

Email: socialscientiajournal@gmail.com

Online access: <http://www.journals.aphriapub.com/index.php/SS/>

RATIONALE AND IMPACT OF UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION POLICIES ON AFRICA AND AFRICANS IN DIASPORA

Olawari D.J. EGBE¹ and Tari GBAIWOGHA²

^{1,2}Department of Political Science, Niger Delta University, Wilberforce Island, Yenagoa, NIGERIA.

Abstract

Immigration is increasingly preoccupying governments, politicians, policy makers and citizens of the Global North. For the most part, the focus has been on the security and economic impacts and social integration of migrants. The United States remains a country greatly shaped by generations of immigrants and their descendants. The U.S. for generations welcomed large immigrants, and oftentimes secures productive employment and successfully integrates them into its population. However, the U.S. immigration law has come under reforms in recent times, especially as its Janus faced stance in handling immigrants has had serious consequences for her global standing. Thus, immigration which has been one of America's great success stories is losing its popularity. This paper addresses the challenges arising from the impacts of the U.S. migration policies on immigrants especially Africans. The study is qualitative and adopts the rational choice theory as it offers a framework for understanding and often formally modelling social and economic behaviour. The paper finds that while immigration has paid direct benefits for the United States, especially her global leadership, recent U.S. administrations' immigration policies and their impacts on Africa and Diaspora Africans have captured little attention from scholarship in the Third World. The paper fills this lacuna by examining the U.S. immigration policies of George Walker Bush, Barak Obama to Donald Trump presidencies on Africa.

Keywords: Africa, Diaspora, Immigration, Third World, United States

Introduction

The emergence of immigration as a major foreign policy issue follows with the increasing wave of globalisation. It is recently regarded as a source of contention in American life. The United States unarguably remains a country that has been greatly shaped by generations of immigrants from different parts of the world and their descendants. The U.S. for generations welcomed large immigrants, and oftentimes secures productive employment and successfully integrates them into its population (Borjas, 2001).

In the United States, legal immigration generally has been increasing since the 1965 Amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act. In addition, the magnitude of illegal immigration tripled in the 1990s (Borjas, 2001). Significantly, the African immigrants in the United States come from almost all regions in Africa. They include a large number of persons who cut across peoples from varied religious, ethnic, racial, linguistic, national, social and cultural backgrounds. There is a distinction between African immigrants and African Americans, many of whose ancestors were involuntarily brought from West Africa to the United States by means of the historic Atlantic slave trade (Facchini & Mayda, 2009).

In some cases, the purpose of immigration is advancement of oneself, before returning to respective origin countries. Nevertheless, many immigrants never return. In recent years, there has been an increase in the number of African immigrants interested in gaining permanent residence in the United States. This has led to a steady increase in the population of immigrants in the United States, leading to pressure on welfare and social services. To curb this, the citizenship requirements in the United States have been made more stringent (Kyoso, 2017). Not only do most countries today compete to attract people from around the world, but the view of the United States as a place of unparalleled openness and opportunities is also crucial to the maintenance of American leadership (Bush & McLarty III, 2009).

There is a current argument that the recent policies are not serving the United States well on any of these fronts. The policies have been revisited and reformed in the incumbent administration of President Donald Trump, with significant variations from the previous administrations put together (Card & Peri, 2016). Various scholars have given their stance on the U.S. immigration policies, the reasons and factors behind their adoption as well as their impacts (Borjas, 2001; Gimpel, 2000; Gimpel & Edwards, 1999; Hainmeller & Hiscox, 2007, 2010; Luedtke, 2005; Scheve & Slaughter, 2001; Scheve & Slaughter 2007; Mayda 2006). However, a more detailed focus has not been given to the capabilities and variations of the different administrations and their collective impact on the United States and Africans and African Diaspora. The collective and growing effects of these policies have continuously shaped the United States to what it has become today – World's largest economy.

This paper is divided into four parts. The first part after this introduction dwells on theoretical framework and methodology. Section two reveals the policies from the previous and present administration. Section three, presents the rationale for the policy choices and adoption chances of successive United States Governments (George Walker Bush, 2001-2009; Barack Hussein Obama, 2009-2017; and Donald Trump, 2017-date). The point in section is that successive administrations in the U.S. demonstrate immigration policy variations in line with the party ideologies of the two dominant political parties-The Republican Party and The Democratic Party. The fourth part of the paper discusses the impacts of the policies on both host and sending countries–Africans and African Diaspora.

Theoretical Framework

Discourse in this paper is dependent on *Rational Choice Theory* as its theoretical handle; especially as it offers a framework for understanding and often formally modelling social and economic behaviour, and in this case, political behaviour. At the risk of further explanation, rational choice is a theoretical paradigm in which individuals' choices are explained based on maximising preferences. The rational choice theory, also known as choice theory or rational action theory is a theory for understanding and often modelling social and economic as well as individual behaviour. The theory also focuses on the determinants of choices. The basic premise of the rational choice theory is that the aggregate of social behaviour results from the behaviour of individual actors (Abell, 2000). A rationalist framework is adopted here to understudy the activities of political actors and the effects on policies that affect international politics. Political actors are assumed to be goal oriented and instrumental in achieving goals of national policies. (Xinyuan, 2007)

Historically, rational choice theory developed as part of the behavioural revolution in American political science of the 1950s and 1960s which sought to investigate how individuals behaved, using empirical methods (Eulau, 1973). Though as a theory, rational choice has often been criticised (a) on account of problems associated with inadequate information and uncertainty which may make it difficult for individuals to make rational decisions and as a result, they may rely on other ways of making decisions, and (b) that human social actions and interactions are complex, and other theories may provide better guides or explanations to how these interactions take place (McCumber, 2011; Ogu 2013); the salience in this theory in the course of this paper is that immigration has paid direct diplomatic benefits for the United States. It is widely believed that one of the major reasons the United States achieved and has been able to retain its position of global leadership is that it is constantly replenishing its pool of talents, not just with the ablest and hardest working from inside its borders but with the best from around the world (Bush & McLarty III, Alden 2009).

Upon this fact, the policies have been updated for immigration to follow a stricter process, as well as restrictions out rightly given to certain categories of individuals. The salient reasons identified for adopting these more stringent policies or actions are to increase respect for the laws, reduce potential security risk, strengthen labour rights and unburden public education and social services with the increasing population (Alex. 2016). Despite the obtainable, the continued ability of the U.S. to develop and enforce a workable system of immigration has threatened to undermine these achievements. The proposal for building a border wall strains U.S. relations with its Mexican neighbour and unfairly burdens the budgetary allocation for projects, to execute the purpose, in an effort to strengthen its immigration policies.

