

The History of Immigration in the U.S.A. and its Policy from 2009 to 2019

Didier Arcade Loumbouzi¹, Préféré Gildas Olenga²

^{1,2}*Faculté des Lettres, Arts et Sciences Humaines /Université Marien Ngouabi, Brazzaville, Congo*
Corresponding author: Didier Arcade Loumbouzi

ABSTRACT : This paper is about immigration in the United States of America from the origins to the present with a focus on the second decade of the twenty-first century. Having a look at the history of immigration in the United States of America before and after 1776, the American immigration system and policies of immigration applied under the presidencies of Barack Obama and Donald Trump, the objective of this work is to show the decline of the U.S. immigration policy. Using the historical approach, it is concluded that people permanently move from different places to establish in America for various reasons and no government policy should stop this immigration but strictly control it as it has always been a relevant contribution to the making and the future of America.

KEYWORD: Barack Obama, Donald Trump, immigration, U.S.A.

I. INTRODUCTION

Immigration is one of the salient issues of the twenty-first century that keep generating passionate and heated debates among intellectuals, politicians or ordinary people in the world as more particularly in the United States of America (U.S.A.). From its discovery as part of the New World later on known as America to its independence, the U.S.A. is closely linked to immigration, the process which helps someone “comes into a country of which one he is not a native for permanent residence” (*Merriam-Webster*, 2018). As it may be legal or illegal, laws and practices to rule it in a given country or, to say it shortly, the Nation’s policy of immigration is the concern of the government. Some specialists have already concluded on this issue such as Richard J. Hardy. (2011), John D. Skrentny, and Jane Lilly López (2013), Sarah Pierce et al (2018). Having a look at the genesis of the U.S. immigration, this paper is also about the policy of immigration as implemented in the United States in the second decade of the twenty-first century more precisely from 2009, the first year of Barack Obama’s two-term presidency, to 2019, the third year of Donald Trump’s still going on presidency. In reality, the debate keeps on to know now how the US immigration policy is changing. It is supposed that any U.S. government policy devoted to an absolute protection of its citizens’ safety and welfare makes the country close to foreigners. To solve this problem, the historical perspective is used to have the current practices reflected in the past from the early times. The objective of this paper is to show the decline of the U.S. immigration policy. Thus, an emphasis is laid on the immigration history in the U.S.A., the U.S. immigration system, and the U.S. immigration policy from 2009 to 2019 through Barack Obama and Donald Trump’s presidencies.

II. A SHORT SURVEY OF IMMIGRATION HISTORY

The history of American immigration goes from the arrival of Christopher Columbus in the New World or the Newfoundland in 1492 to the present. It has been going on in different stages. Some historians like Leonard C. Wood et al (1975: 550) distinguish the Old Immigration from the New Immigration:

The term *Old Immigration* refers to the people who came to America before 1885, when the nation’s people were mostly farmers. The *New Immigration* refers to people who began to arrive in America after 1885, as the United States developed rapidly into an industrial nation.

This distinction remains true as it was seemingly made on the basis of the economical evolution of America. It can be made on the basis of laws as the country changed from colony into modern independent Nation. So, the two periods can differently be identified to speak about the Pre-Independence Immigration from 1492 to 1776 and the Post-Independence Immigration from 1789 to the present.

II.1. Pre-independence immigration

The New World was already inhabited by Indians as Christopher Columbus called them when he shifted to that place thinking that it was the west of India in 1492. Indians could have come from somewhere to settle there, they are treated here not as immigrants but as natives. They progressively witnessed the coming of European settlers dispossessing them from the land which remains under the control of England until 1776, the year ending the colonial times. During that period, many Africans also came as slaves.

The first European to arrive in the New World was Christopher Columbus, the Italian explorer commonly introduced as the man who discovered America in 1492 although Amerigo Vespucci an Italian, too, claimed “to have been the first to have seen South America” (*Oxford*, 2018). For sure, the latter was the man from whom the Newfoundland has been called since 1507 (*Encarta Encyclopedia*, 2008) when a German mapmaker, Martin Waldseemüller, produced a map of the world accompanied by a treatise entitled *Cosmographiae Introductio*, with an important reference to him, as his first name (Amerigo) can explain the origin of the name America.

