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This is a summary outline to the House of Representatives’ H.R. 15 Border Security, Economic Opportunity and Immigration Modernization Act. The bill is largely based on the Senates bipartisan bill, S.744, passed by a 68-32 vote. H.R. 15 removes the Corker-Hoeven border security amendment. Instead, the House includes their own border security bill, H.R. 1417, which was passed unanimously by the Homeland Security Committee in May 2013. The border security bill requires extensive reporting and metrics to measure progress and accountability of border enforcement methods. These new measures would include regular reports from the Department of Homeland Security to be assessed by the Government Accountability Office, a five-year period to build a strategy to gain situational awareness and control over the southwest border, and an implementation plan for biometric entry system.

This article outlines the challenge of how to “make border security compatible with a sensible immigration system that strengthens the U.S. economy rather than weakens it.” It begins with a brief history of U.S. border control efforts, followed by an analysis of the recent efforts over the last two decades to effectively seal off the border to illegal migrants – a politically popular effort that has, as Alden writes, required “one of the most ambitious expansions of government power in modern history,” in “a country with a strong tradition of limited government.” The article goes on to outline many consequences of current border enforcement policies – both intended and unintended – and concludes with a set of recommendations for improving effectiveness and flexibility moving forward.


Edward Alden testifies before the United States Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs on how Congress and the Obama administration can use data to improve the effectiveness of border enforcement policies and tactics.


This article summarizes a report by the Council on Foreign Relations in which the authors examine U.S. efforts to prevent illegal immigration to the United States. Although the United States has witnessed a sharp drop in illegal border crossings in the past decade alongside an enormous increase in government activities to prevent illegal immigration, there remains little understanding of the role enforcement has played. Better data and analyses to assist lawmakers in crafting more successful policies and to support administration officials in implementing these policies are long overdue.
http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/Legal_Side_Immigration_Ay%C3%B3n.pdf.

This Mexico Institute Brief features new data obtained from the Office of Immigration Statistics of the Department of Homeland Security on the last twenty-five years of legal and legalized Mexican immigration. The data principally reveal the leading role that Mexico plays as a source of legal immigration to the United States — over 5 million legal and legalized Mexican immigrants since 1985 — and how this immigration has increasingly settled across the country over time; how widely the rate at which these immigrants are becoming citizens varies between different regions of the country and even within single states; and consequently the large number — perhaps over 3 million — of these immigrants who would have been eligible but had not become citizens by the end of 2010. These findings argue for the need to fashion policy and citizenship promotion efforts specifically addressed to unnaturalized immigrants in at least three distinguishable situations: the long-term eligible who may qualify to become citizens under an eased set of testing requirements.


This extensive report gives an extensive overview of the history and development of the U.S. immigration system and the various enforcement measures that have been developed. The Executive Summary reads: “the combined actions of these federal agencies and their immigration enforcement programs constitute a complex, cross-agency system that is interconnected in an unprecedented fashion. This modern-day immigration enforcement system, which evolved both by deliberate design and by unanticipated developments, is organized around […] six distinct pillars: (1) border enforcement; (2) visa controls and travel screening; (3) information and interoperability of data systems; (4) workplace enforcement; (5) the intersection of the criminal justice system and immigration enforcement; and (6) the detention and removal or noncitizens.”
The United States confronts a wide array of threats at U.S. borders, ranging from terrorists who may have weapons of mass destruction, to transnational criminals smuggling drugs or counterfeit goods, to unauthorized migrants intending to live and work in the United States. Given this diversity of threats, how may Congress and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) set border security priorities and allocate scarce enforcement resources? In general, DHS’s answer to this question is organized around risk management, a process that involves risk assessment and the allocation of resources based on a cost-benefit analysis. This report focuses on the first part of this process by identifying border threats and describing a framework for understanding risks at U.S. borders. DHS employs models to classify threats as relatively high- or low-risk for certain planning and budgeting exercises and to implement certain border security programs. Members of Congress may wish to use similar models to evaluate the costs and benefits of potential border security policies and to allocate border enforcement resources. This report discusses some of the issues involved in modeling border-related threats.

