



Immigration: problems and prospects

Mohammad Reza Iravani

Department of Social Work, Islamic Azad, University Khomeinishahr Branch, Daneshjou Blvd, Iran.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 31 March 2011;

Received in revised form:

25 April 2011;

Accepted: 30 April 2011;

Keywords

Brain drain,
Immigration,
Problem.

ABSTRACT

The global volume of immigration is high in absolute terms, but low in relative terms. The International Integration and Refugee Association estimated 190 million international migrants in 2005, about 3 percent of The Middle East, some parts of Europe, small areas of South East Asia, and a few spots in the West Indies have the highest percentages of immigration population recorded by the UN Census 2005. The International Organization for Migration said there are more than 200 million migrants around the world today. Europe hosted the largest number of immigrants, with 70.6 million people in 2005, the latest year for which figures are available. North America, with over 45.1 million immigrants, is second, followed by Asia, which hosts nearly 25.3 million. Most of today's migrant workers come from Asia.[1].

© 2011 Elixir All rights reserved.

Introduction

India's high tech revolution has jump-started both the Indian economy and has also opened the door to the fulfillment of the infallible 'desi' dream of returning home one day. Challenging employment opportunities combined with the charm of living at home are now encouraging a lot of permanent residents to return to their home country. However before starting this journey, one needs to remember that quite a few of us have created ties, particularly immigration related, to this land of opportunity. It is equally important to take all precautions to safeguard one's immigrant or nonimmigrant status in the U.S. With the changing face of the immigration policies, it is imperative that one's immigrant or nonimmigrant status in the U.S. is not violated.

A Permanent Resident Alien (popularly known as the "Green Card" holder) who spends lengthy period of time outside the U.S. must take precautions to preserve their U.S. permanent resident status. Prolonged absences from the U.S. may pose problems upon re-entry, as the Immigration Services may consider that the returning resident has "abandoned" permanent resident status. The "temporary" absence abroad should not exceed six months.

However, returning within Theories of immigration traditionally distinguish between push factors and pull factors. Push factors refer primarily to the motive for emigration from the country of origin. In the case of economic migration (usually labour migration), differentials in wage rates are prominent. Poor individuals from less developed countries can have far higher standards of living in developed countries than in their originating countries. Escape from poverty (personal or for relatives staying behind) is a traditional push factor, the availability of jobs is the related pull factor. Natural disasters and can amplify poverty-driven migration flows. This kind of migration may be illegal immigration in the destination country (emigration is also illegal in some countries, such as North Korea, Zimbabwe, and Somalia).

Immigration While the movement of people has existed throughout history at various levels, modern immigration tourists are considered non-immigrants (see expatriate).

Immigration that violates the immigration laws of the destination country is termed illegal immigration. Seasonal labor migration, while generally non-pregnant in nature (typically for periods of less than a year), is often treated as a form of immigration. The modern concept of immigration is related to the development of Nationals and nationality law. Citizenship in a nation-state confers an inalienable right of residence in that state, but residency of non-citizens is subject to conditions set by immigration law. The emergence of nation-states made immigration a political issue: by definition it is the homeland of a nation defined by shared ethnicity and/or culture.

Emigration and immigration are sometimes mandatory in a contract of employment: religious missionaries, and employees of transnational corporations, international non-governmental organizations and the diplomatic service can expect to work 'overseas'. They are often referred to as 'expatriates', and their conditions of employment are typically equal to or better than those applying in the host country (for similar work).

For some migrants, education is the primary pull factor (although most international students are not classified as immigrants, but may choose to become immigrants if they refuse to return). Retirement migration from rich countries to lower-cost countries with better climate, is a new type of international migration. Examples include immigration of retired British citizens to Spain or Italy and of retired Canadian citizens to the U.S. (mainly to the U.S. states of Florida and Texas). Non-economic push factors include persecution (religious and otherwise), frequent abuse, bullying, oppression, ethnic cleansing and even genocide, and risks to civilians during war. Political motives traditionally motivate refugee flows - to escape dictatorship for instance.

