrict their number, and make a preference system that allowed only the immigrants' relatives, especially those who were from northern and Western Europe. This policy transformed the American society from being European to be Latin American and Asian immigrants. Their number gradually increased in the period of 1990s, and put immigration as widespread movement in the 21st century (Martin and Midgley 4). In 2001, the American society witnessed four categories of immigrants; the biggest group represented the natives' relatives, and the second group consisted of other

foreigners who were accepted because of some economic issues, such as those who had outstanding ability, high educational level, and skilled workers. The third group was for the refugees who fled to US, because of the bad conditions in their homelands. While the fourth group was collected from various categories, such as European and African countries (Martin and Midgley 5-7).

The dramatic adjustments that happened in America changed the structure of US immigrants in 1970s, the same thing happened in the decades of 20s and 21s. It gathered different countries, who brought different languages, religions, and cultures (Martin and Midgley 14). But there were radical changes in determining the concept of refugee during the 20s. America granted opportunity to those who fled to live in the US, because of the political oppression especially in the Middle East. After 9/11 attacks, about 3,000 were murdered and most were harmed. In this case, George W. Bush passed a law against terrorist attacks, and made some powerful systems that guaranteed the security of the nation. The controlling of the ID cards to make sure with legally entering, even the abductors came to America across Mexican or Canadian borders. The Congress passed the USA Patriot Act to control them through electronic searches, and to protect the US borders from any terrorists' attacks (Martin and Midgley 17-20). In fact, the fourth wave was consisted of wide categories, most of them were who entered the US legally and illegally, and less than half were skilled workers. The immigrants saw America as industrial country, which enabled them economic opportunities that guaranteed their lives (Mauk and Oakland 63).

1.2.The Impact of Immigration

1.2.1 The Impact of Immigration on the US Economy

All over the time, the United States has been seen as land of opportunity, where the immigrants could achieve prosperity and upward mobility. In other words, US natives had

concerned that the immigrants failed to assimilate into US society. For instance, the impact of immigration covered all aspects of life of America, and it took a major role in the United States' society, politics, religion, especially economy and labor force. The effects of immigrants on natives and on the US economy can be perceived positive as well as negative. Economically speaking, the immigration had larger effect on the wages and employment opportunities of native workers; it decreased the labor ratio as well as reduced wages of low-skilled natives. In other hand, the movement of the immigration contributed in transforming American manufacturing from being small-scale artisanal shops to big factories that was engaged in mass production. The immigrants surged trade flows between the US and Europe in the early twentieth century, therefore they had contributed in increasing trade, innovation, and economic growth (Abramitzky and Boustan 19-21).

Besides, the immigration affected the U.S. economy on the employment and wages of domestic workers, a U.S. exchange with other nations, the growth rate of the economy, and the costs those individuals paid for goods and services. In fact, the U.S. benefited from immigration in the growth of the supply of labor, a help in producing new services, and in the production of net economic gains for native born residents. Therefore, the domestic workers had been gained because the immigrants were paid less than the global value of these services (Smith and Edmonston 4).

The immigration permitted the domestic workers to be used more efficiently and specializing in producing goods, and in the consumption as well. Even the U.S. economy witnessed increasing in the size and scale of the economy. However, it was neither decreased nor grew up the productivity of labor and capital. The U.S. residents divided into distinctive groups, some of them were gainers, and others were losers. The gainers who they had a profitable factors with the labor of immigrants, were higher-skilled workers. The losers, who

compete with immigrants with fall wages, were less-skilled workers (Smith and Edmonston 5).

Moreover, other groups that did not benefit from the immigration movement were immigrants from previous waves, and blacks who suffer from the inflow of low-skilled immigrants (Smith and Edmonston 6). In this case, this effect spread not only where immigrants live, but it distributed across the United States as whole. So that the immigration had played a main role in extending wage inequality for any group of native workers. The foreign-born earned less the native workers, other workers came from Latin America earned the lowest wages, and the new immigrants who were well educated as well. This gap in both skills and wages had affected the employment opportunities of domestic workers (Smith and Edmonston 7).

In this perspective, the immigration affected the supply side of the local labor market, which increased the supply of labor. While the demand side was increased the consumption of goods and services, both of them made a distinctive economic effects on natives as well as on immigrants. Therefore, the growth in the supply of labor through the immigration caused decreasing in the wages, and firms participated on the spread of the production of goods and services with an adaptation of the production technologies. On the other hand, the local labor market witnessed a great increasing on the prices, due to the increasing on the demand side through a larger population. In addition, this rising in the sales of the local economy will yield a lot of tax revenue. So that the fiscal impact tends to be positive (Longhi, Nijkamp and Poot 3).

1.2.2 The Impact of Immigration on the US Society

Immigration had widely affected American society in different fields of social relations and institutions. Since the United States became a home to notable thirty-nine million

immigrants, there were a dramatic changes rebuilt the American society in three dominant areas: Work, ethno racial relations and community institutions. In this case, immigration had a powerful impact on the growing number of population, especially during the last four decades (Rosenblum and Tichenor 190).

First of all, work was considered as basic key of immigrants' lives, they took a large proportion of labor force in the United States. Therefore, they changed the ethnic division of labor, and created new ethnic occupational and industrial specializations through ethnic members in many cities. The appearance of these specialties had reflected to immigrants' skills, cultural preferences, human capital, and their previous experiences that were available in the local economy. As well as to their ability in communicating in English language in directing some members into jobs, this was very important in American society. In other hand, the lack of immigrants' skills, experiences, and ability limited a majority of their scope. In addition, the unauthorized immigrants were considered as another reason that led to close of all chances of work in the regulated portion of the labor market. In other words, Entrepreneur-rich immigrants had a big influence in providing a lot of jobs, which were available to ethnic workers. For instance, the Chinese restaurants were considered as one of the most powerful business sectors, which were dominated by an army of male waiters, busboys, deliverymen, cooks, dishwashers, and managers. They served the tourist trade in New York City by the mid-twentieth century; also they became a part of Jewish culture for more than half a century. Therefore, their numbers increased to 43,000 Chinese restaurants in the United States, which was witnessed a growing popularity in both South and Midwest of Chinese immigrants. Besides, the coming of new immigrants of Koreans greengrocers had possessed 1.800, or 60 percent of New York areas produce stores, over and above than 1.100 grocery stores. Thus, many Koreans had begun their own business such as producing nail

salons, which were a major business in New York –New Jersey metropolitan area (Rosenblum and Tichenor 191-193).

1.2.3. The Impact of Immigration on Politics

Immigration issue had affected the American politics on both ideological unity and group pluralism. This impact made indirect changes on voting behavior and the party system, which its political aftermath had been deep and ongoing. So that each immigrant group had been adapted the basic tenets of the American creed, and had been a part of the contest for political power. Some politicians had taken a big consideration of the immigrant vote, as well as to Jefferson and his followers who captured the loyalties of the new comers. Because they were recognized that in order to become a dominant party, a larger circle of diverse groups of immigrants should have. Therefore, they sought to increasing proportion of immigrant voters through campaign tune for the election:

Come Dutch and Yankee, Irish, Scot,

With intermixed relation;

From whence we came, it matters not;

We all make, now, one nation (Fuchs 270).

Political leaders' position toward the immigration could be seen as an essential point in ruling the United States government. For instance, in the nineteenth century, the Scotch-Irish was considered as dominant power in the progress of the Jeffersonian Party, and they were being a part in American society. Some of them were leaders, voters, and part in the White House. Soon after another ethnic group of newcomers arrived were Irish-Catholic immigrants, about one million immigrants came to the United States between 1850 and 1860 century. Although, some of them were unskilled workers, and others were working in the construction

of railroads and canals, they were politically talented and they were likable by the party of Jackson (Fuchs 271). Because of their ability to realize the Irish-Democratic vote, their jobs on high positions of leadership, their skillfulness in speaking English, and their aspirations for a better life kept the Democratic Party alive (Fuchs 272).

1.2.4. The Impact of Immigration on Religion

Religious beliefs and practices had affected the lives of immigrants as well as the natives of the United States, through stressing on the progressive of culture and the advantages of religious faith after the issue of immigration. In this case, there was an important role of religion in most immigrants' communities, due to the establishment of an immigrant churches, Buddhist and Hindu temples, and Islamic mosques in American society. This last was considered as refuge from both the religious intolerance and the discrimination from the society. For instance, more than 800 Chinese Protestant churches in the U.S. in 2000, and about 250 Korean ethnic churches in New York City in 1980s. The wave of post-1965 immigrants had seemingly built the character of the individual, the content of American religious institutions, and brought new religious distinction to the United States (Hirschman 1206). While other new immigrants had brought a growth numbers of American Christianity as well as the followers of non-Christian religions, and other immigrants were not religious at all. With particular attention to the role of the immigrant religious organizations, that gave social services to different members of the society. In addition to its impact on the cultural absorption, and the lives of different generations of immigrants. In fact, immigrants had neglected their native languages as well as their ethnic traditions, whilst they maintained their religions (Cadge and Ecklund 361).

America was an extraordinary, religious, and unstable new world. Religion in the United States was unlike from other countries in the world, because there were diversified and

forceful religious choices. The government supported this diversity of religious groups, since it had great effect on political, social, and cultural life. Some of immigrants were similar in both culture and religious, while others were from atheistic countries, and they had difficulties in the understanding of American religious life. They came to the United States either for religious freedom, or for personal economic issues. As they went to create their identity, to found their own church, temples, and mosque, and to establish new religions, or being free from all the religions. However, the American citizens thought that immigrants would remain practicing their religions and their creeds in the United States (Granquist). As Mark Granquist states: “America is a religious supermarket, and immigrants often have great fun shopping in her aisles” (4). In this case, the diversity of religions sought to build a way for the assimilation of immigrants within the American society. Those newcomers engaged in sharing their religions, and their activities of churches and temples through joining religious organizations, as well as their involvement in creating a community in their new country (Hirschman 1207).

1.3.The Negative Impact of Immigration

Immigration had been a serious cause, that its roots had affected negatively the U.S. society from all the aspects especially economics. As well as, the growing population of immigrants had unintended and undesirable consequences, such as the lack of natural resources, the need of new and expensive infrastructure to be built, decreasing the wages of workers (Nilsson 1). In addition, the lack of housing with suitable costs was very difficult to the government, which sought to build houses in very short time to extra people (Nilsson 5). In fact, the need of scarce resources among immigrants had created more competing ends. In the case that land became scarcer, and because of the growing population. It was more difficult to provide lands for agriculture or domestic use. Besides, the increasing of large number of immigrants cost a lot of problems, such as the need for more hospitals, or rather the

hospital beds, the shortage of water supply. So all these factors led to what was called infrastructure problems (Nilsson2).

Another negative economic impact was the wage decline, the increasing of new comers led to descending on wages of the workers. Therefore, the augmentation of the supply of labor, the supply of capital, and the supply of natural resources, were considered as factors that was driving down wages and participating in serious problem, such as unemployment and poverty (Nilsson 2). For all those new comers' life was good. Edwin S. Rubenstein states, "We are a nation of immigrants: except for American Indians, we or our ancestors left other countries for a better life in the United States."(1). Immigration was benefit to the U.S. economy, through expanding the market economy, adding proficiency and experience to the natives, and improved living standards of previous immigrants (Rubenstein 1).

In turns, the U.S. society witnessed a rapid growth of immigrants, who benefited from millions of jobs faster than native labor force (Rubenstein 4). Due to about 500.000 legal immigrants of refugees of Second World War and foreign immigrants, the United States became overcrowded, and this affected negatively Americans life. As American Federation of Labor's Samuel Gompers declares, "We immediately realized that immigration is, in its fundamental aspects, a labor problem." Thus, immigration restrictions remained a law until that period finished in 1965 (Rubenstein 1).

Congress responded to John F. Kennedy who removed the national origins quotas, and brought new system. This system was granted preferences for relatives of U.S. citizens. As Edward M. Kennedy, the chairman of the subcommittee, states: "Our cities will not be flooded with a million immigrants annually. Under the proposed bill, the present level of immigration remains substantially the same..." (Rubenstein 2). Consequently, this restriction aimed to make wages high and decreasing large influxes of immigrants and their down wages,

the highest unemployment rates as well. In other words, immigration threatened the economy of America, through downfall the native born worker's productivity and their wages, reducing their income, while others lost their jobs with moving to other cities (Rubenstein 3). Although immigrants were the successor of the immigration policy, through getting more than their home country. They were extremely poorer, less educated, and had downfall wages. In fact, immigration had also derived native born workers to poverty because of their lower wages too. So in many cases, more immigration led to more poverty in America (Rubenstein 9).

