Immigration & Security Initiative Workshops (2005-2009)

“Immigration Policy Post-9/11”

The first of these workshops, held at the University of Pittsburgh on September 9th and 10th of 2005, was entitled ‘Immigration Policy Post-9/11’ and focused on comparisons of the U.S., E.U., and Russia. As part of a larger project called the “Comparative Immigration Policy and Global Security” and underwritten by the Ford Foundation, the inaugural event was organized by Pittsburg University’s Ford Institute for Human Security, in collaboration with its Ridgeway Center for International Security Studies, the Center for Russian and East European Studies, the Center for West European Studies, the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, The International Business Center at the Katz Graduate School of Business, as well as the University Center for International Studies.

Focusing primarily on the shift in regional security policies after the 9/11 attacks, the workshop identified immigration as the source of divergent policy streams between the U.S. and the European Union. Even before 9/11, policymakers throughout much of
the E.U. viewed security through the lens of immigration, whereas policymakers in the
U.S. tended not to until after the tragedy. But the linkage of immigration policy to
national security became a key part of the subsequent ‘war on terror,’ calling into
question many of the fundamental civil liberties enjoyed by citizens, residents, and
visitors of many Western nations. Spurred on particularly by recent acts of terrorism such
as the subway and bus attacks in London, Madrid’s train bombings, and an attack on the
grammar school in Beslan Russia, security issues continue to burn in the public
consciousness and therefore demand further scrutiny.

ISI researchers were asked to think about how institutions, both public and private
can reconcile the need for security in the face of the need for continued ‘healthy’
migration. This fundamental dichotomy raises issues of how fears of ‘the other’ can by
eased while simultaneously continuing to promote effective integration. What does all of
this mean for routine safety, citizenship and nationality; identity and notions of loyalty?

In pursuit of answers, the two-day workshop schedule consisted of five separate
panels, each featuring several presentations and extended discussion, as well as a special
roundtable discussion to conclude the event. Panel I focused on New Regulations and
New Institutional Structures. Panel II looked at Internal Security and Immigration
Policies. Panel III examined Identity Politics and most particularly, the integration of
Muslims in the West. Panel IV focused in Civil Liberties and how the inherent tension
between freedom and security has played out since 9/11. The last panel V looked into the
Impact on Labor, Economic Policies and Competitiveness. And the final roundtable
discussion concluded the discussions with some interesting conclusions about the benefits
of the comprehensive integration of minority groups.
The key questions were:

How much have policies changed? Was 9/11 in the U.S., E.U., and Russia a turning point (a common theme among American commentators) or, alternatively, did it mark an acceleration of trends toward efforts to reduce immigrant flows evident before 9/11 (a more common view in the EU)?

To what degree is there a tendency toward policy convergence or divergence across these areas in the period since 9/11?

To the degree that any convergence has taken place, is it patterned on a model evident in the European Union, Russia or the United States?

The 2006 ISI Initiative workshop in Paris, France served as a critical follow-up to the inaugural event held the previous year, continuing the joint sponsorship of the University of Pittsburg’s Ford Institute for Human Security and The Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques (Sciences, Po). The event was also part of a broader collaboration with the interdisciplinary research program CHALLENGE (The Changing Landscape of European (In)security). Bringing together the resources of some 23 universities and research laboratories in 14 selected countries throughout the European Union, the work done by CHALLENGE constitutes a very comprehensive research effort. It was funded by
the European Commission with 1.4 million euros made available to the group over a period of 5 years (from June 2004 to June 2009) in the FP6 (Framework Program for Research and Development). The organization focuses on both the conceptual and empirical aspects of decision-making to aid in the reformation of European security practices that impact civil liberties and broader social cohesion. It is organized into 15 work packages (WP) and main thematic objectives. They are: to enable a better understanding of interference between internal and external security and evaluate the changes taking place in the relationship between security and liberty in Europe, to analyze the role and transformation of institutions with different elements of security, and to facilitate and promote a new interdisciplinary network of researchers working on the re-conceptualization and analysis of many theoretical implications, (political, sociological and legal), related to new forms of violence. The team's research program regularly organizes lectures on these topics as well as smaller seminars frequently attended by academics, security professionals and representatives of non-governmental organizations.

Taking on these and other related issues, the two-day ISI network event, held on June 8th and 9th, 2006 assembled people from around the globe, including members of the government and parliament, high profile civil servants of national and European institutions, members of NGOs, European and North American academics, and others to discuss immigration and integration policies, border controls, the fight against terrorism, and other issues. The group of renowned scholars and experts in the area of immigration focused more particularly on the various aspects of human security, and how minorities and other individuals were affected on the ground by the more abrasive security regimes put in place as a result of fears over ‘second wave attacks’ after 9/11.
Given the immense scope of immigration and security issues in the modern world, the ISI organizers outlined very clear objectives for the talks. Designed to explore the ways in which immigration policies have been affected by national security interests, and vice versa based on a comparative analysis of U.S. and E.U. responses to the challenges posed by the expanded notion of “internal security,” the in-depth study of the “securitization” of immigration issues accordingly looked into four specific areas of inquiry that are not typically linked. They were border security concerns, internal security concerns, issues of discrimination and xenophobia, as well as integration of multi-generational immigrant populations through a linkage of social, urban, housing, and educational policies. Furthermore, they examined deeper the definition of threats and dangers, the changing security practices of transatlantic governments, the role of judges, and the infringement of some fundamental civil liberties.