Some migration is for personal reasons, based on a relationship (e.g. to be with family or a partner), such as in family reunification or transnational marriage. In a few cases, an individual may wish to immigrate to a new country in a form of transferred patriotism. Evasion of criminal justice (e.g. avoiding arrest) is a personal motivation. This type of emigration and immigration is not normally legal, if a crime is internationally recognized, although criminals may disguise their identities or

find other loopholes to evade detection. There have been cases, for example, of those who might be guilty of war crimes disguising themselves as victims of war or conflict and then pursuing asylum in a different country.

Barriers to immigration come not only in legal form; natural barriers to immigration can also be very powerful. Immigrants when leaving their country also leave everything familiar: their family, friends, support network, and culture. They also need to liquidate their assets often at a large loss, and incur the expense of moving. When they arrive in a new country this is often with many uncertainties including finding work, where to live, new laws, new cultural norms, language or accent issues, possible racism and other exclusionary behavior towards them and their family. These barriers act to limit international migration (scenarios where populations move en masse to other continents, creating huge population surges, and their associated strain on infrastructure and services, ignore these inherent limits on migration.)

Immigration control in UK

Immigration control is about how and why people from countries outside the UK are allowed to come to the UK and how long they can stay. It is also about what they are allowed to do when they are in the UK, for example, whether they can work, whether relatives can come to the UK to join them afterwards, and whether they can use the National Health Service or claim benefits.

The rules about immigration control (which are law) are complicated by the fact that they overlap with nationality law - that is, the law about who is or is not a British citizen, and the rights of the different types of British citizen. The system of immigration control in the UK splits people into two broad categories: those who have 'right of abode' in the UK and who can live, work and move in and out of the country as they wish, and those who require permission in order to enter and remain here. There are certain groups of people who do not fit easily into these two categories and who do not have to get leave to 'enter and remain' even though they do not have 'right of abode'. Included in this group are people who can benefit from European rights of free movement.

Where people do need leave to enter the UK, immigration rules set out various ways in which it can be granted. Some examples of different immigration categories are: 'visitor', 'spouse', 'au pair' and 'student'. In each category, the rules indicate different requirements that must be satisfied before someone will be granted leave to come and stay. For example, students must show that they will follow a full time course of study. The rules require that most of the categories of people coming to the UK will be able to support themselves without relying on public funds.

The immigration rules also specify how long leave to remain in the UK should be granted for. Leave to remain can be either 'limited' or 'indefinite.' Limited leave is granted to people who are coming to the UK for 'temporary' reasons, for example, as students. Other people applying for leave to remain may be eligible for 'indefinite' leave, with the possibility of being able to apply for UK citizenship. People in most 'temporary' categories, such as visitors, will also need to show that they intend to leave the country when the purpose of their stay is over.

People who require leave to enter the UK will usually need to get 'entry clearance' to show that they are entitled to enter the UK under the immigration rules. There are detailed rules about how to qualify for entry clearance within each category of

applicant coming to the UK. Some groups, such as refugees and asylum seekers do not require entry clearance, but most do.

In the rest of this information, you can find a list of some of the immigration problems which you may need advice on, as well as a list of organizations which may be able to help. You should bear in mind that immigration laws are strictly enforced in the UK and the consequences of misunderstanding your right to be here can be very serious. It can include the risk of deportation. It is therefore essential to consult a specialist adviser if you are unsure about your position, or the position of family and friends.

What are the most recent developments regarding immigration?

Immigration was poised to be a major issue in the 2008 Presidential campaign. Republicans had stalled all Congressional attempts to resolve the issue of undocumented aliens through legislation with the expectation that the Presidential candidate would take advantage of the anti-immigrant attitudes of many voters. However, like President Bush, John McCain is a moderate on the issue has voted for a legalization process. The 2008 Republican platform is silent on the legalization issue but opposes amnesty, strict border enforcement, and foolproof workplace enforcement. The 2008 Democratic platform urges a similar commitment to border and workplace enforcement but supports a system that requires undocumented immigrants who are in good standing to pay a fine, pay taxes, learn English, and go to the back of the line for the opportunity to become citizens.

