Abstract
The paper addresses the different aspects of the politics of immigration, the underlying factors that motivate, force or pressurize people to move from their country of origin to new abodes in foreign nations. In the introduction the paper discusses different theories playing their due role in the immigration process, namely Realism and Constructivism. The paper examines the history of immigration and post-World War II resettlement followed by an analysis of how immigration policies are now centered towards securitization as opposed to humanitarianism after 9/11, within the scenario of globalization. Muslim migrant issues and more stringent immigration policies are also weighed in on, followed by a look at immigration in regions which are not hotspot settlement destinations. Lastly an analysis is presented about the selection of a host country a person opts for when contemplating relocation; a new concept is also discussed and determined whereby an individual can opt for “citizenship by investment” and if such a plan is an accepted means of taking on a new nationality.
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Introduction: State and the Burden of Immigration
According to Realism, International Law allowed for immigration on the pretext of humanitarianism. However since 9/11, constructivism has set in replacing humanitarianism with securitization. Host countries which had open immigration policies are now seeking secure borders for their citizens, hence significantly controlling the immigration inflow. Immigration and security have now become complimentary, a development revealed through the ‘Immigration and Naturalization Service’ (INS) which was recently merged with the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). Europeans have followed suit by being labeled as ‘Fortress Europe’ with stricter inflow to their borders (Boylan, 2009). The paper addresses different aspects of the politics of immigration primarily the underlying factors that motivate, force or pressurize people to move from their country of origin to new abodes in
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foreign nations. Recent statistics reveal that migration has speedily spiked in the past decade and a half, reaching 244 million in 2015 from 222 million in 2010, and 173 million in 2000. The majority of migrants opt for Europe or Asia, making it two thirds of the migrant population (76 million and 75 million respectively). North America falls in third for the next highest number of migrants (54 million). The first part of this paper focuses on sovereign states and factors that place a burden on immigration for them. Then the history of immigration and post-war resettlement is viewed, and in the last part of the paper factors in on securitization and Muslim migrant issues are addressed.

Immigration policies are multifaceted and hence the followers and opponents of different types of immigration policies vary according to their priorities. Ellis (2005) states that the geography of immigrants in the United States crosses with a federalized system for distributing welfare and other social costs of immigration; hence giving rise to friction between the central and local government. The central government in this case is responsible for admission of immigrants into the country whereas the local governments undertake the management of social costs of immigrant inclusion.

Gordan, Travers, & Whitehead (2007) contend that immigration to the UK and especially to London has snowballed in recent years; London now stands in competition to New York and Toronto for the most diverse populations. The migrants are primarily young and hold diversity in their skills and countries of origin, however one key factor which attributes to London’s economy is the difference between immigrants originating from richer countries and those from poorer countries. Both categories of immigrants are reasonably well qualified but most of those from richer countries are likely to exit the country, while those from poorer countries are more likely to stay for a longer duration. This prolonged tenure of stay then leads to a long-term population growth both directly and through their UK-born children (ibid, 2007).

Schulzkek (2012) states that asylum seekers are primarily attracted to social democratic welfare states because of the benevolent welfare supplies and lack of employment opportunities, whereas the labor migrant edges away from such facilities in order to access the labor market. Freeman (1995) holds the view that existing literature on immigration extensively focuses on western nations and non-western nations are primarily considered as ‘sending countries’. Greenstone & Looney (2010) elaborate the economic effects of immigration fluctuate immensely, depending on whether immigrants are untrained agricultural workers, or extremely skilled PhD computer scientists.

**Historical Background**

London, the capital of the once great British Empire on which the sun never set, started off as a city of foreigners since Roman rule. It was a commercial hub back in those days. However, with the demise of the Roman Empire in the 5th century, London’s inhabitants were no longer immigrants but natural born citizens. With the institution of English rule by King Alfred, a span of fruitfulness for business ushered in leading to increased travelling through this trading center of merchants, diplomats and even servants. Lombard Street, a banking center took its name after Lombard tradesmen who settled there from the north of Italy in the 12th century. Between the 15th and 16th century there was almost a doubling of foreigners in the British capital, which intermittently angered the local residents due to the advantages granted to those
‘visitors’. However the monarchy welcomed this influx as certain advantages came along with it, such as the avenues for accelerated tax collection. London became a center for trade and thrived as a cosmopolitan city even before the Reformation. By the mid-17th century there was considerable growth in the number of immigrants, most of whom were fleeing religious persecution, such as anti-Semitism. Continental Europe hence became a rescue location for the ‘needy’, a direct impact of this expansion of foreigners was manifest in the form of increased expenses, making London one of the most expensive places in the entire continent. However it was not all about expenditure or high wages, the economy took a boost and more merchants became increasingly active in the emerging city (Gordan, Travers, & Whitehead, 2007).