In 1497, John Cabot, another Italian explorer but sponsored by the king of England travelled to the north of the Newfoundland. The exploration started changing into settlement with Captain John Smith who founded the first English permanent territory called Jamestown in 1607 before a larger region around it and called New England in 1614. He stimulated the migration to that place. Later on, important groups of people migrated not only from England but also from other European countries (Scotland, France, Netherland, Spain, Germany, etc) for various reasons. Immigrants did not shift to a paradise when they arrived. In addition to wilderness, they sometimes met Indians’ hostility. So, starting life was not at all easy in the New World. This is proved by the origins of the Thanksgiving celebration in relation to what happened in Plymouth in November 1620 reported by George B. Tindall and David P. Shi (1989: 21):

The Pilgrims built and occupied their dwellings amid the winter snows. Many failed to see the arrival of spring. “It pleased God,” Bradford noted, “to visit us with death daily, and with so general a disease that the living were scarce able to bury the dead.” Nearly half the colonists died of exposure and disease, but friendly relations with the neighboring Indians proved their salvation. In the spring of 1621, the colonists met Squanto, who showed them how to grow maize. By autumn the Pilgrims had had a bumper crop of corn, a flourishing fur trade, and a supply of lumber for shipment. To celebrate they held a harvest feast with the Indians which later would be dubbed Thanksgiving.

The Thanksgiving day celebrated each fourth Thursday of November in the USA is a memorable day when Americans remember not only the “miracle” to survive harsh realities experienced there but also the arrival of people meeting some friendly Natives. These were immigrants from Europe who decided to settle in the New World and to build what will become the U.S.A. Europeans in general and English in particular were the first immigrants who were soon joined by Africans.

It may sound debatable to mention Africans as part of the pre-independence immigration while slavery was officially practiced. The debate is legitimate but it does not exclude African presence in the area in this indicated period. As such, Africans identified far from their own land could be concerned with immigration.

Africans’ early moving to the New World was traced with that of Europeans. The African presence stood visible there from the beginning. John F. Kennedy’s words cited by L. C. Wood et al. (1975: 550) proved it: “The three ships which discovered America sailed under a Spanish flag, were commanded by an Italian sea captain, and included in their crews an Englishman, an Irishman, a Jew, and a Negro.” It is evident that an African being placed in this position could not justify the starting point of Africans’ immigration to the New World. Even when there was the group of the first twenty blacks who arrived there as servants in 1619 just after the foundation of New England, a region including Jamestown, there was nothing yet. Anyway, Africans only followed Europeans’ steps by accident. They never imitated Europeans but they were brought by force because of slavery, a practice justified by the necessity to provide their farms with an important manpower needed for hard work. Even though, they did not personally decide to settle in the New World, Dorothy and Thomas Hoobler (2003: 28) in *We Are Americans* identified them as “unwilling immigrants of colonial times” what Vincent N. Parrillo (1997: 347) already stated with more precision by writing: “Most Africans who arrived in America from 1619 until the end of the slavery trade, in 1808, were unwilling immigrants [...]” No one of them took a personal decision to move back as well as no one of them was back to Africa. Their no return trip to the New World placed them in a situation of immigration.

While the first immigrants went to the New World, they were very soon joined by other people from Africa. In early or colonial America, African “immigrants” were used doing hard work. Through their inhuman exploitation by white immigrant masters, they contributed a lot to the enterprise of building the prospective U.S.A.

It is better to emphasize that each of the people, Europeans and Africans, differently migrated to the New World. Be it done willingly or unwillingly, immigration supposes cutting the link to the homeland and devote one's life to the destination country. The New World was transformed from a kind of land almost not cultivated or exploited to a new modern society. From the discovery to colonial times and from colonial times to the independence, so many changes occurred thanks to immigrants, makers of a process founding a Nation. That was the work of pioneers who came to recognize themselves as citizens and claim independence. Changing the colonial America into the United States of America on July 4, 1776, immigrants were changing themselves into Americans. The preamble of the Constitution reads:

We the people of the United States of America, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and prosperity, do ordain this constitution for the United States of America (L. C. Wood et al, 1975: 206).

This constitution shaping America as a modern Nation and identifying Americans as a real people came into existence thanks to immigrants, now Americans. The personal pronoun "we" was a singular one in practice. At the beginning it stood for whites excluding nonwhites.

From 1776, the country did not resemble the land which was inhabited by its Natives in the beginning. On the one hand, Europeans, the pioneers, made a new country in the image of their former countries. On the other hand, Africans maintained in slavery were also instrumental in the transformation and the making up of the new American society.

II.2. Post-independence immigration

If the making process of the U.S.A. with 13 states in 1776 kept on until the entry into the Union of Alaska and Hawaii in 1959, immigration to the U.S.A. did not stop after 1776 even when its constitution came into effect in 1789. Instead of saying more from then to the present about individual or massive immigration from Europe, America (Mexico, Latin America), Asia, and even Africa, the development is limited to examples of the mid-1800, a very significant period in the history of immigration in the USA. Within the same period, there were massive immigrations from Europe, Mexico, and China.