In June 2007, the Senate rejected bi-partisan compromise legislation (Click to see vote chart) which had been introduced in attempt to resolve the immigration controversy. The measure proposed to allow illegal immigrants to obtain a renewable visa if they were present on January 1, 2007. Additional visas would have been awarded to temporary workers. A worker verification system and increased border security system had to be in place before the visa programs go into effect. A special, less burdensome path to legal status was provided for undocumented agricultural workers and high school graduates who came to the U.S. illegally with their parents.

Despite its bi-partisan origins, the legislation was defeated largely because of deep divisions in public sentiment regarding the proper response to the massive-scale illegal immigration which has occurred in the U.S. during the past 15 years. Legislative efforts to address the problem to date have been limited to increase funding for border security. In May 2006, the Senate passed reform measure which provided for stricter border control but also allowed for a legalization process for many illegal immigrants presently in the country. (Click to see vote chart) This measure appeared to have the Bush Administration's support, but the House deliberately delayed any action. In March 2007, the Bush Administration announced a major change in policy; advocating a very costly visa and legalization process, some of which was added to the compromise legislation. Immigrants and their supporters initially reacted bitterly to this change which appears to be an effort to mollify natives sentiments.

Surveys indicate that the American public is very concerned about the illegal immigration situation (Click to see chart) and the subject dominates conservative-oriented talk radio. Various grassroots movements have developed concerning the issue. A volunteer citizen group calling themselves the "Minutemen" patrolled the Arizona border in April 2005 for the purpose of

discouraging entrants drawing considerable publicity. Other efforts have sought to expose persons who are employing day labor at various pick up locations. Republican political analysts are preparing to use immigration as a "wedge issue" much as they have used abortion and gun control.

Despite public sentiment, there appear to be powerful moneyed interests which support the present system which provides a steady, compliant, low wage labor force in an economy that has a low level of unemployment. This is particularly true in the agricultural sector. The arrangement also benefits Mexico. Although Mexico now has a fertility rate comparable to the U.S., it had an unsustainable birth rate in the 1960's and 1970's and its economic development could not match the growth of its working age population.

The stark reality is that the illegal immigration situation could be resolved very quickly through simple enforcement of existing legislation. If job site enforcement was anywhere near the level it was in the early 90's (when border security was lax), perhaps over 90% of illegal immigrants would permanently leave the country and the entire process could take less than a month. Immigration opponents have more than a sufficient reason to be outraged at this lack of enforcement of the nation's laws. Yet virtually all analysts agree that the expulsion of the nation's illegal immigrants would at this point cause a massive economic disruption.

How do people legally immigrate into the United States?

Almost a million people legally immigrated into the U.S. in 2004 under qualifying categories: The categories are:

Employment-based preference is a category that permits a limited number of individuals who possess job skills which are in demand by the economy. In 2002, this group was dominated by persons with computer and engineering skills.

Family preference is a category that permits individuals to sponsor a limited number of relatives (adult children of U.S. citizens, spouses and children of immigrants, and siblings of citizens).

Immediate Relatives of U.S. Citizens is a category that permits citizens to sponsor an unlimited number of minor children, spouses, and parents. This has been the largest category.

Diversity is a category authorized by recent legislation which authorizes a limited number of individuals to immigrate based on past under-representation in the immigrant population. Refugees/Ashlee's are admitted on a limited basis based on political and humanitarian reasons. The maximum numbers vary year-to-year based on Presidential determinations.

What is the difference between legal immigrants and citizens?

Legal immigrants are basically entitled to the same rights as citizens although they cannot vote or hold political office. About 40% of immigrants become citizens through a process called naturalization. In order to become naturalized, immigrants must reside in the U.S. for five years. Most must demonstrate a proficiency in English and a knowledge of U.S. history and government. The primary motive for immigrants to become citizens is that they qualify to assist their relatives immigrate.