Immigration Policies of the United States

This section examines immigration policies of the United States under different recent administrations. Throughout the 20th Century, and particularly twenty years after the end of the United States-Mexican Bacero Programme, the United States' immigration system tolerated a high degree of illegality and tacitly permitted widespread employment in agriculture and other low-skilled sectors of the economy. Until recently, significant changes have begun to set in (Rosenblum, 2011).

From George W. Bush to Barak Obama Administrations Evolving for so many years, there has been several attempts to adopt sustainable immigration policies that would be of considerable benefits to all parties. Notably, congress explicitly rejected proposals in the 1950s to make it illegal to hire or employ unauthorised immigrants, considered and later rejected other bills that included employer sanctions in the 1960s and 1970s. Even the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) was written and implemented in a way that generally failed to prevent employers from hiring unauthorised workers. This system was a stable policy regime for many years because it assured a supply of low-wage immigrant workers without forcing law makers to confront difficult questions about how many immigrants to admit. But as the real and perceived costs of illegality increased, the system came under pressure to reform (Rosenblum 2011)

President George W. Bush strongly supported these reform efforts. As a former border-state governor with a business background, he had promised during his campaign to speed immigration processing for immigrant families and employers; he embraced Latino family values and argued that immigration was not a problem to be solved; and that it was the sign of a successful nation (Clayton, 2003). Bush's interest in migration reform was fuelled by Mexican President Vicente Fox, another former border-state governor, who was sworn in a month before Bush as Mexico's first democratically elected governor from an opposition party. Fox had campaigned to be the president of 'all Mexicans' and saw to the improvement of conditions of Mexicans in the United States as a top priority in the Mexico-US relations. With President George Bush viewing better US-Mexican relations as his 'signature foreign policy legacy', the administration also embarked on other cognitive immigration plans.

However, bilateral migration talks were derailed by the events of 9/11. It was believed that the terrorist attacks were carried out by individuals who came to the United States with student and visitor visas, and immigration processes and border controls immediately became a central topic of concern in the aftermath. The public debates and new policy measures that followed initially conflated antiterrorism measures with immigration control (Rosenblum, 2011). There were several efforts thus made to further strengthen the visa security, immigration and border control

Upon release of the 9/11 Commission's final report in July 2004, Congress took up a fourth bill, the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act (hereinafter IRTPA).

IRTPA mainly addressed the 9/11 Commission's recommendations to create an Office of the Director of National Intelligence and to fund additional surveillance, border control enforcement, and immigration detention beds. These provisions were agreed to with little controversy and signed into law in December, 2004. Earlier that year, programmes for tracking aliens' movement into and within the United States were merged into a more comprehensive U.S.-Visit Programme. Under this programme, all non-immigrants were required to submit biometric data upon receiving a visa, at ports of entry, and again upon leaving the United States, though the implementation of exit tracking has been delayed for technical reasons (USGAO, 2009).

The Bush administration witnessed the introduction of different immigration bills, to curb adverse effects of the increase of illegal immigrants of different categories. Although most of the proposals made by the executive were turned down or slowed by Congress, which made the efforts almost unnoticeable. The failure of congress to pass comprehensive immigration reform in 2006 opened the door for restrictive state legislation, with the state of Arizona taking the lead in introducing strict controls. The United States, with over eleven million irregular immigrants, rely heavily on their labour in agriculture, construction and services, yet has been unstable to move towards comprehensive legal immigration reforms and employment for the immigrants (Castles, Haas & Miller, 2014). At the same time, post 9/11 restriction in immigration policies have made it increasingly difficult to obtain visas and residence permits (green cards), even for the high-skilled, thus resulting in failure of past administrations to consolidate reputable immigration policies that would be of fairly equal benefits to Africans, Africans Diaspora and of course the United States.

Taking a peek at the evolution of U.S. immigration policy over the past four decades, it is thus noticeable that the system relied for many years on a tacit acceptance of illegal inflows and unauthorised employment, so that illegality came to define the immigration policy problem, with tougher enforcement being the default policy response. In the short term, Congress' decision not to pass Comprehensive Immigration Reform Bills in 2006-10 (hereinafter, CIR) reflected bad timing for those who were in favour of CIR, with generous immigration bills partly thwarted by electoral considerations in 2006 and 2007 and the economic downturn after 2008. But these short-term obstacles reveal deeper political challenges related to how coalitions and interest groups interact with immigration policy; these challenges however, raise important questions about the future of US immigration reform (Rosenblum, 2011)

In 2008, presidential candidate Senator Barack Obama made several promises to various groups of voters in order to attract their support and ensure that they would be motivated to come out to vote on election day. On record, in the November 2008 election, Obama received the largest margin of support among Latino voters, since Bill Jefferson Clinton was re-elected in 1996. This strong support from Latino voters helped Barak

Obama to secure a majority of votes in key states including Florida, Indiana, Nevada and New Mexico; states that had gone to Bush in 2004. Thus, Obama owed the Latino community for their strong support and he strived to fulfil the promise of CIR he made during the electioneering campaigns (Skrentny & López, 2013).

To Latino voters, the key promise was to pass Comprehensive Immigration Reform (CIR). When he won the elections, expectations were high. Nine years into the administration, President Barack Obama who entered the White House on a promise to reform America's immigration system, was hardly an original one as congress had proposed several versions during and after the George W. Bush administration, varying in detail, but sharing a 'good bargain approach'. This means that the hallmark of Comprehensive Immigration Reform (CIR) is an attempt to broker a bargain between election restrictionists who oppose large scale immigration and undocumented immigration. This is because in the long run, many legislators believe that the Comprehensive Immigration Reform (CIR) would allow the legislation of undocumented population nearly four times larger than that legalised by IRCA (Immigration Reform Control Act of 1956) (Skrentny & Lopez, 2013).

Whereas Republicans had joined in CIR efforts in 1986 and in Bush's failed efforts in 2006 and 2007, not a single Republican was willing to support CIR in Obama's first term (Skentry, 2013). Moreover, given the large number of 'veto points' in the U.S. legislative process, this unprecedented polarisation rendered Obama's CIR legislative agenda dead in its tracks (Amenta, 1998). Republican intransigence was on display even when Obama and reformers in the U.S. Congress tried for something less than CIR, the 'DREAM Act', which applied only to those immigrants who were brought to the United States at a young age, has never been arrested, and has satisfied educational or military requirements; this bill was blocked by the Republicans (Batalova & McHugh, 2010, Preston, 2010).