1.4.Immigration Restrictions from the 1882 to the 1945

1.4.1 The Chinese Exclusion Act

The first Chinese immigrants arrived in the United State in 1820; they got away and flee due to the bad economic conditions in China. They took on low-skilled with low-paying jobs. Their numbers began to increase till 1880s, but this growing number of Chinese affected on the nativist, particularly those who lived in California, and they posed an economic peril to the U.S. As a result, they passed legal discriminated restrictions against them, which represented in: The Chinese had to pay a tax per person in different fields such as in hospital, school, and property tax. As well as, they were denied from obtaining naturalized citizenship, they didn't have the right to vote, and they were badly treated through different types of violence. On May 6, 1882, Congress responded to the nativist demands by signing the Chinese Exclusion Act under President Chester A. Arthur. This act was considered as the first significant legal restriction on immigration in U.S. It banned and excluded all the Chinese immigrants' laborers for a period of ten years from the country. In 1892, Congress passed law that prevented Chinese immigration indefinitely from U.S (Lindsay).

Overall, there are several reasons that led the Chinese people moved to California. Firstly, they wanted to be rich through mine gold, this characterized the period as the Gold Rush. Secondly, the Chinese people represented a large number of immigrants that they came to the U.S, because they were looking for better opportunities through holding cheap jobs. They were worked as farmers and low-paying workers in railroad construction. Even though, the nativist blamed the Chinese for the economic depression and for the reduction in job opportunities. In addition, they viewed them as drug users and violent men that they hold gangs. Except some classes of Chinese people who were holding diplomat, teachers, doctors, and travelers, they permitted to enter the country unless they obtained the permission of the Chinese government. In other side, the American journalists published racist pictures in their newspapers and magazines, that represented the Chinese immigrants as rats, and they viewed them as exotic people (Chan).

Restrictions that imposed on Chinese immigrants marked a series of acts, which suspended Chinese immigration for more than twenty years. The Page Law of 1875, which closed the door of the immigration, and prohibited any person from entering the country, in particular those who had immoral purposes. A case in point, women who wanted to be sex workers as well as Asian laborers, and this referred to any person from China, Japan, or any oriental country. This act had the right to reject any undesirable person from entering the country (Chen 1).

On September 13, 1888, Congress passed the Scott Act. It was barred the coming of Chinese laborers who had returned to China, and they couldn't reenter the U.S. unless they had family or property. The Geary Act was passed in 1892, which extended the exclusion for another ten years. The Chinese immigrants had obtained the certificates of residence, which was the same to the green cards. By the end of the second ten years, on April 29, 1902, another act stressed on the idea that all laws excluded the coming of Chinese persons, and

persons of Chinese descent into the U.S. without terminal date. All restrictions affected on the immigration policy for 61 years were repealed in 1943, when China was a U.S. ally in the Second World War. But a quota of annual immigrants restricted the Chinese immigrants until the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 (Lu).

1.4.2 The Gentlemen's Agreement

A gentlemen's Agreement of 1907 was informal and legally non-binding agreement between United States and Japan represented efforts by President Theodore Roosevelt to rest the tension between the two nations. Both Japanese and American governments sought to avoid offending the rising world power of Japan. In other words, the U.S could not impose official restrictions on Japanese immigrants because an existing trade treaty with Japan guaranteed all forms of the entering. In return, the Japan co-operate with Canada to restrict its citizens. Thus, Japanese government agreed not to issue any passports to the immigrants who wanted to work in the United States, except to certain categories such as parents, children, and wives of Japanese laborers could immigrate to the United States. This diplomatic agreement that reached between the two nations was called the 'Gentleman's Agreement'. Consequently, it was monitored the Japanese American population which was more gender balanced than other Asian American communities (Kaibara14).

President Theodore Roosevelt passed an order to urge the city of San Francisco, and called the government and San Francisco board of education officials to Washington to negotiate the agreement. As a result to the segregation order, in which children of Japanese and Korean parents were segregated from white students in schools with already segregated Chinese. Even though the few Koreans complied with the order, in other side the Japanese were extremely objected. In this case, the Gentlemen's Agreement was defused threats of war, rescinded the segregation order, and most importantly limited further Japanese immigration to

the United States. Before the San Francisco earthquake of April, 1906, anti-Asian sentiment was being redirected from the Chinese to the Japanese through statements that starting from San Francisco mayor Eugene Schmitz; a series of articles described what had been called the ‘yellow peril’; and the Asiatic Exclusion League, which might have been composed by one hundred unions to extend the Chinese Exclusion Act in order to isolate the Japanese as well as the Korean students from public schools (Sax).

In addition, restrictions on the Japanese immigration under the terms of the agreement had been considered involuntary, because of the flow of Japanese laborers’ living in United States. There were about 8,000 Japanese immigrants reached British Columbia and Canada during 1907, in order to work on the western section of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. Therefore, the inflammation of anti-Asian sentiment was increased (“Gentlemen’s Agreement, 1908).

1.4.3. The Asiatic Barred Zone

On February 5, 1917, the United States Congress passed Immigration Act of 1917, which was known as The Asiatic Barred Zone. It was considered as the broader immigration act that had enacted in the U.S. As this act directed to restrict and banned rather than to made reforms or regulations. It imposed new categories to the immigrants who could enter the U.S. legally and barred the immigrants from Asia-Pacific Zone. It ruled the immigration policy till the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 had passed, which known as the McCarran-Walter Act (“Immigration Act of 1917-USA”).

This act created new categories of people, the list of ‘undesirables’ that they had been banned from entering the country, including : alcoholics, idiots, criminals and convicts, epileptics, imbeciles, polygamists, anarchists, beggars, prostitutes, poor and persons being mentally or physically defective. In addition, this restriction affected even the European

immigrants because of barring all immigrants over the age of sixteen who were illiterate, they had to pass a literacy tests. As well as, it granted the laborers a temporary permits because the law didn't accept them as immigrants ("Immigration Act of 1917-USA").

Another restriction represented in a tax of 8 \$ per person was imposed on immigrants, except children under the age of sixteen. Overall, one of the aspects of the 1917 Act was designated to people who could not immigrate and they restricted from entering the country. The exclusion zone was not specified to longitudes and latitudes along Asia, Pacific Islands, and the surrounding countries, but it included people from the Arabian Peninsula, the Indian sub-continent, and Central Asia. In other side, Woodrow Wilson omitted Japan because the immigrants had already faced a several prohibitions and Philippines because its immigrants were belonged to the American territory (Tucker and Creller).

The idea of the restricted list had been presented before 1917 particularly the literacy test. In each time was failed, because it was defeated by the veto more than one time (by Welson in 1915, by Taft in 1912, and by Cleveland in 1897). On February 5, 1917, Congress overrode Wilson's veto that was passed on December 14, 1916, and the Immigration Act of 1917 became law. The restrictions of 1917s were completely changed by the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. This last was revised all the previous restrictions of the law concerned with nationality, naturalization , and immigration, but unfortunately it didn't work with the category of people who were homosexuals, which still restricted till 1990 (Dan).

1.4.4. The Emergency Quota Act

During the 1920s, the need for skilled and unskilled workers in the industries or in the agriculture, which pushed many immigrants to come to the United States, had been declined. All the borders were closed; there was industrial society stand for machines and robots, rather than workers (Lehtinan 4). In this case, Congress passed quota system in 1921 to limit the

number of immigrants, and banned those who came for seeking a better life for the next four decades. In 1922, about 309,556 immigrants entered the United States, in contrast to the previous year when their number had increased to 805,228. Most of them were from eastern and southern Europe (*Immigration Act of 1921 Imposes Quota System, 1921-1924*). For instance, the Immigration act of 1917 had established the Dillingham Commission for its chairman, Republican Senator William P. Dillingham; the commission's report stated that negative effects of immigration caused a great peril to America in all aspects of life, such as society, culture, economy, and moral welfare. So the number of immigrants from eastern and southern Europe should be decreased (Longley). However, this act granted of what was called "special partiality". It was for the members of a family, such as parents, sibling, children under 18 in order to save the family unity, and to be free from strict quota system (*Immigration Act of 1921 Imposes Quota System, 1921-1924*). In other words, the aim of this act was to restrict the population growth, through setting annual quotas of new immigrants from each country at three percent of the number of foreign-born persons of such resident in U.S. in 1910 (Barrientes).

1.4.5. The Immigration Act of 1924

Between 1882 and 1924, several of immigration laws derived to the execution of the 1924 legislation, or what was known as the Johnson-Reed Immigration Act in May 26, 1924. The American citizens pushed the government to put an end to the immigration movements, and specifically to restrict those who were from southern and Eastern Europe, since they were worried about their national security and economic state. As a million of newcomers arrived in looking for job opportunities, for new home where to build their identity, and to be free from any religion and from political conflict (Morton). The quotas system aimed to identify the immigrants that would able to come to the United States, it used census totals of each country two percent, except the Asian and Japanese immigrants were restricted. Filipinos

immigrants were allowed since their land belonged to U.S. territory (*1924 Immigration Act: The New & Improved White America*). Another category could come to America was known as a “non-quota” immigrant, it contained wives, unmarried, minor children of U.S. citizens, others were living in Western hemisphere, and “bona-fide students” who were under the age of 15. Besides these classification were considered as “quota immigrant”, and they were limited by the annual restriction (Marcos and Nguyen).

The act of 1924 was neither considered as the first bill restricting immigration nor the first quota system, but it could limit the number of immigrants that entered the United States. Because the aftermath of World War 1 caused a state of instability, and this raised a concern of both the American public and Congress. Upon signing the act, President Calvin Coolidge sought to make America ethnically and racially homogenous, under his saying: “America must remain America”. In other words, Eugenicists claimed that the differences of society or race of new immigrants could passed genetically from one to another, thus the purpose behind prohibiting the southeastern European was that Americans saw them as inferior and criminal. The Immigration Act of 1924 was remained in progress until 1965 (Shelley).

1.4.6. The Bracero Program

After the United States entered the Second World War in 1941, many people left their countries and immigrated to America. In order to seek new jobs in industries that backed the war. These reforms of the American workforce led to the necessity for other workers, especially those who worked in the agricultural industry. In 1942, the United States passed another bill was the Bracero Treaty with Mexico; it opened the door for the legal immigration. Under this law, about 4.5 million Mexican workers arrived to work in the agriculture and its railroads. An official Bracero Contract based on some points that granted rights to the employer and his family. For instance, they were alike to those who worked in other area in

paying wages, any braceros would be accepted only by the worker or the Mexican government, and it was prevented the minor children under the age of 14 to work in fields. In other words, all the employees were granted their health, housing, food, and wages by the U.S. government (Page).

The agreement between the United States and Mexico was considered as most powerful worker programs in the world that was lasted between 1942 to 1964. The workers were called braceros because of their “strong arms” of the program. Because the Americans were rejected to work in the agriculture, the request for more Mexican workers was increased. However, the Mexican workers faced bad social conditions there, not what the contrast based on. They started demand for the reforms on living conditions, race, discrimination, and other political and social problems. As well as, they joined to some organizations that protect their rights in the United States. On October 1, 1947, the National Farm Labor Union started a strike opposed to DiGiorgio Corporation in California, about 1.000 strikers, under the Mexican American leader Chavez. Therefore, the United Farm Workers responded to their demands, and the United States government made reforms that granted the rights of the workers. In fact, the working in the farm lands was very beneficial to feed the American citizens, and it was very significant to the Mexican men, who saw it as a great chance to work and support their families (Holt).

1.5.The Immigration Policies from the 1965 to the 2014

1.5.1.The Immigration and Nationality Act

On October 3, 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the immigration and nationality act. It was referred to the Hart-Celler Act .It aimed to put an end to the prior U.S. policy that stressed on a person’s national origin. This act was directed by the preference system that privileging family ties and occupational skills. With that signing, dramatic

changes marked great demographics of America which would have an immediate and lasting impact. This system opened the door to legal and illegal immigration, as President George Washington had claimed that “America was for the oppressed and persecuted of all Nations and Religions”. Thus the coming of new immigrants from all over the world had really changed the face of America. The previous system of immigration that was used before had rejected by several groups of immigrants such as the Italian, Poles and Portuguese, they claimed that the current policy discriminated against them and sought to limit the immigration from Africa, Asia, Southern and Eastern Europe, and from the Middle East. As well as, it favored the countries from Northern and Western Europe (*Immigration and Nationality Act: Everything You Need to Know*).

As soon as, John F Kennedy had called for the reform of immigration policy which he considered as ‘intolerable’, but he had been assassinated. In this case, Congress passed the immigration and nationality act of 1965 by Representative Emanuel Celler from New York and Philip Hart, a Senator from Michigan and supported by the Senator Ted Kennedy of Massachusetts. They have all been favored to the preference system ("U.S. Immigration Since 1965").

