

PAPER ID: 20260201052

## The Politics of Immigration in the United States: Policy Debates and Government Responses: A Review

Yogender Singh<sup>1</sup> Gill & Dr. Babita<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Research Scholar, Department of Political Science & Public Administration, Baba Mastnath University, Rohtak.

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science & Public administration, Baba Mastnath University, Rohtak.

**Abstract:** This paper provides an in-depth analysis of immigration politics in the United States. It examines institutional structures, political debates, policy evolution, and the use of emerging technologies in immigration enforcement and administration. The paper also explores the impact of these policies on civil liberties, public opinion, and immigrant communities. The purpose of this paper is to critically analyse how political institutions and actors in the United States respond to immigration challenges. Rather than focusing solely on policy outcomes, the chapter emphasizes the political processes through which immigration policies are debated, designed, implemented, and contested. This approach allows for a more nuanced understanding of immigration governance as a dynamic and evolving process, influenced by electoral incentives, public opinion, and shifting security and humanitarian priorities. Such an analysis is essential for assessing the effectiveness, consistency, and democratic legitimacy of U.S. immigration policies. The study also evaluates key legislative and executive actions, including border enforcement measures, asylum policies, visa reforms, and programs addressing undocumented immigrants. By assessing the impacts of these policies on migrants, host communities, and institutional governance, the paper highlights the persistent tensions between enforcement-oriented and rights-based approaches. The analysis underscores the role of partisan polarization and federal state dynamics in shaping immigration outcomes. Ultimately, the paper argues that sustainable immigration reform requires a balanced framework that integrates security, economic needs, and human rights while responding to demographic and global migration trends.

**Keywords:** Immigration politics, United States, policy polarization, border governance, refugee policy, comparative politics

### Introduction

Immigration has remained one of the most contested and influential issues in United States politics, shaping electoral debates, public opinion, and policy agendas across administrations. This paper examines the evolution of immigration politics in the U.S. and analyses major policy responses adopted at the federal level in recent decades. It explores how political ideologies, economic considerations, national security concerns, and humanitarian obligations have influenced immigration policymaking. Immigration has emerged as one of the most complex and contested political issues of the contemporary world, influencing national policies, democratic institutions, and public discourse across countries. In an era of intensified globalization, technological advancement, and transnational mobility, the movement of people across borders has become both inevitable and politically sensitive. Governments are increasingly required to respond to immigration in ways that balance economic demands, national security, humanitarian responsibilities, and social cohesion. As a result, immigration is no longer viewed merely as a demographic or economic phenomenon but as a central political issue that shapes governance and democratic decision-making. Immigration has emerged as one of the most politically significant and contentious issues in contemporary governance, particularly within democratic states experiencing large-scale and diverse migration flows. In the United States, immigration occupies a central position

in political discourse, policy formulation, and electoral competition. This chapter focuses on the political responses to immigration in the United States, examining how historical legacies, institutional arrangements, party politics, and socio-political forces have collectively shaped immigration governance. By situating the U.S. experience within the broader comparative framework of this study, the chapter provides essential analytical groundwork for understanding similarities and contrasts with India's migration politics. The United States presents a particularly compelling case for the study of immigration politics due to its long history as a major destination country and its foundational narrative as a nation of immigrants. At the same time, the U.S. has consistently struggled to reconcile this narrative with concerns related to national identity, security, economic competition, and social cohesion. These tensions have generated highly politicized responses to immigration, making the U.S. an important reference point for analysing how democratic systems respond to migration pressures. This chapter approaches immigration not merely as a demographic or economic phenomenon, but as a deeply political issue shaped by power relations, institutional constraints, and ideological contestation. A key theme of the chapter is the historical evolution of immigration policy in the United States and its enduring influence on contemporary political responses. Immigration policy has developed through periods of openness and restriction, reflecting changing economic