Immigrants came from Europe mostly Ireland and Germany, and had several reasons to do so as they are reported by Leonard C. Wood et al (1975: 550). Because of Potato Famine in Ireland during the period 1845-1851, millions of Irish were obliged to leave their homeland. Among numerous Germans moving to America in the 1840's, there were farmers forced by crop failures, Jews in search of religious freedom and others escaped from political troubles. Apart from Irish and German immigrants, there were other British, Scandinavians, Norwegians, and Sweden coming in America. Immigration kept on and "the increase in population it brought contributed to economic growth" (G. B. Tindall and D. E. Shi, 1989: 296).

Immigrants came also from Mexico as it may not be surprising for historic and geographic reasons. Mexico and the U.S.A. share a common border which history draws the moving of their people from one country to another. When Mexico got its independence from Spain in 1821, Americans were authorized to live in the Mexican northern territory where regions such as California (rich in gold) and Texas attracted them. They were more and more numerous there. When Texas proclaimed its independence from Mexico in 1836, the U.S.A. recognized it before annexing this new independent state in 1845 (G. B. Tindall and D. E. Shi, 1989: 337-340). At this time, Texas included not only the current Texas but also parts of what are now New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, Kansas and Oklahoma. The annexation of Texas raised a conflict between U.S.A. and Mexico. Since the attempt to reach a peaceful agreement failed, both countries moved closer to an armed conflict known as the Mexican War (G. B. Tindall and D. E. Shi, 1989: 344-352). Mexico finally ceded to the U.S.A. the present states of California, Nevada, Utah, and parts of Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado and Wyoming. The Mexican War ended in 1848 with a treaty and extended citizenship with about 80,000 Mexicans living in the southwest mostly in Texas and California. With the new frontier Mexicans did not stop migrating to the U.S.A. until now.

Other immigrants came from Asia to mention the example of Chinese. The history of Chinese immigration in the United States of America starts with the Gold Rush in the mid-1800. The discovery of gold in California really contributed to immigration mainly from China and to a severe internal migration also. From 1849 and beyond, Chinese were attracted to California and other western states. "For a time, Chinese workers were in great demand. They helped build the transcontinental railroads" (L. C. Wood et al, 1975: 551).

What happened in the mid-1800 proves that people came from everywhere in the world to migrate to the United States. The search of a better life pushed people from Europe (because of potato famine in Germany, crops failures in Ireland) and China (attracted by Gold Rush) to do so. It was also the same reason for Mexicans, though there are others which are historically and geographically justified so as to explain in part the necessity for Donald Trump to construct the wall in the U.S. border with Mexico. That necessity in its turn illustrates the permanent immigration to the U.S.A. in general and the persistent massive Mexicans' and Latino Americans'

massive immigration to the U.S.A. through Mexico. So, America has been attracting citizens of the world for long.

To conclude on the short survey of immigration history, one comes to the equation clearly reading that America equals immigration, a true equation in spite of the native Indians' previous presence. The early times started with Europeans joined by Africans, though slaves. There were other immigrants mostly in the middle of the nineteenth century including people from other American countries and Asia. This happens in the middle of the nineteenth century at the time of the Gold Rush in California. Otherwise, the United States of America undoubtedly exists today thanks to immigrants. The land owned by pre-Columbian Indians changed into modern country. America is synonymous with immigration that is America remains a country of immigrants as well as a product of immigration. Anyway, the different stages which have been recalled from the early 1600's to the mid 1800's do not embody the entire history of immigration to the U.S.A. where people continue to migrate individually or massively making of it an everlasting destination all along the last two centuries. On the opposite of the early times, now people move to a country with an immigration system.

III. PRESENTATION OF THE AMERICAN IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

Immigration system is a reference to the Nation's laws and practices in matters of immigration and naturalization. The constitution which gives birth to the United States of America has been officially in use since 1789. That land could no longer be an empty place for anyone in search of refuge or other opportunities since one year later the first immigration law came into existence: The Naturalization Act of 1790. This Act was the starting point of a system or a process to define the statute of people born or coming to live in America. That process progressively shapes the U.S. immigration policy differently implemented by political parties.

III.1. Naturalization Act of 1790 and others

To say it simply, naturalization is a process by which an immigrant can officially become a citizen of a country which is not his or her own. When America became independent, its constitution made no specific mention of immigration or naturalization. But, the second section of its article six reads:

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made, in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be supreme law of the land; and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any state to the contrary notwithstanding (L. C. Wood et al, 1975: 218).