The immigrants’ visas (green cards) were granted on a first-come and first-served basis, and it was based on seven –category preference system:

1. Unmarried adult sons and daughters of U.S.citizens
2. Spouses,children,and unmarried sons and daughters
3. Professionals,scientists,and artists of exceptional ability
4. Married children of U.S.citizens
5. Brothers and sisters of U.S.citizens over the age of 21

6. Skilled and unskilled workers in occupations for which there is insufficient labor supply
7. Refugees given conditional entry or adjustments.

This meant that immigrants from Asia or Africa or from over the world were naturalized and these give them opportunity to come legally to America (Alam).

Within a few years after the act was passed, an unanticipated effects led to increase in illegal immigration. The conflicts during the Cold War caused a huge number of immigrants who were fleeing from the hardships under the communist governments of Eastern Europe, and they were trying to find an opportunity in America. Even those who were entered the country legally, they had more than quadrupled. This is what brought a massive change in the demographics in just a matter of a few years. Even though the main object of removing the national origins quota system was to make sure that the immigrants would come from Europe, But what was not taken into account that the immigrants came from Mexico, Korea, the Philippines, India, Cuba and Vietnam (*Immigration and Nationality Act: Everything You Need to Know*).

The immigration act of 1965 was transformed from being a bill to becoming a law, and thus took only nine months to be enacted. As it became a basis for bringing immigrants who were entered America successfully. They were more talent in terms of education, earnings, and this made them equal to Native Americans. Over time, this change happened in the American society for the first time, and made the act as one of the most important pieces in U.S history (Alam).

1.5.2. The Indochina Migration and Refugee Assistance Act

Congress passed the Indochina Migration and Refugee Assistance Act on May 23, 1975, under President Gerald Ford. It was a reaction to the Fall of Saigon as well as the end of the Vietnam War. This act was allowed the refugees who had fled from the Southeast Asian countries, South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and those who couldn't come again to those

countries because of the bad conditions, to enter the United States under a special status and provided financial assistance for their resettlement. Many Americans were disturbed because of the large number of refugees that they could be as serious problem in the American society. As they could cause decreasing in wages as well as construct a social burden. So Congress passed the law with permission of these refugees from Vietnam and Cambodia, then in 1976, the act was amended to include Laos, and other groups such as Conference of Catholic Bishops, Civitan International, and the International Rescue Committee. At the same time the United State sought to put them in different places, in order to avoid them form a large enclave (Bily).

As far as, this act was established the Indochinese Refugee Assistance Program (IRAP), which was passed through the Refugee Parole Program and the Orderly Departure Program. The IRAP permitted the immigrants to enter the local services, that they were distributed through the state by federal government. Many Southeast Asian refugees had fled to the state of Minnesota, which was one of the states that had received a large number of refugees. In December 1975, Wendell Anderson established an Indochinese Resettlement Office, which it would be later as the Refugee Programs Office in 1981. These programs participated in the resettlement process as well as they supported refugee families, and helped them set their new homes (Park).

In the fact that the Indochina Migration and Refugee Act was a turning point in U.S. It was opened the gates for years of mass refugee acceptance, also it allowed any persons from Southeast Asia to enter the country, and it provided a safe conditions to those who had been denied their human rights from the Vietnam War. By 1978, the U.S. was getting thousands of displaced people who immigrated through unsafe waters of the Pacific, and this continued until the refugee policy was reformed along with the Refugee Act of 1980. Because of the Indochina Migration and Refugee Act of 1975, the United States had proceeded being as

symbol of using a liberal approach to refugee admittance, particularly with those from countries that were engaged militarily with the United States. In 2001, the act was ended with the war in Afghanistan (“Indochina Migration and Refugee Assistance Act”).

1.5.3. The Refugee Act

Before 1980, American government admitted about 17,400 refugees came to the United States per year, especially those who were coming from the Communist countries or the countries of the Middle East. Due to the great number of the refugees, another authority established for the serious cases when the number of refugees increased, it was called the Attorney General's parole authority. However, this last was concerned about the coming of refugees, because persons who were allowed to enter the United States should be traditionally agreed with the levels and the personal characteristics that the Congress identified (Meissner 129). The American citizens were worried about a huge number of populations, and about the opening of “floodgates”, but the government claimed that countries, such as Canada, France, and Australia opened their doors to refugees. On September 6, 1979, the bill was supported by the Senate, and it was signed into legislation on March 3, 1980 by President Jimmy Carter (Cortés 2).

As a result, the Refugee act of 1980 passed an urgent response to these obstacles, through creating a record of positive fulfillment (Meissner 130). Besides, this act sought to establish well controlled, homogeneous, and not prejudiced process of refugee resettlement. In such a way that rejected the discrimination with a regard to national origins. For instance, it unlocked the doors to refugees from all over the world, since they were considered as an integral part of America's multiculturalism. In order to accomplish this law concerning refugee resettlement, the U.S. government should reconsider the refugee with regard to the U.N. 1951 convention's definition. That removed the ideas of discrimination, and took the

consideration of refugee as a person who could not live in the country of nationality because of some bad political, social, and religious circumstances, except those who were being a part of these persecutions. The act of 1980 was directed to those who accepted by a political asylum like the Vietnamese refugees and others who had come prior to 1980, and others who were allowed to leave their country like Cuban political prisoner release program. Moreover, the law aimed to increase the number of refugees from 17.400 to 50.000 per year, with providing monetary and medical support, and a broad scope of social aid to help refugees resettle in the United States (Cortés 1).

1.5.4. Immigration Reform and Control Act

Before 1986, the federal immigration laws passed legal legislation that granted employment to the undocumented aliens, through what was known as Texas Proviso, which worked to decrease the rate of joblessness. In turns, the American citizens blamed the government for the job opportunities that it gave to the undocumented immigrants. They believed that aliens took jobs from them, and caused economic problems (Aguilar 15). However, Congress saw employer sanctions as last resort for the economic crisis of labor market, and gave a chance to raise the proportion of illegal immigration. Therefore, the Congress and President Reagan perceived that immigration reform and control act of the borders during October 1986 was the perfect law that pulled out United States from this peril (Aguilar 16).

The act of 1986 had represented some significant components to decrease the number of undocumented immigrants, who they moved to resettle in the United States. The employer sanctions or was known as “keystone” of the law, it granted jobs to people who were not allowed to work, and without checking person’s identity or the paperwork requirements to take a job legally. In part, The IRCA was passed to maintain legal workers from any

discrimination by employer sanctions, as well as to punish those who verified others nationality. In addition, after signing the act, there were about 50% of aliens immigrated in Border Patrol staffing, and this led to the flow of unauthorized immigrants along the US-Mexico border. Because of the IRCA, about 2.7 million of immigrants had permanent residency in the United States. It was considered as great legislation program in American history, and its legalization lasted till today (Cooper and O'Neil 3).

1.5.5. The Immigration Act of 1990

The Immigration Act enacted on November 29, 1990 was considered as a turning point in the U.S. history, which was introduced first by Senator Ted Kennedy in 1989. It was signed into a law by George H. W. Bush. It was one of the most changes and considered as reform of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965. It changed the previous immigration law that prohibited granting visas to immigrants from several countries, and due to these changes, the number of legal immigrants was raised, in particular the number of the visas was limited to separate categories. As well as, the previous immigration law restricted immigrants because of their homosexuality and their sickness HIV-positive (“The Immigration Act of 1990”).

Besides, the first group of legal immigrants was called ‘the priority workers’. This category oriented to those who have extraordinary ability such as skilled professors and researchers, and the immigrants who were beneficial to the United State in different fields of science. The second group was for the aliens. This category directed to those who were ‘advanced professionals’ who got high degrees in their study, and immigrants who had ‘exceptional ability’. The third group oriented to all the workers. The immigrants who considered to be a skilled worker, and those who had occupations but they were unskilled, they were also concerned with other workers and included in this category simply to fill the position in receiving visas (“The Immigration Act of 1990”).

Several changes made by the establishment of 1990, it determined a flexible effects on family-based, employment-based, and diversity immigrant visas. This diversity was available for the first time by the 1990 Act. It directed to family reunification that passed in the 1965 Act, and the most skill-based immigrants. Before this law enacted, the number of diversity visas set by means of lottery, which was a system provided visas to immigrants randomly (Greenwood and Ziel). In this perspective, the immigration act of 1990 aimed to increase the skilled labor positions such as professors, scientists, doctors, artists in the United States. So that the restriction of new immigrants was decreased, and this led to increasing in non-immigrants who were non-skilled workers. However, this intended event made the skilled workers exhausted in many fields, and this affected the United States positively and negatively. As expected, the U.S. urged for protecting the nation's borders and ports of entry the country (Bell).

1.5.6.The USA Patriot Act

After the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, Congress and W. Bush passed the USA Patriot Act, which was considered as one of the greatest essential laws in American history in the period of 2001 that changed and intervened in the lives of Americans. This act sought to punish and prohibit the terrorist activities in the U.S. specifically and all over the world broadly with the support of "law enforcement investigatory rules" (Damania 44). In addition, these pieces of legislation served the civil liberties of Americans, and guaranteed the national well-being of U.S. In the previous year, the Fourth Amendment to the constitution granted the right of American citizens to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures, and giving acceptable reasons before any search warrant. On the other hand, the 2001 bill had the goal of differentiating between searches and seizures, in order to respond to criminal activity and to the foreign intelligence. Therefore, the government perceived that the target of the search was a foreign intelligence, and the federal authority made it much easier for any

surveillance activities in terrorism cases without the knowledge of the owners, and then share these information with law enforcement (Pike 19-21).

Another provision of this act was enhancing border security through preventing any suspected terrorist from getting visas, and from possessed any material support for their activities (Rosenbach and Peritz 92). As well as, there were other provisions that needed to prohibit the liberties of all Americans in order to stop any terrorist activities against the United States, As Benjamin Franklin stated in 1755: “Those who would give up essential Liberty, to purchase a little temporary Safety, deserve neither Liberty nor Safety” (Robinson 40).

1.5.7.The Real ID Act

The United States government enacted to the American citizens various laws after September 11, 2001 in order to save the country from the terrorist attacks, most of these law gave the government the right to know everyone lived in U.S. even those who were non-citizens. One of the significant legislation was The Real ID Act, which was passed by President Bush on May 11, 2005. It changed some of the immigration system, and established other personal requirements for both the identification cards and drivers' licenses (Govindaiah 201).

Most of the Real ID provisions represented in verifying the identity cards from all the personal information, such as full name, signature, address, photograph, and identification number with examining of the authenticity of these information (Kephart 2). In this point, many states were not accepted to pay for the surveillance mandate, and they were not supported the Real ID Act. In the other hand, Congress took money into the federal government's national ID project, and paid out many millions on Real ID. So all states pushed the government to stop applying this law (Harper 1).

1.5.8. The Border Protection, Anti-terrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act

On December 16, 2005, the Border Protection, Anti-terrorism Act was passed by the U.S. House of Representatives, that aimed to provide some workers in order to check employees' immigration status, seeking to raise a several personal borders, made punishments for the immigrants who broke the law, and stopped the illegal immigrants who were not from Mexico. In addition, it gave some technologies as radios for border law enforcement, along with parts of Texas (Dworaczvk 12). However, this act had confronted severe objections in the Senate, some of them were to limit the idea of "catch and release" in terms of lasting a crime from six months to one year. In addition, it imposed 700 miles of border walls, and increased harsh punishments on the immigration's corruption, such as smuggling and all the kinds of trickery (*Zero Tolerance For Illegal Immigration: An Urgent Policy Need*).

Besides, the act of 2005 passed a pieces of provision, such as providing several technological tools to help DHS in controlling the borders, creating a Border Security Advisory Committee that contains representatives of the government, providing the homeland security a cash reserve to the favor of the border enforcement activities, and granting extra walls to be built over the U.S. Mexico Border with taking the consideration to the Northern and Canadian Border. In fact, this law aimed to direct the illegal immigration by making it more powerful central enforcement of immigration legislation and executing extra border security parts ("Summary of the Sensenbrenner Immigration Bill").

1.5.9. The Secure Fence Act

The United States granted the security of its borders against the terrorists or illegal immigration, since the border security could have a great impact on the social life. The Secure Fence Act of 2006 ordered the Homeland Security to build fences from three to four meters over the parts of the US-Mexico border. The purpose behind establishing border fences to put

an end to the great number of population (*The Impact of Border Security Measures on Wildlife*). This act was enacted on October 26, 2006, which provided a set of changes to the Homeland Security, and guided to create extra five fences along with the southeast of America through making barriers as well as to the camera system (Neto and Kim 14). In other words, The act of 2006 was based on a system of “prevention through deterrence,” the criminal justice theory declared that all the harsh and criminal anxiety, pursuit, and penalties were considered as the best and useful way for those who broke the law (Tavares 33). Furthermore, it brought very necessary suggestions that protect human rights, such as the right of native people, the right to life, and the right to good conditions (34). In fact, The Secure Fence Act identified that a about 700-mile fence be built, particularized its borders and a timetable for its accomplishments over 18 months. In addition, it declared that “all unlawful entries” into the United States be barred. Funds to start building, \$1.2 billion, were assigned in the Defense Authorization Act of 2006, which was passed by the President (Nelson 2).