demands, racial and cultural ideologies, and geopolitical considerations. These historical patterns continue to shape political debates and institutional practices, underscoring the importance of historical context in understanding present-day policy choices. By tracing these developments, the chapter highlights how past policy decisions create path dependencies that constrain and inform current political responses. Immigration has emerged as one of the most influential and contested political issues in the United States, shaping electoral outcomes, policy agendas, and national identity debates over several decades [3]. As a country historically defined by migration, the U.S. presents a complex paradox: while immigration has been central to its economic growth, cultural diversity, and global influence, it has simultaneously generated political polarization, public anxiety, and intense policy disputes [5]. Understanding the political responses to immigration in the United States is therefore essential for contextualizing contemporary governance challenges and for undertaking a meaningful comparative analysis with countries such as India, which experience migration through different historical, demographic, and political lenses [11]. The political discourse surrounding immigration in the United States is deeply rooted in its historical evolution. From the early waves of European settlers to the forced migration of enslaved Africans, and later to mass immigration from Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East, U.S. immigration patterns have continually transformed the nation's social fabric [20]. These demographic shifts have often triggered political reactions aimed at regulating, restricting, or redefining the boundaries of national belonging [26]. Policies such as the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, and post-9/11 security-driven immigration measures reflect how political responses have oscillated between openness and exclusion, depending on economic conditions, security concerns, and prevailing public sentiments.

In recent decades, immigration politics in the United States have become increasingly polarized, reflecting broader ideological divisions within the political system. Political parties have adopted sharply contrasting positions, with immigration often framed either as a driver of economic vitality and cultural enrichment or as a threat to national security, labour markets, and social cohesion. These competing narratives have transformed immigration from a policy issue into a symbolic battleground over sovereignty, identity, and globalization. As a result, immigration debates frequently dominate presidential campaigns, congressional negotiations, and judicial proceedings, highlighting their central role in American political life. The rise of irregular migration, particularly along the U.S.–Mexico border, has further intensified political responses. Large-scale movements of asylum seekers and undocumented migrants

have prompted successive administrations to implement divergent strategies ranging from enforcement-oriented border control and deportation policies to humanitarian-focused approaches emphasizing asylum protections and pathways to legal status. Executive orders, changes in refugee admission ceilings, and fluctuating enforcement priorities illustrate how immigration policy in the U.S. is often shaped by executive authority, reflecting both institutional flexibility and political volatility. These shifts underscore the dynamic and often reactive nature of political responses to immigration within the American system. Public opinion plays a critical role in shaping immigration politics in the United States. Media portrayals, economic cycles, and security events significantly influence how immigration is perceived by voters, thereby affecting policy decisions. Periods of economic uncertainty or heightened security threats have historically coincided with restrictive immigration measures, while phases of economic expansion and labour shortages have led to more accommodative policies. Political leaders frequently respond to these public attitudes, balancing electoral considerations with economic imperatives and international obligations. This interaction between public perception and political action makes U.S. immigration policy particularly susceptible to short-term political pressures.

Institutionally, the U.S. political system adds further complexity to immigration governance. The division of powers among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches often results in policy gridlock, legal challenges, and inconsistent implementation. While Congress holds the authority to legislate comprehensive immigration reforms, partisan divisions have repeatedly stalled such efforts, leading to reliance on executive actions and administrative discretion. Judicial interventions have also played a decisive role, with courts frequently adjudicating disputes over immigration enforcement, asylum rights, and executive authority. These institutional dynamics highlight the fragmented nature of political responses to immigration in the United States. Placing the U.S. experience within a comparative framework is particularly valuable when examining immigration politics alongside India. While India is primarily characterized by internal migration and regional cross-border movements rather than large-scale permanent immigration, both countries face challenges related to national identity, security, citizenship, and political mobilization around migration issues. The U.S. context, marked by its status as a global destination country and its highly visible immigration debates, provides a contrasting yet informative backdrop against which India's political responses to migration can be analysed. Such a comparison enables a deeper understanding of how democratic systems with diverse populations respond differently to migration

pressures based on historical legacies, institutional structures, and political priorities.

