

БЕЛГОРОДСКИЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ НАЦИОНАЛЬНЫЙ
ИССЛЕДОВАТЕЛЬСКИЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ



БЕЛГОРОДСКИЙ ДИАЛОГ–2016
ПРОБЛЕМЫ ФИЛОЛОГИИ, ВСЕОБЩЕЙ И
ОТЕЧЕСТВЕННОЙ ИСТОРИИ

СБОРНИК МАТЕРИАЛОВ
VIII Международного молодёжного
научного форума

г. Белгород 7—9 апреля 2016 г.

Белгород 2016

АНГЛОЯЗЫЧНАЯ СЕКЦИЯ ПОСТЕРНЫХ ДОКЛАДОВ
«INTERNATIONAL AND DOMESTIC TRANSFORMATIONS»

**EMERGING PATTERNS OF IMMIGRATION FROM MENA
TO EUROPE**

Joshua Bemis

Middle Tennessee State University
Department of Political Science
International Affairs program
Instructor: Dr. Korobkov

Today, more than ever we can see an ever-growing pattern happening before our eyes. Huge amounts of immigrants are leaving their home country for Europe. Most of these people are coming from MENA (Middle East and North Africa).

So many questions need be answered in this growing concern for our planet. How did this happen? What led to such large current migration in terms of so many different goals across the board of these immigrants to leave their home country? These different goals range from taking care of a family, needing work, to the destruction of a home country by a plethora of different problems. I will try to map out the different ways that migration in Europe is possible. What are the impacts on the new country? Whether its religion, or resilience to non-conformity from the new migrants, it will be hard to justify just one side of things. Contributing to this new migration are these migration triggers, which I will go in to more detail in this paper. The further progression of migration from MENA to Europe will have unforeseen consequences. These consequences will be politically driven and furthermore, most EU nations will have to try to solve the problem in the current state of affairs especially in the Middle East. I will also try to show some of the processes of trying to slow down or even stop migration into this European countries, as well as what the future will look like for both Europe and MENA.

We can first take a look at the economic boom in Europe after World War II, specifically in countries like France, Belgium, and Germany. This boom led to these countries allowing immigrants in for work (Ben-David 2). The following decades of economic downfall showed the effect in which having guest workers in these countries contributed to the stay of these guest workers, because even jobless, they did not want to return to their own home countries. European governments realized that immigration like this wasn't the best thing all the time. Once a halt on migration was to occur in European countries, most of these immigrants felt rushed trying to bring their families abroad in worries that they would never be allowed in after the policies took effect in their respectively new home country. But since then most of Europe has had an incredibly relaxed version of immigration policies making it incredibly easy to come in as an immigrant until just recently, following the Paris attacks. European countries are scrambling to figure out

a way to answer this tough and complex decision for allowing or not allowing immigrants to come in to their country.

The current crisis is just a large hiccup in the already growing problem that Europe faces with immigration from MENA. “The International Organization for Migration has revealed that over 330,000 people have crossed the Mediterranean so far this year. Consequently, the number deaths are ranging in the thousands and there no reasons to believe that more of these tragedies will not occur in the short term” (Azikiwe 1). This article was written in September and just in the matter of months that make up the difference until now, so many more people have fled their countries to try getting into Europe. Most of the people are claiming to be Syrian, saying that they are refugees of their home country. “Estimates from the UN Refugee Agency suggest that more than 4 million Syrians are refugees, 50,000 more have sought asylum and at least 7 million more are internally displaced” (Chamie 1). These numbers will grow and keep growing until a number of things happen. Most of these happenings can only be seen on paper, but nevertheless, all are important. These include and are not limited to: the political stability of someone’s home country, the ability to work for a living wage (whether you are low or high skilled labor), etc.

I’d like to go now to the different ways that it is possible to migrate to Europe. The first and most negative impact on someone’s home country is employment or student permit for skilled workers. What this shows is a drain of skilled workers from a country that people are leaving and eventually drains them of these workers because they all know they have a chance to make more money and have a much brighter future outside their home country. The next would be marriage immigration and family reunification. Marriage immigration basically states that the generations past the first of being in a new country show a higher age at marriage and fewer number of children the farther you go down the line of generations of people (Ben-David 7). Next is family reunification. It “is one of the most common ways to immigrate to Europe today. This means that immigration laws on host countries have transformed immigrant youth into virtual human visas” (Ben-David 7). I think this shows that the current mass of immigrants show that value on the family is a large impact on going West and getting away from, from what we see today, political turmoil in their home country. The last of these of these possibilities is asylum and illegal immigration. A large divide has happened in defining asylum seekers and those who request refugee status. The current state of affairs that Europe is dealing with right now is the large amount of people calling for refugee status even if they are not from Syria. What people will do is burn their papers and claim they fled the country in terms that they would be killed or persecuted heavily if they stayed in their home country. That’s also a problem that Europe has to deal with seeing as not everyone is probably coming from the same place, but no one has a clue where they are actually coming from. “Those who live illegally do not pay taxes and cannot enjoy the full benefits of a welfare society. However, as more illegal immigrants arrive in a country, pressure grows to regu-

larize them by awarding them amnesty and residence permits. Though regularization deals with the humanitarian aspects of the illegal immigrant's situation, it also gives incentives for illegal behavior and further immigration" (Ben-David 10). All of these possibilities of immigration show a challenge to the harboring country and those around it seeing as some will venture out because of relaxed border restrictions, especially in the E.U.

Something small I want to touch up on is the impact on the new countries culture as a whole from these new immigrants, mainly coming from the Middle East. One problem I see is the religious aspect of such culturally different peoples no matter what country in Europe we're talking about. I'm not blaming the religion of one person as the hindrance for them coming in to a country, but because of how extraordinarily different these two people are can create some anxiety from the new country in terms that these people will either chose to assimilate into their new country's culture or not. These terms are not of a legal variety, but because most people of the new country that were natives will obviously harbor some disdain for a people not following tradition in the sense that they will continue to pray to their perspective gods, they will eat their homelands food, they will not basically become part of the population but a subset of it. An issue in morality will be a divide between these two people because of different values. This is not a bad thing either, but again, can be used to empower some political faction trying to oust the immigration into their native lands.

Next I want to touch on Philippe Fargues' creation of these 'triggers' that initiate such migration to occur. "Four interlinked migration triggers are crucial to forecast flows effectively: the demographic youth bulge; the employment and social situation in MENA countries; environmental conditions, including pressures on land use and natural resources; and political instability and conflict" (Fargues 13). High birth rates created an incredibly large amount of able bodied, young workers. This young work force shows a problem though. Because of high unemployment in their home countries, this young work force will not be able to save any money from money never made, which in Fargues' eyes is the key to development in these youth's respective countries. Next, "Unemployment has risen everywhere in the region, particularly among young educated people, In part because of failed economic policies...when jobs are lacking – especially for the university educated – and educational attainment is not rewarded, young people do not have the means nor the incentives to make the most of their demographic 'gift'. Furthermore they cannot convert their talents into development gains that benefit the whole population" (Fargues 14-5). What this shows is the ability of other countries, like those in Europe and abroad, to pick up this large group of educated, willing to work, and young people so that they can attain the future they couldn't in their home country. Even though this is a new idea, environmental concerns are a growing challenge in understanding immigration. Mostly due to a home country becoming inhospitable creates that want to flee the home country and obtain the right to live somewhere else. "...environmental migration will mainly oc-

cur in less developed countries where people do not have the financial means to defend against environmental changes. Others are skeptical and respond that there is no evidence to suggest that natural disasters alone can cause massive, permanent migration; natural disasters occur within a political context, such as a government failure or an open conflict. Climate change may influence the push factors of migration but not the pull factors, which many scholars view as the main drivers of migration” (Fargues 15). The last of the triggers is the one we can see happening right now, political instability. The Syrian conflict can be the best example for this incredible amount of immigration into Europe.

Now what processes have arisen and will be continued as a means of halting, if not stopping, immigration at all? Some I want to include are: tightening restrictions on allowing a certain amount of immigrants in to a country is always looming especially in the EU right now, ad campaigns in showing the danger of immigration in terms of personal safety, and even new countries supporting MENA countries so that the infrastructure can be created as a positive and progress into developing a better future for those wanting to leave their home countries for better opportunity in Europe. “Tightening immigration laws is an obvious strategy but one that is undercut by inconsistent regulations among EU states...A recent EU court decision, however, scrapped the requirement for a minimum stay and rejected any national restrictions on free movement. Judicial activism compounds the problem when courts create new legislation by imposing their own opinions” (Ben-David 11). This processes will eventually be evolved in new ways in current state of affairs and we will most likely see a large influx or tight to very loose restrictions on immigration.