Why is the United States experiencing a new "wave" of new immigration?

The United States has recently experienced a rate of immigration that in numbers is close to the level of immigration that occurred at the turn of the last century. (Click to see chart) The combined legal and illegal immigration is well over one

million per year. Foreign-born persons now constitute over 10% of the population for the first time since the 1930s.. In California and New York over 20% of the population is foreign born and the ratio is over 10% in many other states. (Click to see map) There have been several reasons for this continuing increase over the past three decades:

Refugee immigration peaked in the late '70s and '80s as the U.S. admitted a large number of Southeast Asian, Cuban and Russian immigrants. Many individuals in these categories have become citizens which has enabled them to sponsor admission for their parents without any numeric limitation.

Two amnesty programs provided legal status to nearly 3 million undocumented immigrants and their families in the late '80s and early '90s. The immigrants legalized under these programs account for almost a quarter of all legal immigration from 1981 to 1995.

A large number of illegal immigrants continue to enter and stay in the country. The increase in the total illegal immigrant population has been dramatic over the last 15 years. A report issued in 2005 based on census data estimates that undocumented immigrants constitute almost 30% of all foreign born residents. The Department of Labor determined that in 2001 undocumented immigrants constituted over one half of all agricultural workers.

Hasn't the U.S. substantially increased border surveillance? Why hasn't illegal immigration slowed?

There are many reasons.

It is true that the budget and staff of the Border Patrol has increased significantly, nearly tripling since 1990. A major effort has been particularly made in the El Paso area (Operation Hold-the-Line) and in San Diego (Operation Gatekeeper). The number of deportable aliens located has significantly increased but this is more a reflection of the greater numbers of people who are attempting to immigrate.

These changes have stopped many illegal crossings - in those areas. They have increased the charges that "coyote" smugglers charge to assist aliens who cross the border at more isolated areas. The charge used to be about \$300. Now it often exceeds \$1000. Because of severe climate conditions at some of the frequent crossing areas, almost 1500 deaths have occurred since 1995. They have also had the effect of keeping immigrants from returning to Mexico because of the difficulty in returning to the U.S. again. But they have not kept new immigrants from coming.

About half of the undocumented immigrant workers do not cross the border surreptitiously. Instead, they pose as tourists or temporary visitors (often improperly using temporary border crossing cards issued to local border residents). These crossings have not been affected by increased border surveillance.

At the same time that border vigilance has intensified, immigration workplace enforcement has significantly declined. The decline in workplace enforcement has been the direct result of local political pressures in regions where the economy is dependent on immigrant labor. There can be little doubt that a combination of workplace enforcement and border vigilance would substantially reduce illegal immigration but that has not happened.

Studies have shown that the volume of illegal immigrants is directly related to economic conditions in Mexico. Mexico has long had more people of working age than jobs and unemployment there is about 20%. As Mexico's economy continues to grow and its birth rate slows, it is likely that illegal

immigration will decline significantly even if additional enforcement measures are not taken.

Most important, it is clear that the sanctions applied to employers have not succeeded in preventing migrants from obtaining employment. Moreover, many undocumented workers find employment in the "underground economy" as gardeners, domestic workers and day laborers. Without a realistic prospect of employment, these people would clearly not come to the country.

Virtually no one defends the status quo on the subject of illegal immigration. The hardships faced by Mexican nationals in coming to the U.S. for work purposes are a reflection of a political need to show an attempt to control such immigration without seriously impeding businesses and individuals from employing them. The individuals who come are doing so in violation of U.S. law at the expense of their countrymen who would like to immigrate but who respect the law. The economic pressures associated with low wages and unemployment in Mexico together with its geographic proximity make such immigration almost inevitable. About 1/8 of the Mexican working population of working age is employed in the U.S. and the U.S. agriculture industry is increasingly dependent on undocumented workers.

What countries do immigrants come from and what states do they go to?