In the 19th century there was an increased influx of foreigners in London due to the famine in nearby Ireland. The Jewish number also swelled, primarily due to people fleeing the persecution of the surrounding region such as Poland and Russia. Many Russian and Polish migrants achieved success in businesses as they continued to settle and made a life for themselves in the new country of their residence. Hence London was not simply a place of refuge for the oppressed; rather it became a business hub and a center of attraction for tourists and the elite (ibid, 2007).

**Post-war Resettlement**

The period after the Second World War brought widespread migration; most people sought refuge due to political victimization which had huge financial impacts. These impacts primarily included a splurge for the labour force in West Germany which continued to increase until the erection of the Wall between East and West Germany (Gordan, Travers, & Whitehead, 2007). The breakdown of nationalities and the respective countries they mostly flocked to, is as follows: Turks moved to Germany, Bangladeshis and Pakistanis fled to England, Algerians to France and Moroccans to Spain and France (Boylan, 2009). For the UK, its immigrants were primarily from former British colonies: namely an influx of immigrants from Africa and South Asia (Peach, 2007). Pakistanis in Britain however, are in the lead and a majority of them came from Azad Kashmir, specifically from Mirpur, an agro-based area. After two decades the Bangladeshis followed the lead primarily coming primarily from Sylhet, mostly a peasant region (Peach, 2007, p. 20).

The 1950s and 1960s labor immigration was encouraged by North European nations who saw it as a tool for financial prosperity. For London, the 1960s saw a different influx of migrants, the ‘non-white’ flow infiltrating from South Asia; many Pakistanis were welcomed for accepting ‘unwanted’ jobs, which led immigrants to the north of England away from London. For production of products, inexpensive labor by off-shoring work became the preferable means for supplies to be traded (Gordan, Travers, & Whitehead, 2007). Interestingly, a contradiction about the Muslim population in Britain is that even though they do not hold a strong economic status on the whole, they serve as exemplary role models socially, given the fact that they have strong family units (Peach, 2007, p. 30).

The late 1980s witnessed migration on a much more heterogeneous level in Western Europe from war torn countries in Eastern Europe and the developing world. The information obtained by these migrants was from a more global media and communication with earlier migrants. London has most definitely been on the
forefront of an increase in immigration since the past two decades receiving nearly 40 percent of the overall inflow. This amounts to three times its demographic share, reflecting a truly metropolitan culture (Gordan, Travers, & Whitehead, 2007). Immigration has affected the following cities the most in order of greatest to least number of migrants: New York, Toronto, Dubai, Los Angeles, London, Amsterdam, Vancouver, Sydney, Miami and Melbourne (ibid, 2007).

**Securitization**

Securitization on the borders is three-pronged, namely global, regional and domestic. At the international level securitization is limited, due to the fact that the different countries have different norms and diverse political climates where migration might not always be viewed as a security challenge. Hence, similar immigration policy is not likely. That said, in the aftermath of 9/11, somewhat alike migration policies are on board; the foremost premise being that every Muslim is a possible terrorist. From the regional perspective, uniformity of securitization is again highly unlikely even for a regional entity like the European Union. Simply because that each country has its own priorities in the political and economic domains; also there is an imbalance in the flow of migrants. Lastly, diversity of perceptions towards migration impede the development of a consolidated securitization policy. At the local level, securitization takes place either by a single actor, for instance a political party or by multiple actors such as any political party, a religious unit and the media. The gravest threat lies in the securitization entity unable to determine with discretion who poses a security threat and who does not; leading to the misleading generalization that all immigrants pose a terror threat. The negative impact of such securitization is the increase of racial discrimination and dislike of foreigners amidst the locals, augmenting right-wing parties and neo-Nazi movements. An example of this intolerance can be seen in Greece where the Neo-Nazi entity ‘Χρυσή Αυγή’ (Golden Dawn) has called for every expatriate to leave, pleading that each immigrant leads to unemployment for Greeks; a scenario all too familiar for places such as France, Canada and the Scandinavian countries (Themistocleous, 2013). Immigration resentment is not limited to these places, there have been open messages to foreigners in the Netherlands from Mark Rutte, the Prime Minster contending that both adjust to the Dutch lifestyle or leave; in no manner will their dissent of the Dutch norms be tolerated (Henley, 2017). Such instances reflect the implementation of constructivism into immigration policies.