The future of immigration from MENA to Europe and abroad will prove to be very interesting. From the large amount of labor forces needing work, to those fleeing current political despair, immigration from now until ever is a never-ending evolution. This evolution cannot be seen or foretold but we can only assess and assume from the current state of affairs what could be the possibility of the future. “Future patterns of migration will not resemble those of the past and not even of the present day. Family profiles of young MENA migrants are going through radical changes. Yesterday, male migrants left their families behind so they could feed and educate them. Remittances were the main reason for leaving, and, in many cases, return was part of the migration project. Tomorrow, all young emigrants will typically have no children or spouses at home, and their ambition and the desire for self-accomplishment will drive them, whether the contemplate staying abroad permanently or returning to their country with increased capital and skills” (Fargues 20). The future, in my eyes, holds a very large emergence of changes politically, economically, and environmentally, not only in MENA countries, but as well as the harboring new countries of immigrants.

All in all the changing face of immigration from MENA to Europe will continue to advance in this evolution, as I stated before. Immigration is an extremely complex system involving so many factors, processes, and thought invoking prob-

lems. What I do know is that in this current state of affairs, Europe will have to figure a way to control, adopt, help, or do whatever it has in its arsenal so that its only infrastructure will not collapse under not tight enough political restriction, need be, or that of the MENA countries to develop enough so that their infrastructure can grow.

Works Cited

1. Azikiwe, Abayomi. "'Destabilization of Africa and the Middle East Prompts Millions to Flee': Mass Migration Deaths Caused by US Foreign Policy." *Global Research*. N.p., n.d. Web. 12 Sept. 2015.
2. Ben-David, Esther. "Europe's Shifting Immigration Dynamic." *Middle East Forum*. N.p., n.d. Web. 12 Sept. 2015.
3. Chamie, Joseph. "Desperate Migration in the Middle East." *Desperate Migration in the Middle East*. N.p., n.d. Web. 12 Sept. 2015.
4. Fargues, Philippe. "Emerging Demographic Patterns across the Mediterranean and Their Implications for Migration through 2030." *Emerging Demographic Patterns across the Mediterranean and Their Implications for Migration through 2030* (2008): 1-29. Print.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY AND TERRORISM

Muslim Chamaev

Middle Tennessee State University
Department of Political Science
International Affairs program

Since the beginning of human existence, we have been evolving with the environment around us and will always continue to do so at an exponential rate. This includes an evolution of violence. Violence has been a part of human society since day one, but as of the past half century a new form of violent people has emerged from the woodwork of the darkest reaches of the human race, these so-called terrorist. The majority of the terrorist who live today do so rather comfortably. However, the terms of this comfort come with a heavy thought in the back of our minds. An act of terror knows no innocent lives, no idea to better the world, and has no positive after effect. It leaves entire nations in grief and disbelief while shattering the lives of thousands of innocent people for no apparent reason. Political gain, land, resources, imperialism, and globalization have been the cause of many violent wars in our past, and there have been millions of lives lost in the process. As sad as this is there have been patriotic and revolutionary causes to these conflicts. Today terrorism induces wars that lead to no positive gain, other than a pointless loss of life. History would remain the same without this menace in

its pages. The only thing to be remembered from this affliction on the world is fear and death. Now ask yourself, what is terrorism?

The definition of terrorism is as clear as its root word – terror. Deep fear. An act of terror is an act by a certain group of people with extremist views, based on systematic implementation and use of fear and violence. Terrorism is mostly used to reach certain political goals and pressure governments to meet their terms by coming up with certain policies. According to the United States Code title 18 section 2331 terrorism is defined and divided into International and domestic terrorism. The Department of Justice defines terrorism as “a violent act or an act dangerous to human life, in violation of criminal laws of the United States or any segment to intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social objectives.

Terrorism is a huge threat because there are no borders or capitals nor huge constructed military bases and it is harder to locate and spy on our enemy. This concerns the world because there are endless possibilities to the threat. However, as we all know The United States is one of the world’s superpowers and it has some of the most valuable tools to prepare and fight this enemy. Terrorist have many different targets, this is broken down into soft and vital infrastructure. Soft targets are targets that do not have extensive security funding, and more vulnerable than a highly protected installation, for example schools, movie theaters, concerts, etc. while Vital infrastructures are framework of networks and systems essential to the defense and economic security of a nation, for example airports, military installations, power plants, seaports and harbors, etc. Every country takes care of domestic and international problems through its domestic and foreign policy. The United States is not an exception. Along with the economic and social issues within our borders, one of our country’s biggest concerns is terrorism and it’s affect on the world.

The goals of research

The goal of this essay is to explore the reasons for acts of terror and the importance of this topic in the world. I believe that not only will this paper increase my knowledge on the topic in which my final grade will be a testimony to that aspect. It will also teach me how the government and government agencies in the US deal with terrorism. I intend to learn about the methods our government uses to deal with this problem and how these methods have developed over time. So I ask myself, what do the terrorists want? What leads them into these life-changing violent decisions?

The importance of the topic

This topic is prevalent because terrorism is a big threat to US soil. Obviously, every human being has a desire to live in peace and be protected from any and all threats in life. Everyone has the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We all want to live in a safe society and raise children without worrying about bombings, killings and kidnapping. This is hard enough on a domestic level, how can this affect us when it takes place globally? The five known types of ter-

rorism comes from biological, chemical, explosive, incendiary, and nuclear. There are also six types of harm that comes from these events. Those being asphyxiation, chemical, etiological, mechanical, radiological, and thermal (Fleming, R. S. 1998). These are things we should want to prevent against.

The sources and the methods applied in this research

When choosing my sources, I tried to stick mostly to the ones that have relation to the government and its agencies, such as the United States Code title 18 section 2331, which clearly defines what it is to be an International and domestic terrorist, The Patriot Act of 2001, the FISA, Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, FISC, Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, and NSL, National Security Letters, to name a few. My methods were very simple, I started my research on terrorism and its evolution, and continued with researching how The United States and its foreign policies deal with this issue in the past.

In the United States Code title 18 section 2331 the definition of international terrorism means (A) “activities that involve violent acts or acts dangerous to human life that are a violation of the criminal laws of the United States or of any State, or that would be a criminal violation if committed within the jurisdiction of the United States or of any State. (B) Appears to be intended (i) to intimidate or coerce a civilian population, (ii) to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion; or (iii) to affect the conduct of a government by mass destruction, assassination, or kidnapping. (C) Occur primarily outside the territorial jurisdiction of the United States, or transcend national boundaries in terms of the means by which they are appear intended to intimidate or coerce, or the locale in which their perpetrators operate or seek asylum.” This is only the first part of international terrorism, however, it goes much deeper into the Immigration and Nationality Act, a person holding interest in property, the acts of War. And also the domestic side of terrorism. It is word for word identical to International terrorism minus the last section in (A) “or that would be a criminal violation if committed within the jurisdiction of the United States or of any State” because it is for sure in the jurisdiction being domestic, and section (C) which states, “Occur primarily within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

The FISC was established in 1978 as a special court of seven Federal District Justices to review the applications for the warrants related to the national security investigations. The provisions were a part of the FISA which required the intelligence gathering in order to obtain a judicial warrant, similar to that of a criminal warrant. Under the FISA, the warrant application is drafted by attorneys in the General Counsel’s Office at the National Security Agency, which must contain the Attorney General’s certification that the target is a foreign power or the agent of a foreign power, with the request of a federal agency officer. Judges of the FISC hear the warrant applications in D.C. There is also a FISC of Review, to review at the government’s request. The 2001 Patriot Act increased the number of judges serving the court from seven to eleven (Boeglin, J., & Taranto, J. 2015).

After the terrorist attack of September 11th, 2001 in downtown New York City President George W. Bush and his office staff passed the PATRIOT ACT. The long title being, Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism ACT of 2001 (Best, S. 2005).

This act is made up of seven titles. Not to go into every title and break them down but to highlight a few. Title 1 enables funding for the act's provisions. Enables the president to authorize seizure of any foreign person's property if suspected of aiding to terrorism. It also condemns discrimination against anyone of Arab descent. Title 2 gives Law Enforcement the ability to surveil agents of foreign powers. This includes the ability to issue a delayed notification search warrant. Title 3 attempts to block funding of terrorist organizations through money laundering, smuggling, etc. Title 4 increases national border security. Title 7 is sharing information between Law Enforcement agencies and funded, and Title 8 defines the crimes to be considered acts of terrorism (Best, S. 2005).

Why do people choose to be terrorists? What are the goals?