Pursuant to this provision, some laws issued in conformity to the legal procedures can be referred to in order to notice how immigration is ruled. The first one before any other is the Naturalization Act issued in 1790.

To begin with the Naturalization Act of 1790, one can mention a short comment made on it by Shiho Imai (2018) insisting on its discriminatory aspect: "Alternately known as the Nationality Act, the Naturalization Act of 1790 restricted citizenship to "any alien, being a free white person" who had been in the U.S. for two years. In effect, it left out indentured servants, slaves, and most women."

This law reflected the colonial context excluding women and nonwhites from citizenship. The restriction was not changed by the Naturalization Acts passed by the Congress in 1795 and 1798. American citizenship only concerned "free white persons." Moreover, it did not exist for people coming from Asia. Many other laws passed in the early 1900's did not remove the restriction, particularly against Asians. The situation improved only with the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) or The McCarran-Walter Act, as it was "named after Senator Pat McCarran (Democrat-Nevada) and Representative Francis Walter (Democratic-Pennsylvania)" who initiated it (History.com, ed., 2009). It was passed in June 1952 and took only effect in December of the same year after President Harry S. Truman's overridden veto (History.com, ed. 2009). It is reported that:

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 upheld the national origins quota system established by the Immigration Act of 1924, reinforcing this controversial system of immigrant selection. [...] It also ended Asian exclusion from immigrating to the United States and introduced a system of preferences based on skill sets and family reunification. (Milestones 1945-1952)

Foreign nationals living in the United States may have a lawful permanent residency or a lawful temporary residency irrespective of their origins and sex. The obtaining of one or another of the above lawful residencies depends on the situation of the immigrant. Also, the INA places both a limit which stops at number of immigrants that are allowed to enter the U.S. annually and a limit on how many immigrants can come to the U.S. from any one country.

To have a look at the law itself, the INA or the McCarran-Walter Act, 1952, there are some basic principles that even characterize the immigration policy under it. The first principle is the reunification of families which allows U.S. citizens and lawful permanent residents to bring certain family members to the United States in respect of certain standard eligibility criteria as age and financial requirements (*McCarran-Walter Act, 1952*). The second principle is the employment-based immigration through which immigrants with

valuable skills can come to the U.S.A. to work permanently or on a temporary basis and temporary non immigrants may choose one or another type of visas since there are at all more than twenty visas for them such as L-1 visas for intercompany transfer, A visas for diplomatic employees or R-1 visas for religious workers (*McCarran-Walter Act, 1952*). The third principle is that of protecting refugees who are admitted according to the degree of the risk they face (*McCarran-Walter Act, 1952*). And last not least, the promotion of diversity carried out through the visa lottery dedicated to immigrants from countries with low rates of immigration to the United States irrespective of races, religions and origins (*McCarran-Walter Act, 1952*). Other immigrants benefit from temporary Protected Status for 6, 12 or 18 months. To become a U.S. citizen, an individual must have had a Legal Permanent Resident (LPR) status. He must be given a green card for at least five years (or three years if he or she obtained the green card through a U.S. citizen spouse or the Violence against Women Act) (*McCarran-Walter Act, 1952*). Of course, there are other conditions and some exceptions.

It took more than one century and half to have an improvement from the exclusive immigration system to the inclusive one. Thanks to the I.N.A., Whites or Nonwhites, men or women, immigrants have equally the advantage to become a U.S. citizen through one of the four above mentioned principles (reunifying families, admitting skilled immigrants, protecting refugees, and promoting diversity) and other conditions. In spite of its considerable contribution to the improvement of immigrants' situation in the USA, the INA known to be "The main immigration statute" (S. Yale-Loehr, 2015) was not perfect to have any question related to immigration solved in it. In fact,

Since 1952 Congress has enacted several significant amendments to the INA. 1965 saw the end to the racist and controversial national origins quotas and the beginning of per-country quotas instead. That year Congress also reshuffled priorities in the immigrant visa selection system, strengthening the preferences for family members of U.S. citizens and resident foreign (S. Yale-Loehr, 2015).

Because of the complexity of the immigration issue going sometime with the realities of each epoch, there have been other acts from 1965, for example,

[...] the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA) [...] to address the problem of illegal immigration [...] The Immigration Act of 1990, often referred to as IMMACT 90 [...] enabling more family-sponsored immigration and increasing employment-based immigration, while providing a "diversity" program for immigrants from countries traditionally underrepresented in the U.S. immigrant mix (e.g., Ireland and some African countries). This program is also known as the "green card visa lottery." [...] the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 [...] Following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, Congress enacted the USA PATRIOT Act (S. Yale-Loehr, 2015).