1.5.10. Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program (DACA)

The Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) policy was passed in 2012 by President Barack Obama in order to direct the requirements of young undocumented immigrants who entered the country as minors. DACA provided special care from the work permission, that it would be put into use after two years, as well as it raised the proportion of the chances of job and with support of higher education between the possessors. During the five years, DACA had confirmed to be an useful planning for improve the waves of the workers and their education. In turns, there were various weak points of this program, through directing the outdated immigration policy. That could be endangered the occupation of the minor undocumented immigrants and their parents, and warned the economical state of the country. The word “Dreamers” was represented to those young newcomers, who were entered the U.S. as minor and recognized as Americans, and they had not a legal position. Therefore, DACA

was an essential program for allowing the young undocumented immigrants to follow their educational dreams, and participated with their family's income (Crouse 1). As supposed about 1.7 million young immigrants were fit for this system. It was worked by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS), which started obtaining the use of this system in August 2012. As well as, it needed any persons to register every two years, because it did not suggest a way for lasting residency to the newcomers (Patler and Cabrera 2).

DACA program granted only to those who were entered the U.S. under the age of 16, those who were living there since 2010 and without having legitimate immigration positions in 2012, and should be registered in schools (*President Obama's Executive Action on Immigration: Positive Step for Hundreds of Thousands of Farmworkers and their Families*).

In addition, the undocumented immigrant population in the U.S. increased about 72%, or over 8 million, it was among 18 and 44 ages, comparing to 36% of American citizens. While the young citizens were nearly to 2 million of them passed as dreamers, who were coming to America as children, and they were not accountable as unauthorized immigrants. As President Obama signed the law states: "they are Americans in their heart, in their minds, in every single way but one: on paper." Therefore, the undocumented immigrants were not allowed to get driver's licenses or identification cards that prohibited labor mobility. In case that DACA could developed the labor market dreamers, increasing their incomes and decreasing the proportion of unemployment. It would also be useful for the economy, by raising the amount of educated workers (Lim and Altonji 4).

1.5.11. Deferred Action for Parents Program (DAPA)

On November 20, 2014, President Obama signed various administrative actions to restore the immigration system. One important action was the constructing of the Deferred Action for Parents of Americans program (DAPA), after program and building up of the

Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program (DACA), and both of them would give remedy from the exclusion about 4 million undocumented immigrants. For instance, DAPA would be granted only to those who were having a U.S. citizens as child born there before 2014 or the residency, or to those who were living there from previous years without having allowable immigration position (*President Obama's Executive Action on Immigration: Positive Step for Hundreds of Thousands of Farmworkers and their Families*).

DAPA and the DACA programs could give chances to get stability and care from deportation and work permission. This governmental remedy was significant point regarding to obtain a greater system of justice for the citizens, and it would benefited from many farmworkers in order to reform their positions in the United States (*President Obama's Executive Action on Immigration: Positive Step for Hundreds of Thousands of Farmworkers and their Families*).

Conclusion

The arrival of so many immigrants from different countries caused a concern of the Americans about the changes that happened in various aspects, such as economics, politics, and culture. Especially after the US terrorists attacks which derived the government to limit their numbers in entering the United States. In the other hand, the American leaders encouraged them to come to US, because they took benefit from them in their political issues. In this case, the government stayed between guaranteeing security to natives as well as granting the immigrants their rights in living in America. When the numbers of legal and illegal immigrants were increased, Congress and the US government started to make restrictions toward those who were not belonged to the preference system of 1965. Besides, it sought to protect its borders against any terrorist, who were came from different ways, and different places.

Chapter Two

Trump Administration and Immigration Enforcement

Introduction

After making immigration the core of his campaign, the president Donald Trump started establishing special executive orders promising major changes to the United States immigration system. After taking office, he arranged a significant movement in changing and modifying the previous policies, beginning with building the wall across the U.S.-Mexico borders, increasing apprehensions and detentions of unauthorized immigrants, abolishing the Deferred Action for Children Arrivals (DACA) program, condemning illegal immigrant criminals, restricting immigrant visa and preventing nationals of seven Muslim countries to decrease the refugee admissions. The Trump administration has made venomous changes to close the American doors.

2.1. The Trump View of Immigration as Security and Economic Threat

Immigrants were associated with crimes, security threats, and job competition for U.S. workers in Trump's campaign. These views sounded for many as the struggles of the country to retrieve from the Great Recession and with the recent terrorist attacks and abroad fanning fears over border security, refugee acceptance, immigration from Muslim countries, and radicalization of immigrants and their children. Trump aimed to address these issues in his campaign to build a wall along the U.S.-Mexico border, expulsion of millions of unauthorized immigrants, overthrowing Obama executive orders such as the Deferred Action for Children Arrivals (DACA) program, decreasing refugee resettlement, stopping Syrian refugee admissions, and executing "extreme vetting" (Pierce and Capps), especially for immigrants and refugees from countries seen as shelters of terrorists (Pierce and Capps).

In his campaign, Trump promised to construct a wall along nearly 2,000-mile border with Mexico. He aimed to dedicate more resources to border security while one-third of the border was already fenced. In his speech in August 2016, Trump suggested enhancing the

Border Patrol by 5,000 agents- or about 20 percent. His concentration on border security would not demonstrate fundamental policy change because border enforcement resources had risen with bipartisan aid throughout the Clinton, Bush, and Obama administration (Pierce and Capps).

Another focus of Trump was to deport those immigrants with criminal records despite his first intention to make a deportation force that would deport all 11million-unauthorized immigrants. This also shows continuity with Obama administration that has preferred the elimination of noncitizens with criminal condemnations. However, a concentration on rising deportations could face considerable oppositions in terms of the deportation of officers, retention area, and the necessity of immigration capacity court. Increasing objection to expel unauthorized immigrants in many big U.S cities also could restrict the incoming administration's capability to enhance expulsions (Pierce and Capps).

A fundamental change from Obama administration to Trump administration would be in ending the DACA program. Trump has pledged to abolish DACA soon after having the authority despite it is not obvious if he would repeal the two year advantages or permit them to expire. Moreover, he wanted to soften his attitude on DACA, and a bipartisan group of senators has presented a law to expand provisional immigration benefits to DACA beneficiaries (Pierce and Capps).

Another Trump concern is his opposition to refugees particularly those coming from Syria. He frequently expressed interests over government's capability to check rightly refugees and proposed decelerating the resettlement of refugees to protect against any probable terrorist threats (Pierce and Capps). In his campaign, he has pointed to the Syrian refugees by calling them "terrorists" (Amos), and blaming them for violent attacks in America. In addition, during the first years of the Syrian war, Syrian resettlement was highly restricted. "The number of Syrians resettled in the U.S. was 105 in 2014 and rose to 1,682 in

2015.” (Amos). Trump menaced the Syrian refugees to expel them from America “I’m putting the people on notice that are coming here from Syria as a part of a mass migration, that if I win, they are going back.” (qtd. in Amos).

2.2. Trump’s Major Immigration Reforms

U.S. immigration policy has witnessed crucial changes since the investiture of Donald Trump. Shaping a notion of immigration as a major threat to the economic and national security of Americans comes from earlier history. The president Trump has authorized spectacular enforcements to legal immigration, decreasing refugee admissions, adding thousands more Border Patrol agents and building a wall on the border with Mexico. Trump’s administration is also imposing huge execution actions.

2.2.1. Build the Border Wall

Trump pledged the Americans in his campaign proposals. Building a border wall is the most prominent and astonishing suggestion, and the one he insisted in repeatedly. “On Day One, we will begin working on an impenetrable, physical, tall, power, beautiful southern border wall. We will use the best technology, including above and below ground sensors, that’s the tunnels.” (qtd. in Bolter et al). Many analysts predicted that the president would diminish this proposal in case of planning to strengthen the border with Mexico, as illegal immigrants crossing the borders essentially have kept coming. He still shows no intentions to annul his promise to this notion (Bolter. et al 3).

The Department Homeland Security (DHS) launched an overbidding operation for models of the border wall. This process started by reusing available funds, which were allocated for fiscal year (FY) 2017. The Department ultimately gave eight agreements with associations to construct a prototype close to San Diego. These prototypes were terminated in October 2017. In addition, this department has dedicated a powerful condition for

supplemental funding to begin construct the wall in FY 2018, suggesting an appropriation of 18 \$ billion over 10 years to build 316 miles new enclosure and to reform or support further 407 miles. This investment would help to cover around half the almost 2,000-mile border between the two countries (Bolter, et al 3).

In his campaign speeches, Trump declared that Mexico would pay for the building of the border wall. That notion seems unrealistic for most observers and this never will happen. This statement actually would deteriorate the American-Mexican relations and influenced substantially Mexican public opinion about the United States. Yet Trump administration probably may appeal one day other changes in the relationship between the two countries as indemnification for the wall, as an example, a shift in equilibrium of trade in favor of the United States (Bolter, et al 4).

The flows of immigrants had significantly decreased at the border due to the little real progress on the border fencing. From January to August 2017, comparing to the same period in 2016, arrests of unauthorized immigrants at the U.S. border with Mexico reduced about half. The massive decrease in decades was a consequence of the long downfall in apprehensions at the border, which had already started. With unreal extra border enforcement efforts to demonstrate such a spectacular yearly change, this fallen points to a change in how unauthorized immigrants grasped enforcement efforts under Trump authority (Bolter, et al 4).

2.2.2. End Catch-and-Release

Stopping Catch-and-release is a fundamental suggestion that Trump promised to realize after winning. His priority was to end practices that sound to promote illegal incoming to the country. His administration concentrated in Catch-and-Release, an unclear term used by the president to present series of the U.S. government policies and practices permit unaccompanied minors, some families, and some asylum seekers to be released into the

community during their asylum or eliminating procedures. In January 2017, Trump set the border security executive instruction that ordered the DHS to stop this practice. Furthermore, an essential interest of the Trump administration seemed to be unaccompanied child migrants because federal law and legal precedent actually demanded officials to allow children to go to a parent or a guardian during the operation. This action seemed for the administration as encouragement for them to try to pass the border without authorization (Bolter, et al4).

Two policies have been executed by the Justice Department administratively as a response to this instruction. Attorney General Jeff Sessions made an agenda in April 2017 directing federal prosecutors to give priority to prosecution of criminal immigration violations, illegal entry, illegal reentry, and smuggling as an example. In addition, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) started seizing sponsors of unaccompanied children whom they gave money to help them to go to the United States or to make them come back for prosecution for one of these crimes. The administration hoped that a little number of children would be released from federal imprisonment. Furthermore, the government refuge for immigrant children, by the end of 2017, were almost amplitude though the reduction in apprehensions of unaccompanied minors at the U.S.-Mexico borders parallel to last year (Bolter, et al 5).

The Attorney General ordered federal prosecutors, in May 2017, to follow “the most serious, readily provable offense” (Bolter, et al 5) in all situations where diversity of charges might be practical, including those related to immigration, with the purpose of applying the legislation to its ultimate extent. This signifies that instead of bringing out somebody apprehended coming across the border back to Mexico, ICE might return them for federal prosecution for illegal entrance. Reports presented that parents who came across the border with their children illegally were adjudicated for unauthorized entrance. This change split up families whereas ICE might seize them together or liberate them until their procedures. Moreover, children were sent to the shelter of the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) when parents were

imprisoned for federal prosecution. They might be liberated for relatives or friend, to nurture care, or might stay in ORR shelter if there was no other options. Thus, The Justice Department has the ability to influence catch-and-release exercises only by regulating its internal policies (Bolter, et al 5).

Besides, the administration had demanded following two legal shifts that would remain unaccompanied children and youth in shelters as well as expedite their ejection to their original country. The first shift was an adjustment to the sections of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008, which recently permitted DHS to get back readily minors from neighboring countries, Canada and Mexico, however, needed to make all other minors detainee, the removal operation of them seemed to be long, it could be months or years. In addition to that, all unaccompanied children would actually treat the same as children from Mexico and Canada under the administrative amendment. This law was basically formulated to forbade human smuggling by guaranteeing that children migrants had access to more strong operation before they were a matter to expulsion. The administration thought that this provision had promoted some minors to attempt to get in the country illegally particularly those from Central America, as they would not be enforced to a rapid elimination (Bolter, et al 5).