To understand such horrific acts, it is imperative that we start from the source of the problem. What causes a person to give up their lives, families, and everything they love to go murder innocent people? There must be a terrible abyss in one's consciousness to do this. Either that or a lot of fear and manipulation. This question has bothered me for many years. How is it that a person could misinterpret a religious text to an extent that he would give up home and family to murder? One of the main reasons it bothered me so much is the first hand experience. My family is originally from Chechnya, a land that has been through an abundance of struggle, externally as well as internally. Terrorism has taken many lives of relatives, friends and neighbors, and people I have grown up with. After seeing all of this throughout my life and doing my research long before this assignment I have come to a few conclusions about the reasons why people become terrorists. According to Pillar, extremists share a perception that American culture has polluted Islamic values and traditions. They view violence as the natural and justified by-product of a cosmic struggle between good and evil. Outrage and unyielding religious beliefs provide moral sanction to use violence against the intrusion of a godless West, symbolized by America, into the Middle East (Pillar, 2008).

Something very common to terrorist conversion is having no satisfaction with their life. Not having accomplished anything makes them stress and leads to mental disorder. We found that lone actors with a history of mental illness are more likely associated with single-issue ideologies than AlQaeda inspired or extreme right-wing ideologies (Corner, E., & Gill, P. 2015). In countries within the middle east such as Chechnya, if a young man realizes at some point there is no way for him to succeed in life and achieve his goals or no way of being able to provide for himself and his family while other men of his age have made it to the high society, he has the opportunity to leave the system where he feels like

an outsider. He hates it to its core, and he can fight it and its values. His aggression is driven by his hatred for a society he was being forced to live in. This

hate is primarily generated by the fact that the society does not provide him personally with all the benefits that he thinks he deserves.

Another reason might be the protest against the current system in general. In this case, the protest is not directed against one's place in the social system, but against the basic principles of its construction. Young people can be arranged quite well in life. They can come from wealthy families. But, they do not want to put up with the "rules of the game" who impose their family and society. The primary Islamist organization that materialized from this civil war was known as the AIAI. Religiously, the AIAI identified itself as Salafist and promoted strict adherence to the Sharia. The religious and ideological beliefs within the AIAI, however, were not uniform and scholars have characterized the AIAI as an "umbrella organization" that loosely unified the different Islamist sects in Somalia (Rand, P. 2015). They are not willing to be integrated into its characteristic structure of status and rank. Failure to make others reckon with him as a person, take into account its own ideas about justice, about how to build their lives; these are things that can cause a young man to turn to the propaganda of a terrorist group. The end result is a man leaving the real world to become a "fighter for justice".

Another reason that leads people to become so violent is motives of revenge. Existing in a number of territories, tough military pressure, especially on young people, is applied to them, their families and friends. This can include years of abuse and torture and extrajudicial executions. This sometimes leads to the fact that young people feel they need to seek revenge for their own suffering and pain of their loved ones. And even more broadly for their co-religionists subjected

to similar treatment. If they do not see any way to protect their rights legally, they can choose the path of armed resistance. It seems today this cause is among the main, if not the principal.

Also, as funny as this might seem, it even happens as a result of fashion. In those regions where the illegal armed groups are active, among young people, its leaders are often seen as heroes. They are Robin Hoods who seek justice and stand up for the ones that are oppressed. Romantic perception of the resistance power pushes some young (usually very young) people to join the illegally armed groups. And when later the illusions are scattered, going back becomes quite difficult.

These are the most common reasons that can ultimately stand behind the decisions of a young man joining a terrorist group. There may be a other small reasons as well such as conflict in the family, for example. But to put such a decision into practice, I believe at least two conditions have to be met: First, The presence of a radical ideology that would give justification would fit under the base of the armed resistance. Second, The presence of the terrorist infrastructure, providing organizational, and financial support of the armed resistance.

I must say that these "conditions" are not mandatory. The ideology of "justice" and "the holy war" are actively involving young people in its ranks. This is using psychological mistreatment and manipulation and the intimidation of violent threats. As a result, these are often considered the main reasons for young

people joining the terrorist groups. However, if it were not for the reasons referred to above, it is unlikely that the indoctrination and systematic retraction of youth to an armed resistance would have had such a serious effect.

Nevertheless, it is undeniable that terrorist groups are really just large masses of global criminals. They are just people hiding from justice. For some of them it is actually a business, like the gangsters of the early 1900's in Chicago and New York. Terrorism grown and changes just like any other thing would grow or change. Trends in the methodology are increasing the size and improvised explosive devices, improving the method of concealment, new detonating and fusing systems, standoff attack capabilities, the ability to engage in hostage/barricade incidents, and usage of the internet for recruiting/fund raising.

Does it have anything to do with Islam?

Unfortunately for me and for other 2 billion representatives of the religion of Islam, many terrorist groups in modern history claim to act in the name of Islam. They sometimes say that they are fighting a holy war called "Jihad" and other times they say they fight in the name of Allah. To most of the people in the world that practice Islam these claims are ludicrous. Obviously that bothers me as well because my religion is a religion of peace and mercy and it's sad to see how the actions of certain individuals affects the whole society of Islam in the world. The question is: Do these horrible actions really have anything in common with Islam? The answer is: No. I am not a scholar or a very knowledgeable person in this religion but I can provide simple proof. This is the basic knowledge that every Muslim must have about his faith and it clearly shows how in reality the ones who claim to be killing and fighting in the name of Islam don't even have this basic knowledge about their own religion. If they do, it's even worse because they are acting against it, they're hurting the name of every other Muslim in the world. The two main rules that a Muslim must go by are the Quran, the book with the words of God and the "Hadith", the sayings, doings, and acknowledgments of the messenger of God, Prophet Muhammad, peace and blessings be upon him, pbuh. These are the foundations of Islam and the guidelines for everything in the religion.

I would like to explain in this essay how important the human rights are and the fairness in the justice of Islam. Our religion provides many human rights for every human being. They include: The life and property of all citizens in an Islamic state are considered sacred; whether a person is Muslim or not. Islam also protects everyone's honor. Insulting others or making fun of them is not permissible. Here is the proof: Prophet Muhammad, pbuh, said: "Truly your blood, your property, and your honor are inviolable." (Narrated in *Saheeh Al-Bukhari*, #1739, and *Mosnad Ahmad*, #2037). Also, I would like to show a verse from the Quran where we can clearly see that Islam prohibits racism and the God speaks of a human equality: "O mankind, We have created you from a male and a female and have made you into nations and tribes for you to know one another. Truly, the noblest of you with God is the most pious. Truly, God is All-Knowing, All-Aware." (Quran, 49:13)

To conclude, Terrorism is not just the Arab blowing themselves up in the name of Islam, neither is it Timothy McVeigh in the Oklahoma City bombing. Terrorism, as defined, can be international or domestic, by Patriotic Americans or foreign individuals. In response to the terror that has struck the United States it adjusted and passed a few acts to better their intelligence, awareness, and ability to prevent and respond to such attacks. Although the dark day in September 2001 and the dark years of the UNABOMBER from 1978 to 1995 are over and history written, they are means for the better responses we have from the United States Government and Law Enforcement Officials.

Work Cited

1. Pillar, P. (2008, June 27). Terrorism and American Foreign Policy. Retrieved November 26, 2015, from <https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/csi-publications/csi-studies/studies/vol46no1/article07.html>
2. Fleming, R. S. (1998). Assessing organizational vulnerability to acts of terrorism. *SAM Advanced Management Journal* (07497075), 63(4), 27.
3. Corner, E., & Gill, P. (2015). A false dichotomy? Mental illness and lone-actor terrorism. *Law And Human Behavior*, 39(1), 23-34. doi:10.1037/lhb0000102
4. Rand, P. (2015). Back to the Congressional Drawing Board: Inapplicability of the AUMF to Al-Shabaab and Other New Faces of Terrorism. *Loyola Of Los Angeles International & Comparative Law Review*, 37(1), 117-151.
5. Boeglin, J., & Taranto, J. (2015). Stare decisis and secret law: on precedent and publication in the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court. *Yale Law Journal*, (6), 2189.
6. Best, S. (2005). The Son of Patriot Act and the Revenge on Democracy. *TAMARA: Journal Of Critical Postmodern Organization Science*, 3(3/4), 1-8.

IS GERMANY A COUNTRY OF IMMIGRATION? GERMANY'S HISTORICAL AND CURRENT ROLE IN IMMIGRATION

Laura Coleman

Middle Tennessee State University

Department of Political Science

International Affairs program

Instructor: Dr. Korobkov

During the period between the two world wars, Germany faces two large population transfers, not including the expulsion of Jews from Germany and territories annexed during this period. While the Jewish expulsion is important to

Germany's historical immigration policies, this paper will summarize the ethnic German return migration, Germany's historical view on foreign immigration, and the latter portion will discuss Germany's current role in the Syrian refugee crisis. In surveying German immigration topics, the paper aims to look at three important players within the system: external forces, immigrants (whether they be foreign or return migrants), and the receiving population. Also mention in regard to the Syrian refugees, the paper will discuss the strategies taken by current German Chancellor Angela Merkel to deal with the situation, and the other factors that play into forming new immigration policies (the uprising of right-wing parties, Turkey's, and opposition from other European leaders).