On December 18, 2010, however, all but three Republican senators joined with five Democrats in opposition, and the bill failed to reach the sixty votes needed to bring it to the floor for debate. The next term brought a Republican majority into the House and ended any hope for CIR legislation in Obama's first term (Gamboa, 2010). With opportunities blocked in Congress, Obama was forced to rely on his authority as president to make progress. He utilised the power of the executive in pursuit of other initiatives. For instance, the Obama administration used some powers of the executive branch in order to facilitate its focus on undocumented immigrants who had committed crimes (Gilbert, 2013).

However, the negative perceptions of the Comprehensive Immigration Reforms (CIR) were not the only problems with Obama's CIR initiatives. There was also a problem with the sometimes deeply held perceptions of the policy beneficiaries themselves. Some members of congress and possibly the electorate saw undocumented immigrants as law breakers who were morally unworthy of documentation (Sentry, 2012). The negative

perceptions of undocumented immigrants throw more light on why George W. Bush could not rally a majority of his own party to support Comprehensive Immigration Reform (CIR) during his second term (Rosenblum 2011).

Aside demonstrating that the Obama administration was keen about border security, there was a different executive strategy on the immigration policy. The administration put in a lot of effort in removing unworthy undocumented immigrants: those who were least deserving or worthy of legalisation, especially criminals. In so doing, Obama could create a distinction between the undeserving undocumented and those deserving legislation. This he also intended to use to convince restrictionists of the workability of his Comprehensive Immigration Reform (CIR) policy. The number of criminals deported during the Obama administration increased substantially, though their percentage among the deported did not differ dramatically from previous administration (Yearbook of Immigration Statistics, 2011).

In addition, the Obama administration used some powers of the executive to facilitate its focus on undocumented immigrants who had committed crimes. These were designed to address the concerns of those sceptical about border enforcement and the worthiness of the beneficiaries of legalisation, in order to bring out much wider benefits for the millions of immigrants who would remain (Olivas, 2012). President Obama made a lot of promises that were to favour immigrants and persons that were not of the United States origin. However, the achievement of these was thwarted by forces in the Congress who prevented the Comprehensive Immigration Reform (Skentry & Lilly, 2013).

President Donald Trump's Immigration Policies After a visit to Mexico in 2016, to meet with the Mexican President, Enrique Peru Nieto, Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump flew to Phoenix, Arizona where he gave perhaps the most detailed policy speech of his campaign. There, he laid out in ten points the immigration policy he intended to pursue if elected president. Among the proposed course of action during the speech are: a) Building a Southern wall which Mexico would pay for. b) End Catch and Release race, targeted towards minors crossing the border wall. c) Enhance the pursuit of unauthorized immigrants who have committed crimes. d) Crackdown on Sanctuary Cities - cities that limit their assistance and cooperation with ICE-an agency with DHS responsible for immigration enforcement, on enforcing immigration laws. e) End Obama era programmes that protected unauthorised immigrants (terminate the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), and the Deferred Action for Parents of Americans, DAPA. f) Introduce a travel ban and extreme vetting to ensure that every individual arriving the country poses no public safety threats, g) Ensure countries accept their deported nationals' Complete Biometric Entry (CBE) h) Exit tracking system to identify non-citizens who enter the country on a visa and later over stay once it expires, i) Turn off the jobs and benefits magnet for unauthorised immigration and step up removal of individuals who abuse public benefits, j) Reform legal immigration system in order to achieve the following goals: to

keep migration levels measured by population share within historical norms to select immigrants based on their likelihood of success in the United States society and their ability to be financially self-sufficient, to choose immigrants based on merit, skill and proficiency and to establish new immigration controls to boost wages and to ensure that open jobs are offered to American workers first (Pierce, Bolter & Selee, 2018, pp 3-26).

Trump argued that these policies if 'rigorously' followed and enforced would accomplish more in a matter of months than past administrations have accomplished on this issue in the last five years. While the full extent of his ambitious promises such as building a wall along the entirety of its Southern border or creating a special deportation task force, are far from being accomplished, the administration has set in motion a range of significant changes during its first year in office. These actions have included increasing arrests and removal of unauthorised immigrants within the United States, banning nationals from eight countries (Venezuela, Libya, North Korea, Chad, Iran, Yemen, Somalia and Syria) from entering into the United States, cancelling DACA and TPS (Temporary Protection Status) designation for nationals of several countries, reducing refugee admissions to the lowest numbers since the resettlement programme began in 1980. Also, the Trump administration has been taking steps to bring to the barest minimum family based immigration (Pierce, Bolter & Selee, 2018).

President Trump has made sweeping changes to American immigration policies, with actions taken to address immigration from Mexico as well as the refugee process from Muslim majority nations (Torricco, 2018). In December 2017, the administration announced a publicity campaign against both 'Chain Migration'(i.e. family based migration) and 'Diversity Visa Lottery'(an annual selection of applicants for green card, submitted by individuals from countries with low rates of migration to the United States). The Trump administration has increased and broadened the enforcement of immigration laws, tried to expand enforcement cooperation with local jurisdictions, reduced refugee admission, end several immigration programmes, implement thorough executive actions by previous administration and even slowed the legal admission of some categories of immigrants (Pierce, Bolter & Selee, 2018).

Significantly, Congress has a significant role to play in ensuring that the major changes in immigration law and in approval of annual appropriations to fund priorities. This is because President Trump's anti-immigrant agenda has forced millions of immigrants to face the threat and consequences of deportation. During Trump's first 100 days in office, immigration related arrests rose by more than 37 percent (Schochet, 2017). Despite his campaign promise to deport only those with criminal records, his administration has made all unauthorised immigrants a priority for deportation, with arrest rates more than doubling for hardworking immigrants without criminal records (Schochet, 2017) The impacts of these policies are rippling, and may cause severe harm to the United States'

economy, their leadership status in the world, etc. The next section assesses the impact of U.S. 'immigration policies' on U.S. homeland.

Rationale and Impacts of Immigration Policies on the United States

Immigration policies in the United States reflect multiple goals. The Immigration and Nationality Act sets immigration policy in the United States on a four count basis: (a) to facilitate the reunification of families by admitting people who already have a family member living in the United States, (b) to attract workers to fill positions in certain occupations for which there are shortages, (c) to increase diversity by admitting people from countries with historically low rates of immigration to the United States, and, (d) to provide a refuge for people who face the risk of racial, religious, or political persecution in their home country. Several categories of permanent and temporary admission have been established to implement those wide ranging goals (CBO 2006). Broadly speaking, there are two main forms of entry into the United States which necessitate migration policies:

a. **Lawful Entry** United States' immigration policies provide two distinct paths for the lawful admission of non-citizens or aliens into the country: permanent (immigrant) admission or temporary (non-immigrant) admission. In the first category, aliens may be granted permanent admission by being accorded the status of Lawful Permanent Residents (LPTs). Aliens admitted in such a capacity are formally classified as immigrants and receive a permanent resident card, commonly referred to as a 'Green Card'. Lawful permanent residents are eligible to work in the United States and may later apply for US citizenship (CBO, 2006).