In summary, immigration politics in the United States represent a multifaceted and evolving domain shaped by history, ideology, public opinion, and institutional constraints. Political responses to immigration have ranged from inclusive reform initiatives to restrictive enforcement-oriented measures, reflecting on-going tensions between economic needs, humanitarian values, and security concerns. This contextual overview establishes the foundation for a comparative examination with India, allowing for a nuanced analysis of how political systems respond to migration challenges in distinct yet interconnected ways. By situating the U.S. experience within this broader comparative perspective, the study aims to contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of immigration as a critical political issue in contemporary governance.

**Historical Evolution of Immigration Policy in the U.S.**

The historical evolution of immigration policy in the United States reflects the nation’s changing economic needs, social attitudes, and political priorities. From its earliest years, the United States has been shaped by successive waves of migration, yet immigration has never been a uniformly welcomed phenomenon. Instead, U.S. immigration policy has developed through a continuous process of inclusion and exclusion, influenced by labour demands, racial and ethnic hierarchies, national security concerns, and shifting conceptions of citizenship and national identity. Tracing this

historical trajectory is essential for understanding contemporary political responses to immigration. During the colonial and early post-independence period, immigration to the United States was largely unregulated. European settlers were encouraged to migrate to populate the new nation, cultivate land, and contribute to economic development. The Naturalization Act of 1790 marked one of the first federal interventions in immigration policy, limiting naturalized citizenship to “free white persons.” This law established a radicalized foundation for American citizenship that would influence immigration policy for more than a century. While immigration itself remained largely unrestricted, access to political and civic rights was selectively granted, reflecting early anxieties about national identity and social cohesion. The mid-nineteenth century witnessed a dramatic increase in immigration, particularly from Ireland and Germany, followed later by migrants from Southern and Eastern Europe and Asia. These demographic changes generated significant political backlash, leading to the rise of nativist movements such as the Know-Nothing Party. Economic competition, religious differences, and cultural fears drove demands for restrictive policies. The most explicit outcome of this sentiment was the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, the first federal law to prohibit immigration based on nationality and race. This act marked a critical turning point, institutionalizing exclusionary practices and legitimizing federal authority over immigration control.

**Table 1: Historical Evolution of Immigration Policy in the United States**

Period	Key Policies / Acts	Main Features	Political Significance
Colonial & Early Republic (Pre-1790–1840s)	Naturalization Act of 1790	Citizenship limited to “free white persons”; minimal federal regulation of immigration	Established racialized foundations of citizenship and early national identity
Mid-19th Century (1840s–1880s)	State-level controls; emergence of nativist movements	Large-scale European and Asian immigration; limited federal oversight	Rise of nativism and public anxiety over labor, religion, and culture
Exclusion Era (1882–1924)	Chinese Exclusion Act (1882); Immigration Act of 1917	Nationality- and race-based exclusions; literacy tests	First explicit federal restriction; institutionalized racial exclusion
Quota System Era (1924–1965)	Immigration Act of 1924 (National Origins Quotas)	Quotas favoring Northern and Western Europe; near-total exclusion of Asians	Immigration used as a tool of demographic and ideological control
Post-War Liberalization (1945–1965)	Displaced Persons Act; Refugee relief measures	Humanitarian admissions influenced by Cold War politics	Gradual shift from racial exclusion to rights-based considerations
Rights-Based Reform Era (1965)	Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965	Abolished national origins quotas; family reunification and skills-based system	Transformed demographic composition of immigration; increased diversity
Undocumented Migration Focus (1980s)	Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA), 1986	Amnesty for undocumented migrants; employer sanctions	Attempted compromise between enforcement and legalization
Security-Oriented Phase	USA PATRIOT Act;	Immigration linked to national	Securitization of immigration

(Post-9/11)	creation of DHS	security; increased surveillance and enforcement	governance
Contemporary Era (2000s–Present)	Executive orders; asylum and border policies	Policy volatility; reliance on executive action amid congressional gridlock	Immigration becomes highly polarized and electorally driven