This first portion focuses on the forced migration of the German people arranged by Hitler, and then policies in enacting to oust ethnic Germans after the end of the second war. Mass population transfers or force migration involves Germany and Russia during the Second World War and post-world war. Under the Hilter-Stalin Act (or Molotov-Ribbentrop Act), Germany and the Soviet Union agreed to allow ethnic Germans resettle in the lands that taken over by the Soviet Union to territory under German occupation (Reinsch pg. 52). Two-third of Poland is annexed by Germany who gives the other thirds to Russia. During The second wave (1944), ethnic Germans evacuated Eastern Europe after the Soviet Union spreads its influence throughout the region. With the Soviet Union and Germany no longer allies after the failed Barbarossa Plan, Hitler claimed that after the Soviet army is pushed back that they would be able to return to their homes (pg. 53).

As of the end of the war, approximately 12 million Germans were forced out Eastern Europe (Feltzer pg. 69). Despite the large scale migration of the German people, Germany loses a majority of its labor force as a result of the war. Its enemies retain many of the working male population (mainly POWs) in camps preventing their return, which played a major factor in attempts to rebuild the nation. During the post war period (1946-1973), West Germany (under occupation from the France, United States, and Britain) organizes a guest work policy to aide with its economic recovery. Many of these guest workers were recruited from southern Europe and Turkey. While these positions were temporary, Turkish workers began bringing their families and settling permanently. Seeing as Turkey allied with Germany during both wars; it is inevitable that Turks and German governments would reach this arrangement (pg. 70). Native population responses to Turk settlement ranged from anti-Turkish hate crimes to opinion polls opposing their immigration.

The Turks also have a history with large scale migration. One of the first instances of force migration is between Turkey and Greece. As a result of the end of the Ottoman Empire and the Lausanne Convention in Switzerland (1923), the two countries begin a series of population transfers. While the many of population transfers were primarily ethnic based, the heart of the Turk-Greco force migrations were religious. The goal was to return ethnic minorities to their home nations

in order prevent conflicts within each nations and mass persecutions. At the end of the First World War, between the intermediate war periods, over 40,000 Greeks (almost the complete minority) immigrated to the Greek islands (even though they had lived within Turkish territories for generations). Approximately 782, 000 Turks did the same having to resettle within Turkey. The question to ask is was the government correct in forcing these groups to move. Compared to the elements of the other cases, the governments were trying to prevent mass persecutions. While Hitler was trying to protect and expand the German nation, the mutual agreement and attempt to benefit both Turkey and Greece diminishes the atrocities faced within the two populations. In 1973, Germany halted its guest worker program in order to promote remigration to the country of origin and social integration of the foreign population who stayed passed their work agreement.

As mention in a paragraph, many of the Turkish workers began bringing their families to Germany. Western German government legalized this process allowing spouses and children under sixteen years of age to be immigrated into the country. Amid the recession starting 1974-1975, immigration population decreased, and emigrating populations increased slightly. However two years later, there is are a resurgence of foreign labor immigration from Turkey, Italy, and Yugoslavia. 1987, another wave of foreign migration hits Germany. The new flow of migration involves asylum seekers fleeing from conflicts in Yugoslavia and southeastern Turkey (Ulrich). During this period of foreign migration, there is still the return migration of ethnic Germans, previously described in the paper. Authors Rainer Munz and Ralf E. Ulrich state that while German citizenship was automatically granted to return migrants, many uses Germany as transit country to immigrate to the United States, Canada, Australia, and South Africa.

As Germany becomes more stable and reunified, the attitudes toward immigration began to develop and change as different groups migrant into the country that historically lacked contact with Germany. Germany, like many European countries, developed policies rooted in the ideas of multiculturalism. The problem with the integration of minorities in German society stems from the conservative policies defining citizenship by ethnicity. While governmental reforms were in progress, society attempts were made to integrate immigrant children by addressing the educational deficits amongst these groups (Giulii pg 150). The author notes an emergence of anti-immigrant sentiments and the tightened of legislation that resulted in the deportation of “undesirable foreigners” (pg. 152) after the destruction of the Berlin Wall. German right wing parties like the Republikaner (Republican) party push to enact harsher policies, but despite negative public opinion towards immigrants (from about of forth of the population), groups with wanting to legislate anti-immigrant polices do not gain national supports. Most of their of the support is from radical Neo-Nazis and similar groups (Feltzer pg 87-90).

Earlier paragraphs briefly touch on Germany’s historical role on asylum seekers from outside Europe. With the current crisis in Syria, it would be good to discuss Germany’s present views on immigration. As discussed in class, many

anti-immigrant parties have gained traction, and other European nationalist movements influenced the closing of borders to any Syrian refugees. German citizens appear to be more accepting of entering immigrant population in the media, but according to German polls, the AfD party (Alternative for Germany) has risen to third place (“Far Right Party...”). German Chancellor Angela Merkel continues to allow Syrian refugees into Germany. Throughout the month of November, there have been discussions on closing the German (and other countries) borders, especially after the terrorist attacks in Paris, November 13.

Other European nations—Hungary being the infamous — have done so permanently, and many are beginning to follow the same rhetoric. France continues to allow refugees in limited number while in a state of emergency and is taking other measures to aid in the Syrian refugee conflict. As of November 29, Merkel has held a mini-summit discussing with other European countries on how to limit the inflow. Economically and possibly politically, Germany doesn’t seem able to take in more refugees, and with the pressure of uprising right wing parties, Merkel seems to be in a position do whatever is possible to keep Germany (and the rest of the European Union) stable. However with the criticism Merkel receives, she may be sacrificing her more of her leadership credibility as the problem continues to progress.

These discussions amongst nine European countries (and Turkey) involve slowly allowing in refugees who would be situated in Turkey into the European Union per year. Turkey would also receive financial funding in order to accommodate refugees. Merkel still faces opposition from leaders of Eastern European countries and some of her peers who believe that there is another way to deal with the refugee crisis without involving Turkey. If these proceedings go through, Turkey may gain a lot from the agreements. According to Ian Traynor’s article, Turkey has promised to stem the refugees in return for renewed discussion on its entrance to the EU. Germany, who has a large Turkish Majority, could possibly see more Turkish migration into its borders, along with the Syrian Refugees. It is possible that Germany may become a transit country for those wanting to go to other European countries (i.e United Kingdom) or the United States. While discussions may be prevalent in the future, Turkey’s ultimatum may just influence the other discussion of dissolving the Schengen zone in order to prevent free movement within Europe to migrants (and refugees) from flooding into the European Union. European leaders may be concern that Turkey’s admission will allow terrorists to penetrate borders into Turkey and ultimately to the rest of the European Union. It’s safe to say that European leaders are very reluctant to rely on Turkey for complete aid in the situation.

After summarizing Germany’s historical large scale migrations and the current immigration crisis, Germany has played an important role in the immigration within in Europe, whether immigration within the European borders and immigration to Europe via its guest-worker programs. Its future policies on the subject will affect not only the political climate of the country, but also Schengen zone and its existence.

While the refugee crisis will not completely destabilize the region, within in the next year, the Germany and the rest of the EU are going to evaluate and change their immigration policies in order to. National Security issues prevent the more liberal policies from being ratified, and now, there is the issue of the rise in Right-wing- parties. Although there is doubt if these parties will gain enough support to be elected, their opponents still have to recognize their influence of the public and plan their political moves based on public opinion. Anti-immigration policies may be all right wing parties need to get become more mainstream (as also seen in the United States). Economically, the European will have to prepare for the incoming low-qualified labor flows and its effects on local employment and unemployment markets. Overall, the current refugee crisis and immigration is going to continue evolving, and if it spirals out of Germany and the European Union's control, this could possibly dissolve the European Union as it currently stands.

Bibliography

1. Fetzer, Joel S. 2000. *Public Attitudes toward Immigration in the United States, France, and Germany*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2. "Far-right party skyrockets to top 3 in German polls amid refugee crisis". Nov. 18, 2015. <https://www.rt.com/news/322513-afd-germany-right-wing-rise/>. Nov. 28, 2015.
3. Giugni, Marco; Passy, Florence. 2006. *Dialogues on Migration Policy*. Oxford: Lexington Books.
4. Munz, Rainer; Ulrich Ralf. E. "Changing Patterns of Immigration to Germany, 1945-1997" <https://migration.ucdavis.edu/rs/more.php?id=69>
5. Reinsch, Jessica; White, Elizabeth. 2011. *The Disentanglement of Populations: Migration, Expulsion, and Displacement in Post-War Europe, 1944-49*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan. Traynor, Ian. "Europe split over refugee deal as Germany leads breakaway coalition." <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/nov/29/germanys-plan-to-strike-eu-wide-refugee-sharing-deal-stalls>. Nov. 29, 2015.