Ending 1997 Flores settlement agreement is the second legal shift designed by the administration. This convention needed the government to keep minors in the least of restrictive setting. The next procedure had decided that Flores enforced both unaccompanied children and minors to travel with their parents. DHS suggested an act to “codify the substantive terms” of the settlement with the purpose of ejecting interpretations of the agreement that were not set clearly in the text of the settlement and to permit for increased apprehension of family units (Bolter, et al 6).

The number of migrants crossing the border was indefinite despite these efforts. Border expulsions declined precipitously from January to April 2017, but had been growing since May, especially among unaccompanied children and families. In the last months of 2017, expulsions of families crossing the border illegally grew from 1,000 in April to 8,000 in December, and expulsions of unaccompanied children migrants grew 1,000 in April to 4,000 in December (Bolter, et al 6).

2.2.3. Curbs on Legal Immigration

Trump declared in his campaign in August 2016 that he would decrease legal immigration to historical norms. This suggestion had distinctively the touch of Sessions, the Alabama senator who was an advisor of Trump's campaign. However, Trump had not defined historical norms. If approvals of legal constant residents were higher comparing to recordkeeping that began in 1820, there would be nearly 400,000 per year. Recently, the United States received more than 1 million legal immigrants each year. This analysis would make major breaks in legal immigration influx. Making an engagement with constant GOP lawmakers who historically preferred high average of immigrants particularly for business linked immigration would need congressional acceptance. In addition, Trump had also agreed on the notion that yearly scales of immigration be set on recurrent basis by an authorization, based on U.S. economic practice and the requirement of the U.S. job market. (Chishti, et al 3).

To accomplish Trump's campaign pledges, the administration had proposed the security examining individuals wanted to enter the United States. Trump pledged to "enhance vetting" (Selee and Pierce 5) that would concentrate on banning the entrance of foreign nationals supposed to be menaces to public safety and confirming the set of information necessary to value applicant's acceptance. Furthermore, the president postponed the Visa Interview Waiver Program that permits certain travelers to renovate their travels authorization without in-person

interview with a consular official. All applicants for employment-based constant residency, applicants for green cards, have to submit to an in-person interview. In earlier times, face-to-face interviews were needed only if there was precise interest linked to the person's application (Selee and pierce 5).

Rising the amount of information of applicants for approval is also another strategy the government relied on to extend vetting. Some applicants have to fill an additional questionnaire, giving 15 years travel and employment histories and residential addresses. Applicants are claimed to provide their usernames in all social media accounts utilized in the last five years. Moreover, an employment-based immigration has influenced by the fewer changes made by the administration. These changes include trying to end an Obama-era program to permit international entrepreneurs parole onto the country, abolishing a policy under which immigration officers afforded consideration to previous admissions, extensions and renewal had much more precise examination. Other changes including the delay of exceptional processing for H-1B applications tentatively and termination of Obama-era program gave authorization to spouses of H-1B visa holders, who had been working on H-1B visa for more than six months and were in the operation of applying persistent residency but were suspended by backlogs (Selee and Pierce 5).

2.2.4. Ending the DACA, DAPA and Temporary Protected Status

The Trump administration has restricted the long advantages favored to unauthorized immigrants. These involves suspending the DACA program formed by president Obama in 2012 and decreasing Temporary Protected Status (TPS) specifications of certain countries as well as the Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents (DAPA). These programs indicate authorization and protection from removals approximately 690,000 unauthorized immigrants who were come to the United States as children and find particular program criteria. At least ten countries committed to terminate the program if

nothing was done under the pressure of Trump and officials. The administration declared the abolition of the DACA program on September 2017. In the same period, the government prevented giving DACA advantages to the new applicants and renewals to individuals whose DACA benefits would end after March 5, 2018. The government prevented granting all renewals regardless of expiration date (Bolter, et al 14-15).

The matter of termination of the Obama programs would result loss of benefits of immigrants. In the beginning of March 6, 2018, an average of 915 immigrants would forfeit their benefits each year. On the contrary, a federal district court judges in San Francisco issued a worldwide injunction demanding the government to continue granting DACA renewals. The Department of justice had ordered this decision, and on January U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) started confirming applications for the DACA renewals (Bolter, et al 15).

Congress has recently discussed a law to supply certain sorts of legal situations to recent DACA beneficiaries and other unauthorized immigrants who classified with people who enter the country as minors, DREAMers. Trump had backed congress members to accomplish a convention and presented his want to sign the law if confirmed, nevertheless, he has conflicted impressions of what else must be involved in the receipt to gain collaboration, namely funding for the border wall or the removal of the Diversity Visa Lottery (Bolter, et al 15).

Besides the elimination of the DACA program, the administration as well terminated two other Obama-era deportation- relief programs. DHS Secretary John F. Killy officially repealed the Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents (DAPA) program and an extension of already DAPA program. These programs would have supplied protection from expulsion; however, never had effects due to a court injunction (Bolter, et al 15).

Trump administration has also prevented temporary status. Approximately 327,000 recipients were deprived from temporary protection. TPS is the provisional form humanitarian care given to nationals of certain countries who are present in the United States incapable to back to their countries because of violent conflict or natural disasters. It recently included over 436,000 immigrant from ten countries. Furthermore, the Trump administration had justified its elimination of TPS designations for certain countries to come up for renewal. The administration had stopped the TPS advantages for El Salvador (which alone has 263,000 beneficiaries), Haiti (with 58,557 beneficiaries), Nicaragua (5,306), and Sudan (1,048), and indicated that they might also terminate TPS for Honduras with (86,031 beneficiaries). For those people disqualified for another situation, this would cause a loss of work authorization and protection form elimination from the United States (Bolter, et al 16).

2.2.5. Zero-Tolerance for Unauthorized Immigrant

Attorney General Jeff Sessions declared that the Department of Justice would sue everyone without exception U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) coming across the border illegally. Adults arrested in the borders would be sent to prison of the United States Marshal Services (USMS) under this zero-tolerance policy, attempting criminal court for the offence of illegal entrance and the offence of re-entrance, sent to federal custody to serve their sentence, and then handed back to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) to be eliminated from the country (Chishti and Bolter).

In April 2017, Sessions released an agenda ordering federal prosecutors to prefer immigration crimes. There were almost 360,000 new immigration prosecutions, proposing that the year-end total could reach about 72,000 in the first six months 2018, compared to 60,000 in FY 2016, according to the Transactional Records Access Clearinghouse (TRAC) at Syracuse University. The rate could increase if the administration applied its zero-tolerance policy (Chishti and Bolter).

Since immigrant children arrested at the border cannot be legally caught in federal apprehension facilities, they will unavoidably be separated from their parents when the adults are criminally sued. Children will be gotten back to the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR), the agency within the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) that treats unaccompanied children. ORR will free them to an adult custodian in the United States (a relative or family friend) if one is obtainable, and if not, to a adopt family; otherwise, the children will be caught in an ORR refuge (Chishti and Bolter).

After winning the election, there have been some changes in how families detained at the border are patronized. Before proposing the zero-tolerance policy, CBP had begun to rise referrals for criminal proceedings of illegal entrance, including of parents. ICE and CBP had also kept a policy of breaking up parents from children in some situations to inquire the legality of the parental relationship, which might be substantial to save minors from selling (Chishti and Bolter).

To protect unauthorized minors, Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act (TVPRA) specialized care to unaccompanied minors who were nationals of non-neighboring countries (including those in Central America). Such minors have to be taken in the protection of ORR and were imposed in long-term removal prosecutions. In addition, those asking for asylum were offered two opportunities to apply, first through U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) in a non-adversarial operation, and if refused, via the immigration courts (Chishti and Bolter).

2.2.6. Ending Refugee Resettlement

Trump started to pass executive actions against refugees after taking office. The proposal of Muslim ban transferred to travel ban on visitors, immigrants and refugees from seven countries, most of them were Muslim countries. On January 2017, the president signed

executive order 13769, Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States, which used directly and contained suspending the entrance for nearly all nationals of Iran, Iraq, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen. The instruction made mess at airports and set manifestations across the country (Bolter, et al 19).

The order challenged obstacles legally after small period of signing it. The court depended on multiple justifications, containing presenting that the order infringed the U.S. Constitution's prevention on the government setting or preferring specific religion. Further, as the case reached the court system, Trump legislated Executive Order 13780, having similar title, on March 6. This order substituted the previous travel ban. The new order ejected Iraq from the list of countries, set a postponed application date, and excepted individuals who were already authorized to travel to the United States (Bolter, et al 20).

Months later, Trump administration attempted for the third time to order Presidential Proclamation 9645 on September 24, 2017. Enhancing Vetting Capabilities and Processes for Detecting Attempted Entry into the United States by Terrorists or Other Public-Safety Threats. This ban restricted to prevent the entrance of groups from Chad, Iran, Libya, North Korea, Somalia, Venezuela and Yemen. Indeed, courts signaled national prosecutions delaying the ban for nationals of all mentioned countries except North Korea and Venezuela. The Supreme Court permitted the travel ban to be completely applicable when the situation kept shifting to legitimate system (Bolter, et al 20).

The administration has risen curbs for refugee applicants from 11 countries considered high risk, radically decreasing refugee approvals from those countries. It tried unlimitedly preventing admissions by family members of refugees formerly within the United States, because of this case to be a matter of a national precursory issue by a federal district court judge in December 2017, which imposed the administration to begin prosecuting family applications (Bolter, et al 20).

On the other hand, Trump motivated countries to be helpful in curbing refugees. In September 24, the president presented that the DHS set universal needs for information sharing to enhance curbing and that the State Department worked with 47 countries that were unappropriated or at danger of not succeeding to respond to these needs. While many countries presented the problems needed of them, eight countries stayed incomplete with regard to their identity-management and information sharing abilities, protocols, and applications, thus they were an issue to the latest travel ban (Bolter, et al 21).

“As soon as I enter the office I am going to ask the Department of State...Homeland Security and the Department of justice to begin a comprehensive review of these cases in order to develop a list of regions and countries from which immigration must be suspended until proven and effective vetting mechanisms can be put in place” (qtd.in Bolter, et al 21).

2.2.7. Pursuit Illegal Immigration Criminals

“What were are going to do is get the people that are criminals and having criminal records, gang members, drug dealers, we have a lot of these people, probably two million, it could be even three million, we are getting them out of our country or we are going to incarcerate. But we’re getting them out of our country, they’re here illegally” (qtd.in Mittelstadt and Chishti).

Donald Trump promised to concentrate greatly in elimination of unauthorized immigrants with criminal records. In recent years, the immigration enforcement system had been calibrate again to put focus on this category. Committed criminals demonstrated just 31 percent for all expulsions implemented by the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement in FY 2008. The share had increased and deemed 59 percent expulsions in FY 2015, the most recent year for which ICE had derived eliminations data (Mittelstadt and Chishti).

In the former laws set by Congress in the mid-1990's, condemnations for many kinds of crimes caused deportation of noncitizens and even lawful provisional residents. After the 9/11 period, federal government passed 287(g) law, immigration law of 1996, to delegate ready state and local authorities to implement parts of federal immigration law. Thus, when the DHS released Secured Communities, a federal-state-information-sharing program, 287 (g) was broadly replaced by it. Namely, Secure Communities utilized fingerprint information to test immigration situations of all detainees to local law enforcement agencies to apprehend individuals for ICE to pull into prison (Mittelstadt and Chishti).

In July 2015, Obama administration superseded Secure Communities with the Priority Enforcement Program (PEP), aimed to be designed to the priorities of local jurisdictions. PEP restricts ICE issuance of arrestees to local law enforcement agencies only for noncitizens who had been condensate of a crime or deem a public-safety risk, consistent with the priorities of the local jurisdiction. Besides, municipalities that encouraged Secure Communities have been known as to as "sanctuary cities" (Mittelstadt and Chishti). They had come under developing scrutiny in Congress, especially after an unauthorized immigrant who was not transferred to ICE for expulsion after finishing a prison sentence in San Francisco regardless of having been expelled on five former occasions shot and killed a young woman. Consequently, lawmakers had presented many bills in Congress that would authorize communities rejecting to collaborate with ICE, in certain situations by removing them from federal funding (Mittelstadt and Chishti).

The Trump administration promised to restore retrieve Secure Communities, which permitted ICE to order all local law enforcement agencies to arrest for expulsion any noncitizens who were removed, whether condensate or not. For this purpose, DHS was funded to indicate, arrest, and expel about 400,000 unauthorized immigrants annually. The existing administration broadly met that number in FY 2009-12 before designing its

adjudicative discretion principles to concentrate entirely on criminals and other public-safety threats, new border crossers, and people with held expulsion orders (Mittelstadt and Chishti).