The second path is admission on a temporary basis. Temporary admission encompasses a large group of people who are granted permission into the United States for a specific purpose and for a limited period of time. Reasons for such admissions include: tourism, diplomatic missions, study and temporary work. Under the United States law, citizens of foreign countries admitted temporarily are classified as 'non-immigrants'. Certain immigrants may be permitted to work in the United States for a limited time depending on the type of visa they receive. However, they are not eligible for citizenship through naturalisation. Non-immigrants wishing to remain in the United States on a permanent basis must apply for permanent admission (CBO,2006).

b. **Unlawful Entry** In addition to facilitating the admission of both immigrants and non-immigrants, United States' policy addresses the issue of unauthorised aliens in the United States. Aliens found to be in violation of the United States immigration laws may be removed from the country through a formal process (which can include penalties such as fines, imprisonment or prohibition against future entry or the offer of a chance to depart voluntarily) (CBO, 2006). In proceeding further, what are the rationales for the adoption of immigration policies, which have tremendous effects on the sending, as well as the host

countries? The issue of immigration and immigration policy have been at the forefront of the United States' policy debate for a very long time now. Recent evidence suggests that public views on immigration continue to diverge greatly (Scheve & Slaughter, 2001; Hanson, Scheve & Slaughter 2007; Mayda 2006)

While the United States remain deeply divided by race, immigration too remains controversial. Even within political parties, different opinions co-exists, so also does different administrations exhibit different views in developing and in pursuit of new policies as they come in. Despite the controversy, a series of important immigration policy measures have been enacted. These policies are facilitated as a result of a conglomerate of varied drives which seem admirable to different opinions and most suitable in pursuing and achieving common interests of both the executive and congress.

Much scholarly attention has advanced diverse factors which influence policy decisions, including geographical factors, ethnic features, political factors, economic factors, social and cultural factors, as well as background of the political elites, geographical factors, etc (Gimpel & Edwards, 1999; Burns & Gimpel, 2000). Recent debates about immigration policy focus on the relative impact of economic self-interest and ideological or cultural factors (Facchini & Mayda, 2009; Hainmeller & Hiscox, 2007, 2010; Luedtke, 2005; Mayda 2006). However, for the purpose of this study, more attention is accorded to the economic and social drive factors.

Economic drive can be seen as a dominant reason for the adoption of policies generally. It also influences voting decisions of the United States' House of Representatives on immigration. Heterogeneous districts differ in their relative endowments of skilled and unskilled labour. By changing factor supplies, immigration affects factor income, thus creating winners and losers (Berry & Seligo, 2002). The effect of immigration on wages, either positive or negative, is often weighed before policy decisions are upheld or debunked. This is because there may be possible adverse effects of immigration on native workers' wages, which no matter how insignificant is of utmost importance.

Inflow of skilled labour may increase competition for jobs in a particular district, which in this case is between natives and aliens. An elected politician supports an immigration policy initiative if it increases his/her constituency voters' well-being, and facts hold that he/she is more likely to favour an open immigration policy towards unskilled immigrants which often results in more skilled labour abundance in such districts. Looking at it from another angle, the inflow of unskilled labour brings availability of low wage labour for certain ventures. But this also puts pressure on the available amount of jobs for the natives (Facchini & Friedrich, 2011). Empirical analysis suggests that labour market characteristics are statistically significant drivers of a representative's voting behaviour on immigration policy. Representatives from more skilled labour abundant districts are more likely to support an open immigration policy towards the unskilled. In terms of magnitude, the

effects are considerable. The expected labour market impact of foreign workers is a robust driver of decision making on immigration policy matters (Albrecht 2014).

Borjas (in David & Giovanni, 2013, pp 2) "...immigration has consequences, and these consequences imply that some people lose while others benefit." This demonstrates that despite the numerous and logical rationale for the continuous flow of African immigrants, there are certain impacts that are borne by both the host country (United States of America in view) and the African natives. Also, there is the net effect of immigration on United States' income as a small positive gain (assuming fixed return to capital).

In terms of theories of economic self-interest, the state of the art in immigration literature presents an interactive model where concerns about an individual's economic gains or losses from immigration are conditioned by the fiscal impact of immigration policy (Borjas 1999a&b; Facchini & Mayda, 2009). Because of the size of welfare state in many developed countries with rising immigration, the fiscal consequences of allowing poorer individuals into social systems with well-established safety nets have become a vibrant political issue (Gimpel & Edwards, 1999). The influence of public finance variables depends on whether the votes involve issues that have direct public finance consequences. Helen and Dustin (2011) argue that public finance variable will be most salient for votes on visas for low skill immigrants and social benefits for immigrants. In addition to economic characteristics, political cum ideological drives also feature significantly in the acceptance and enforcement of immigration policies. By its nature, immigration policy is multidimensional and hence the supporters and opponents of the different categories of immigration policies will vary (Meyers, 2007).

A substantial part of the immigration literature has debated the relative importance of ideology versus economic interests. Some authors have argued that ideology and beliefs are most important in immigration preferences. These studies tend to show that a wide variety of ideological factors can affect an individual's attitude towards immigration (Burns & Gimpel, 2000; Milner, Helen and Tingley, Dustin, 2011; Hauneller & Hillcox, 2007). Conservative ideology supports a minimum role for government, especially in terms of the active distribution of resources, whereas those holding left-wing ideologies favour a more expansive role of government in society and often favour redistribution to the poor. These ideological explanations have been utilised in explaining other important policy decisions. However, most existing evidence suggests that conservatives are less likely than liberals to support immigration despite conservative antipathy for government intervention in markets. Numerous public opinion studies show that individuals with left-party orientations tend to be more sympathetic to increasing immigration (Burns, Miller, Fachinni, Citrin, & Haunmeller, 2007). Legislative studies also confirm this finding. Hix and Noury (2007) in analysing legislative voting in the European Union (EU) find that left-right political orientation is the key explanatory variable for immigration voting, not

material concerns. Fetter's (2006) study of the 109th Congress also found strong support from conservatives for anti-immigration policy (Helen & Dustin, 2011).