GLOBALIZATION AND SOVEREIGNTY IS GLOBALIZATION THE EROSION OF STATE SOVEREIGNTY?

Balen Yousif Jalal

Middle Tennessee State University

Department of Political Science

International Affairs program

Instructor: Dr. Korobkov

Introduction

Today's world is comprised of a significant number of independent actors, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), social movements, intergovernmental

organizations, transnational corporations, and so forth. This is despite the increasing number of terrorist groups, drug cartels, and interest groups. In other words, today's world has in one way or another been touched by the process of globalization. Moreover, the existence of sovereign states has also positively or negatively been influenced by this process of globalization. As argued by Addis, "the globalization of economic, social, cultural life has put into question the defining features of state sovereignty" (2004, pp. 13-14). Thus, the most controversial question that has attracted globalists, politicians, and even students of this field is to what degree are sovereign states losing their authority or reinforcing their authority and control over their borders and citizens? Is globalization the erosion of state sovereignty? This is the research question that this paper tries to investigate.

The addressed problem is about the effect that globalization has on state sovereignty. Tackling this problem is significant. This is because, in today's world, some states are doubtful to adhere to the process of globalization because of the trepidation that former is eroding their sovereignty. On the other hand, there are states which they see globalization as neutral in the demise of their sovereignty and their adherence to the process is self-assured. This is despite the fact that there are states that are not sure to what extent their sovereignty is maintained by having already joined the process of globalization. Accordingly, this paper argues that state are neither keeping nor losing their full sovereignty in today's globalized world. And, even when states are losing some of their sovereignty by adhering to the globalization process, it should be mainly seen as positive. In doing so, the paper adopts a qualitative method depending on recent books, qualitative and quantitative journal articles, and historical documents about the subject matter.

Globalization Vs Sovereignty

In order to investigate the question of whether sovereignty is being eroded by globalization or not, the definitions of the terms are a necessary step. Thus, this section of the paper defines globalization and sovereignty to put forward a better ground to investigate whether globalization is the demise of state sovereignty or not.

According to David Held, globalization is "the widening, deepening and speeding up of worldwide interconnectedness in all aspects of contemporary social life, from the cultural to the criminal, the financial to the spiritual" (Ferguson & Mansbach 2012, p.17). It turns out from Held's definition that by globalization we mean a flatter world, a more globalized world of trade, and a world in which activities and events cross borders disregard to wherever they happen. Moreover, Globalization can be better understood by looking at the five definitions given by Jan Aart Scholte. He defines globalization as first 'internationalization' indicating to the idea that states are interdependent therefore borders are open for interstate activities, second 'universalization' referring to the integration of local and global cultures, third 'westernization' meaning the dominance of western culture and ideology over the globe, forth 'respacilization' that is people's activity integration

and connection in a global scale, and finally economic liberalization which means the bridge of markets between states without any restrictions (2012, p.18).

Accordingly, if by globalization we mean a wider and flatter globe, does that mean sovereignty of states are in termination and does this flat world really exist? If by globalization we mean the liberalization of economy, does that mean individual states have to neglect their sovereign rules and regulations that are obstacles to international trade, and will this be considered as the erosion of state sovereignty? After defining sovereignty, the paper provides critical answers to these questions so that whether globalization is the demise of state sovereignty or not will be evidently shown.

State Sovereignty:

Generally, sovereignty means “absolute supremacy over internal affairs within its territory, absolute right to govern its people, and freedom from any external interference in the above matters” (Wang, 2004, p.473). That simply means states can be considered as sovereign when they are able to have full control over their domestic issues without adhering to any other laws that are above this particular state’s rules and regulations, and with no interference from external force. Specifically and practically, sovereignty can be categorized into four different parts; these are ‘interdependence sovereignty’, ‘domestic sovereignty’, international legal sovereignty’, and Westphalian sovereignty’. First, when individual states have power over the activities taking place within their borders that is ‘interdependence sovereignty’, second, when states have control over structure in the state and are able to use the structure of influence behavior that is ‘domestic sovereignty’, third, when states are not forced to any international agreement and all have equal and free opportunity to join or not that is ‘international legal sovereignty’, and finally, the most common type of sovereignty is Westphalian sovereignty which was established in 1648 to guarantee the states’ frontiers free from external involvement and intervention (Krasner 2001, pp. 231-233).

What can be drawn from the meaning and definition of sovereignty shown above is that globalization can be more or less a challenge to state sovereignty. This is because if by controlling movements across borders states are sovereign, then how can we explain the technological component of globalization which has led to the uncontrollable cross border communication, transportation, terrorist entrance, ideas, and even diseases? How can we explain the intervention attempts by the west for democracy promotion which is an obvious violation of Westphalian type of sovereignty? The next discussion will concentrate on these questions by looking at various arguments about the effect of globalization on state sovereignty.

The effect of globalization on state sovereignty: Analysis

The fact cannot be ignored how globalized is today’s world. It is also true that sovereignty of states is somehow challenged under the umbrella of this globalized world. Yet, what is a matter of discussion is to what extent globalization represents this challenge to sovereignty. According to Thakur, not only governments, power, and international organizations but also people have changed dra-

matically in the course of the last 100 years in which they are no longer interested in self-reliant and secluded attempts of governance. In today's contemporary world, state borders have been more open in a way that neither national governments can deal with major issues such as security alone nor intergovernmental organization's activities can be restricted to individual state borders. Today, financial and economic interests have linked governments in a combined transportation and communication networks. "No country is an island unto itself anymore" (2002, p. 268).

The above indicates to the fact the state sovereignty is the victim of the new era of world interdependence. Governments seem to be subject to the rules of international agreements. There are circumstances in which international rules are imposed over rules and regulations of national government. This indicates to nothing but an obvious challenge to state sovereignty. For example, Jones by assessing the impact of North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) on state sovereignty, he has come to the conclusion that "states are starting to realize that federal commitment to free trade involves promises to which they will have to conform...Trading partners have leeway to challenge many state rules that are seen as barriers to trade" (Jones 1994, p.37). That means; by adhering to international trade which is the product of globalization, states' sovereignty are seriously challenged and under the threat of decline. The more states are interdependent economically, the more sovereignty they have to sacrifice by putting the laws of international agreements over the laws of individuals and national governments. And, because of the fact capitalism represents the majority part of world market economy, capitalism as a western philosophy (globalization of economy) have also caused the decline of not only state sovereignties but also the fundamental existence of nation states. This is been fortified by Michael Mann who argues "capitalism, now become global, transnational, post-industrial, informational, consumerist, neoliberal and restructures, is undermining the nation-state – its macroeconomic planning, its collectivist welfare state, its citizens' sense of collective identity, its general caging of social life" (1997 p.473).

What is more, not only states ability to control over its own rules and regulations are challenged by the process of globalization but also the main principle of state, territory is also challenged. For example, according to Alan Hudson, territory is the main tool in differentiating sovereign states in today's contemporary world. However, the process of globalization has transformed "state-territoriality or sovereignty, the central principle of differentiation in modernity" (2000 p.280). That is an indication to the idea that today's world is becoming more interdependent and flatter in which state's sovereignty of rules, economy, and even territory is seriously challenged by the process of globalization.

Are we approaching the end of sovereignty?

As shown above, intellectuals such as Alan Hudson, Michael Mann, Jones, Thakur and some others have revealed their concern about the threat and challenge that globalization has put on state sovereignty in which they perceive the sover-

eignty of states to be in decline. Although this could be partially true but that does not mean that states are losing their full sovereignty. Even if states are sacrificing some of their sovereignty, it is mainly due to the expected advantages that states are willing to achieve. Therefore, this paper supports the argument that sovereignty is still an important principle in the arsenal of individual states in today's world.

According to Krasner, "those who proclaim the death of sovereignty misread history. The nation-state has a keen instinct for survival and has so far adapted to new challenges – even the challenge of globalization" (2001, p.20). Krasner seems not to ignore the fact that sovereignty is challenged by globalization but this challenge for him is just like any other challenges that states have confronted throughout history. For example, he argues the only state that its sovereignty has been protected, controlled, and less challenged than any other states is the United States of America. Not only sovereignty of weaker states but also sovereignty of other stronger states such as china, which was occupied, have always challenged (2001, p.20). Therefore, it can be argued that globalization is not a new challenge for state's sovereignty. It is just like any other challenges that state sovereignty has continuously confronted.