While we discuss borders, globalization needs to be considered as a major concern in the present age. Globalization is a phenomenon that has ushered a post-geographical era. The world community is connected through advanced means of communication. Such occurrences apparently dilute states’ sovereignty. Huge capitalist companies are not restricted to their home ground and domestic markets; they penetrate into the globe, leading to production and consumption globally (Cox, 2004). With such apparent economic benefits, the question that must be addressed is what has caused the shift in immigration policies from globalization and humanitarianism back to realism and securitization? Interestingly the grandeur of sovereignty and rights to securitize one’s borders has been revisited since 9/11. The hyper-reinforcement of boundary security is championed in countries where immigrants are keen to enter. The EU internally is more porous but externally there are tighter border controls, this transformation has resulted in the exemption of passport procedures amongst EU countries, while entry into ‘Fortress Europe’ is more
stringent. Globalization however has not mitigated the right to citizenship, a right especially coveted where social welfare benefits exist; such privileges prevail to become causes of immigration. The US-Mexico border presents its own pros and cons; despite the fact that immigration to the US is becoming increasingly stringent, it is an accepted fact that numerous unlawful Mexican immigrants are the source of survival for the employers of California and Texas. It remains a paradox, for economic convenience borders are diluted but for securitization all laws and rules are upheld with the highest of obligations (Cox, 2004).

**Muslim Migrant Issues**

Issues of immigration are steadily making their way to the top of agenda priorities. Post 9/11, Muslim societies in the United States and Europe have been under tight scrutiny. The blame of the attacks resting on Muslims has led their entire belief system and actions to come under the microscope. There is apparently a contrast to the treatment Muslims face in the US as opposed to Europe. European Muslims take tougher repercussions due to some of the following reasons:

- The US is a country founded on the principles of a new settlement, whereas such concepts in Europe are not politically accepted.
- Muslims cling to their religious practices which distinguish them from an openly secular Europe.
- Muslims who migrate to the US tend to spread throughout the country and obtain good qualifications or succeed as merchants, opposed to Muslims in Western Europe who more or less assemble in enclaves and are comparatively less influential than their Muslim American counterparts (Ezzarqui, n.d.).

Post 9/11 terror attacks reveal that the offenders were not destitute individuals seeking monetary gains, rather educated youngsters with potentials for bright futures from various countries. What is especially troubling is when second generation British born Muslims adopt extremist ideologies (Inglehart & Norris, 2009). The concept that integration is the solution to eradicate extremism is found to be contrary. For instance if we consider the case of Omar Shaikh, the renowned British Muslim guilty of terrorism, studied in an elite private British school instead of a religious Muslim school. One of the 9/11 hijackers Zacarias Moussaoui has been described by his brother as having a non-religious rearing and his first entry into a mosque was in Britain in his mature years. These examples serve to relay that the socially integrated individuals are equally prone to terrorism. Surprisingly, a Gallup survey reveals that Muslims in the UK display more confidence in their government and other agencies of the country in contrast to other UK citizens (Winter, 2007, pp. 37-38).

To a large extent internet is held responsible for this extremist ideology the youth edge towards. Cyberspace is believed to have filled the vacuum that individuals encounter when facing an identity crisis. Studies also suggest that some radicalized youngsters turn to extremism in the course of finding solace against the people who hold disregard for Muslims in general. This transnational space which is not monitored rears intense hatred and enlistment of future terrorists (Winter, 2007, pp. 39-40). A Pew survey revealed the American Muslim youth consider themselves to be Muslims first and then Americans (Barrett, 2007, p. 77). However it is necessary to
point out that no European Muslim has carried out an act of terrorism directly after his transnational space encounter and that personal contact has remained a prerequisite for recruitment of such acts. One advantage of this type of enrollment is that these sites can be monitored with those possessing the required language skills. As heated discussions continue about maintaining a balance between civil freedom and increasing surveillance, the UK has taken measures for more securitization such as expanding its personnel in the M15 by 50 percent with a strong focus on employing Urdu, Arabic, Farsi speaking individuals; France has also made efforts in the same direction, but other countries such as Germany and Spain are lagging in this area. The European welfare set-up allows immigrants survival means without employment whereas the US does not offer such generous ‘gains’. The immigrants have to instead work for the American dream. Geneive Abdo, an author and reputed journalist notes that more females are donning the hijab and increased Muslim youth are flocking to Islamic schools, owning their Muslim identity, sensing that assimilation is futile. One Muslim female shared with Abdo that certain people of her religion go to all ends to fit in, they drink and go on courtships, however her main apprehension was losing her modesty in the midst of her assimilation (Barrett, 2007, p. 78).