In principle, conservatives should support unrestricted immigration. Interfering with the flow of people means government interference with the market. However, many immigration policies involve the question of who pays for the cost of immigration and its control and conservatives are opposed to higher taxes for the same reason. On the other hand, liberal administrators and legislators have different preferences. While they may accept a government's role in managing immigration flows, their preferences depend on the perceived effects of immigration to citizens. If immigration has a negative effect, e.g. displacement of poor native workers, unfavourable conditions, etc., they might prefer government policies to limit immigration like strict visa limits on low skill immigration. If immigration is seen as economically beneficial or in some ways fulfilling a desirable set of political goals e.g. expanding the coalition of groups that favour redistributive programmes, then left-wing individuals (Liberals) may favour less restrictive immigration policies such as higher Visa limits and less border control (Sonia & Saro, 2011).

If government policy on immigration revolves around redistributing its costs, one can expect partisan political ideology to play a major role. If these costs are more present in some types of immigration policy than others, thus we should expect ideology to have a stronger effect there. Therefore, ideology is expected to play a large role in explaining policy decisions and votes on welfare benefits for immigrants. Border control votes are largely symbolic since they involve policies that tend to have little actual effect on immigration flows. Hence the votes are expected to be highly ideological. Helen and Dustin (2011) stress that ideology will play a salient role on immigration votes about border control.

Immigration also affects the flow of politics in the host country. For example, immigrant voters seem to lean more towards candidates with similar inclinations and are possibly going to favour their course more in the race. They may thus drift more towards candidates that may not be entirely natives of the host communities. This became apparent during the United States' presidential election in 2012. The burgeoning minority population of the United States voted overwhelmingly in favour of Obama whereas the Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney won most of the white non-Hispanic votes. According to analysis of exit polls, 71 percent of Latino voters voted for President Obama compared to 27 percent for Romney. Latinos comprised 10 percent of the electorate, up from 9 percent in 2008 and 8 percent in 2004. Hispanics make up a growing share of voters in key battleground states such as Florida, Nevada and Colorado (Lopez & Taylor, cited in Stephen Castles, Hein de Haas, & Miller 2014). A recent study estimated that 40 million Latinos will be eligible to vote in 2030, up from 23.7 million in 2010 (Taylor, et al, 2012). The magnitude of Obama's victory seemed to reflect the increasing estrangement of the Republican Party from the daily lives and concerns of many Latino voters. This

particularly relates to the inability of President George W. Bush to secure immigration reforms, and more generally, strong Republican opposition with regard to immigration reform allowing the legislation of the approximately 11 million irregular migrants living in the United States, who are primarily Mexican and of Central American origin (Stephen, et al, 2014).

From the above discussion, we find that the rationale for the adoption of immigration policies and for different categories of immigration legislation will have different perception based on a differentiated measure of ideology. The next section assesses the impact of these sweeping immigration policies on Africans and Diaspora Africans.

Impacts of United States' Immigration Policy on Africans and African Diaspora

The policies to regulate immigration in the United States are expected to control and regulate the flow of migrants into the country; restrict, reduce or further encourage. Each of the policy choices are accompanied by several rationales, as well as impact on both the countries of origin and destination countries. It is worthy to note, however, that international migration is an ever growing phenomenon that has important implications for both the sending and receiving countries. While immigration is accompanied by social, health, economic, cultural impacts, the implications on Africans and Africans Diaspora are given attention here. Over the years, there has been a massive influx of Africans into the United States. Following this, there has been records of some successful feats as well as immigrants facing diverse travails either during their journeys or through the experiences in the communities they chose to settle in (Hamermesh, Daniel, & Bean 1998).

The effects of the United States' policies impact Africans directly. Following from the adoption of more stringent policies, trend of immigration and illegal entry into the United States is tightened and thus come with a lot of consequences. Over the years, Africans have always faced difficult times as a result of the dwindling economy and as a result some individuals resort to moving away in search of greener pastures, to provide better lives for themselves and their families at large. These movements away from the home countries are accompanied by positive and negative impacts which are discussed in this section.

Emigration from one's own country into another comes with the rare advantage in contribution to human capital formation. There is a growing body of evidence suggesting that the income from remittances is disproportionately spent on education and health rather than everyday consumption (Adams 2005; Adams, Cuenecuecha, & Page, J, 2008; World Bank, 2006b; Valero-Gil, 2008; Nagarajan, 2009). With a growing educated population, development will then not be far-fetched. Evidence from rural Pakistan suggests that temporary migration is associated with higher school enrolment, especially for girls (Mansuri 2006). Furthermore, migration has been observed to increase health knowledge in addition to the direct effect on wealth, which has led to lower rates of infant mortality and higher birth weights in Mexico (Hildebrandt & McKenzie, 2005).

Visiting and returning migrants may also bring back health-improving practices such as drinking safe water and better sanitation (UNDP 2009, p.79). Tougher restrictions in the flow of movements may act as a discouragement from individuals to seek knowledge of better skills or outrightly limit them, when they do not meet up the requirements involved, which have been further heightened by the present Trump administration. This means that the immigration policies of the United States inversely have an effect on education, especially for individuals who prefer to study abroad. Over the years, records show that there has been accommodation of immigrants in public schools. Every year about 65,000 immigrant students graduate from high schools and enter the workforce, or look into continuing their education, in the United States. (Sheehy, Kelsey 2014). However, our concern here is the consequent reduction in such records when more stringent policies are effectively implemented.

High-skilled emigration or the so-called “brain drain” can imply a loss of public resources invested in their education, can reduce the sending country’s productive capacity, and can worsen the business environment, especially in small economies. The emigration of the highly skilled can be particularly important in the education and health sectors in small countries that face severe shortages of health workers (Docquier, Marchiori, & Shen, 2010). Moreover, the departure of doctors may result in underemployment of nurses and other auxiliary staff (Commander, Kangasniemi, & Winters, 2004). However, as argued by Dustmann, Fadlon, & Weiss (2010), return migration can lead to mitigation of the brain drain, if not a net brain gain. When the migrants return, they have usually acquired skills that are needed in the sending community as manifested by a sizable wage premium paid to the returned migrants (Wahba, 2007). For example, the vacancy rate in Ghana’s public sector health positions was 47 percent for doctors and 57 percent for nurses in 2002 (Dovlo, 2003). Again, there is the possibility of emigrating abroad increases the interest in and returns to higher education, which can increase the total number of highly skilled also in the home country (Stark, 2004; World Bank 2006).