If globalization is not new, one might pose; why globalization seems to be a more serious challenge to state sovereignty than previously? The answer is simple. A historian Naill Ferguson has already described globalization as "all happened before...from around 1870 until World War One, the world economy thrived in ways that look familiar today" therefore "globalization is not new but stronger and faster" (Ferguson & Mansbach, 2012, pp. 20, 75). That is why it should not be surprising that globalization can be a stronger and tougher challenge to state sovereignty than previously but the existence of today's 'stronger and faster globalization' should not be seen as the demise of state sovereignty while states have always lived with such a challenge even before and after the Westphalian system.

It was already argued by scholars such as Hudson and Thakur that state sovereignty has become the victim of the new interdependent globe. That is to say the world is now flat in a way that territorial sovereignty and state-centric rules and regulation are in decline because of the global international trade that has linked sovereign states. The fact cannot be ignored that obstacles to trade and barriers to interdependence have dramatically reduced in compare to the years of 1950s. Globalization has played its important role in connecting the world. However, as argued by John Agnew, that does not mean the irrelevance of individual states to the world. For instance, the success of china is the result of her self-contained efforts and abilities to take advantages of the new world opportunities not the outcome of imposed and increased international trade. Moreover, the majority part of the globe specifically the parts of Africa, Latin America and the Middle East remain too isolated and unconnected in regard to international trade companies. Therefore, although international trade as a component of globalization has affected some countries to give away some of their sovereignty, there are many parts of the world that are not joined and connected to this bargain. In other words, "the

world is flat is a great book title, but it does little justice to how the world still really works” (2009, pp. 13-14).

In the early 1990s, the triumph of liberal democracy was also considered as the success of globalization spreading democracy in the world. That is to say sovereign states were globalized under the umbrella of a globalizing liberal democracy. That is partially true but it cannot be generalized to all sovereign states because, as argued by Cohen, it is true that “the sovereign state form was globalized in the second half of the twentieth century. Yet we still inhabit a global pluriverse of 192 sovereign states whose political cultures, organizational principles, and conceptions of justice and legitimacy are diverse and at times in conflict with one another” (2012, p.20). Also, That indicates to the fact that sovereignty is neither fully kept nor lost in today’s globalized world while there are states who are keeping their sovereignty and those who are willing to lose some of their sovereignty by adhering to the process of globalization whether to financial component, territorial component, or technological component of globalization. Therefore, an important question needs to be raised here; why there are states who will to give away some of their sovereignty and adhere to the process of globalization.

Abdicating some of state sovereignty: positive or negative?

Whether it is mainly positive or negative to give away some of state sovereignty by adhering to the process of globalization is related to the question of why do some states do that? Are they forced to adhere to the process of globalization? The answer is ambiguous because the existence and the popularity of international trade, the spread of capitalism, the increasing number of multinational corporations has evidently made it impossible for states to survive without adhering to those international deals specifically trade. At the same time, it is not fair to consider this reality as enforcement and imposition on sovereign states while states still have the choice to be part of this globalized world of deals and bargains. Therefore, “it is erroneous to counterpose globalization to the state... Globalization does not undermine the state but includes the trans-formation of state forms: it is both predicated on and produces such transformations” (Shaw 1997, p. 497). That refers to the fact globalization has led to the transformation of states but it is still optional for states to be part of this transformation in majority of cases. Therefore, states sovereignty is mainly affected by this transformation and the reason that this transformation has shaped the majority of states is because states are seeing advantage in being part of this transformation. For instance, according to an empirical study that Rothe and Mullins have done, they come to the conclusion that “states seem to be voluntarily abdicating certain elements of sovereignty – entering into of international treaties”...And, “states even protect their sovereignty through entering reservations to treaties being signed and ratified” (2010, p.79). A clear example would be the case of the United Nations. For instance, it can be argued that Syria has got a great advantage of the veto part of the agreement that United Nations have signed. If we remove the veto principle in the UN and if there is not Russia and china to use this veto power, western troops will immediately in-

tervene in the internal affairs of Syria and the Syrian sovereignty will certainly steps to erode. The same can be true for the case of Israel who has maintained her sovereignty as a result of the former principle of UN.

Another example of how states voluntarily relinquish their sovereignty especially in the case of economic globalization is the example of border activities. According to Wang, “economic globalization requires a compatible legal mechanism for the conduct of cross border exchanges and transactions. Otherwise, cross-border economic transactions cannot be conducted in an orderly manner” (Wang p. 474). Therefore, it is both expected and seen as positive by sovereign states to relinquish some of their sovereignty in order to gain an economic advantage. If sovereign state do not allow some uncontrolled border activities that might be incompatible with the sovereign state’s rules and regulations, then the economic transactions cannot be possible therefore the economic advantage would also be hard to achieve.

States also voluntarily abdicate some of their sovereignty to the international law for common advantage. The role of intergovernmental organization cannot be ignored in that regard. Those international institution and treaties such Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) play significant roles in controlling global security issues such as the role they play in checking whether states possess nuclear weapons or not. This certainly undermines the sovereignty of states but, as Ferguson and Mansbach argue, this should be seen as an important accomplishment of globalization (2012, p. 171).

Conclusion:

The major goal of this paper was to investigate the question of whether globalization has declined state sovereignty or not. The study found that globalization has not directly and forcefully declined state sovereignty. Rather, sovereignty seems to be more affected by the transformation that globalization has introduced in this new era of increasing number of intergovernmental organizations, multinational corporations, international trade and law. More importantly, it was found that being part of this transformation has been a challenge not a death to the sovereignty of states. Some states has coped with this challenge by voluntarily abdicating some of their sovereignty in order to get advantage of this new transformation that globalization has introduced.

“Accordingly, states, despite their efforts put into preserving their control on sovereignty, cannot really build walls anymore” (Pusterla & Piccin 2012, p. 121). However, that does not mean they are forced not to do so, there are a significant number of states specifically in the Middle East and Africa that are not part of this world integration of financial aspects of globalization. Therefore, as this study has argued, it should be evident that states are neither keeping nor losing their full sovereignty in today’s globalized world. Even if states are abdicating some of their sovereignty, they are doing it voluntarily and it should be seen mainly as positive.

Bibliography

1. Addis A. (2004). The Thin State in Thick Globalism: Sovereignty in the Information
2. Age. *Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law*, 37(1), 1-107
3. Agnew, J. (2009). *Globalization and Sovereignty*. United States of America: Maryland: by Rowman & Littlefield Publishers
4. Cohen, J. (2012). *Globalization and Sovereignty: Rethinking Legality, Legitimacy, and Constitutionalism*. New York: by Cambridge University Press
5. Ferguson, Y. H & Mansbach, R.W (2012). *Globalization: The Return of Borders to a Borderless World?* New York: by Routledge
6. Hudson, A. (2000). Offshorenness, Globalization and Sovereignty: A Post-modern Geo-Political economy? *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 25(3), 269-283.
7. Jones, B. (1994). Free trade and state sovereignty. *Spectrum: Journal Of State Government*, 67, 37-43
8. Krasner, S. D. (2001). Abiding sovereignty. *International Political Science Review*, 22(3), 229-251.
9. Krasner, S. D. (2001). Sovereignty. *Foreign Policy*, 122, 20-29.
10. Mann, M. (1997). Has Globalization Ended the Rise of the Nation-State?. *Review Of International Political Economy*, 4(3), 472-496.
11. Pusterla, E., & Piccin, F. (2012). The Loss of Sovereignty Control and the Illusion of Building Walls. *Journal Of Borderlands Studies*, 27(2), 121-138
12. Rothe, D. L., & Mullins, C. W. (2010). The Death of State Sovereignty? An Empirical
13. Exploration. *International Journal Of Comparative & Applied Criminal Justice*, 34(1), 79-96. Shaw, M. (1997).
14. The State of Globalization: Towards a Theory of State Transformation. *Review Of International Political Economy*, 4(3), 497-513.
15. Thakur, R. (2002). Security in the New Millennium in *Enhancing Global Governance: Towards a New Diplomacy* by Cooper, A.F, English, J. & Thakur R. New York: United Nations University Press
16. Wang, G. (2004). The Impact of Globalization on State Sovereignty. *Chinese Journal Of International Law*, 3(2), 473-483.

THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION AND ITS FOREIGN POLICY ACTIONS POST 9/11

Jason Jones

Middle Tennessee State University

Department of Political Science

International Affairs program

Instructor: Dr. Korobkov

On September 11, 2001 America was struck by one of the most violent attacks on home soil in history. Terrorist operating for the Terror group Al Qaeda hi-jacked numerous commercial aircraft in which they flew into the Pentagon as well as the World Trade Center's bringing massive civilian casualties to the American people. Throughout this paper I would like to examine first, the Constitutional understanding of the use of war powers prior to the terrorist attacks on September 11. I would then like to transition to some of the actions taken by the Bush Administration specifically in its implementation and use of foreign policy in response to the attacks. Next, we will discuss how these policies differ from previous foreign policy views, and how the Bush Administration attempts to adapt to the new age threats America and the rest of the world now face. Finally, I would like to touch briefly on the use of the media to rally public support either for or against policy initiatives, as well as briefly discuss how the implementation of the media was used by the Bush Administration in response to 9/11.