Nowadays the INA constitutes the basis on which the American immigration system works knowing it has been followed by different amendments taking into account new realities unknown before. So, no policy concerning immigration can be shaped out of it.

III.2. The immigration policy and Political Parties

According to Richard J. Hardy (1996: 268), a political party is a "group of people with shared interests or principles that are organized to nominate candidates for public office in order to win elections, control government and set public policy." The Democratic Party and the Republican Party are the two major political parties which have been ruling the United States successive Administrative. The relation between immigration policy and political party is that of the responsibility of a party in charge with the executive power in matters of laws on immigration.

Obviously, laws on immigration exist thanks to the Congress which represents the legislative power. Their practice depends on a given party through its elect candidate as President conducting the Government or the Administration in accordance with his vision. While the Democratic Party supposed to be liberal and the Republican Party supposed to be conservative have some differences, they also share many similarities in the way the immigration policy should be applied. However, there may be some democrats with conservative views and some republicans with liberal ones. Democrats as well as republicans have traditionally known basic attitudes on different issues as well as specific proposals to remedy punctually on some social problems such as the immigration issue. It has been one of the main problems in American society since it is almost linked to every aspect of life. Nowadays, it has become a very complex issue in as much as one can find very few similarities and some more differences in the Democratic Party's immigration policy in comparison with that of the Republican Party.

The overarching policy differences concern the efficacy and limits of government with respect to three important principles of American democracy—liberty, security and equality. Unfortunately, these principles are often at loggerheads and virtually every policy dispute boils down to two central issues: liberty v. security and liberty v.

equality. Too much liberty leads to chaos and too much security restricts freedom. And too much liberty results in inequalities, but too much emphasis on equality stifles freedom.[...] In general, Democrats favor liberty over security and equality over liberty, while Republicans favor security over liberty, but liberty over equality (R. J. Hardy, 2011: 17),

Generally speaking, “Democrats support liberalized immigration laws; Republicans want to tighten immigration laws” (R. J. Hardy, 2011:18). These differences are just generalizations, and they do not include all Democrats and all Republicans at all times. Indeed, many Democrats support Republican policies and vice versa. “It just depends on the particular time frame, the specific constituencies involved and the political milieu in which the policies were framed” (R. J. Hardy, 2011:18). Each Party traces its own way to achieve the destiny of the Nation.

The presentation of the Immigration system can now be concluded on as the laws about immigration and the attitude of a political party toward them are known. Beginning with the Naturalization Act of 1790, one can notice the progressive shaping of the immigration system through centuries boosted at a given stage by the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. In addition to the Constitution, people’s entries and the nationality process being clearly regulated, any political party knows what to do as far as immigration is concerned. Be it the Democratic Party aiming at liberalizing laws of immigration or the Republican Party aiming at tightening them, each party acts according to its own political vision without compromising the existence of the U.S., a country always attracting people differently motivated throughout the world. The responsibility of a political Party is engaged once its candidate becomes the elect president to rule the Nation.

IV. IMMIGRATION POLICIES IN SHORT FROM 2009 TO 2019

The laws passed by the Congress representing the Legislative Power must be executed by the President and his Administration representing the Executive power by determining the policy of the U.S. in all fields. The U.S. immigration policy has been differently carried out in the twenty-first century if we compare it with the previous centuries since each period has got its realities. The Executive faces new issues in matters of immigration in the twenty-first century compelling it to apply a policy that looked different from the preceding ones. A short analysis of Presidents Barack Obama’s immigration policy and that of Donald Trump is made by looking at their campaign pledges on immigration and what they come to do during their tenure. That helps to show which one of these policies is closer to the U.S. founding ideals.

IV.1. Obama’s liberal vision of immigration

Barrack Obama’s political opinions were substantially defined according to the vision of his party, the Democratic Party characterized by its liberal tendencies. When campaigning for the presidency, he called for a compassionate, generous and tolerant America that is opened to the dreams of immigrants. He intends to reform the American immigration policy mainly by regularizing the situation of many illegal immigrants already living in the United States under certain conditions. Obama’s words are reported by Jitka Richterová (2015: 2):

“[We] have to recognize that we’ve got 12 million undocumented workers who are already here. Many of them living their lives alongside other Americans. Their kids are going to school. Many of the kids, in fact, were born in this country and are citizens. And so, it’s absolutely vital that we bring those families out of the shadows and that we give them the opportunity to travel a pathway to citizenship. It’s not automatic citizenship. It’s not amnesty. They would have to pay a fine. They would have to not have engaged in any criminal activity. They would have to learn English. They would have to go to the back of the line so that they did not get citizenship before those persons who had come here legally”.