Despite concerns about the detrimental effects of brain drain on health, the shortage of health professionals in Africa is likely to stem from causes entirely unrelated to international migration (Clemens 2007), such as fragmented labour markets and insufficient public financing (Lucas, 2006). The U.S immigration policies which are being put in place will bring a reduction in this trend, as the processes involved in lawful entry has become more rigorous in recent policies. Economically, in contrast to critics who worry that immigrants take American jobs and depress American wages, considerable research suggests that immigrants contribute to the vibrancy of American economic development and the richness of its cultural life. They start new businesses, patent novel ideas, and create jobs. Although, evidence on the relationship between remittance inflows and economic growth in migrant-sending countries remains inconclusive, empirical studies

have found little evidence in support of a positive impact of remittances on economic growth (IMF 2005; World Bank, 2006; Spatafora, 2005; Barajas, Chami, Fullenkamp, Gapen, & Montiel 2009; Singh, Haacker, & Lee 2009).

However, remittances improve financial access and financial development and therefore stimulate growth (Toxopeus & Lensik, 2007; Giuliano & Ruiz-Arranz, 2005). The gains come in the form of the remittance that the migrants send home, which is often described as perhaps the most tangible and least controversial link between migration and development (Ratha, 2007). According to official estimates, migrants from developing countries sent over \$315 billion to their origin countries in 2009, three times the size of official development assistance (Ratha, Mohapatra & Silwal 2010).

Migration and remittance have both direct and indirect effects on the welfare of the population in the migrant sending countries. When the policies put in place no longer permits the residence of some Africans Diasporas or further limits immigrants from entry, the economic expectations thus are thwarted. This results in want, lack or shortage and contributes to poverty in the origin countries. For Africans Diaspora, the fear of deportation causes destabilisation and hinges on productivity.

At its best, migration can be a rewarding experience that is made in the interest of the household welfare. In most cases moving to another country and being separated from one's immediate family takes place at considerable financial and emotional cost (D'Emilio, Cordero, Bainvel, Skoog, Comini, Gough, Dias, Saab, & Kilbane 2007). The emotional impact is not just limited to the migrants themselves, but also to the family left behind. Especially in poorer households where the whole family cannot afford to move together, they may resort to migrating one after the other and this process can be cut short by the new policies limiting the movement of other family members which may have been left behind from residing with their family members in the United States. With the tougher measures put in place to discourage immigration into the United States, some families may be left frustrated, resulting also in emotional imbalance, depending on the reason necessitating such movements. For Africans Diaspora, this may result in complete detachment from their families.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Migration is a constant aspect of human history. Thus, it is widely believed that the trend of immigration into the United States is likely to continue in the next decades because of both push and pull factors. High socio-economic inequalities between developed and developing countries that increase the number of job seekers and many wars and authoritarian regimes that increase number of asylum seekers are among the most important push factors. On the other hand, the decline and aging of indigenous population in most Western countries and the unwillingness by many native workers to perform lower-tier jobs are among the important pull factors.

Amidst the factors that facilitate migration and the contribution of African immigrants to the United States, there are also negative trends that exhibit themselves as a result of immigration, such as immigrants' constituting a strain on the country's welfare system, undermining the cultural life of the host states, fear of becoming a threat in the future, making crime problems worse, reducing job opportunities of natives and so on. These have caused host administrations to embark on more stringent policies accompanied by several impacts on origin countries.

The welfare implications on the origin countries are also most noticeable. The main channels through which migration alleviates poverty are increased income from remittance, ability to smooth consumption, access to finance for starting up businesses, as well as tapping on to the knowledge and resources provided by the international community of the migrant Diaspora. Besides pure monetary gains, migration and remittance allow for provision of better health care and education investment. All these may be affected by the policy decisions of the host countries. Exploitation of migrants in different forms are also prevalent, by employers and recruiters; separation from family can also be stressful for immigrants although large scale immigration can pose serious challenges to a nation's identity and even by far sovereignty.

The paper finds that the rate of immigration and activities of migrants has affected policy decisions of leaders on the subject as well as support of the electorate in the different administrations. The paper finds that leaders with the most favoured inclination towards the aliens are either supported or voted against, where the political ideology of the legislators and electorates play out. Despite the benefits of immigration, the public and the policymakers at the destination country usually believe that immigration can become an economic burden, as immigration is feared to lead to loss of jobs, heavy burden on public services, social tension and increased criminality (UNDP, 2009) despite the evidence to the contrary. The negative economic outcome for the destination countries are increased job competition that allegedly brings down the wages for the locals, and the increased fiscal burden for caring for a growing population of immigrants. The negative effect of restricted immigration to the U.S. may also result in increased job competition, which is already prevalent in the area.

On one hand, the challenge of having millions of undocumented aliens working, residing and having families in the United States simply has so far not been dealt with head on. On the other hand, America has long devoted its time, energy and financial resources to the development or reconstruction of other nations, whether in Africa, South Eastern Europe, Middle East or Central Asia. Yet it is the lopsided economic condition of so many states that has led to the mass migration that is now seen as a major domestic challenge in the United States. Immigrants are viewed as part of the reason for the high cost of social services. Thus, immigration is not only part of the urbanisation challenge but the interaction between migration and the rapid urbanisation is likely to be important for

policy in the destination countries in the South. Thus, it is acceptable for these policies to be revisited and further strengthened, however the degree to which it is tightened should not inversely further worsen the state of the African countries. Several considerations should be made to ensure that neither the receiving nor sending countries suffer severe impacts.

As stated earlier, the paper finds that immigration has paid direct diplomatic benefits for the United States as well, as the trend constantly replenishes its pool of talent. Upon this fact, the policies have been updated for immigration to follow a stricter process, as well as restrictions out rightly given to certain individuals. The reasons identified for adopting these more stringent policies or actions are to increase respect for the laws, reduce potential security risk, strengthen labour rights and unburden public education and social services with the increasing population.

To address the immigration phenomenon appropriately, it is important to understand how immigration is perceived by the host country. This paper analysed the perceived reasons backing the adoption of certain migration policies by different administrations in the U.S. It was found that the Donald Trump administration has the strongest and more stringent policies and is perceived as containing numerous negative impacts. The Bush administration towed the line of its predecessors and the Obama administration was fair handed in the treatment of migrants. Different administrations enact policies of different perspectives according to the logic explained in rational choice theories, which recognizes the ability of leaders to make policy decisions that they consider reasonable at that particular point in time, taking into consideration the impacts. Thus, the paper explored congressional factors influencing immigration policies in connection with the theoretical approach adopted in this study which emphasises rational choices in the face of political and social decisions which guides administrations on their policy choices, and goes a long way to determine their success or failure.