Accordingly, those removed immigrants would be qualified for an immigration court session. Although the immigration court system, an administrative system within the U.S. Department of Justice, had formerly an excessive burden. The immigration courts challenged an accumulation of more than 520,000 cases, with an average wait nationally of 675 days for a removal hearing. In addition, if Congress supplied extra requisition for removals, DHS would still have to put enforcement options in a world of restricted resources (Mittelstadt and Chishti).

2.2.8. Immigrants and Nonimmigrant Visa

Trump had spread his authority to limit and reduce the number of foreign comers who had permanent and temporary residence in the United Sates. His administration might have the ability to decrease the number of foreign nationals ultimately authorized to immigrate. In October 1, 2017, The USCIS gave procuration, Mandatory Interviews for Employment-Based Visa Applicants, to all applicants for employment-based permanent residency to make individual interviews. Face-to-face interviews were formerly needed when there was a particular matter related to the foreign national's application. The need of interview was also expanded to relatives of refugees and asylees who were requested to associate in the principal asylee or refugee in the United States (Pierce 32).

USCIS made a new agenda, Decreased Interview Waivers for Certain Green Card Applicants, in November 30, 2018, to restrict demands that applicants wanted to abolish conditions on permanent residence and ask for waivers. Lawful permanent resident status on a conditional basis was given to foreign nationals applying for permanent resident through a qualifying marriage that was less than two years old at the time of application. Conditional

permanent residents had to ask the USCIS to remove condition on their status to avert having their status finished after two years. Thus, applicants had to attend to the interview. This new agenda limited the demands that the USCIS officers might take into consideration such a waiver (Pierce 32).

Increased Scrutiny for Marriage Petitions Involving Minors was a new memo that the USCIS established in February 19, 2019, ordering adjudicators to consider marriage petition involving minors. The adjudicators had to grant that the marriage was lawful and legal in the U.S. case where the applicants would reside. Moreover, USCIS ordered officers to make an extra interview for some spousal petition involving a minor. Applicants consequently had to appear in the interview twice before being accepted (Pierce 33).

The administration had started an acquiescence review program for regional centers and termination of regional centers on an accelerated basis, Increased Scrutiny for EB-5 Regional Centers. Regional centers permitted EB-5 investors to have permanent residence and to collect their resources into a big project arranged by the center. Major EB-5 immigrant visa recipients used regional centers. In December 31, 2018, 218 regional centers was terminated by the Trump administration. In comparison with Obama administration, it terminated 73 regional centers (Pierce 33).

Trump administration focus on nonimmigrants visa program, permitting foreign nationals to reside in the United States for certain purposes temporarily, aimed to save the interests of the United States workers. This program focused on Trump executive order of April 2017, “Buy American and Hire American”(Pierce 33), which supported agencies to “rigorously enforce” and administer U.S. immigration law to create higher wages and employment rates for U.S. workers. For instance, “The USCIS and labor Department have increased the scrutiny with which new nonimmigrants applications are processed and

intensified efforts to ensure that nonimmigrants already inside the United States are adhering to the term of their visa status” (qtd.in pierce 33)

USCIS had focused on rising the number of H-1B visas applicants with advanced degrees. It has modified how the annual lottery that chooses H-1B visa works. Beginning in April 2019, USCIS managed a lottery for the 65,000 general slots, indicating all H-1B visa recipients with advanced degrees. Then, it managed a lottery for 25,000 supplemental master’s cap slots, including the other recipients with advanced degree. The shift made results in 11 percent rise in the number of chosen requests for recipients a master’s or higher degree (pierce 36).

Congress authorized the Department Homeland Security to determine whether to rise the annual H-2B visa for temporary non-agricultural workers. DHS enhanced the cap by 15,000 visas for both Fiscal Years 2017 and 2018. Because of the pressure of the Congress, DHS mentioned it would rise the cap by 30,000 visas in the FY 2019, but the visa was restricted only for those who benefited previously H-2 visas. The DHS wanted to have more extra visas because without foreign workers, businesses would suffer from financial damages (pierce 34).

2.2.9. Expansion of E-Verify Program

The administration of Trump puts focus on E-Verify program to make significant reforms in immigration based on employment. The term E-Verify refers to “internet-based system that allow an employer to verify an employee’s work-authorization status.” (qtd.in Chepp). This program was created in November 1997, it is one of the three employment verification test programs, which originated by the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA). Congress pointed to “ensure reliability in employment

authorization verification, combat counterfeiting of identity documents, and protect employee privacy.” (qtd.in Chepp).

The current legislative and executive orders have established to adjust the E-Verify program. The Congress presented the E-Verify System Act of 2018 that suggested adjusting the IIRIRA to authorize the use of E-Verify nationally. Both the Legal Workforce Act and the Securing America’s Future Act of 2018 addressed the DHS to make a mandatory employment eligibility verification system designed on the recent E-Verify program. Trump has also launched a plan to extend E-Verify program, requiring 23 million dollars in his Fiscal Year 2019 (Chepp). “We will ensure that E-Verify is used to the fullest extent possible under existing law, and we will work with Congress to strengthen and expand its use across the country. (qtd.in Pierce, et al 24)

Trump Organization has declared that it does not let employers to live in the U.S. without legal authorization. The president Trump has frequently considered millions of illegal immigrants in the country as a disaster on the economic standards, stealing jobs from American citizens. He has also deemed them as criminals and druggers (Condon).

2.3. The Effects of Expectancy and Fears

There is a powerful proof that the spread of tough declaration about immigration and policy changes have had severe impacts on individuals’ behaviors both in and out of the United States. Since immigrant communities attempted to remain “under the radar” (Pierce, et al 10), there have been data of crimes reported; beginning with local violence, a small number of applications common advantages to which immigrant or their U.S. born children have nickname; increasing no-shows at health care appointments. These counting propose an important shift in the manner of rating 11 million unauthorized immigrants in the United

States live their lives since certain behavioral shifts are harsh to authenticate systematically (Pierce, et al 10).

The period after the president Trump took office and the end of the agenda of 2017, more than 20,000 asylum seekers were arrested between ports of entry at the U.S. - Canada border, more than eight times the number apprehended in 2016. By the year 2018, these numbers still increased, more than 10,000 asylum seekers had been held ports of entry, a rise of 140 percent compared to the similar time in 2017 (Pierce, et al 11).

Trump administration declaration and policies deemed to be among the circumstances that curbed decrease the influx of unauthorized immigrants from Mexico to the United States. Detentions of unauthorized immigrants at the U.S.-Mexico border declined by more than one-quarter compared to the previous year, the minimal amount registered from 1971. In fact, without true extra enforcement efforts at the border to demonstrate such spectacular yearly change, this indicates to a shift in comprehensions about enforcement possible unauthorized border crossers. Further, frequent detentions have risen lightly, pointing that tough declaration alone may not influence probable migrants' decisions about wither to try to come across the border in a long time (Pierce, et al 11).

larger severe impact on immigration and terrorism to the United States. International arrivals to the United States fell 2.3 million in the first three quarters of 2017 compared to the same period. Equally important, the incorporation of higher education associations detected that about 40 percent of colleges and universities that answered to 2017 research declared a decline in international applicants, and that the broadest reduction derived from students in the Middle East. In addition, New H-1B enforcements have also dropped for the first time since the 2008-09 regression: 199,000 implementations were presented for the FY 2018 cap, a reduction of 15 percent from the last year, and 190,000 were presented for the FY 2019 cap (Pierce, et al 11).

2.4. Congressional Reaction to Trump Immigration Reforms

immigration laws though the Republican Party is stated in the White House and in the control of the legislative branch. In his campaign, Donald Trump has presented certain immigration policy goals that would need legislation, including condensing immigration enforcement and reducing levels of legal immigration in the country. Moreover, number of themes included in the president's immigration related executive orders needed the agreement of the Congress to enact. In April 2017, "Buy American and Hire American" (Pierce, et al 13) executive order, as an example, when Trump asked the federal agencies to propose reforms to the operation of issuing H-1B visas that would assure they are "awarded to the most-skilled or the highest-paid petition beneficiaries" (Pierce, et al 13). Such reform would demand an act of Congress (Pierce, et al 13).

Many Trump proposals require authenticating of the Congress. The renting of 15,000 extra border and interior enforcement officers, the extension of an electronic system help employers to verify the work eligibility of employees (E-verify), and the building of the border wall, these were some mandated changes needed funds that would claim to be enacted by Congress. Consequently, the compromise needed in the bipartisan requisition process had signified that these funds had not been confirmed (Pierce, et al 13).

Furthermore, the DACA program would be delayed slowly after the administration announcement. Congress with both houses differently deemed and did not succeed to enact the bill to make a legislative fix. The president backed a bill by Senator Chuck Grassley in negotiations of the Senate, which would have separate different family-based immigration categories. After receiving the minimum number of votes of the three DACA bills, DACA fell the vote in the Senate. In June 2018, the president encouraged both bills when the House considered the issue, an inflexible immigration bill presented by Committee Chairman Bob

Goodlatte and a compromised promise presented by Republican Leadership. Both did not succeed in the requisite votes (Pierce, et al 13).

2.5. The Courts Role

Several White House's immigration changes had been prevented of being executed by the judicial system. This was particularly real in respect with the efforts to instruct a ban of admission for nationals of various Muslim- majority countries, which the administration had attempted to implement three times. On one hand, Trump frequently repeated his pledges a ban on Muslim individuals coming in the country, as a way of increasing national security. When he started to issue executive orders, the pledged Muslim ban had turned to a travel ban on visitors, refugees from seven countries, all Muslim-majority (Selee and pierce 8).

On the other hand, Trump first two tries immediately engaged in the judicial system. Executive Order 13769, Protecting the Nation from Foreign Entry into the United States, legislated January 27, was contained prevention of admissions of almost all the nationals. The order challenged legal issues, several of which led to federal court orders that frequently curbed or banned key sections. Since the case reached the court system, the president signed the Executive Order 13780, on March 6. In addition, replacing the former travel ban, the new order excluded Iraq from the list of countries, postponed the application date, and executed individuals who already permitted to travel to the country. Although these efforts to neglect the legal pitfalls of its predecessor, it was an issue of controlling order of blocking application of travel ban (Selee and pierce 8).

Accordingly, in both situations, the court depended on several legal justifications. Contained discovering that the order infringed the Constitution's prevention on the government setting or preferring a significant religion. The Supreme Court ultimately released

for fractional application of the travel ban, except as it implemented to visas applicants with “bona fide” relationships to the United States people or structures (Selee and pierce 8).

The administration attempted three times to issue Presidential Proclamation 9645, “Enhancing Vetting Capabilities and Processes for Detecting Attempt Entry into the United States by Terrorists or other Public-Safety Threats”(Selee and Pierce 8), on September 24. This ban was restricted to modify visa limitations on individuals. Indeed, courts issued national injunctions, dropping out all mentioned countries, unless North Korea and Venezuela. The Supreme Court authorized the travel ban to be completely applied after the Department of Justice appeal (Selee and pierce 8).

2.2.6. Trump Administration Enforcement and the Precedent Enforcements

Trump’s declarations revealed that his enforcement would be sever and intolerant unlike the previous presidents’ enforcements. On January 20, 2017, and after his investiture, Trumps’ promises were executed except some of them due to obstacles from Congress or the Supreme Court. To compare his administration policies with the precedent once, there are several areas to point them out. Starting with the Muslim Ban, the president Trump explained that his executive order of preventing seven Muslim countries by creating a policy originated from the previous president Barak Obama in 2011. He announced, “My policy is similar to what Obama did in 2011 when he banned visa for refugees from Iraq for six months.” (qtd.in Arafa 13-14). The statement declared, “The seven countries named in the executive order are the same countries previously identified by the Obama’s administration as sources of terror.” (qtd.in Arafa 14). According to advocates, legal experts and Obama administration officers, the 2011 immigration boundaries was significantly distinct in intention and logistics. In this respect, Trump’s prevention was broader than the former administrations and did not specify a particular threat. Thus, the 2011 policy directed a limited group of people such as refugees and particular immigrant visa recipients from Iraq unlike Trump’s prevention, which

addressed a massive group and eliminated millions of individuals from seven countries, nearly every kind of available visa (Arafa 15).

Accordingly, the argument of Trump's order can be demonstrated as to "protect the United States from foreign nationals entering from countries compromised by terrorism." (qtd.in Arafa 15), and to enforce a "more rigorous vetting process." (Arafa 15). Therefore, Trump's order deems proactive, expecting a possible attack, whereas Obama's 2011 policy was reactive, reacting to significant menace (Arafa 15).