In other words, Obama’s immigration policy aims to legalize many of the undocumented immigrants in the country, but within a larger plan which sees a place for guest workers coming for residency and possibly citizenship. Under his plan, he maintains that so many illegal immigrants will become legal ones and there will be a strong reduction of illegal immigration to the United States. In fact, the former illegal immigrants will have to pay fines and penalties for violating the U.S. immigration law. And that reduction of illegal immigration will be possible through the reinforcement of border enforcement and the crackdown on employers who hire undocumented immigrants. Also, all new workers on the United States homeland must be checked with in order to know if they have legally come to the United States. “After a few years of experimentation with executive forays into immigration policy, the Obama administration appeared to have exhausted its options” (J. D. Skrentny and J. L. López, 2013: 73). Although most of Obama’s immigration policy practices seem to be tolerant towards illegal immigrants already living in the U.S., Obama authorized mass arrests and raids against some of them so that his immigration policy does not totally resemble an amnesty.

Generally, the Democratic Party has strong support from minorities and labor unions. As a result, legalization of 10 or 15 million undocumented immigrants would mean, certainly, more Democratic Party voters

and more union members. That may be one of the reasons for Obama to support his comprehensive immigration reform. Again, it is worth reminding that minority groups particularly Latinos greatly contributed to the reelection of Barack Obama. In fact, “up to 10% of U.S. voters are Latino immigrants, which is the largest group of immigrants” (J.Richterová, 2015: 6).

There are so many actions Obama did which urge us to maintain that his immigration policy was tolerant. In spite of immigration raids mostly during his first term, Obama voted against immigration raids later on and he supported easier way for immigrants to obtain benefits of Social Security. He also supported permanent allowance for staying in the U.S. and he advocated a system that would allow reunification of family members, even under the price of giving all the members U.S. citizenship. Obama also voted in favor of the Development, Relief and Education for Alien Minors Act (known as Dream Act). In fact, that act would grant citizenship to children of undocumented immigrants. During his second term, “Barack Obama signed the most significantly changing immigration laws in three decades. These laws are resulting in excusing millions of undocumented immigrants living in the U.S.A. to be pardoned so far for three years” (J. Richterová, 2015: 5). He also stressed that the detention system needs to be more human and the programs for immigrants have to be more efficient, pro-active and protecting. He wanted the social, health and education conditions for immigrants to be improved and he suggested that the new Health Care Reform could allow the immigrants to benefit from it.

According to Barack Obama, every American family has its own history of immigration and coming to America and building up to their ideals and dreams. That is one of the reasons U.S. citizens should be more tolerant towards new immigrants, he claims. Their values are reflecting the same values that brought us here, he adds (J.Richterová, 2015: 6).

Barack Obama conducted his Administration to consider the ultimate pardon and integration of undocumented immigrants as a way to sustain the very basic ideals on which the U.S.A. was created. Therefore, that would help U.S. economy and increase the worthiness of undocumented workers.

While defending the INA in front of people opposed to it like President Harry S. Truman saying that the law was “un-American and inhuman,” Senator McCarran compared the attracting image of America to an oasis and he had a warning: “If this oasis of the world should be overrun, perverted, contaminated, or destroyed, then the last flickering light of humanity will be extinguished” (History.com, ed. 2009). Motivated by his vision of immigration as an integral part of the American heritage and being aware of Senator McCarran’s warning, Barack Obama referred to laws but with more tolerance in the treatment of immigration to maintain its resourceful aspect for the Nation.

IV.2. Trump’s conservative vision of immigration

Donald Trump goes from conservative vision of the Republican Party to develop his policy. During the presidential campaign, he pledged to make America great again. In matters of immigration, he shows no tolerance towards illegal immigrants and sometimes to legal ones. Laws concerning immigration must be tightened. What means that there should be a true practice to materialize his policy. In this way, some actions are needed. Trump’s policy obviously aims at establishing a bureau that will investigate abuses of visa programs and building a wall between the United States-Mexico entire border and deported millions of undocumented individuals.

One notices that Donald Trump wants to prevent foreigners from massively coming in his country. As the proverb clearly reads “charity begins at home,” he first claims Americans and their businesses to come back home expressing himself during his first electoral debate as a Republican candidate challenging Hilary Clinton, a Democrat candidate:

“Our jobs are fleeing the country. They are going to Mexico. They are going to many other countries... But we have to stop our jobs from being stolen from us. We have to stop our companies from leaving the United States and, with it, firing all of their people. I’ll be reducing taxes tremendously from 35 percent to 15 percent for companies, small and big businesses. That is going to be a job creator like we haven’t seen since Ronald Reagan” (“First U.S. Presidential Debate, 2016”).