**Institutional Framework Governing Immigration**

The governance of immigration in the United States is shaped by a complex institutional framework involving multiple branches of government and a range of federal agencies. Unlike centralized policy systems, U.S. immigration governance is characterized by a separation of powers that distributes authority among Congress, the Executive, the Judiciary, and administrative institutions [15]. This structure creates both checks and balances and persistent challenges, often resulting in policy fragmentation, legal disputes, and fluctuating enforcement priorities. Understanding the institutional framework is essential for analyzing how political responses to immigration are formulated, implemented, and contested in the United States [17]. Congress holds the primary constitutional authority over

immigration policy. Under Article I of the U.S. Constitution, Congress has the power to regulate naturalization, establish immigration laws, and determine eligibility for citizenship [18]. Historically, major immigration reforms—such as the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 and the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986—have emerged through congressional legislation. However, in recent decades, deep partisan divisions have significantly limited Congress’s ability to pass comprehensive immigration reform [19]. While Congress continues to shape immigration through funding decisions, oversight hearings, and incremental legislative amendments, its failure to enact broad reforms has created a legislative vacuum. This gridlock has shifted greater responsibility to the executive branch, altering the balance of institutional power [20].

**Table .2: Institutional Framework Governing Immigration in the United States**

Institution / Actor	Constitutional / Legal Basis	Key Roles and Functions	Impact on Immigration Policy
Congress	Article I, U.S. Constitution	Enacts immigration and naturalization laws; allocates funding; conducts oversight	Sets legal framework but often constrained by partisan gridlock
President / Executive Branch	Article II, U.S. Constitution	Issues executive orders; sets enforcement priorities; determines refugee admission ceilings	Expands executive discretion; leads to policy volatility across administrations
Department of Homeland Security (DHS)	Homeland Security Act, 2002	Border security, immigration enforcement, visa processing, detention and removal	Centralizes enforcement and securitizes immigration governance
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS)	DHS administrative authority	Processes visas, asylum applications, and naturalization	Influences legal immigration and humanitarian access
Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE)	DHS administrative authority	Interior enforcement, detention, and deportation	Reinforces enforcement-oriented political responses
Customs and Border Protection (CBP)	DHS administrative authority	Border control, inspections, and surveillance	Shapes border governance and deterrence strategies
Department of State	Foreign affairs authority	Issues visas abroad; manages refugee admissions and diplomacy	Links immigration policy with foreign policy goals
Judiciary (Federal Courts & Supreme Court)	Article III, U.S. Constitution	Reviews legality of laws and executive actions; protects constitutional rights	Acts as a check on executive power; introduces legal constraints
Immigration Courts (EOIR)	Department of Justice	Adjudicates asylum, deportation, and appeals cases	Affects due process and case backlogs
State Governments	Federal–state relations	Challenge or support federal policy through litigation and enforcement	Adds institutional complexity and policy contestation

The executive branch plays a central role in the administration and enforcement of immigration laws. The President possesses significant discretion in shaping immigration policy through executive orders, policy directives, and administrative rulemaking [23]. This authority extends to setting enforcement priorities, determining refugee admission ceilings, granting temporary protections, and managing border security strategies. Presidential influence has expanded particularly in periods of congressional inaction, allowing successive administrations to pursue markedly different immigration agendas [25]. While this flexibility enables rapid policy responses, it also contributes to instability, as executive actions are often reversed or modified by subsequent administrations. Federal agencies operating under the executive branch are instrumental in implementing immigration policy [27]. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS), established after the September 11, 2001 attacks, is the primary agency responsible for immigration enforcement and border security. Sub-agencies such as U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS), Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), and Customs and Border Protection (CBP) perform distinct but interconnected functions, including visa processing, interior enforcement, detention, deportation, and border management [29]. The Department of State also plays a crucial role in managing visa issuance and refugee admissions abroad, while the Department of Justice oversees immigration courts through the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR). Coordination among these agencies is essential but often challenged by bureaucratic complexity and political pressures.