From the discussions in this paper, it is possible to come up with several recommendations on the subject matter that nurture the benefits and mitigate the negative effects of migration. However, we recommend that the United States put several factors into consideration, thoroughly weighing the pros and cons before embarking on its immigration policies, so as not to distort its view as world power in the international system. African countries are also expected to put facilities in place to reduce mass immigration, to curb the negative outcomes from this trend. In general, 'fixing' the 'broken' immigration system could be accomplished through legalisation and reforms to create more legal visas, through more effective immigration enforcement, or through a combination of the two, which was the logic of CIR.

References

Abell, Peter (2000), 'Sociological Theory and Rational Choice Theory' in Bryan Turner, *The Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*, Second Edition, Blackwell Publishers, Malden, Massachusetts.

- Adams, R. H. (2006). Remittances and poverty in Ghana, The World Bank: Policy Research Working Paper, No.3838.
- Adams, R. H., Cuenecuecha, A and Page, J (2008). Remittances, consumption and investment in Ghana, World Bank: Policy Research Working Paper, No. 4515.
- Alex Nowrashteh (2016), Common Arguments Against Immigration, Addressed, Foundation for Economic Education. <https://fee.org/articles>
- Albrecht Glitz (2014), *The labour market impact of immigration*, published by: CREI Universitat Pompeu Fabra
- Amenta, E (1998). *Bold relief: Institutional politics and the origins of modern American social policy*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Barajas, A., R. Chami, R. Fullenkamp, C. Gapen, M & Montiel, P (2009). Do workers' remittances promote economic growth? Washington D.C: IMF Working Paper WP/09/153, International Monetary Fund
- Batalova, J and McHugh, M (2010) Dream vs. reality: An analysis of potential Dream Act beneficiaries, Migration Policy Institute <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/dream-insight-july2010.pdf>.
- Berry, R.A, Soligo, A (1969). Some welfare effects of international migration. *Journal of Political Economy*, 77, 778-794.
- Borjas, G (1999a). *Heaven's door: Immigration Policy and the American Economy*, Princeton: University Press.
- Borjas, G (1999b). Immigration and welfare magnets, *Journal of Labour Economics*, 17, 607-637
- Borjas, G (2001). *Heaven's door: immigration policy and the American economy*, N.J. and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Borjas, G and Freeman, R.B. (1992). Immigration and the work force: Economic consequences for the United States and source areas, National Bureau of Economic Research Project Report.
- Boswell, R (1987). The immigration reform amendments of 1986: Reform or rehash, *Journal of Legislation*, 14(1), 23-40.
- Burns, Peter and Gimpel, James (2000) Economic security, prejudicial stereotypes, and public opinion on immigration policy, *Political Science Quarterly*, 115, 201-225
- Bush, Jeb and McLarty III, Thomas, Edward Alden (2009). U.S. immigration policy, Independent Task Force Report No. 63
- Castles, S, de Haas, H, and Miller, M (2014). *The age of migration: International population movements in the modern world*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Clayton Brown (2003), *Globalization and America Since 1945*, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield
- Clemens, M (2007). Do visas kill? Health effects of African health professional emigration. Washington DC: Centre for Global Development (CGD) Working Paper, No. 114,
- Commander, S, Kangasniemi, M and Winters, L.A (2004). The brain drain: Curse or boon? A survey of the literature, In R.E. Baldwin, and L.A. Winters (Eds.) *Challenges to globalization: Analyzing the economics*, (pp.235-278), National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Congressional Budget Office (C.B.O, 2006). Immigration policy in the United States-The Congress of the United States, Congressional Budget Office
- D'Emilio, A.L., Cordero, B, Bainvel, B. Skoog, C., Comini, D. Gough, J, Dias, M, Saab, R and Kilbane, T (2007). The impact of international migration: Children left behind in selected countries of Latin America and the Caribbean. New York: Division of Policy and Planning, United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF).
- David C and Peri, G (2016). Immigration economics by George J. Borjas: A review essay, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 54(4), 1333-1349, doi.org/10.1257/jel.20151248
- Docquier, F., Marchiori, L and Shen, I.L (2010). Brain drain in globalization: A general equilibrium analysis from the sending countries' perspective, CEPR Discussion Paper, No. 7682.

- Dovlo, D. (2003). The brain drain and retention of health professionals in Africa: A case study prepared for regional training conference, improving tertiary education in sub-Saharan Africa: Things that work, Accra, 23-25 September.
- Dustmann, C., Fadlon, I and Weiss, Y (2010). Return migration, human capital accumulation, and the brain drain. Unpublished draft paper prepared for the multi-donor trust fund on labour markets, job creation and economic growth administered by the World Bank's Social Protection and Labour Unit, April 2010.
- Eulau, H (1973 Ed.) *Behaviouralism in political science*, New York: Atherton Press
- Facchini, G (2011). What drives United States immigration policy: Evidence from congressional roll call votes, *IZA Discussion Paper* No. 5561
- Facchini, G, Mayda, A.M and Mishra, P (2009). Do interest groups affect immigration? IMF Working Paper, WP/08/244
- Facchini, G. and Mayda, A. M (2007). Individual attitudes towards immigrants: Welfare-state determinants across countries, CESinfo Working Paper Series 1768.
- Facchini, G. and Mayda, A. M (2008). From individual attitudes towards migrants to migration policy outcomes: Theory and evidence. *Economic Policy* 56, 651-713.
- Facchini, G. and Mayda, A. M (2009). Does the welfare state affect individual attitudes toward immigrants? Evidence across countries, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 91, 295-314
- Gamboa, S (2010) New congress frosty towards immigrants, [http://www.salon.com/2010/12/26/ us immigration_what_next/](http://www.salon.com/2010/12/26/us_immigration_what_next/), accessed 20th June, 2018.
- Gimpel, James and Edwards, J.R (1999). *The congressional politics of immigration reform*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gilbert, I (2013). Obama's ruby slippers: Enforcement discretion in the absence of immigration reform, *West Virginia Law Review*, 116, 255-312.
- Giuliano, P and Ruiz-Arranz, M (2005). Remittances, financial development and growth, IMF Working Paper Series, WP/05/234,
- Hamermesh, Daniel, & Bean, Frank. (Eds.). (1998). Help or Hindrance?; The Economic Implications of Immigration for African Americans. Russell Sage Foundation. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7758/9781610442640>
- Hanson Gordon, Kenneth Scheve & Matthew Slaughter (2007), Public Finance and Individual Preferences over Globalization Strategies, *Economics and Politics* 19, 1-33
- Hainmueller, J. and Hiscox, M (2007) Educated preferences: Explaining individual attitudes toward immigration in Europe. *International Organization* 61, 399-442.
- Hainmueller, J. and Hiscox, M (2010). Attitudes toward highly skilled and low skilled immigration: Evidence from a survey experiment. *American Political Science Review*, 104, 61-84.
- Hergsten, F.C (2005). The United States and the world economy: Economic policy for the next decade, Washington DC: Challenges of the US Immigration Policies by Gordon Howard Hanson
- Hildebrandt, N and McKenzie, D (2005). The effects of migration on child health in Mexico, World Bank Policy Research Paper, No. 3573,
- International Monetary Fund (IMF, 2005). World economic outlook: Globalisation and external imbalances, Washington, D.C.
- Kyoso, D.E (2017). *How immigrants adjust to life in the United States: Challenges and opportunities*. North Charleston, South Carolina: CreateSpace: Independent Publishing Platform
- Lopez, M. H and Taylor, P (2009). "Dissecting the 2008 Electorate: Most Diverse in U.S. History." Pew Hispanic Center, Pew Research Center. April 40, 2009, Available at <http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1209/racial-ethnic-voterspresidential-election>