This declaration announces his radical position against foreigners’ entry in his country as one could hear him saying literally: “we stay in our country and you stay in yours.” Donald Trump is showing nationalism and chauvinism in his vision which impacts on his immigration policy.

On April 2018, President Trump signed an executive order entitled ‘Buy American and Hire American’ in which he pushes the Departments of State, Labor, Justice and Homeland Security to issue new rules and guidance to protect the interests of U.S. workers and to prevent fraud and abuse in the immigration system (S. Pierce et al, 2018: 8)

In this effect, he is mostly concerned with American interests. Though this concern is not particular to him as president of the USA, the matter with him is that he ignores the current facts of everyday life and the different cultures and economic systems around the world. Countries of the world become connected and similar to each other because of the influence of large multinational companies and the improved communication.

The Trump Administration is hostile to immigration by disregarding not only the values on which the United States was founded but also the fact that American population is essentially made up of migratory processes having contributed the building of the Nation. Donald Trump enthusiastically promised to construct a wall along the U.S.A.-Mexico border forgetting the particular history of south west of the USA owing much to Mexico. Even if "Mexico is the source of over 95 percent of unauthorized aliens apprehended in the United States" (A. Portes and R. G. Rumbaut, 1990:11), the solution to improve that situation cannot be limited to the wall since no physical barrier can stop human relations. That wall is going to separate physically the two countries but not, for example, their people historically and sociologically linked and living along the border in both countries. Though Trump's promise of the construction is not yet achieved, this should not hide the fact that he has already accomplished many pledges of his presidential campaign. Early in his office, he signed an "Executive Order on immigration, which temporarily prohibits refugees and citizens of seven predominantly Muslim countries [Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen] from entering the U.S." (O. B. Waxman, 2017). It also temporarily suspended all refugees coming into the country for 120 days and indefinitely suspended refugees from Syria. The order created chaos at airports around the world as confusion made it unclear who could come into the country. For him, the rate of crimes committed in the United States by foreign people is higher than that of American citizens.

There are several other actions implemented by the Trump administration that really show no tolerance to immigrants as one can mention some of them: the end of the Temporary Protection Status (TPS) which "is a form of protection offered to nationals of certain countries who are present in the U.S. and unable to return to their countries due to violent conflict or natural disaster" (S. Pierce et al, 2018: 6), the suspension of "the Visa Interview Waiver Program, which allows certain travelers to renew their travel authorizations without a in-person interview" (S. Pierce et al, 2018: 7), the end of the Obama's program allowing "DHS [Department of Homeland Security] to grant foreign-born entrepreneurs parole into the country for a certain period if doing so was judged to hold economic benefits for the country" (S. Pierce et al, 2018: 8). To say more about Trump Administration in matters of immigration,

The most controversial aspect of the zero-tolerance policy was the separation of migrant children from their Parents when taken in custody. Parents were transferred to U.S. Marshal Custody in advance of their criminal proceedings, and their children, who cannot be held in criminal custody, were placed in shelters run by a separate government agency. This put parents and children on separate legal tracks, making it difficult for the government to reunite them following parents' criminal proceedings (S. Pierce et al, 2018: 5).

Trump shows himself as a pragmatic to make all Americans happy: Americans first, other citizens of the world are not listed. Every country has its own problems that they have to solve on their own. Apart from the reasons related to employments, Trump's immigration policy also finds its justification through the national security argument. In his view, immigration is also one of the causes of terrorism on American homeland.

Concluding on the two presidents' immigration policies from 2009 to 2019, Barack Obama worked to give equal opportunity to legal or illegal migrants to stay in the country whereas Donald Trump is working to avoid migrants in the country be they legal or illegal. Thus, each president comes to achieve his electoral intentions materialized through Acts proving a comprehensive policy for Barack Obama and a radical policy for Donald Trump. In so doing everyone thinks to act for the sake of the Nation. But the question is to appreciate the real state of immigration and the following statistics can help:

[...] the Obama administration increased the refugee admission ceiling from 70,000 in FY 2013-15 to 85,000 in FY 2016 and Further to 11,000 in FY 2017. Citing security concerns about the programs, the Trump administration immediately took steps to scale it back, temporarily suspending the program and attempting to limit FY 2017 admissions to 50,000. In the end, 53,716 were admitted during FY 2017. For FY 2018, the administration lowered the ceiling even further to 45,000 refugees, the lowest level since the current U.S. resettlement program began in 1980 (S. Pierce et al, 2018: 6)

These statistics in reference to the Fiscal Year (FY) are certainly mentioned to mean the impact of refugee admission on the U. S. economy, an aspect neglected by the Trump Administration. This specific case of refugees is illustrative of the situation of immigration in general. Immigration has been increasing under Barack Obama's policy while it is decreasing under Donald Trump's policy.