**Immigration and Party Politics**

Immigration has become one of the most polarizing issues in contemporary U.S. party politics, deeply influencing ideological divisions, electoral strategies, and governance outcomes. While immigration policy was once characterized by bipartisan cooperation, particularly during the mid-twentieth century, it has increasingly evolved into a partisan battleground. The contrasting positions of the Democratic and Republican parties reflect broader disagreements over national identity, economic priorities, and the role of government, making immigration a central issue in political competition. The Democratic Party generally approaches immigration from a perspective that emphasizes inclusivity, humanitarian protection, and the economic contributions of immigrants. Democratic leaders often advocate for comprehensive immigration reform that includes pathways to legal status or citizenship for undocumented immigrants, expanded refugee admissions, and protections for asylum seekers. Immigration is frequently framed as a civil rights issue, with emphasis on family reunification, diversity, and social integration. The party’s electoral base, which includes racial and ethnic minorities, urban voters, and immigrant communities, has reinforced its relatively pro-immigration stance. However, internal divisions also exist within the Democratic Party, particularly between progressive factions advocating open and expansive policies and moderate members concerned about border enforcement and electoral backlash.

**Table .3: Immigration and Party Politics in the United States**

Aspect	Democratic Party	Republican Party	Political Implications
Ideological Orientation	Liberal, rights-based, inclusion-focused	Conservative, sovereignty- and security-focused	Ideological divide drives polarization
Approach to Immigration	Support for comprehensive reform and legalization pathways	Emphasis on enforcement and restriction	Limits bipartisan cooperation
Undocumented Immigration	Advocates regularization and protections	Prioritizes deportation and deterrence	Central source of policy conflict
Border Security	Supports border management with humanitarian safeguards	Emphasizes strict border control and physical barriers	Enforcement vs. humanitarian tension
Refugee and Asylum Policy	Favors higher admissions and protection commitments	Supports reduced admissions and stricter eligibility	Reflects competing moral and security frames
Legal Immigration	Supports family reunification and diversity	Promotes merit-based and reduced family migration	Shapes visa policy debates
Electoral Strategy	Mobilizes minority, urban, and immigrant voters	Appeals to nationalist and conservative constituencies	Immigration used as electoral mobilization tool
Policy Instruments	Legislative reform, civil rights protections	Executive enforcement, regulatory restriction	Reinforces policy instability
Internal Divisions	Progressive vs. moderate factions	Establishment vs. populist factions	Complicates party coherence
Impact on Governance	Push for inclusive reform amid resistance	Push for restrictive policies amid opposition	Sustains legislative gridlock and volatility

In contrast, the Republican Party has increasingly adopted a restrictive approach to immigration, prioritizing border security, enforcement, and national sovereignty. Republican rhetoric often links immigration to concerns about illegal entry, crime, labour competition, and cultural change. Calls for stricter border controls, increased deportations, and limitations on refugee admissions have become central elements of the party’s platform. Immigration is frequently framed as a security and rule-of-law issue, resonating with voters who perceive immigration as a threat to economic stability or national identity. Over time, these positions have hardened, particularly with the rise of populist and nationalist movements within the party.

**Immigration, National Security, and Border Governance**

Immigration policy in the United States has become increasingly intertwined with national security concerns, particularly in the context of border governance. While immigration and border control were historically viewed

primarily through economic and demographic lenses, security considerations have progressively reshaped political responses, institutional priorities, and public discourse. This securitization of immigration has significantly influenced policy formulation, enforcement strategies, and the framing of migrants within political narratives. The association between immigration and national security intensified during the late twentieth century and reached a critical turning point following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. In the aftermath of these attacks, immigration was no longer treated solely as a civil or administrative matter but as a central component of homeland security. The establishment of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) institutionalized this shift, consolidating border control, immigration enforcement, and internal security functions under a single authority. This restructuring reflected the political prioritization of border management as a defence mechanism against perceived external threats .