First, I would like to begin by providing an understanding of Americas Constitutional approaches to war powers abroad previous to 9/11. Chapters two through four of *The powers of war and peace: the constitution and foreign affairs after 9/11*, provides an understanding of the U.S. ability to use its powers in the event of an attack by the framers of the Constitution. Prior to 9/11 the Constitution is understood as depending less on fixed legal processes for decision making, but rather focuses more on the political interactions between the executive and legislative branches. The allocation of powers are displaced differently between the President, Congress, and the Senate by allowing them to shape the different process by relying on the consensus decisions of the international community, as well as their relative political positions regarding the circumstances at that present time. It is important to note that the framers of the Constitution provide no single or "correct" method for making war or peace, making international agreements, or enforcing international laws but rather provides room for the executive and legislative branches to cooperate with one another in manners as they see fit. The Presidential powers of enacting war were considered to be within certain checks and balances, by requiring congressional approval for war funds for example which keeps everyone operating under the same understanding so to speak (Entman 7-10).

Prior to the terror attacks on 9/11, war was considered by the Constitution to be solely between two or more specific nation-states. However, after the attacks

on 9/11 the American people realized this is no longer the case. John Yoo describes throughout his *powers of war and peace: the constitution and foreign affairs after 9/11*. Threats of war may now be more imminent than before. Rather than a specific nation-state acting against another, threats are now coming from three main primary sources. These sources include and can be directly linked to the easy availability and technology to manufacture weapons of mass destruction, emergence of rouge nations, and the rise of international terrorist organizations such as Al Qaeda. Prior to the attacks of 9/11, Americas view of taking military action against potential threats was previously understood as being used as a method of last resort, but now in the present times the use of force may need to be taken more seriously than ever before as these threats to the U.S. become increasingly more difficult to locate and resolve.

These attacks on 9/11 without a doubt changed the U.S. foreign policy stance toward the rest of the world especially in regards to nations or actors we may so deem to be dangerous. The Bush Administration introduced a new sense of aggressiveness within American policy in his decisions to invade Iraq. According to *America Unbound: The Bush Revolution in Foreign Policy* written by Ivo Daalder and James Lindsay, outline two basic points to the Bush Administration's approach to world affairs post 9/11. First, America would not be susceptible to constraints from other nations or international agreements as it sought out to address the dangers of the world. Secondly, America must use its strength to change the status quo meaning that America would no longer use the method of preemption as a method of last resort. *The National Security Strategy* document of 2002 elevated military preemption against rouge states and terrorist groups as a matter of "common sense" (Litwak 30). Bush argued in a report outlining his national security strategy "the United States can no longer solely rely on a reactive posture as we have in the past... we can no longer allow our enemies to strike first. Indeed, the United States should be prepared to act preemptively against imminent threats, but also preemptively toward potential threats." The Bush Administration also acknowledged that it should use its powers to change the regimes within potentially dangerous rouge states as we have in the past indirectly, but rather now directly. The attacks on September 11 propelled foreign policy from a secondary objective of the Bush Administration to its fight on the fore front. (Daalder and Lindsay 25-27).

The disastrous attack left the Bush Administration free to enact a foreign policy revolution which was met by evaporating congressional resistance. The enormity of the attacks, as well as a principled belief that lawmakers should look to strong Presidential leadership in times of crisis allowed the Bush Administration to freely alter previous reflections of American Foreign Policy. The actions of September 11 provide the U.S. necessity to use force more quickly and preemptively than in the past. This had led the United States to re-align some of its previous international commitments such as declaring the Geneva Convention not to apply to terrorist's organizations and the termination of the anti- ballistic mis-

sile treaty. Some other legal controversies arising out of the Bush Administrations war on terror also include use of force, interrogations, and the targeting and detention of enemy combatants. As this new age of war knows no limits or boundaries the Bush Administration's policies toward terrorism evolve into an aggressive form of foreign policy not previously implemented by America.

Defensive counter-measures to national security were also taken into consideration by the Bush Administration as a result of the 9/11 attacks. These measures have included the consolidation of several agencies into a U.S. Department of Homeland Security which proved to be the largest reorganization of Federal agencies since the creation of the Department of Defense. In addition, special interest has been taken in the advancement of aviation security by replacing the previous system of contract security scanners by a new Transportation Security Administration which operates as part of the Homeland Security Agency. (Pillar 4).

Meanwhile, public opinion for the support of military response upon the actors of September 11 was high, leading Congress to approve a unanimous authorization to the President to use, "all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001." The administration also provided the Bush Doctrine which provided a new guide to U.S. foreign policy relations with other countries post 9/11. Bush declared, "Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists. From this day forward, any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism by the U.S. as a hostile regime. This served as a political statement, designed to pressure states in which had been linked to harboring and/or aiding terrorist activities to either cease and desist or be held accountable by the U.S. The Bush Administrations declaration of preemption against these states and the start of the War in Afghanistan were also done so by the Bush Administration under complete disregard for seeking the United Nations Security Council authorization for the U.S. post 9/11 military operations claiming the use of self-defense under a provision of the United Nations Charter 51. This was in conflict with resolutions that had previously been in place for decades sparking NATO alliances to invoke its charter's collective defense provision for the first time in history. As promised, the Bush campaign from early October 2002 through the fall of the Taliban regime in December was conducted in an unconventional manner through the use of regular military, but also operations consisting of special operations units and CIA paramilitary troops operating clandestinely. The Bush Administration also expressed opposition to pre 9/11 humanitarian concerns and foreign policy goals by distinguishing rouge states as states which posed as a threat focusing the majority of foreign policy concerns regarding these matters while not giving much attention to failed states, although there situations seemed tragic there was simply no threat posed by these states therefore humanitarian policies remained overlooked (Litwak 30-45).

The Bush Administration at this point remained seemingly flexible to serving American interests in rouge states deemed to pose threats to U.S. interests. It is also

clear that the failure to seek UN Security Council approval for the War in Afghanistan as well as the reluctance to accept military units from other allied countries made it hard to predict how the Bush Administration would proceed into the future or if they even ever really had a concrete plan at all. The Bush Doctrine provided revolutionary changes from the outdated Cold War concepts of deterrence and containment. These rash policies however did come under some scrutiny. The presentation of the preemption strategy created controversy mainly among European Allies. These allies felt as if the meaning of the *National Security Strategy* would become simply a general doctrine of preemption against states deemed to pose a threat by the U.S. fearing this concept could be used unilaterally by the U.S. making specific cases for multilateral military action against a state even if these circumstances may be in non-compliance with UN Security Council resolutions. This very situation had already previously occurred resulting in non-compliance with resolutions which have been in place for long periods of time (Litwak 49). How was the Bush Administration able to conquer such drastic changes with little to no resistance? Were the terrorist acts on 9/11 so terrible as to create such compliance amongst a vast variety of lawmakers and allies for invasions? Or perhaps there were other factors in assistance such as the role of the media.

I would now like to briefly discuss how the role of the media has developed as coverage of international events grows it is now used as a tool to shape public opinion toward these foreign policy initiatives. The Bush Administration began using the media to shape public opinion the very day after the 9/11 attacks. In an address to the nation Bush states, “the deliberate and deadly attacks which were carried out yesterday were more than acts of terror, they were acts of war.” In 2002 Bush also delivered his State of the Union address in which in regards to the situations in the middle east he used the term “evil” five times while using the term “war” twelve. In these addresses the Bush Administration uses the media to describe the terrorism problem as acts of war committed by enemies who were evil. This sort of political rhetoric was used to rally public and congressional support for the war efforts taken by the Bush Administration. Repeating these two concepts helped to unite the country shortly after the attacks while also being used to exclude all other understandings of the terrorism situation outside of the purview of the Bush Administration. Did tactics such as these prove effective? The answer to that question is yes, studies show public support for the Bush Administration was high, and Congress provided no resistance to the war effort. The Bush Administration also appealed to public opinion of its strategies by not calling for sacrifices from the civilians. In other words, rather than proposing a tax increase and a veterans affairs cut to help finance the war, the Bush Administration encouraged Americans to get out and spend more, as well as proposing tax reduction plans to Congress. These two political strategies of using media influence while providing no sacrifice to the civilian carried the Bush Administration through the first phases of the war with virtually no resistance at home (Entman 1-5).