As a product of the Bi-national Task Force on the United States-Mexico Border, this report was created as a cooperative effort of the Pacific Council and the Mexican Council on Foreign Relations (COMEXI). It sets a track for generating new and innovative dynamics for border interactions in 6 key areas of mutual concern: Security, Economic Development, Migration, Water Management, the Environment and Facilitation. Recommendations were derived from the three Task Force meetings: the first meeting on border security and facilitation, the second meeting on resources, environmental issues, energy policy, migration and economic development, and the third meeting on border managing institutions. Notable are recommendations on security, where the report recommends that the US & Mexico should expand cooperative law enforcement efforts along the border, such as the OASISS Program. Other significant recommendations include those on Migration, which assert that both countries need to address the deleterious effects on individuals, families and communities by jointly developing a plan for managing future flows (both temporary and permanent), taking into account the demographic and labor market realities of both countries.

The sharp decline in the U.S. population of unauthorized immigrants that accompanied the 2007-2009 recession has bottomed out, and the number may be rising again. As of March 2012, 11.7 million unauthorized immigrants were living in the United States, according to a new preliminary Pew Research Center estimate based on U.S. government data. The estimated number of unauthorized immigrants peaked at 12.2 million in 2007 and fell to 11.3 million in 2009, breaking a rising trend that had held for decades. Although there are indications the number of unauthorized immigrants may be rising, the 2012 population estimate is the midpoint of a wide range of possible values and in a statistical sense is no different from the 2009 estimate.


In his testimony to the House Homeland Security Subcommittee, Mr. Dinkins concludes that, “DHS has made significant progress in preventing terrorists from exploiting the visa process. Technological advances have created an opportunity for law enforcement to identify and mitigate national security and public safety threats on an efficient basis that otherwise would have required hundreds of employees. These new technologies enable us to address these threats in a more cost-effective and expeditious manner than ever before.”


To better understand the histories and motivations of immigrants who attempt to cross the U.S. – Mexico border without authorization, researchers with BORDERS interviewed 1,000 detainees in the U.S. Border Patrol Tucson Sector during the summer of 2012. This report is the summary of their findings.
This is the Federation for American Immigration Reform’s summary of House bill H.R. 1417, The Border Security Results Act introduced by Security Chairman Michael McCaul (R-TX) and co-sponsored by several Democratic Representatives including Reps. Sheila Jackson Lee (D-TX), Bennie Thompson (D-TX), and Henry Cuellar (D-TX). The Bill would enact a number of changes for the Department of Homeland Security including requiring annual reports to Congress, a strategy plan “for gaining” awareness and operational control of the border, and a plan for implementing a biometric entry-exit system.


In his testimony U.S. Customs and Border Protection Border Patrol Chief, Michael Fisher, argues that “over past four years,” the Obama Administration “has undertaken an unprecedented effort to secure our border and transform our Nation’s immigration enforcement systems into one that focuses on public safety, national security, and on the integrity of the immigration system. DHS has deployed historic levels of personnel, technology and infrastructure to the Southwest border to reduce the flow of illicit drugs, cash, and weapons and to expedite legal trade and travel through trusted traveler and trader initiatives. CBP has made significant progress in securing the border with the support of Congress through a multi-layered approach using a variety of tools at our disposal. CBP will continue to work with DHS and our federal, state, local, tribal, and international partners, to strengthen border security and infrastructure”. He concludes by stating that “Congress can help by passing a commonsense immigration reform bill that will allow CBP to focus its resources on the most serious criminal actors threatening our borders.”

While lopsided majorities of Hispanics and Asian Americans support creating a pathway to citizenship for unauthorized immigrants, two new surveys from the Pew Research Center also show that these groups believe it is more important for unauthorized immigrants to get relief from the threat of deportation. By 55% to 35%, Hispanics say that they think being able to live and work in the United States legally without the threat of deportation is more important for unauthorized immigrants than a pathway to citizenship. Asian Americans hold a similar view, albeit by a smaller margin—49% to 44%.