Legal immigrants to the U.S. primarily come from Latin America and Asia. The overwhelming majority of illegal immigrants come from Mexico and Central America. Prior to 1970, most immigrants came from Europe. In the early 20th century, Asians were specifically excluded by legislation. Moreover, a "quota" system, in effect during much of the 20th century limited immigration and gave preferential treatment to European immigrants.

Legal immigrants tend to choose the large population states as their state of preference. California, New York, Texas and Florida contain the largest percentages of unauthorized immigrants but, in contrast to 1990, this immigration has now spread throughout the country.

How is immigration affecting the country?

Immigration is the main reason for U.S. population growth. Based on the current rate of immigration, U.S. population will increase substantially increase by 2050 and 65% of this growth will be either the direct or indirect effect of immigration. Immigration will significantly affect the ethnic make-up of the population.

Whether these trends are positives or negatives is the subject of a national debate. The debate centers around these themes:

Advantages of immigration:

Greater supply of unskilled workers Studies have indicated that because most immigrants occupy low-paying, low-skill jobs, their presence is complementary. Because of their contributions, the overall economy is stronger and the wage level and standard of living of most native workers is higher than would exist if they were not present. In particular, the high concentration of undocumented workers in the agricultural industry keeps food prices relatively low.

A younger workforce The ratio of retired persons to workers will dramatically increase in coming decades which will require significant adjustments in the Social Security system. (See Social Security) Immigrants and their children tend to be

younger than natives. As a result, continued or greater immigration will slow the increase of this important ratio.

Skilled workers in needed sectors Immigrants who arrive under the "employment preference" category often are employed in occupations which are important. For example, 20% of U.S. doctors are foreign born. But critics of immigration policy note that this is because the supply of native doctors is kept artificially low and that these doctors are probably even more essential to their native countries.

Disadvantages of immigration:

Greater poverty Because immigrants occupy low income employment, their wages are low and they are more affected by downturns in the economy. In comparison to natives, they tend not to have health insurance and need to resort to public assistance more often.

More educational costs Immigrant children and the children of immigrants account for a disproportionate amount of public education costs than do natives due to the greater birth rate for Hispanics and need for more intensive instruction. Immigrants have significantly lower educational attainment than do natives. But the children of Latino immigrants have educational levels which approach that of natives and by the third generation virtually all are fluent in English and only a minority speaks any Spanish.

Lower unskilled wage levels even studies that suggest that immigrants generate an overall increase in wage levels, acknowledge that they negatively impact wages in the low skill occupation sectors that they occupy.

Increased danger of terrorism some argue that the continued ability of illegal immigrants to enter the country increases the threat of domestic terrorism. In reality, the threat is minimal. The known dangers associated with terrorism all involve Islamic individuals. Islam is not prominent in Mexico or other Central American countries. There is undoubtedly cooperative intelligence arrangements between the U.S. and Mexico designed to monitor the small threat that Islamic individuals who live in or enter Mexico might present.

How do immigration policies differ in other countries?

Although U.S. immigration is substantial, other countries have adopted policies which encourage even greater immigration. Canada has long encouraged immigration as a vehicle for economic growth and its policies place greater emphasis on economic needs as a basis for recruitment of new immigrants. This is also true of Australia. Some European countries, notably Germany, have begun to encourage immigration in recognition of a growing labor shortage which will continue as the native population ages. Countries in Europe which had traditionally been emigrant countries, such as Ireland, Italy and Spain, are now beginning to experience net immigration for the first time. Some European countries and Canada have guest worker programs which allow workers to temporarily immigrate and then return to the country of origin.

What are current proposals to modify immigration policies?

There is some public sentiment for limiting future immigration by reducing the numerical limits for permitted entrants but this view does not presently have major support in the Congress or with the Administration. The key issues are being considered are:

Greater emphasis on employment-related immigration

In the recent past the allotment of employment-related preference visas has not been filled because of numerical limits applicable to certain countries and because of other technical

requirements. Legislation was recently passed to relax these provisions.