V. CONCLUSION

To conclude with this paper, “the United States is obviously a nation of immigrants, comprised of complex multifaceted ethnic, racial, social, religious, economic, regional, ideological and cultural interests” (R. J. Hardy, 2011: 6). The historical perspective has helped to notice that in the beginning it was a land of opportunity, an open door for anyone shifting there what could no longer be maintained from its independence. Then the system to control immigration began with a restrictive law in 1790 followed by others but really improved by a non-restricted law, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. In addition to its amendments, this remains the basic law in matters of immigration in the U.S. as it is the starting point of any policy in this field implemented by a given Administration or Government and its President dependent on his political party’s vision. The Democratic Party and the Republican Party through Barrack Obama’s comprehensive policy and Donald Trump’s radical policy have differently carried out the immigration issue in the twenty-first century. The former has made immigration laws tolerant and even humanitarian while the latter opposes zero-tolerance and has tightened immigration laws by strengthening controls on the borders and deporting many illegal immigrants. Thus, Trump’s immigration policy is the negation of Obama’s immigration policy being grateful to immigrants’ historic contribution to the building of the U.S. and faithful to the ideals on which the United States was created. In the end of this paper, it is undoubtedly proved in relation to laws and statistics that immigration is getting lower and lower and the perception to stop this historical practice is visible. In reality, no policy should stop immigration but strictly control it as it has always been a relevant contribution to the making and the future of America.

REFERENCES

- [1] HARDY Richard J., 2011, *The Paradoxes of Political Parties in American Constitutional Development* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).
- [2] SKRENTNY John D. and Jane Lilly López, 2013, “Obama’s Immigration Reform: The Triumph of Executive Action” *Indian Journal of Law and Social Equality*, 18(2), 62-79.
- [3] PIERCE Sarah, Jessica Bolter, Andrew Selee, 2018, *U.S. Immigration Policy under Trump: Deep Changes and Lasting Impacts*, Washington D.C: Migration Policy Institute.
- [4] WOOD Leonard C., Ralph H. Gabriel, Edward L. Biller, 1975, *America: Its People and Values*, New York, Harcourt Brace Jovanovitch.
- [5] TINDALL George B. and David E. Shi., 1989, *America. A Narrative History*, New York: W.W. Norton.
- [6] HOOBLER Thomas and Dorothy 2003, *We Are Americans*, New York: Library of Congress.
- [7] PARRILLO Vincent N., 1997, *Strangers to These Shores. Race and Ethnic Relations in the United States*, Boston, Allyn and Bacon.
- [8] IMAI Shiho, 2013, “Naturalization Act of 1790” *Densho Encyclopedia* <https://encyclopedia.densho.org/Naturalization>. Accessed Nov. 2 2017
- [9] MILESTONES 1945-1952, “The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (The McCarran-Walter Act)” *Office of the Historian*, Foreign Service Institute, United States Department of State <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/immigration-act> Accessed 21 October 2018
- [10] *McCarran-Walter Act, 1952* United States Statutes at large, Vol. 66, 82nd Cong., 1952, 163-282. <https://www.loveman.sdsu.edu/docs/1952McCarranWalterAct/> Accessed July 8 2018
- [11] HISTORY.COM, ed., “McCarran-Walter Act Goes into effect,” Nov. 13 2009, <https://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/mccarren-walker-act-goes-into-effect> Accessed July 17 2018
- [12] YALE-LOEHR Stephen and Lindsay Schoonmaker, 2015, “Overview of U.S. Immigration Law.” <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/> Accessed July 8 2018
- [13] HARDY Richard J., 1996, *Government in America*, Houghton, Mifflin.
- [14] RICHTEROVÁ Jikta, 2015, “Barrack Obama’s Immigration Reforms Brief Analysis.” <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/> Accessed 20 Nov. 2017
- [15] “First U.S. Presidential Debate: Clinton vs Trump, September 27, 2016” Learning English TV. [Http://www.learningenglish.voanews.com/a/3527633.html](http://www.learningenglish.voanews.com/a/3527633.html). Accessed 20 Feb. 2018
- [16] PORTES Alejandro and Rubén G. Rumbaut, 1990 *Immigrant America*, Berkeley, University of California Press.
- [17] WAXMAN Olivia B. 2017, “What to Know About the 1952 Law Invoked by President Trump’s Immigration Order” *Time*, February 6, 2017 <https://www.time.com/4656940/donald-trump-immigration-order-1952/> Accessed September 18 2017