The U.S. Department of Homeland Security has reported that since fiscal year 2006, about $4.4 billion has been invested in southwest border technology and infrastructure. Through fiscal year 2010, these resources were used to support DHS’s goal to achieve “operational control” of the nation’s borders by reducing cross-border illegal activity. The extent of operational control—also referred to as effective control—was defined as the number of border miles where Border Patrol had the capability to detect, respond to, and interdict cross-border illegal activity. In fiscal year 2011, citing a need to establish new goals and measures that reflect a more quantitative methodology and an evolving vision for border control, DHS transitioned to using the number of apprehensions on the southwest border as an interim goal and measure. This interim measure, which reports on program activity levels and not program results, limits DHS and congressional oversight and accountability. In this statement to Congress, the Government Accountability Office recommends the development of “milestones and time frames that could assist Border Patrol in monitoring progress in developing goals and measures necessary to assess the status of border security and the extent to which existing resources and capabilities are appropriate and sufficient.” In a December 2012 report (below), GAO recommended that CBP ensure Border Patrol develops said milestones and time frames for developing border security goals and measures to assess progress made and inform resource needs. DHS reportedly “concurred with these recommendations and plans to address them.”


Terry Goddard, former Arizona Attorney General, provides a three part series report on border security based on his informal investigations and experiences as a prosecutor in a state at the heart of the southwest border. He believes a “more effective border defence is possible, but not on the present course.” He suggests a more effective border security approach should focus on significantly cutting off drug cartels money supply rather than only focusing on the current Administration’s “defence-only build up of Border Patrol and National Guard on the border.” He suggests combating illegal drug cartels with a “full arsenal of law-enforcement methods.”


In part two of this three part series, Terry Goddard provides his insight into methods to improve border security by significantly ending drug smuggling methods. He urges for a “broader and more and more analytical approach to what motivates the smugglers—and the means by which they illegally move drugs, money, guns, and people in such large volumes with such impunity.” According to Goddard, cartels will simply regroups and pick up their operations again as if they are not dismantled from the core.
In the final part of his series paper, Goddard focus on improvements required to cut illegal drug cartels’ money supply as a method to improve border security. He summarized the Obama’s administration’s proposed changes to criminal statutes regulated to money laundering as: harmonizing the definition of money transmitting businesses, extending wiretap authority for electronic communication, promoting corporate transparency. He suggests modelling federal law after state laws regarding the consequences for giving false information in connection with a financial transaction.


This article contends that all countries face similar challenges when it comes to border enforcement, including the prevention of cross-border terrorism, illegal migration, human smuggling and trafficking, and other criminal activity. Therefore, the authors make an effort to address broad enforcement concerns that affect countries across the world, particularly the shared “basic dilemma: policies in one area have perverse, regrettable, and often unintended consequences and feedbacks.” The article concludes that “proper border policy depends on a commitment to the rule of law, low levels of corruption, effective police and border control forces, and successful coordination both among responsible agencies and with like-minded states. Effective coordination among strong institutions and agencies is the ultimate force multiplier that makes borders strong and anti-crime efforts effective.”


This report is the product of a year-long study by WOLA and Mexico’s College of the Northern Border (COLEF) analysing the impact of the U.S. and Mexico’s security policies along the border. “The study finds a dramatic buildup of U.S. security forces along the southern border – a fivefold increase of the Border Patrol in the last decade, an unusual new role for U.S. soldiers on U.S. soil, drones and other high-tech surveillance, plus hundreds of miles of completed fencing – without a clear impact on security. For instance, the study finds that despite the security buildup, more drugs are crossing than ever before. […] Furthermore, the study reveals that security policies that were designed to combat terrorism and drug trafficking are causing a humanitarian crisis and putting migrants in increasing danger. Migrants are often subject to abuse and mistreatment while in U.S. custody, and face higher risks of death in the desert than in previous years. The report also documents a sharp drop in migrant crossings, claiming that since 2005, the number of migrants apprehended by the Border Patrol has plummeted by 61 percent, to levels not seen since Richard Nixon was president. Finally, the study finds that violence in Mexico is not spilling over to the U.S. side of the border. U.S. border cities experience fewer violent crimes than the national average, or even the averages of the border states.