**Table 4: Immigration, National Security, and Border Governance in the United States**

Dimension	Key Components	Policy Instruments / Measures	Political and Governance Implications
<b>National Security Framing</b>	Immigration linked to terrorism, crime, and transnational threats	Security vetting, travel restrictions, surveillance systems	Securitization of immigration discourse
<b>Border Governance</b>	U.S.–Mexico border management	Physical barriers, border fencing, wall construction	Symbolic and political emphasis on sovereignty
<b>Border Enforcement Agencies</b>	DHS, CBP, ICE	Patrol expansion, detention centers, expedited removals	Strengthened enforcement-oriented governance
<b>Asylum at the Border</b>	Processing of asylum seekers	Restricted entry points, deterrence-based procedures	Humanitarian and legal controversies
<b>Internal Security Measures</b>	Monitoring within U.S. territory	Workplace raids, interior enforcement operations	Increased fear and marginalization of migrants
<b>Technology and Surveillance</b>	Advanced border technologies	Drones, biometric data, databases	Raises civil liberties and privacy concerns
<b>Executive Authority</b>	Presidential discretion in security matters	Emergency declarations, executive orders	Expanded executive power
<b>Judicial Oversight</b>	Legal review of security measures	Court challenges to enforcement actions	Balances security with constitutional rights
<b>Public and Political Discourse</b>	Immigration as a security threat	Political rhetoric, campaign narratives	Fuels polarization and public anxiety
<b>International Cooperation</b>	Cross-border and regional agreements	Bilateral enforcement and return agreements	Externalization of border control

Border governance, particularly along the U.S.–Mexico border, has become a focal point of national security debates. Political responses have emphasized physical barriers, enhanced surveillance technologies, increased personnel deployment, and expanded detention infrastructure. These measures are often justified on grounds of preventing unauthorized entry, human trafficking, drug smuggling, and potential security threats. However, the framing of border control as a security imperative has also contributed to the

criminalization of migration, blurring distinctions between migrants, asylum seekers, and transnational criminal actors.

**Critical Assessment of U.S. Political Responses**

A critical assessment of U.S. political responses to immigration reveals a pattern of reactive, polarized, and institutionally fragmented policymaking. While the United States possesses a long-standing immigration framework and extensive administrative capacity, its political responses often fail to address the structural drivers of migration in a coherent and sustainable manner. Instead, immigration policy is

frequently shaped by short-term political considerations, electoral incentives, and ideological contestation. One of the primary weaknesses of U.S. political responses is the absence of comprehensive legislative reform. Despite widespread recognition of systemic challenges such as undocumented migration, asylum backlogs, labour market mismatches, and humanitarian protection gaps—Congress has repeatedly failed to enact durable reforms. This legislative paralysis has shifted policymaking authority toward the executive branch, resulting in overreliance on executive orders and administrative discretion. While such mechanisms allow for flexibility, they undermine policy stability and democratic accountability.

The institutional framework governing immigration was identified as a key factor contributing to policy complexity and instability. The division of authority among Congress, the executive branch, the judiciary, and federal agencies has produced fragmented governance, often marked by legislative gridlock and executive overreach. While this structure ensures checks and balances, it has also resulted in inconsistent implementation and frequent legal challenges. The reliance on executive action in the absence of comprehensive legislative reform has emerged as a defining feature of modern U.S. immigration governance. Party politics were shown to play a decisive role in shaping immigration debates and policy outcomes. Increasing polarization between Democrats and Republicans has transformed immigration into a symbolic and ideological issue, limiting opportunities for bipartisan compromise. Electoral strategies, media narratives, and identity-based mobilization have intensified partisan divisions, reinforcing policy volatility and undermining long-term planning. The paper also highlighted the growing securitization of immigration, particularly in relation to border governance and national security. The framing of migration as a security threat has expanded enforcement mechanisms and executive authority while raising concerns about civil liberties and humanitarian obligations. Refugee and asylum policies further illustrated the tension between legal commitments and political constraints, as humanitarian protections have been subject to fluctuating priorities and administrative discretion. The role of media, public opinion, and interest groups was shown to be central in shaping immigration narratives and political responses. These actors influence policy agendas by framing immigration as either a crisis or a humanitarian responsibility, contributing to public polarization and political mobilization. The interaction among these forces underscores the socially constructed nature of immigration politics in the United States. Finally, the analysis of recent policy shifts during the Trump and Biden administrations demonstrated how immigration governance has become highly contingent on partisan control and executive leadership. The sharp

