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Trump: a New Immigration Policy in the United States?


According to many commentators, the US immigration policy is totally new with President Trump. The American Administration, at the head of a country whose population was largely made up of migratory inflows, is said to have become hostile to immigration. What is the real truth?

Uncutted by multiple tweets, some of which come to deny the words of his close collaborators, President Trump’s policy seems unclear. Yet, at least in one area, the migration issue, Trump’s continuity and perseverance in applying his program is remarkable and even astonishing. Indeed, in democracies, voters often find that an elected president moves away from his election promises, whereas President Trump seems determined to implement what he announced.

A precisely announced policy

Indeed, on August 31st, 2016, in a speech in Phoenix, Arizona, several months before the election, Donald Trump presented ten proposals for US immigration policy. Their stated goals were to reduce immigration, including stricter enforcement of existing laws on illegal immigration. This speech was the most detailed of his campaign. The issue of immigration was then one of the key points of his state-speech was the most detailed of his campaign. The issue of immigration was then one of the key points of his state-

mination Center of Fort Clinton, at the southern end of Manhattan, then at Ellis Island in 1892, criteria were set to quarantine some people or even deny them entry. The shipping companies that transported the migrants were required to repatriate them at their expense. Approximately 2% of the entrants thus had their admission to the United States rejected because of their poor health or criminal record.

The migration policy of the United States has often been based on a logic of quotas decided by Congress, even if the geographical quotas disappeared from 1978 to 2016 to partially reappear in 2017. For the future, it is the voters who, by their choices in the parliamentary and presidential elections, will decide this policy.

The return of previous procedures

Should we consider that the principles implemented to achieve this goal, such as the use of quotas tending towards zero with certain countries or the deployment of police officers, are unprecedented in the migratory history of the United States? Actually, this country has always had policies whose purpose was, according to the point of view that we take, to control immigration or to contain it. To take just a few examples, let’s recall some decisions. In 1798, there was the Alien and Sedition Act, including measures to curb the naturalization process that was deemed too fast. From 1882 to 1943, the Chinese Exclusion Act prohibited entry to Chinese nationals. As another example, at the Federal Immigration Center of Fort Clinton, at the southern end of Manhattan, then at Ellis Island in 1892, criteria were set to quarantine some people or even deny them entry. The shipping companies that transported the migrants were required to repatriate them at their expense. Approximately 2% of the entrants thus had their admission to the United States rejected because of their poor health or criminal record.

The migration policy of the United States has often been based on a logic of quotas decided by Congress, even if the geographical quotas disappeared from 1978 to 2016 to partially reappear in 2017. For the future, it is the voters who, by their choices in the parliamentary and presidential elections, will decide this policy.

(Translation: Claude Grandpey)