The Obama and Trump DHS Secretaries focused on enforcement agendas to rise executive orders against criminal immigrants. In Obama's agenda of 2014, his DHS Secretary Jeh Johnson recorded condemnations for gang-related activities, crimes under state or federal laws, crimes under the INA, and condemnation of more than two felonies as enforcement priorities. However, the Trump enforcement executive order involved more than those condemned of felonies. It contained any undocumented immigrant who was just accused with any criminal misdemeanor; this indicates that anyone who infringes any sort of law (Bill 271).

Immigrant's deportation has been a significant issue of immigration enforcement for decades. Trump administration's deportation was insisted in expelling millions of undocumented foreign nationals. In the first week of February 2017, hundreds of immigrants were arrested, "marked the first large-scale raid under the Trump administration—and a crackdown was, by all indications, just the start of much more to come." (qtd.in Bill 273). Similarly, the president George W. Bush arranged offensive, gun-wielding immigration attacks that made numerous apprehensions. For instance, Postville attack in 2008 "included helicopters circling above and resulted in the arrest of 389 immigrants, many of whom were "held at a cattle exhibit hall."(qtd.in Bill 275). In the same way, Mitchell Palmer reacted to the strike of millions of workers in 1919, by making an exceptional DOJ split dedicated to presenting aliens and communists and warning to gather radicals. He started with eighteen

aggressive attacks on November 7, 1919, with many of detainees being transmitted to the Ellis Island immigration center. These raids resulted 3,000 detainees. The arrests contained strict questioning. Ellis Island officials expelled 249 individuals (Bill 275).

Trump's deportation of Mexican immigrants is comparable to Operation Wetback. In 1954, the president Dwight D. Eisenhower released immigration policy targeting Mexican immigrants; rated 1.1 million undocumented immigrants were expelled. The removals were immediately linked to the creation of Bracero Program. To make this program workable, undocumented farmer workers had to be deported. Trump mentioned in his campaign building a great wall along the U.S.-Mexican borders To end the flow of Mexicans. This notion was already existing from the presidential period of Bush. On October 26, 2006, the president George W. Bush enacted the Secure Fence Act. He said, "This bill will help protect the American people. This bill will make our borders more secure. It is an important step toward immigration reform." (qtd.in Bill 278). Likewise, the president Clinton set Operation Gatekeeper in 1994. This policy aimed to end the influx of illegal immigrants across the southern border. The policy of "control through deterrence" (Bill 278) was executed by constructing firstly an enclosure along the fourteen-mile range from the Pacific Ocean eastward. The three policies from the last three decades were established to prevent the Mexican immigrants to enter the U.S. territory (Bill 277-279).

The expansion of the interior enforcement 287 (g) agreement by Trump administration can take a backseat to the Obama presidential era. The DHS secretary of the president Obama decreased the number of 287 (g) agreement to thirty-two, the whole number of the 287 (g) agreements surpassed seventy in Obama and Bush regimes. The Trump Administration raised the number of agreements to sixty by July 31, 2017, containing eighteen new agreements in Texas alone (Bill 281).

Conclusion

In modern history of the United States, no administration has put its focus on immigration policies and made it its higher priority as Trump has done. The exclusive goals of the president Trump on restricting the flow of immigration are based on deporting all immigrants from the country and preventing those who want to enter it. Trump sever restrictions would decrease the number of immigrants if he insisted in continuing his tough changes.

General Conclusion

The most crucial and endless matter of the United States has been restricting the flow of immigrants and even curbing it. For decades, United States presidents have urged significant restrictions, but these restrictions have not reached the wanted target yet. Thus, the requirement of renewing the laws was ultimately necessary for exceptional situations despite the U.S. benefits from immigrants. This study seeks to examine whether the president Donald Trump has followed the previous presidents' immigration policies or has enhanced new distinct policy. Through the findings of this analysis, this thesis attempts to draw some conclusions about the reasons behind increasing the restrictions against the immigrants from former presidents to Trump presidency. It also attempts to portray major changes of Trump on immigration policy.

Generally, the study reveals that, since the arrival of huge number of immigrants to the United States has started to have significant effects on political, social and economic fields, Trump and the former administrations have considered them as security and economic threat. The fact that post 9/11 attacks have increased fears of Americans from other terrorist attacks and fears from criminal immigrants, as well as their effects on job competitions for U.S. workers and the Great Recession. These issues have pushed Trump to make his campaign based on immigration reforms, believing in making "America great again".

The findings suggest that Trump has most likely established a different immigration policy. After his inauguration as president, as presented in chapter two, Trump started to build a great wall along the U.S.-Mexican border to curb totally unauthorized Mexican immigrants to enter the country. After fencing most of the border despite the little budget, the rates of immigration have decreased comparing to the years 2016 and 2017. Apprehensions of illegal Mexican immigrants decreased about half. This indicates that Trump has a considerable effect on border security than the precedent policies.

Zero-Tolerance policy is a significant restriction that Trump set to prosecute everyone coming across the border illegally without exception. Although this policy is venomous and can separate families and harm minors, the effectiveness of it can be demonstrated in the increase of the prosecution of illegal immigrants in the FY of 2016. If this policy continued to be applied to satisfy Trump's tendency of winning and making his policy fruitful, the crises would be aggravated and resulted losses within families.

Trump administration has professed racist attitudes toward programs formed by Obama administration, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), the Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Temporary Protected Status (TPS). These programs reveal the authorization and protection of immigrants from removals. Despite the obstacles that Trump faced to eliminate these policies, he has succeeded to make pressure on the Department of Justice and Congress, as well as obliged the disqualified countries to stop sending their nationals. This prevention results massive damages on immigrants.

Trump has insisted repeatedly on banning Muslims. The problem of Trump is not with countries, but with the religion itself, he has dedicated his efforts to infringe the image of Muslims. In this regard, Muslim ban has expanded to cover seven major Muslim countries; this can be justified by Trump as strengthening national security and saving America from terror. Indeed, Trump's opinions seems obnoxious and hateful to logic and human experience.

A legal immigrant has not be neglected by Trump administrative actions. His goal is to decrease extremely immigrants even if they have lawful residence. This indicates that Trump wants to make America just for Americans. He has attempted to enact many laws to create barriers that make immigrants will not demand applications. This policy seems unfair and severe as Trump has discriminated foreign nationals.

This work can be considered as a background for further studies and investigations of American immigration policy. It provides useful insights into the immigration restrictions toward the new immigrants. Thus, this study serves as basis upon which the coming students enlarge their studies in this specific field of research. For the coming researches, it will be a good suggestion if the students look deeper into restrictions on Muslim immigration through different presidential eras.

Works Cited

Abramitzky, Ran, and Leah Boustan. "Immigration in American Economic History." *Journal of Economic Literature*, vol. 55, no. 4, 2017, pp. 1311-45.

Aguilar, Mabel. "The Discriminatory Impact of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986." *Chicana/o Latina/o Law Review*, vol. 10, no. 14, 1990, pp. 14-32.

Alam, Mohammed Badrul. "Immigration Act of 1965." *History Hub*, ABC-CLIO, 2019, historyhub.abc-clio.com/Search/Display/2146406. Accessed 22 May 2019.

Amos, Deborah. "For Refugee And Advocates, An Anxious Wait For Clarity On Trump's Policy", *NPR*, 15 Nov. 2016, www.apnews.com/ba3ab0ebfb3e42ae99354702add557. Accessed 7 September 2019.

Arafa, Mohamed. "A question to the President of the United States, Donald Trump: is it a travel ban, or a Muslim ban, or a travel Muslim ban?" . Indiana University School of Law (United States of America), 25 April 2018.

Barrientes, Brenda. "1921 Emergency Quota Law". *Campus Library*. Hein Online, nd. library.uwb.edu/Static/USimmigration/1921_emergency_quota_law.html

Bell, Keith J. "Immigration Act of 1990." *Immigration to the United States*. immigrationtounitedstates.org, n.d. immigrationtounitedstates.org/592-immigration-act-of-1990.html.

Bill O, Hing . "Entering the Trump Ice Age: Contextualizing the New Immigration Enforcement Regime". *Texas A&M Law Review*, vol 5, no 2, 2018, pp. 253 .

Billy, Cynthia A. "Indochina Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1975". *Immigration to the United States* . immigrationtounitedstates.org, n.d.

[www://immigrationtounitedstates.org/607-indochina-migration-and-refugee-assistance-act-of-1975.html](http://www.immigrationtounitedstates.org/607-indochina-migration-and-refugee-assistance-act-of-1975.html).

Bolter, Jessica, et al. "Trump's First Year On Immigration Policy: Rhetoric vs. Reality".

Migration Policy Institute. January 2018.

Brackemyre, Ted. "Immigrants, Cities, and Disease." *U.S. History Scene*. Np, nd.

ushistoryscene.com/article/immigrants-cities-disease/

Cadge, Wendy, and Elaine Howard Ecklund. "Immigration and Religion". *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 33, 2007, pp. 359-379.

Chan, Rosalie. "The Chinese Exclusion Act, Explained." *TeenVogue*. Condé Nast, 15 May .

2018. www.teenvogue.com/story/the-chinese-exclusion-act-explained. Accessed 21 April. 2019.

Chen, Joyce. *The Impact of Skill-Based Immigration Restrictions: The Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882*. The Ohio State University, 2012.

Chepp, Dillon. "E-Verify: A Sensible First Step Toward Immigration Reform". *The AU*

Legislation and Policy Brief. 1 February 2019, www.legislationandpolicy.com/3984/e-verify-a-practical-first-step-toward-immigration-reform/. Accessed 10 September 2019.

Chishti, Muzaffar, and Jessica Bolter. "Family Separation and "Zero-Tolerance" Policies

Family Separation and "Zero-Tolerance" Policies Rolled Out to Stem Unwanted Migrants, But May Face Rolled Out to Stem Unwanted Migrants, But May Face Challenges", *Migration policy Institute*, 24 May 2018,

www.migrationpolicy.org/article/family-separation-and-zero-tolerance-policies-rolled-out-stem-unwanted-migrants-may-face. Accessed 8 September 2019.

- Chishti, Muzaffar, et al. "Despite Hard-Line Immigration Campaign Pledges, Trump Policy Remains in Flux". *Migration Policy Institute*. December 2016.
- Condon, Bernard. "Trump Organization to Use E-Verify for Worker Status Check". *AP News*. 31 January 2019, www.npr.org/sections/parallels/2016/11/15/502010346/for-refugees-and-advocates-an-anxious-wait-for-clarity-on-trumps-policy. Accessed 5 September 2019.
- Cooper, Betsy and Kevin O'Neil. "Lessons from the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986." *Immigration Research Library*. Migration Policy Institute, August 2005, www.immigrationresearch.org/system/files/PolicyBrief_No3_Aug05.pdf
- Cortés, Carlos E. "Refugee Act (1980)". *Multicultural America: A Multimedia Encyclopedia*, vol. 4, 2013.
- Crouse, Victoria. "The Benefits of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) on Immigrants in Michigan." *The Michigan League for Public Policy*. State Policy Analyst, December 2017. mlpp.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/the-benefits-of-daca-on-immigrants-in-michigan.pdf
- Damania, Siddharth. "The perfect storm: The politics, policies, and people of the USA Patriot Act." *Stanford Undergraduate Research Journal*. ED. Jennifer Levy, and Daniel Shaffer. Np, 2011. 44-49
- Dan, Major. "February 5, 1917: US Acts to Racially Limit Immigration (Sound Familiar?)." *History and Headlines*. Historyandheadlines.Com, 5 February. 2018. www.historyandheadlines.com/february-5-1917-us-acts-racially-limit-immigration-sound-familiar/. Accessed 22 Aug. 2019.

Dirkdeklein. "Immigration Act of 1917-USA." *History of Sorts*. History of Sorts, 5 Feb. 2017.

dirkdeklein.net/2017/02/05/immigration-act-of-1917-usa/.

Dworaczyk, Kellie. "The Role of States in Immigration Enforcement". *The House Research*

Organization. Focus Reports, 24 February. 2006.

hro.house.texas.gov/focus/immigration79-12.pdf

"Final Position Statement The Impact of Border Security Measures on Wildlife." *THE*

WILDLIFE SOCIETY. Np, nd. [wildlife.org/wp-](http://wildlife.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/PS_ImpactofBorderSecurity_Oct2018.pdf)

[content/uploads/2018/05/PS_ImpactofBorderSecurity_Oct2018.pdf](http://wildlife.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/PS_ImpactofBorderSecurity_Oct2018.pdf)

Fuchs, Lawrence H. "Some Political Aspects of Immigration." *21 Law and Contemporary*

Problems, vol. 21, no. 2, 1956, pp. 270-283.