contrasts between restrictive and inclusive approaches reflect deeper ideological divides and institutional weaknesses, reinforcing the absence of a stable, consensus-driven framework.

### Conclusions:

This paper examined the political responses to immigration in the United States, highlighting the historical, institutional, and political dynamics that have shaped immigration governance. By situating immigration within broader debates on national identity, security, humanitarian responsibility, and democratic accountability, the chapter provided a comprehensive understanding of how immigration has become one of the most contested policy arenas in U.S. politics. The paper began with a contextual overview of immigration politics in the United States, emphasizing its centrality to political discourse and electoral competition. Immigration was shown to be both a foundational element of American nationhood and a persistent source of political tension. Historical analysis demonstrated that U.S. immigration policy has evolved through cycles of inclusion and exclusion, shaped by economic needs, racial ideologies, security concerns, and shifting public attitudes. From early radicalized naturalization laws and exclusionary quotas to post-1965 reforms and contemporary enforcement-driven approaches, immigration policy has continually reflected prevailing political priorities.

In conclusion, this paper revealed that U.S. political responses to immigration are characterized by polarization, institutional fragmentation, and policy instability, despite strong administrative capacity and democratic safeguards. These findings provide a critical foundation for the comparative analysis with India in the subsequent chapter, enabling a deeper understanding of how different democratic systems respond to migration challenges within their unique historical and political contexts.

### References

1. Rose, B. A., Milton, B. J., Edwin, M. R., Arun, B., & Merrin, R. S. (2026). Exploring Sri Lankan Displacement and Systemic Racism: A Comparative Analysis of the Movie, Kannathil Muthamittal and Gloria Meltzer's Only in Sri Lanka. In *Neocolonialism* (pp. 380-384). Routledge.
2. Cleton, L., Irastorza, N., Weinar, A., & Zhyznomirska, L. (Eds.). (2026). *The Routledge Handbook of the Politics of Migration in Europe*. Taylor & Francis.
3. Wu, L. (2026). All on the Same Page? Comparing European Populist Radical Right Governments' Foreign Policy towards China. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 22(1), oraf037.
4. Wani, I. A., & Ahmad, I. (2025, August). Marginalization and the politics of recognition: A