Day one consisted of a participants’ welcoming address, an opening session followed by four separate roundtables, and a summary panel. The kick-off to the event was called “At the Limits of the Liberal State. The Answers to Terrorist Threat: Adequacy, Efficiency, Proportionality and Legitimacy.” Afterwards, the panel I was entitled “Immigrant Threats and Assets. EU and US Approaches Regarding Migrants, Asylum Seekers and Tourists.” Panel II was called “Controlling Frontiers and Projecting Abroad: EU and US Strategies in Comparative Perspective.” Panel III was called “Framing the Enemy and How to Protect. EU and US,” followed by the final roundtable which tackled “Intelligence Sharing and Civil Liberties at Stake: EU and US.”

Discrimination,” Panel III: “Factors of (dis)Integration,” and Panel IV: “Identity Politics.” Finally, to summate the event was the “Plenary Conclusion: Immigration, Security, Integration. The Challenges Ahead.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The key questions were:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much have policies changed? Was 9/11 in these two geographic regions a turning point (a common theme among American commentators) or, alternatively, did it mark an acceleration of trends toward efforts to reduce immigrant flows evident before 9/11 (a more common view in the EU)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what degree is there a tendency toward policy convergence or divergence across these areas in the period since 9/11?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To the degree that any convergence has taken place, is it patterned on a model evident in the European Union, Russia or the United States?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The 2007 meeting of the Immigration & Security Initiative brought together a predominately new set of contributors to the table, and initiated a new phase of the ISI’s work. Most simply put, the event held on September 7th and 8th of 2007, sought to answer the fundamental question of whether integration policies can be employed as an effective means by which the cycle of alienation, radicalization, and insecurity can be broken. This
is based on the general finding of the two previous workshops that many of the security policies put in place after 9/11 actually turned out to be counterproductive in several ways. Attempts to generate secure environments internally and trans-nationally often turned out to create further conditions of insecurity. This fundamental paradox of the prevailing approaches to security after 9/11 in the U.S. and many E.U. nations leaves the as yet fully unanswered question of how to best avoid this vicious loop. How can policy actors better address the social, political and economic needs of migrants and their families to foster a general environment of inclusion and social acceptance? Consistent with this area of inquiry, the workshop sought to examine the underpinnings of the immigration-security nexus vis-à-vis a closer look at main issue areas such as housing policy, employment policy, education policy, entrepreneurship, welfare, and the exercise of political rights.

In pursuit of answers to the questions surrounding the particulars of social integration mechanisms, day one consisted of an introductory session of key notions and questions as well as Panel I: “The New Landscape of Integration.” This set the stage for day two, which centered on a more in-depth look at integration as a primary means for ensuring security in liberal democratic and industrialized societies. It consisted of Panel II: “The Effects of the Immigration/Security Nexus,” Panel III: “The Security/Diversity Dilemma,” Panel IV: “The Reappraisal of Integration,” and a final concluding session. This aggressive schedule of events, packed into a two-day forum found that indeed, past approaches have been severely problematic on a series of fronts. The security/ insecurity paradox remains a large obstacle to societal tranquility within Western nations, and the most effective and empirically-based way to tackle the problems that stem from it is to
shape public policies that strive toward comprehensive integration of cultural, ethnic, and religious minorities.

The key questions were:

How can we think about the central concepts of integration theory in view of the new realities of security and immigration in Europe and the US? How can we revise or generate theories that account for the new exigencies of security and enhanced cross-cultural cleavages in the context of large immigrant populations whose historic origins lie outside the foundations of western society?

Have the policies associated with integration in America and Europe converged? Are there elements of convergence between the EU and US or among the national governments of the EU? If so, what are the sources and origins of any areas of convergence? Are they driven by the differing character of immigrants, the changing nature of the challenges posed by immigrants or by changes embedded within host societies?

Why has integration alternatively failed or been ignored as a security issue in Europe and the US? Why is it that the ‘securitization of immigration’ has become such a potent force on the governments and politics of both continents, yet the vast bulk of internal measures have focused on internal surveillance rather than on providing the socio-economic platform that might integrate new immigrants (both economically and politically) and might both isolate and identify any radical fringe? Can security and integration be reconciled and, if so, how?