Amnesty and guest worker programs

In January 2004, the Bush Administration proposed a solution to the undocumented problem in the form of a new guest worker program. In order to qualify under this plan, the workers must have a job offer and the employer must show no Americans wanted the job. Under the plan, undocumented workers who gained temporary-worker status would enjoy the rights and protections of legal workers. They could also apply for green cards, which convey permanent residency and, potentially, citizenship. The workers must return to their home countries at the end of the term. Dependents of the temporary workers would be allowed in the US if the workers could prove they could support their family. The workers would be allowed to move freely back and forth between the US and their home country. The proposal has rekindled the immigration debate by pitting employers and many Hispanics who support the proposal against some elements of organized labor and many conservative "America First" citizens who oppose it. The proposal does not have broad public support.

The Bush proposal has not been acted upon by Congress. The Republican platform advocates the approval of this plan and rejects any consideration of amnesty. The Democratic platform indicates an opposition to the "second class" status proposed by the Bush plan but does not propose a legalized alternative. Instead it advocates improving the level of government services to undocumented workers and their families and focusing border control efforts on terrorist threats.

In the meantime, the overall number of legal immigrants continues to grow substantially contributing to an ever growing portion of the U.S. resident population that is foreign born. There is little mainstream political opposition to the rate of legal immigration.

Where do Democrats and Republicans stand on immigration issues?

In general, Democrats vote to encourage immigration and Republicans are for greater enforcement at the border areas. But immigration is not a strictly partisan issue. Many business interests supported by Republicans rely on immigrant labor and many labor interests supported by Democrats often take a protectionist position on immigration issues. Certain key votes during the last decade demonstrate this uneven pattern.

Immigration in case of USA

In 1965, Lyndon Baines Johnson maneuvered through Congress and then signed into law a measure which was a dramatic break with the past history of this country. This was the Immigration Reform Law of 1965. In doing so, the floodgates were opened allowing ever greater masses of people from Third World cultures to flow into the United States. This was done with deceptive statistics and assurances from politicians and the liberal press which totally ignored (or covered up) all considerations of the problems inherent in such mass incursions of those with absolutely NO background of self government or freedom into our society. And here we are speaking only of LEGAL immigrants!

Whether the liberals like it or not, this country was founded by people who were almost entirely European in origin. ONLY in Europe had the concepts and ideas of individual worth and freedom been painfully developed and put into practice, haltingly and slowly over 2000 years of effort and, often, with loss to some old authoritarian idea presented with a new name.

Our Founding Fathers were astute students of history. While absolutely rejecting the then existing monarchical forms of government, they recognized the indisputable fact that the sources of such fundamental ideas as the rule of law, equality before the law, free enterprise, the rights of private property, individualism and, most especially, LIMITED government were uniquely European in origin. Over that same 2000 years of human history in the entire rest of the world, the old idea of the "divine right of kings," the concept that the ruler, whatever his title might be, could do no wrong and that the common man had no rights at all, remained in force.

Without its European foundation, the United States would have no Constitution, no Bill of Rights, no individual freedoms or, even, the idea of limited government. However, note that if our nation's way of life was based on a cultural inheritance from Europe which was common to the vast majority of Americans, then the PRESERVATION of that cultural heritage is dependent on the continued existence of that European based majority.

Lawrence Austere, the author of several books on the effects of immigration has written: "If in some experiment in mass migration, 50 million Chinese exchanged places with 50 million French— and even if the Chinese learned the French language and immersed themselves in French culture— the new society they formed would no longer be France in any recognizable sense. France, as we know it, would have ceased to exist."

Despite the politically correct gibberish of "multiculturalism" now being programmed into the minds of our young people in government schools, history clearly shows, with extremely rare exceptions, that nations, ancient and modern, in which the majority of citizens share only diversity, suffer social tensions, recurrent upheavals and chaos which can ONLY be restrained by recourse to tyranny.