Muslim Student Association (MSA) reflects hard core beliefs which frown on US foreign policy and Israel; alongside statistics reveal a visible increase in hate crimes recorded by Muslim organizations (ibid, 2007). Moderate Muslim leaders walk a tightrope where they desire their communities to integrate into their respective adopted societies and at the same time do not want to be perceived as unfaithful by radicals of their faith. After the 9/11 attacks, financial support for Islamic religious causes has dipped primarily due to fear of being traced to terrorism (Winter, 2007, p.42). Another heated debate in Germany is whether their law-abiding denizens who hold opinions opposed to German values and norms should have their citizenship revoked or not be granted citizenship if they are awaiting it? German authorities continue to ponder how to integrate Muslim leaders and religious organizations with Leitkultur (‘German values’). If a comparison be drawn between the integration policies of France and Germany, a defence line for Germany is that France has generated generations of ‘français de papier’ (‘officially French’) without creating ‘français-de-coeur’ (‘wholeheartedly French’) (Laurence, n.d.). The US also takes issue with extremism in Europe, apprehending there is a threat that these European passport holders can penetrate their terrorist intents on US soil, leading to a conflict between the transatlantic partners. Governments have taken action against radical imams accused of hate speech, France and Germany have deported those accused of such incitement. France has revoked the license of the Lebanese-Manar TV network, guilty of spreading hatred and aggression. Europe aims to train imams schooled in the West as currently most of these religious leaders are ‘imported’ to these western countries; such efforts however have led radical imams to go underground.

Prisons are another terrorist recruiting ground and are considered incubators for processing hard core terrorists. Criminals accused of petty crimes and drug accusations become indoctrinated and eventually get recruited to terrorist organizations; the US has started to segregate prisoners who are suspected radicals. However Europeans have not followed this policy and continue to place such prisoners together with the hope of rehabilitation, something they need to reevaluate.
European prison authorities are also incompetent in their efforts to monitor suspects due to language barriers and not monitoring those who leave prison.

Countries where terror threats are on high alert, especially both sides of the Atlantic, have Muslim immigrants on the rise. Moreover the existing Muslims who have already acquired the respective countries’ citizenship have a higher birth rate than non-Muslim families (Archick et al., 2011). The aging white Western European populace will lead to an increase of ‘foreign’ labor requirements; this vacuum will likely be filled by the exploding and unemployed population of North Africa, Eastern Europe and Russia which provides means of unlawful migration. Another source of labor force extended family, for instance, statistics reveal that 50 percent of naturalized Pakistanis in Britain resort to marrying Pakistanis who then take on British citizenship (Modood, 2012). Consequences of Muslim progeny are that they are sometimes discontented in spite of being European passport holders. In essence, they fail to integrate with their adopted country, leading to the ‘breeding of Osama bin Ladens’, some suggest the solution to such mushrooming is communal assimilation of these potential ‘lone wolves’ (Boylan, 2009). Although assimilation is welcomed for the results it ought to produce, the application of it is definitely contrary; for instance in France wearing of the hijab is not acceptable and hence such discrimination has its own fall-outs. The French secular status implemented a ban on all noticeable religious signs in schools such as crosses, Jewish yarmulkes and Sikh turbans in order to allow integrity amongst pupils. In contrast to this policy, the UK, Finland and Italy advocate tolerance of religious icons in public locations in order to support a multicultural strategy, stating that citizens have the right to live as hyphenated British-Muslims. Although the exact statistics for the Muslim population are not available since many European countries do not include a religion column in their census, one thing is for sure, the Muslim population is on a rapid rise in Europe (Peach, 2007, p. 7).

Holland’s replica of Donald Trump, right-wing Geert Wilders is adamant about his views regarding the negative impact of Muslims in his country. Although Wilders has been convicted of provoking prejudice through hate speech and many of his countrymen are in disagreement with his views, moreover in support of Wilder, the Brexit and Trump’s victory predicted that Wilders would win the March 15th 2017 elections (Hjelmgaard, 2017). To the relief of many, Wilders did not win; however, he gained an increased number of seats and has explicitly stated it is not the end of him (Graham, 2017). Wilders in his election campaign had even stated that he would ban the holy Islamic book, and further close down all Muslim places of worship. The threat of Islam to the Netherlands and whether the Dutch have done their share to safeguard their culture was a topic of discussion during the election debates. A recent survey revealed that Dutch Muslims, mostly with Turkish and Moroccan roots no longer feel at home in the Netherlands. The entire publicity during the election campaign was about Muslims, forcing Muslims to feel they are under surveillance, constantly being targeted as outcasts, so much so that they choose to address themselves as Moroccans rather than Dutch Moroccans. Interestingly, the physical color of a person has become very relevant, if one is white or not, white voters harbor resentment for immigrants’ posterity who have advanced the social rungs of society (Bahceli, 2017). Further, Turkey’s inclusion into the European Union has not been welcomed by all; opponents consider the EU to be somewhat of a ‘Christian club’ so
a Muslim nation’s integration signals to a possible clash of civilizations (Ezzarqui, n.d.).