Organized in collaboration with LOCALMULTIDEM (Multicultural Democracy and Immigrants Social Capital in Europe: Participation, Organizational Networks, and Public Policies at the Local Level), a research network funded by the EUROPEAN COMMISSION under Framework Programme 6, the 2008 ISI workshop largely continued the train of thought initiated at the 2007 gathering. The event focused on
unresolved problems surrounding the alienation of first-, second-, and third-generation immigrants and how the denial of civil liberties, the politics of estrangement, and often their humiliation has served to undermine security goals. Because of the general refusal to legitimize the swathe of social and political grievances expressed by immigrant communities, isolation has most frequently trumped integration.

The workshop included six panels focusing on different aspects of the political participation and integration of migrants and their descendents. It was broken down into three main parts: “The Issue Challenges of Migration for Democracies,” “Top-Down Political Contexts and Options for Policy Reforms,” and “Bottom-Up Civil Society, Movements and the Migrants Themselves.” Within these purviews, Panel I addressed the impact of the securitization of immigration issues on both sides of the Atlantic. Panel II focused on the specific issue of unwanted immigration, explicitly of illegal immigrants and asylum seekers, notably Muslims. Panel III was devoted to the analysis of political and institutional opportunities (such as state policies), while Panel IV tackled the specific impact of other ‘opportunities’ that are not grounded in the nation-state and that may be equally relevant to favor or prevent migrants from being politically active. Panel V looked at the role of civil society organizations in the integration of migrants, including the social capital arising from organizational networks. Finally, Panel VI examined the individual characteristics of migrants, and how they can lead to increased participation and integration. A wrap-up session was devoted to the question of how policymakers at all levels of governance can address the newly emerging transatlantic immigration dilemma.
The key findings of this conference were published in the edited volume by Ariane Chebel d’Appollonia and Simon Reich entitled *Immigration, Integration & Security: America and Europe in Comparative perspective*, pursuant to the key questions raised at the 2008 conference.

The key questions were:

How can we think about the central concepts of integration theory in view of the new realities of security and immigration in Europe and the US? How can we revise or generate theories that account for the new exigencies of security and enhanced cross-cultural cleavages in the context of large immigrant populations whose historic origins lie outside the foundations of western society?

Are there significant differences in the degree to which different ethnic, cultural or national groups are politically integrated into local life? If such differences exist, what factors help explain the variations in the degree of political integration from one immigrant group to another?

Have the policies associated with integration in America and Europe converged? If so, what are the sources and origins of areas of convergence? Are they driven by the differing character of immigrants, the changing nature of the challenges posed by immigrants or by changes embedded within host societies?

Why has integration alternatively failed or been ignored as a security issue in Europe and the US? Why is it that the ‘securitization of immigration’ has become such a potent force on the governments and politics of both continents, yet the vast bulk of internal measures have focused on internal surveillance rather than on providing the socio-economic platform that might integrate new immigrants (both economically and politically) and might both isolate and identify any radical fringe? Can security and integration be reconciled and, if so, how?

(2009)

“Integration and Security: Muslim Minorities and Public Policy in Europe and the United States”

On March 19, 2009 the ISI held a policy forum in Paris focusing more particularly on the challenges facing the integration of Muslim minorities in Europe and
the United States. It was a joint partnership between CEVIPOF, Sciences Po and The Division of Global Affairs, Rutgers-Newark. It was once again underwritten by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, and was the extension of a three-year collaborative study from both sides of the Atlantic. The findings dealt with the relationship between minority integration and public safety and were published in the DGA policy brief from 2009 and will also be featured at length in the forthcoming edited volume by Ariane Chebel d’Appollonia and Simon Reich entitled Rethinking Integration: Reconciling the Needs of New Immigrant Populations and the Security of Transatlantic Societies (see publications below).

The conference program featured a debate among policy experts on the securitization of immigration and integration policies, followed by some presentations and more debate on issues raised by the impact of the radicalization process and integration. Afterwards, the conversation shifted to cover the issue inescapable issue of policing minorities and vulnerable populations. Drawing from the ‘hands-on’ knowledge and expertise of policy makers, particular attention was paid to the issue of surveillance, and the extent to which security cameras and other means of keeping tabs on citizens within nations that have been the victims of terrorist attacks are useful to policing. By extension, what does this mean for civil liberties? The workshop also dealt with the focus on internal security and the increasingly pervasive phenomenon of ‘home-grown’ terrorists, who often do not ‘fit the mold’ and challenge conventional metrics for gauging the prevalence of extremism in American and European communities.

Central topics covered by the presentation of ISI contributors included “The Securitization of Immigration & Integration Policies,” “Issues Raised by the Impact of
the Radicalization Process on Integration,” “Policing Minorities & Vulnerable Populations,” as well as “Policing Options & Other Forms of Political and Socio-Economic Integration.” Discussions on these topics were followed by concluding remarks and key policy recommendations.

**The key questions were:**

- Have traditional surveillance and policing security measures enhanced public safety?
- What has been the influence of such measures on the process of radicalization among minority communities?
- What effect have these security measures had on the claims made by legitimate asylum seekers?
- Are Arabs and Muslims in fact divided in their loyalties?
- What policing options are open to policymakers in dealing with minority communities?
- What other forms of politics, economic and social incorporation may address security problems?