As essayist Samuel Francis has pointed out: "The late Roman Empire, the Byzantine Empire, the Ottoman Empire, and the dominions of the Habsburgs and the Romanovs, among others, all presided over a kind of rainbow coalition of nations and peoples, who for the most part managed to live happily together because their secret compulsions to spill each others blood were restrained by the overwhelming power of the despots and dynasties who ruled them. Political freedom relies on a shared political culture...and when the common culture disintegrates under the impact of mass migrations, only institutionalized force can hold the regime together." (This, big government politician Lyndon Johnson understood!)

Prior to the 1965 law, immigrants from Third World countries were allowed to enter this country in very limited numbers. During the 70's and 80's and 90's ever larger numbers of Third World people poured into this country. Granted that most of them sincerely desire to improve their economic status. Granted that most may have great ambition and even business ability. Granted that the vast majority of such people are law-abiding, as they are able to understand our laws.

However, the vast majority of these people have little or no knowledge of the cultural and religious basis of our society. Tragically, instead of assimilating into our culture as the waves of immigrants from European nations did in the 19th and early 20th centuries, these new arrivals regard themselves as members of "new minority groups," often with the encouragement of our politicians who are eager for their votes. Many of these groups are using organized efforts in the courts or legislatures to attack

the very American religious and cultural traditions which produced the country they were so eager to come to.

We will continue our discussion of the impact which the influx of Third World peoples has had on our nation in our next column.

The nationwide effort to gain more control over immigration includes heightened border security, new restrictions on certain visa categories and on visitors, and the abolishment of the INS. For people entering U.S.A which means more scrutiny with more questions being asked about their motives to come here. Stricter controls of passengers and their luggage on airports are already in place, and will probably be part of air travel for a long time. Big-brother-like scenarios may become a reality. For immigrants who are in the process of adjusting their status to become permanent residents, things will remain the same, with the possible exception of interrogations of people from Muslim countries and Arab or Asian origins. With the change in government agency, processing times may get longer or shorter. There is no telling just yet. For illegal immigrants, the conditions have become harsher through tougher border control, the stalling of 245(i), the abandonment of amnesty talks and an all-time low in the acceptance of their status among Americans. However, there is another side to it: the current economic slump seems to be in recovery, and that means, in simple terms, more workers are needed, although I am not too optimistic about an immediate boom in the economy. If U.S.A and Mexico keep improving their economical relationships, the prospects for illegal from Mexico might not be too bad. By doing so, U.S.A might alienate other nations that send us illegal immigrants, but that is another issue.

The government has its work cut out for it. Knowing how disorganized and ineffective the INS has been, this new plan seems like a monumental task. Firing people and cleaning up is one thing, but training new (or old) personnel requires time and expertise, and is long-term a matter. The death and rebirth of immigration services and the coordination with the other agencies should be taken seriously by President Bush and lawmakers, and we expect more than just lip-service. Lets hope that the coordination of these agencies will happen in a reasonable amount of time and with success, for a well-working immigration agency would be extremely beneficial to a great many of us.

References:

1. Bryan Balin, *State Immigration Legislation and Immigrant Flows: An Analysis* The Johns Hopkins University, 2008
2. Peter C. Meilander (2001), *Towards a Theory of Immigration*, Palgrave Macmillan, ISBN 978-0312240349
3. Joe Freeman (2007), *Living and Working in the European Union for Non-EU Nationals*, Lulu.com. ISBN 0-9786254-0-4.
4. Isabel Valle. *Fields of Toil: A Migrant Family's Journey*, ISBN 978-0-87422-101-5
5. Lorane A. West. *Color: Latino Voices in the Pacific Northwest*, ISBN 978-0-87422-274-6
6. Massey, Douglas S., Arango, Joaquín, Graeme, Hugo, Kouaouci, Ali, Pellegrino, Adela and Taylor, J. Edward (2005), *Worlds in Motion: Understanding International Migration at the End of the Millennium*, New York: Oxford University Press, ISBN 0-19-928276-5.
7. Dowell Myers (2007), *Immigrants and Boomers: Forging a New Social Contract for the Future of America*, Russell Sage Foundation, ISBN 978-0-87154-636-4.