Internal struggles within the Muslim community also take their toll; the Shia, Sunni divide and the spread of the Saudi Salafi/Wahhabi ideology, perceived as less tolerant, has greatly contributed to tarnishing the Muslim image worldwide. Where all responses have been weighed in, the following may also be worth mentioning. Kausar Mohammed, a young performer from California has sung ‘Dangerous Muslim’ with the message that Trump’s rhetoric for Muslims may actually prove contradictory. The youth wishes to address Islamophobia and desires that all Muslims should not be categorized according to the stereotypes of the West (Kuruvilla, 2017).

Immigration in Other Regions
Apprehensions about migration overviews indicate there are often outdated migration policies and since the rapid growth of terrorism there are increased limitations on welcoming foreigners. In the Persian Gulf, western foreigners comprise one-third to one-fourth of the working foreign population; they are financially strong but still not integrated. In contrast, the large South Asian and the Southeast Asian workforce, in spite of spending extended durations in the Gulf countries are not granted rights for permanent residency or citizenship. In Asia, immigration is a low political priority and not a topic in the limelight as in North America and Western Europe. Varied immigration responses swing from almost complete denial to active acceptance. South America has inter-regional migration, mostly pushed by factors such as financial and economic advancement along with some situations of political unrest. Argentina, Venezuela, Costa Rica and Mexico are key destinations for migrants from the same continent. Latin America also lacks in granting due legal standing to migrants, which hinders their options of finding stable work. Africa, due to its increasing poverty, rural people are forced to flee to cities in search of better employment. The widespread effect of AIDS on the economy and the increased civil strife has impacted the flow of people within the region (Ezzarqui, n.d.).

Conclusion
Asylum seekers are prone to choose welfare states for their country of destination for fear of being unemployed and not being granted work permits and because these social democratic welfare states provide benevolent welfare supplies. Labor migrants are more likely to be inclined to countries where welfare benefits are not widespread as such ‘advantages’ deter market efficiency and locating a working slot does not come with ease. The corporatist welfare state has claimed that both types of immigrants are definitely pulled by this welfare regime because considerably high welfare conditions along with market-based regulations have an advantageous blend for forced as well as economic migrants. The liberal welfare states contrary to common belief do not have a magnetic force for labor migrants, in spite of the perception that their economic policies pull migrants. The reason for this rejection is possibly their welfare benefits being too marginal (Schulzke, 2012).

An emerging immigration trend is “citizenship by investment”. As countries become more stringent with their immigration laws, a budding and widespread industry is offering an alternative to citizenship through paying a handsome fee. This fee is paid in the form of property deals, businesses or donations to a nation’s government, all in exchange for a visa or a passport. The most popular destination is
the Caribbean with its golden beaches, where there is no outrageous investment plus the laws are more welcoming. Besides such magnets for investment, another factor to score points as the most sought after nation by immigrants is by evaluating which country has the most visa-free destinations on its passport. At the moment, Germany takes this distinction. Andrew Henderson, an American businessman is acquiring his fifth citizenship, stating that such opportunities provide him reduced taxes and improved treatment. Such initiatives however, are not without their share of controversy. US senator Dianne Feinstein has introduced a bill to eliminate the EB-5 programme, stating that it is not acceptable to sell citizenship rights to the rich, while millions tirelessly await their visa destinies (Beck, 2017).

As for securitization, McIntosh & Bogden (2016) state that Trump’s immigration policy is three-fold, whereby its first target is US boundary protection, which is primarily directed towards a wall being erected on the Mexican border. Secondly, Trump aims to augment the assets and authority of the Federal law agency and thirdly, Trump desires to reduce immigration in order to adjust the US employee in the local market, due to a salary increase. In regard to the Muslim factor, Leila Ezzarqui (n.d.) regards the compulsory courses and tests in the native language of the host nation as deliberated procedures towards integration. These are important but they are not mechanisms for integration and they should not overshadow pressing issues catering to education, health etc. Katrine Anspaha (2008) supports the fact that previously Muslims in Europe had little impact on EU’s foreign policy however since the Global War on Terror, the Islamic factor cannot be overlooked and European decision makers need to make conscious efforts to make the Muslims inclusive to their policies.
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