- Lucas, R.E.B (1987). Emigration to South Africa's mines, *American Economic Review*, 77(3), 313-330.
- Lucas, R.E.B (2006). Migration and economic development in Africa: A review of evidence, *Journal of African Economies*, 15(2), 337-395.
- Luedtke, A (2005) European integration, public opinion and immigration policy: Testing the impact of national identity. *European Union Politics* 6, 83-112.
- Mansuri, G (2006). Migration, sex bias, and child growth in rural Pakistan, Policy Research Working Paper, No. 3946,
- Marozzi, M(2016). Construction, robustness assessment and application of an index of perceived level of socio-economic threat from immigrants: A study of 47 European countries and regions, *Springer*, 128(1), 413-437
- Mayda, A. M (2006) Who is against immigration? A cross-country investigation of individual attitudes toward immigration, *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 88, 510-530
- McCumber, J (2011). The Failure of Rational Choice Philosophy," *New York Times*, <http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/06/19/the-failure-of-rational-choice/>. Accessed 25th June, 2018
- Meyers, E (2000) Theories of international immigration policy: A comparative analysis, *International Migration Review* 34, 1245-1282.
- Milner, He and Tingley, D (2011), The Economic and Political Influences on Different Dimensions of United States Immigration Policy (October 3, 2011). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2182086> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2182086>
- Nagarajan, S. (2009). "Migration, Remittances, and Household Health: Evidence from South Africa." Ph.D. dissertation, George Washington University, Washington, DC
- Ogu, Michael Ihuoma (2013). Rational choice theory: Assumptions, strengths, and greatest weaknesses in application outside the western milieu context, *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 1(3),90-99.
- Olivas, M (2012).Dreams deferred: Deferred action, prosecutorial discretion, and the vexing case(s) of DREAM Act students, *William and Mary Bill of Rights Journal*, 21(2), 463-547.
- Pierce, S, Bolter, J and Selee, A (2018) Trump's first year on immigration policies: rhetoric or reality, Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.
- Preston, James (2010). Immigration vote leaves Obama's policy in disarray, *New York Times*, www.nytimes.com/2010/12/19/us/politics/19dream.html, Accessed 25th June, 2018.
- Ratha, D and Mohapatra, S and Scheja, E (2011) Impact of migration on economic and social development: A review of evidence and emerging issues, World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 5558.
- Ratha, D and Shaw, W (2007). South-south migration and remittances, *World Bank Working Paper*, No. 102
- Ratha, D, Mohapatra, S and Silwal, A (2010). Outlook for remittance flows 2010-11 *Migration and Development Brief*, No. 12,
- Rosenblum, M.R (2011). US immigration policy since 9/11: Understanding the stalemate over comprehensive immigration reform. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.
- Schochet, L (2017). Trump's immigration policies are harming American children, Centre for American Studies.
- Selena, C and Saige, P (2006). Congress of United States, congressional budget office, immigration policy in the United States,
- Sheehy, Kelsey (2014) "How Immigrants Without Legal Status Can Pay for College", US News and World Report on 15 Aug. 2014
- Singh, R.J, Haacker, M and Lee, K.W (2009). Determinants and macroeconomic impact of remittances in sub-Saharan Africa, IMF Working Paper WP/09/216

- Skrentny, J. D. and López, J. L. (2013). Obama's immigration Reform: The triumph of executive action, *Indiana Journal of Law and Social Equality*, 2(1), 62-79.
- Sonia Alonso & Saro Claro da Fonseca, (2011) Party Politics published online - DOI: 10.1177/1354068810393265
- Spatafora, N (2005). Two current issues facing developing countries, In *World Economic Outlook: Globalisation and external Imbalances*, Washington DC: IMF
- Stephen Castles, Hein de Haas&Mark Miller(2014), *The Age of Migration*, Gulford Press, Palgrave Macmillan Higher Education, New York.
- Taylor, P, Gonzalez-Barrera, A, Passel, J.S and Lopez,. M.H (2012). "An Awakened Giant: The Hispanic Electorate is Likely to Double by 2030," Pew Research Center, <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2012/11/14/an-awakened-giant-the-hispanic-electorate-is-likely-to-double-by-2030/>
- Torrice, S (2018). Trump's immigration policy, policy intern-community, Economic Development of Michigan
- Toxopeus, H and Lensink, R (2007). Remittances and financial inclusion in development, UNU-WIDER Research Paper No.2007/49,
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP, 2009). Overcoming barriers: Human mobility and development. New York: United Nations Development Programme.
- United States Government Accountability Office (USGAO, 2009). Key US-VISIT components at varying stages of completion, but integrated and reliable schedule needed, Washington, DC: GAO, www.gao.gov/new.items/d1013.pdf.
- Valero-Gil, J (2008). Remittances and the household's expenditure on health, MPRA Paper No. 9572
- Wahba, J (2007). Returns to overseas work experience: The case of Egypt, In C. Ozden and M. Schiff (Eds.) *International migration, economic development and policy*, World Bank and Washington DC: Palgrave MacMillian
- World Bank. (2006). Global Economic Prospects 2006: Economic Implications of Remittances and Migration. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Xinyuan Dai (2007), *International Institutions and National Policies*, Cambridge: CU Press
- Yearbook of Immigration Statistics: 2011

Biographical Notes

Olawari D.J, EGBE, Ph.D, is a Lecturer in the Department of Political Science, Niger Delta University, Wilberforce Island Yenagoa- NIGERIA. Mail: odjegbe@gmail.com,

Tari GBAIWOGHA, is a PG Student in the Department of Political Science, Niger Delta University, Wilberforce Island Yenagoa, NIGERIA. Mail: pinkietarie@gmail.com.