This paper was written as a chapter for a forthcoming book on the 50th anniversary of the Immigration Act of 1965 and as an original article for the IMMIGRATION & NATIONALITY REVIEW. Immigration enforcement has progressively focused – some would contend almost exclusively – on limiting migration from Mexico to the United States. By re-allocating opportunities for lawful immigration from Latin America to Asia – and diminishing legal discrimination in admissions against Asian immigrants while expanding discrimination against Latina/os, the Immigration Act of 1965 transformed the relative mix of Asian and Latina/o immigrants legally coming to the United States. The Act, by placing an artificial ceiling on legal migration from Mexico wholly disconnected from the great (and increasingly unsatisfied) demand for immigration, the legislation simultaneously spurred the growth of a large – and consistently expanding – population of Mexican immigrants unauthorized by the U.S. immigration laws from being in, and subject to removal from, the country.

This report analyses the policies and performance measures for U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), as the primary agency charged with ensuring the smooth flow of trade through U.S. ports of entry. The authors examine CBP’s policies with regard to U.S. imports, the greater emphasis from Congress on import security and terrorism prevention since 9/11, as well as CBP’s risk management approach to dealing with imports. How effectively CBP has performed its import policy mission is a matter of some debate. Some participants in CBP’s “trusted trader” programs argue that the concessions CBP provides at the border do not adequately justify the effort and expense participants undergo to certify their supply chains with CBP. Questions have also been raised about CBP’s management of trade facilitation, especially the “customs modernization” process through which the Automated Commercial System trade data management system is being phased out in favor of the newer Automated Commercial Environment. Some critics also assert that CBP has not adequately fulfilled its trade enforcement role, especially its duties for preventing illegal transshipments, protecting U.S. intellectual property rights, and collecting duties. Still others criticize CBP’s performance of its security functions, especially because it does not yet physically scan 100% of maritime cargo as mandated by the SAFE Port Act of 2006.


This article stands as a sharp critique to the border security measures in the Corker-Hoeven amendment, which passed through the U.S. Senate in the recent S.744, otherwise known as the Comprehensive Immigration Reform (CIR) bill passed in June 2013 by the bi-partisan “Gang of Eight.” Notably, Kerwin argues that the amendment (1) is unnecessary and (2) counter-productive; (3) that “border enforcement is no longer primarily an issue of resources, it is one of performance”; and (4) the amendment will militarize the border at the expense of civil liberties.

Koslowski gives a thorough overview of the challenges – technical and otherwise – associated with effectively enforcing border security efforts in a transparent and measurable manner. In the third section of the report (“US Border and Security Systems: Development, Implementation, and Effectiveness”), the author outlines six specific security programs and analyses the effectiveness of each. From the Executive Summary: “Congress has a history of setting immigration enforcement goals that are not always realistic or feasible, even with the billions of dollars that lawmakers have been willing to appropriate for the purpose. Policies to date have met varying levels of success in reducing illegal immigration; and it is far from clear whether they have been worth the extraordinary cost or whether resources could be more productively employed elsewhere. Given that illegal immigration is essentially a function of labor demand, more persistent efforts prosecute law-breaking employers could probably do much more to reduce illegal immigration than increasing the already high spending on border fences, physical or virtual.”