"Gentlemen's Agreement, 1908 (Hayashi-Lemieux Agreement)." *Pier21.Ca*. Canadian

Museum of Immigration at Pier 21, 2018. [pier21.ca/research/immigration-](http://pier21.ca/research/immigration-history/gentlemens-agreement-1908)

[history/gentlemens-agreement-1908](http://pier21.ca/research/immigration-history/gentlemens-agreement-1908). Accessed 22 July. 2019.

Govindaiah, Manoj. *Driver licensing under the REAL ID Act: can current technology balance*

security and privacy?. Recent development, 2006.

Greenwood, Michael J, and Fred A. Ziel. "THE IMPACT OF THE IMMIGRATION ACT OF

1990 ON U.S. IMMIGRATION." *Migration Dialogue*. FM Software, Inc, n.d.

migration.ucdavis.edu/mn/cir/greenwood/combined.htm.

Harper, Jim. "REAL ID: A State-by-State Update". *object.cato.org*. Cato Institute Policy

Analysis, 12 May. 2014. object.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/pubs/pdf/pa749_web_1.pdf

Hirschman, Charles. "The Role of Religion in the Origins and Adaptation of Immigrant Groups in the United States". *International Migration Review*, vol. 38, no. 3, 2004, pp. 1206-1233.

Holt, Cameron. "Bracero Program: Crossing the Border to a New Life by History Day Award Winner Cameron Holt". *History Link*. Creative Commons license, 9 September. 2012. www.historylink.org/file/10165

"Immigration Act of 1921 Imposes Quota System, 1921-1924." *Historic U.S. Events*. Detroit: Gale, 5 Feb. 2013. www.dentonisd.org/cms/lib/TX21000245/Centricity/Domain/535/Immigration%20Act.pdf

"Immigration Act Of 1990." *Immigration Laws*. N.P, 2017. <https://immigration.laws.com/immigration-act-of-1990>.

"Immigration and Nationality Act: Everything You Need to Know." *upcounsel*. UpCounsel, Inc, n.d. www.upcounsel.com/immigration-and-nationality-act.

"Immigration in American History." *History Hub*. ABC-CLIO, LLC, nd. historyhub.abc-clio.com/Support/Display/2144524?tab=1

"Indochina Migration and Refugee Assistance Act". *Wikipedia*. Wikimedia Foundation, Inc, 6 April. 2019. en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indochina_Migration_and_Refugee_Assistance_Act

"Irish and German immigration." *Khan Academy*. Np, nd. www.khanacademy.org/humanities/us-history/the-early-republic/politics-society-early-19th-c/a/irish-and-german-immigration

- Kaibara, Helen. "The Transpacific Origins of the "Model Minority" Myth of Japanese Americans." *Studies on Asia*, vol. 4, no. 2, October 2014, pp. 5-34.
- Kephart, Janice. "Repealing REAL ID? Rolling Back Driver's License Security". *cis.org*. Center for Immigration Studies, June 2009.
cis.org/sites/cis.org/files/articles/2009/realid.pdf
- Lehtinen, Vilja. *America Would Lose Its Soul": The Immigration Restriction Debate, 1920-1924*. Master's Thesis, Helsinki University, 2002.
- Lim, Martin, and Joseph G. Altonji. "Estimating the Effect of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) on DREAMers". *The Department of Economics*. Yale University, 2018.
economics.yale.edu/sites/default/files/files/Undergraduate/Nominated%20Senior%20Essays/2017-18/MartinLim_Senior%20Essay.pdf
- Lindsay, James. M "TWE Remembers: The Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882." *Council on Foreign Relations*. N.p, 2011. www.cfr.org/blog/twe-remembers-chinese-exclusion-act-1882. Accessed 22 Aug. 2019.
- Longhi, Simonetta. Peter Nijkamp, and Jacques Poot, "The Economic Impact of Immigration on the Labor Market of Host Countries - Meta-Analytic Evidence." *Tinbergen Institute Discussion Paper*, no. 11, 2011-103/3.
- Longley, Robert. "National Origins Act Established the US Immigration Quota System." *ThoughtCo*. Dotdash, 12 April. 2019. www.thoughtco.com/national-origins-act-4683986
- Lu, Suping. "Chinese Exclusion Acts: A Brief History of United States Legislation Aimed at Chinese Immigrants." *Readex*. N.p, 31 Aug. 2015, www.readex.com/readex-

[report/chinese-exclusion-acts-brief-history-united-states-legislation-aimed-chinese.](#)

Accessed 22 July. 2019.

Marcos, Catherine, and Tracy Nguyen. "1924 Immigration Act." *Campus Library*. Hein Online, nd. library.uwb.edu/Static/USimmigration/1924_immigration_act.html

Martin, Philip, and Elizabeth Midgley. "Immigration: Shaping and Reshaping America". *Population Bulletins*, vol. 58, no. 2, 2003, pp. 3-37.

Mauk, David, and John Oakland. *American Civilization : An Introduction*. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2005.

Meissner, Doris M. "The Refugee Act of 1980: what have we learned?" *Revue européenne des migrations internationales*, vol. 6, no. 1, 1990, pp. 129-140.

Mittelstadt, Michelle, and Muzaffar Chishti. "Unauthorized Immigrants with Criminal Convictions: Who Might Be a Priority for Removal?", *Migration policy Institute*, November 2016, www.migrationpolicy.org/news/unauthorized-immigrants-criminal-convictions-who-might-be-priority-removal. Accessed 8 September 2019.

Morton, Sunny. "The Immigration Act of 1924 and the End of Ellis Island". *Family Search*. Intellectual Reserve, Inc, 31 July. 2018. www.familysearch.org/blog/en/immigration-act-1924-ellis-island/

Nelson, Camp Alan C. "OPERATION B.E.E.F. Border Enforcement Evaluation First". *American Border Patrol*. A non-profit 501c, nd. americanpatrol.com/ABP/BEEF/PDF/BEEFPLANDEC118.pdf

Neto, Blas Nuñez, and Yule Kim. “Border Security: Barriers Along the U.S. International Border”. *Congressional Research Service Reports*. Library Of Congress, 13 May. 2008. trac.syr.edu/immigration/library/P2613.pdf

Nilsson, Tomas. “Negative Economic Impacts of Immigration and Population Growth”. *Productivity Commission*. Sustainable Population Australia (Tasmania), 21 September. 2015. www.pc.gov.au/inquiries/completed/migration-population/submissions/sub009/sub009.pdf

Page, Murry. “Reexamining the Bracero program, when Mexican workers were recruited to the U.S.”. *Yucatan Expat Life*. Np, 12 November. 2018. yucatanexpatlife.com/reexamining-the-bracero-program-when-mexican-workers-were-recruited-to-the-u-s/

Park, Sharon. “Indochinese Refugee Resettlement Office, 1975-1986.” *MNOPEdia*. Minnesota Historical Society, 22 August. 2016. www.mnopedia.org/group/indochinese-refugee-resettlement-office-1975-1986.

Patler, Caitlin, et al. “From Undocumented to DACAmented: Impacts of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) Program”. *eScholarship*. UCLA: Institute for Research on Labor and Employment, 06 June. 2005. escholarship.org/uc/item/3060d4z3.

Pierce, Sarah, and Randy Capps. “As Trump Takes Office, Immigration Enforcement and Policy Poised to Undergo Major Changes”, *Migration Policy Institute*, 19 Dec. 2016, www.migrationpolicy.org/article/trump-takes-office-immigration-enforcement-and-policy-poised-undergo-major. Accessed 5 September 2019.

Pierce, Sarah, et al. “U.S. Immigration Policy Under Trump: Deep Changes And Lasting Impacts”. *Migration Policy Institute*. July 2018.

Pierce, Sarah. "Immigration-Related Policy Changes In The First Two Years Of The Trump Administration". *Migration policy Institute*. May 2019.

Pike, George H. "Legal Issues: History Repeated with the USA PATRIOT Act." *Information today*, vol. 19, no. 11, 2002, pp. 19-21.

"President Obama's Executive Action on Immigration: Positive Step for Hundreds of Thousands of Farmworkers and their Families." *Farmworkerjustice*.
www.farmworkerjustice.org/sites/default/files/President%20Obama%20s%20Executive%20Action%20on%20Immigration.pdf

Robinson, Matthew. "Freedom in an Era of Terror: A Critical Analysis of the USA Patriot Act." *Justice Policy Journal*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2007, pp. 1-48.

Rodgers, Drew. "Waves of Immigration." *NDLA*. Np, 26 January. 2018.
ndla.no/en/subjects/subject:23/topic:1:184671/resource:1:50210

Rosenbach, Eric and Aki J. Peritz. *Confrontation or Collaboration? Congress and the Intelligence Community*. Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard Kennedy School, July 2009.

Rosenblum, R.Marc, and Daniel J. Tichenor. *The Oxford Handbook of the Politics of International Migration*. Oxford University Press, 2012.

Rubenstein, Edwin S. "The Negative Economic Impact of Immigration on American Workers." *NPG Forum Paper*. Negative Population Growth, Inc, 2016. npg.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/2016NegativeEconomicImpactForumPaper.pdf .

- Sax, Richard. "Gentleman's Agreement". *Immigration to the United States*.
www.immigrationtounitedstates.org/516-gentlemens-agreement.html. Accessed 3 June,
2019.
- Selee, Andrew, and Sarah Pierce. "Immigration Under Trump: A Review of Policy Shifts in
the Year since the Election". *Migration Policy Institute*. December 2017.
- Shelley, Lydia. "The Immigration Act of 1924". *Medium*. Np, nd.
medium.com/@ellesmythy/the-immigration-act-of-1924-cd5e0cc08976
- Shirey, Wayne. "Immigration waves." *Immigration to the United States*. Np, nd.
immigrationtounitedstates.org/603-immigration-waves.html
- Smith, James P, and Barry Edmonston. *The New Americans: Economic, Demographic, and
Fiscal Effects of Immigration*. National Academies Press, 1997.
- "Summary of the Sensenbrenner Immigration bill." *National Conference of State
Legislatures*. [www.ncsl.org/research/immigration/summary-of-the-sensenbrenner-
immigration-bill.aspx](http://www.ncsl.org/research/immigration/summary-of-the-sensenbrenner-immigration-bill.aspx)
- Tavares, Marta. "Fencing Out the Neighbors: Legal Implications of the U.S.-Mexico Border
Security Fence." *Human Rights Brief*, vol. 14, no. 3, 2007, pp. 33-61.
- Tucker, Davis, and Jessi Creller. "1917 Immigration Act." . *U.S. Immigration Legislation
Online*. Uwb.Edu, 2018.
library.uwb.edu/Static/USimmigration/1917_immigration_act.html.
- "U.S. Immigration Since 1965". *HISTORY*. A&E Television Networks, 5 March. 2010.
www.history.com/topics/immigration/us-immigration-since-1965

“Zero Tolerance For Illegal Immigration:An Urgent Policy Need”. *NPG Forum Paper*.

Negative Population Growth, Inc, May 2006. npg.org/forum_series/zerotolerance.pdf

“1924 Immigration Act: The New & Improved White America”. *Gringa of the Barrio*. Np,

nd. gringaofthebarrio.wordpress.com/2015/06/29/1924-immigration-act-the-new-improved-white-america/

ملخص

تتطلع هذه الدراسة الى البحث عن ما إذا كان الرئيس الأمريكي ترامب قد اتبع ما قد سلفه من سياسات الهجرة او قد انتهج سياسة جديدة. حيث تعرض التركيز الاول لإدارة ترامب على إيجاد طريقة لإخراج المهاجرين من الولايات المتحدة الامريكية، وذلك من خلال سن تشريعات للحد من الهجرة. ولتحليل الاتجاهات التاريخية للهجرة خلال الفترة الممتدة من نهاية القرن التاسع عشر الى بداية القرن الحادي والعشرين، بالإضافة الى تحديد الأسباب الحقيقية وراء قدوم المهاجرين، يعتبر المنهج الوصفي التحليلي منهاجا مناسباً لتحليل الحاجة الملحة لتطبيق قانون الحد من الهجرة مع أخذ عين الاعتبار الى تصرف الشعب الأمريكي اتجاه مشكلة الهجرة. وفي هذا الصدد، يتكون هذا البحث من فصلين رئيسيين، الفصل الأول يتناول سياسات الهجرة السابقة وأثر المهاجرين على الولايات المتحدة الامريكية، أما الفصل الثاني فيعرض أهم قوانين الهجرة التي طبقها ترامب. وفي الأخير تبين هذه الدراسة مرتكزة على تقيدات إدارة ترامب ضد المهاجرين، على أن سياسته قد انتهجت مساراً آخر مخالفاً للسياسات السابقة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: سياسة ترامب التنفيذية، التضيقات، سياسات الهجرة، مواقف الامريكيين.