- comparative study of Gujjar and Pahari communities in Jammu and Kashmir (India). In *Forum for development studies* (pp. 1-26). Routledge.
5. Bauer, A. J., Roy, S., & Gago, V. (2025). Toward comparative analysis of right-authoritarian politics: Argentina, India, and the US. *Communication, Culture & Critique*, 18(1), 9-14.
  6. Samanta, P., & Chattopadhyay, S. (2025). Exploring the perception of ethnic migrants in Kolkata, India: A comparative study using sentiment analysis. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 47(10), 3634-3653.
  7. Jagannarayan, N., & Prasuna, A. (2025). Income dynamics in Maharashtra: A comparative analysis (2019–2021). *International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)*, 5(4), 405-416.
  8. Attewell, D., Jozwiak, A., & Kuhn, E. (2025). Backlash or Inclusion? The Political Effects of Co-Ethnic Immigration. *Political Behavior*, 1-22.
  9. Gupta, D., Kumar, P., Okano, N., & Sharma, M. (2025). Climate-Induced Migration in India and Bangladesh: A Systematic Review of Drivers, Impacts, and Adaptation Mechanisms. *Climate*, 13(4), 81.
  10. Jacobs, E. M. (2025). Greener pastures: why Indian international students leave the US labor market. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 51(5), 1346-1370.
  11. Khan, I. (2024). Economic and governance drivers of global remittances: a comparative study of the UK, US, and UAE to India. *Journal of Financial Economic Policy*, 16(3), 273-295.
  12. Glennon, B. (2024). Skilled immigrants, firms, and the global geography of innovation. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 38(1), 3-26.
  13. Kenny, J. (2024). Disapproval of climate policy dismantlement: A comparative analysis of international public opinion on Donald Trump's withdrawal from the Paris climate change regime. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 26(3-4), 351-366.
  14. Obaidullah, M., & Raihan, M. S. (2024). Soft power competition: a comparative analysis of China and the US in South Asia. In *Soft power and diplomatic strategies in Asia and the Middle East* (pp. 197-226). IGI Global Scientific Publishing.
  15. Obaidullah, M., & Raihan, M. S. (2024). Soft power competition: a comparative analysis of China and the US in South Asia. In *Soft power and diplomatic strategies in Asia and the Middle East* (pp. 197-226). IGI Global Scientific Publishing.
  16. Arar, K., & Örüçü, D. (2024). Post-migration ecology in educational leadership and policy for social justice: Welcoming refugee students in two distinct national contexts. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 52(6), 1410-1433.
  17. Babula, M. (2023). The association of prayer frequency and Maslow's hierarchy of needs: A comparative study of the USA, India and Turkey. *Journal of religion and health*, 62(3), 1832-1852.
  18. Smirnov, O., Lahav, G., Orbell, J., Zhang, M., & Xiao, T. (2023). Climate change, drought, and potential environmental migration flows under different policy scenarios. *International Migration Review*, 57(1), 36-67.
  19. Gillis, A., Geiger, N., Raimi, K., Cunningham, J. L., & Sarge, M. A. (2023). Climate change-induced immigration to the United States has mixed influences on public support for climate change and migrants. *Climatic Change*, 176(5), 48.
  20. Gomes, S. L., Hermans, L. M., Chakraborty, S., Luft, S., Butsch, C., & Banerjee, P. S. (2023). Comparative analysis of local adaptation processes in the future across peri-urban India to support transformations to sustainability. *Global Environmental Change*, 82, 102721.
  21. Khan, S. H. (2023). The role of intellectual property rights in achieving sustainable development goals: A comparative analysis of policy frameworks and their impact. *Migration Letters*, 20(9), 489-501.
  22. Khandelwal, C. (2022). Networked Social Movements: A Critical Interrogation of Pro and Anti-Immigration Twitter Discourse in India and the USA.
  23. Gheorghiu, M., Pehrson, S., & Christ, O. (2022). Status, relative deprivation, and moral devaluation of immigrants. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 61(2), 510-531.
  24. Barhate, B., Hirudayaraj, M., & Nair, P. K. (2022). Leadership challenges and behaviours in the information technology sector during COVID-19: a comparative study of leaders from India and the US. *Human Resource Development International*, 25(3), 274-297.
  25. Ochoa, A. (2021). Divine Politics: A Comparative Analysis of Religious Influence on Immigration Policymaking Among the Contemporary Case Study Nations of the United States, Turkey, and India.
  26. Khan, A., & Arokkiaraj, H. (2021). Challenges of reverse migration in India: a comparative study of internal and international migrant workers in the

- post-COVID economy. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 9(1), 49.
27. Mitchell, S. M., & Pizzi, E. (2021). Natural disasters, forced migration, and conflict: The importance of government policy responses. *International Studies Review*, 23(3), 580-604.
28. An, B. Y., & Tang, S. Y. (2020). Lessons from COVID-19 responses in East Asia: Institutional infrastructure and enduring policy instruments. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 50(6-7), 790-800.
29. Bhatia, A., & Makkar, B. (2020). CSR disclosure in developing and developed countries: a comparative study. *Journal of Global Responsibility*, 11(1), 1-26.