This report focuses on the issue of repatriated migrants’ belongings being taken and not returned by U.S. authorities at the border stations. Overall, it found that the taking of belongings and the failure to return them is not a random, sporadic occurrence, but a systematic practice. One indication of this is that just over one-third of deportees report having belongings taken and not returned. One finding is that, among deportees who were carrying Mexican identification cards, 1 out of every 4 had their card taken and not returned. The taking of possessions, particularly identity documents, can have serious consequences and is an expression of how dysfunctional the deportation system is. The study finds that migrants processed through Operation Streamline, or held in detention for a week or longer, are most likely to have their possessions taken and not returned.
This report focuses on the mistreatment of unauthorized migrants while in U.S. custody, mainly at border stations. Overall, the investigators found that the physical and verbal mistreatment of migrants is not a random, sporadic occurrence but, rather, a systematic practice. One indication of their claim is that 11% of deportees they interviewed reported some form of physical abuse and 23% reported verbal mistreatment while in U.S. custody. Their finding is supported by other academic studies and reports from non-governmental institutions, which they identify. Another finding presented is that migrants often note they are targets for nationalistic and racist remarks. When taken in the context of prior studies, the report authors believe the abuse of migrants while in U.S. custody is a systematic problem due to a lack of accountability in U.S. Customs and Border Protection.


In her statement, Policy Office of International Director of Canadian Affairs, Deborah Meyers, concludes that, “The proximity of Canada to the United States, the large flows of goods and people between our two countries, and the intertwined nature of our economies, communities, and the security of our citizens require that bilateral security cooperation remain a U.S. priority. The Beyond the Border Declaration and accompanying Action Plan provide the overarching vision to guide U.S.-Canada bilateral cooperation. This initiative has already and will continue to yield important security and trade and travel benefits for the American public. DHS is committed to working with partners in and outside of government on both sides of the border to see through its implementation.”

Ms Meissner’s statement to the U.S. Senate Committee on Homeland Security is based on her “personal experience with border and immigration enforcement when [she] served as Commissioner of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) from 1993 through 2000.” It is also based on her 2013 MPI report (which is included in this bibliography), Immigration Enforcement in the United States: The Rise of a Formidable Machinery. The report describes the totality and evolution since the mid-1980s of the nation’s modern-day immigration enforcement machinery. This statement to Congress focuses on border enforcement and the improvements that have been made in border security in the context of immigration enforcement system improvements overall.


This report outlines the key changes in border management over the past decade, highlights current and future challenges, and raises the following fundamental key question: what will be needed to ensure the successful operation of the new border management architecture? The report urges policymakers to consider reducing incompatible and ad hoc policy development, balance goals and consider trade offs to border investments, technological improvements, mapping and addressing weak points in the immigration system, making sure there are sufficient resources to judiciously assess and draw out key pieces of intelligence from data gathered, and learning from other countries’ border management, but remembering that what works in one country will not automatically work for the United States.

The authors examine U.S. efforts to prevent illegal immigration to the United States. Although the United States has witnessed a sharp drop in illegal border crossings in the past decade alongside an enormous increase in government activities to prevent illegal immigration, there remains little understanding of the role enforcement has played. Better data and analyses to assist lawmakers in crafting more successful policies and to support administration officials in implementing these policies are long overdue.


“This hearing raises an important question for Members of Congress concerned about border security: What would a secure border look like? The United States spends billions of dollars and expends extraordinary effort to secure the border; and the Department of Homeland Security collects tables full of enforcement data. Yet after years of grappling with this question, no consensus exists about how to measure border security or how to evaluate existing enforcement efforts. Thus, while the White House asserts that our borders today “are more secure that at any time in the past several decades,” Chairman Miller and others have warned against “accepting empty promises on border security,” and asked “how the American people can be assured that the border is truly secure?” Mr. Rosenblum’s testimony begins by describing how to measure border security and identifies several concrete steps that could be taken to develop better border metrics. The second part reviews recent border security and immigration enforcement efforts and identifies possible gaps in these efforts.

As a follow-up to the January 2012 CRS report with the same title, this report describes trends in border apprehensions, recidivism, and estimated got aways and turn backs. Yet none of these existing data are designed to measure illegal border flows or the degree to which the border is secured. Thus, the report also describes methods for estimating illegal border flows based on enforcement data and migrant surveys. Drawing on multiple data sources, the report suggests conclusions about the state of border security. Robust investments at the border were not associated with reduced illegal inflows during the 1980s and 1990s, but a range of evidence suggests a substantial drop in illegal inflows in 2007-2011, followed by a slight rise in 2012. Enforcement, along with the economic downturn in the United States, likely contributed to the drop in unauthorized migration, though the precise share of the decline attributable to enforcement is unknown. Enhanced border enforcement also may have contributed to a number of secondary costs and benefits. To the extent that border enforcement successfully deters illegal entries, such enforcement may reduce border-area violence and migrant deaths, protect fragile border ecosystems, and improve the quality of life in border communities. But to the extent that aliens are not deterred, the concentration of enforcement resources on the border may increase border area violence and migrant deaths, encourage unauthorized migrants to find new ways to enter illegally and to remain in the United States for longer periods of time, damage border ecosystems, harm border-area businesses and the quality of life in border communities, and strain U.S. relations with Mexico and Canada.


“Twenty-five years after the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 marked the beginning of the modern era in border enforcement, this report reviews recent enforcement efforts, takes stock of the current state of border security, and considers lessons that may be learned about a quarter century of enhanced migration control efforts at U.S. borders. IRCA authorized a 50% increase in the size of the USBP, and at least 10 additional laws since then have included provisions related to migration enforcement and/or border security. Appropriations for the USBP have increased about 750% since 1989—a number which excludes many other programs related to border enforcement. [...] This report concludes by raising additional questions about future investments at the border, how to weigh such investments against other enforcement strategies, and the relationship between border enforcement and the broader debate about U.S. immigration policy.”

This Office of Immigration Statistics (OIS) Annual Report presents information on foreign nationals determined inadmissible, apprehended, arrested, detained, returned, or removed during 2012. Each year, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) undertakes immigration enforcement actions involving hundreds of thousands of foreign nationals. These actions include the apprehension or arrest, detention, return, and removal from the United States of foreign nationals who are removable under U.S. immigration law. Foreign nationals may be removable from the United States for violations including illegally entering the United States, failing to abide by the terms and conditions of admission, or engaging in violent crimes, document and benefit fraud, terrorist activity, or drug smuggling. Primary responsibility for the enforcement of immigration law within DHS rests with U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS). CBP is generally responsible for immigration enforcement at and between the ports of entry and ICE is generally responsible for interior enforcement. USCIS is generally responsible for the adjudication of immigration benefit applications.


This report, published by the Congressional Research Service, summarizes entry and exit statistics, as well as denials and arrests made at designated ports of entry. At the core of the study is a tension aptly described by Seghetti: “CBP’s primary immigration enforcement mission at ports of entry is to confirm that travellers are eligible to enter the United States and to exclude inadmissible aliens. Yet strict enforcement is in tension with a second core mission: to facilitate the flow of lawful travellers, who are the vast majority of persons seeking admission. A fundamental question for Congress and DHS is how to balance these competing concerns.” The author goes on to provide an overview of data collection strategies at the border as well as pointing to areas of concern or disagreement, including the collection of “biographic” data compared with “biometric data,” A number of key questions are raised, an example being about DHS’ ability to use existing entry-exit data to identify and apprehend visa overstayers.

This article makes the claim that “ICE deportations of illegal aliens are at their lowest since 2007, and that about half of the deportations they took credit for were actually Border Patrol cases, not illegal aliens arrested in the interior. In addition to exposing that ICE is deporting fewer illegal aliens despite having more resources, these statistics undermine the administration’s claims of record ICE deportations. Deportations of criminal illegal aliens fell as well, even though ICE agents are encountering more of them in the interior.”


This RAND Corporation report was commissioned by the DHS Office of Program Analysis and Evaluation, and is intended to provide research and recommendations about strategic-level measures for assessing the effectiveness of border-security efforts and informing program decisions, which inevitably involve trade-offs within and across DHS missions. This report describes the results of a short study on such measures. It should be of interest to analysts and leaders responsible for establishing and implementing border-security policies and seeking to understand how to develop measures for the effectiveness of homeland security programs.
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