According to *Projections of Power: Framing News, Public Opinion, and U.S. Foreign Policy* written by Robert Entman, as the war progressed, the initial

patriotic rally around the Bush Campaign and support for the Bush Doctrine remained high as the international news coverage of the war efforts moved into the fore front of popular culture where it still remains today. As the war moved forward, coverage of the day to day operations began to be viewed world-wide, and speculation on what to do next and how to proceed began to formulate. After the Taliban fell in mid-December, the Bush Administration's attempt to shift the focus of military power to Afghanistan was met with resistance among political elites and certain media outlets. Connections which were attempted to be made between Osama Bin Laden and Saddam Hussein were met with questioning among political leaders, and a media shift led to a change in the Bush Administrations previous preemption tactics. It becomes clear the media is a force to be reckoned with by this point by influencing the Bush Administration to seek approval from Congress, as well as the United Nations before moving forward with military operations in Afghanistan. However, the media tool used at the beginning of the war, as well as the public support it generated allowed the Bush Administration to enact many of its foreign policy goals.

In conclusion, as a result of the terror attacks on 9/11, the foreign policy initiative within America changed from previous concerns. Recognition of non-state rouge nations as a threat of national security called for the abandonment of previous concerns of deterrence and containment while moving toward a theory of preemption. Humanitarian issues and failed states were shifted aside as the Bush Administration ignored UN resolutions and used increasing media coverage to rally public opinion and gain support of the war on terror with little to no resistance from Congress. Were these actions a bit rash? Looking at the situation from today's perspective with the arise of groups such as ISIS and destabilization of the middle east perhaps more time should have been used in considering a plan of action. Regardless the Bush Administration pushed on at all costs to combat the war on terror for better or for worse is still being determined.

Works Cited

1. Daalder, Ivo H., and James M. Lindsay. *America unbound: The Bush revolution in foreign policy*. Brookings Institution Press, 2003.
2. Entman, Robert M. *Projections of power: Framing news, public opinion, and US foreign policy*. University of Chicago Press, 2004.
3. Litwak, Robert. *Regime change: US strategy through the prism of 9/11*. JHU Press, 2007.
4. Pillar, Paul R. *Terrorism and US foreign policy*. Brookings Institution Press, 2001.
5. Yoo, John. *The powers of war and peace: The Constitution and foreign affairs after 9/11*. University of Chicago Press, 2008.

NORTH KOREAN DEFECTORS: ECONOMIC IMMIGRANTS OR POLITICAL REFUGEES?

Deanna Mix

Middle Tennessee State University

Department of Political Science

International Affairs program

Instructor: Dr. Korobkov

“It is now known that every home in the country has a portrait of the “Great Leader” Kim Il Sung and the “Dear Leader” Kim Jong Il. Inspectors visit homes to hand out fines and admonishments if the portraits are not well kept. Every government building and subway car displays the two portraits, and every adult citizen wears a button of Kim Il Sung. Movies and propaganda constantly repeat the blessings bestowed on them by the two Kims. The veneration required is so complete that the former North Koreans interviewed for this report did not believe that religious activity was permitted because, among other reasons, it would be perceived as a threat to the government’s authority.” – Michael Cromartie, Commissioner of the US Commission on International Religious Freedom

North Korea has been known for its brutal and inhumane practices since its existence in the international community in 1948. It is not uncommon for the country to have extreme famines due to inadequate infrastructure, causing its citizens to face intense starvation and death. Famine is an increasingly large fear facing North Koreans, but the fear that surpasses starvation is from that of their own government. Those living within North Korea face brutal political persecution from their own government and because of these fears, many decided to flee for their lives to South Korea where they are ethnically and culturally similar. The journey is perilous, needless to say, and to escape one must make the journey through China without being caught. If an escapee is unfortunately captured, they are labeled as an economic immigrant and sent back to North Korea to face punishment which could include execution. This draws attention to the difference between an economic immigrant and a refugee and whether North Koreans deserve the protection of a refugee status.

It is important to begin with a firm grasp of the differences between a refugee and an economic immigrant. An economic immigrant is an individual who moves from their home of origin in order to obtain a higher standard of living and greater opportunity. Many migrants face exploitation and abuse, causing them to seek a better lifestyle elsewhere through mobility. While conditions may be treacherous, it is often preferable to the poverty, insecurity, and lack of opportunity a migrant faces in their home country. (Castles, *The age of migration: international population movements in the modern world*, 1993, p. 7). Then there are the conditions that qualify an individual for refugee status. A refugee is a person who feels the need to flee their home in fear of persecution, war, or violence in their country including from their government. A refugee also has a reasonable fear of

persecutions for their race, religion, nationality, political opinion, or for their membership in certain social groups. When a refugee flees their home country, they are often afraid to ever return. ("What is a refugee - USA for UNHCR"). With these two distinct definitions in mind, we can begin to explore whether North Koreans are economic immigrants or refugees by taking a close look at what life is like living within North Korea.

The social and political challenges North Koreans face are immense. The harsh authoritarian dictatorship began in 1948 after the Korean War when Kim Il Sung took charge of the country and declared that all North Korean revolutionaries be executed, thus establishing a policy for zero-tolerance in terms of dissent from the government. After Kim Il Sung's death in 1994, Kim Jong Il took his father's place as the leader of North Korea and established what we now know as Gulags, or prison camps. These camps, also known as *Kwan-li-so*, vary in numbers and in their positions within North Korea. It is hard to obtain a definite number of just how many prisoners are held within these prison camps, but the numbers range from 150,000 to 200,000 people. The means by which the prisoners are sent to and treated in the *Kwan-li-so* are the factors that qualifies North Koreans for refugee status in the international community. Prison camps and Gulags have always played an infamous role in North Korean history due to their gross amounts of human rights violations. Since 1950, any individual that was unfortunately branded s "anti-revolutionary" were sent to the prison camps or violently executed. These *Kwan-li-so* are often nestled into the North Korean Hinterlands or in mountains terrain, making escape difficult or impossible. (Lee, "North Korean Human Rights: A Story of Apathy, Victims, and International Law"). Perceived wrongdoers and their extended family are "arrested", or more accurately, they are abducted in the middle of the night and taken into one of these prison camps. Three generations of the offending political prisoner's family are sent to these prison camps including parents, children, and grandchildren, even if these prisoners have done nothing wrong. Those arrested are not granted any form of judicial process or legal recourse to confront their accuser to offer a form of defense and are commonly perceived as dissenters by word of mouth. After being abducted, prisoners are deposited in the *Kwan-li-so* to work in physical labor from mining to timber-cutting. (Hawk, *The hidden gulag: exposing North Korea's prison camps: prisoners' testimonies and satellite photographs*, 2003, p. 24). Once family members are captured and sent to these *Kwan-li-so*, survival becomes a fearsome task.

Inside the prison camps, prisoners face daunting tasks as well as suffer from mass illness. Sanitization and medical care are a rare commodity within the *Kwan-li-so* and prisoners often have to suffer through illnesses without medical attention. If a prisoner fails to complete a set quota or attempts to escape they are punished with public beatings, weeks in an isolation box too small to sit up in, or public execution. Routinely, the public executions are reserved for those who attempt to escape from the *Kwan-li-so* and are captured in the process. Accounts from defectors who escape the *Kwan-li-so* retell the horror of prisoners being forced to dig their

own graves, lie down in them, and be struck to death by camp authorities with a hammer to the back of the head. Other defectors spoke about detainees being strangled by the prison officers and then beaten to death by wooden sticks in front of crowds of prisoners to prevent others from running. (Killalea, "Save us China, you're our only hope"). The most common feature of day-to-day life in the prison camps are a combination of malnutrition due to below substance food rations and excruciating forms of labor causing many prisoners to form disabilities early on in life. This semi-starvation lifestyle leads to an atmosphere of distrust and hostility between prisoners. Prison culture in the *Kwan-li-so* begins to kick in and detainees often fight each other for scraps of food and for the clothing of deceased prisoners to keep warm in the frigid, mountainous conditions. The camps are notorious for exhibiting abhorrent and vicious actions from human beings, which stem from the treatment the prisoners receive from the prison guard. Torture is also another common practice within the *Kwan-li-so*. Kim Sun Min, a North Korean prisoner who escaped, shared his memory of the atrocities of torture. According to Kim Sun Min, in 1977 at the Onsong bo-wi-bu National Security Agency detention center, "his fingers were broken and he was kicked and beaten on the head and face until his ears, eyes, nose, and mouth bled" (Hawk, *The hidden gulag: exposing North Korea's prison camps : prisoners' testimonies and satellite photographs*, 2003, p. 25,70).

China and Russia have taken a particularly unconcerned response to the atrocities of its neighboring state. Despite China being a party to the Refugee Convention and Protocol, China has prevented U.N. agencies, including the UN-HCR, to have contact with North Korean defectors residing in China. The Chinese government claims the reason is because the defectors are economic immigrants rather than political refugees who crossed the border into China without an official visa with no other concern than to find food. China has championed a long standing policy of blocking North Koreans from applying for political asylum. What is more compelling, China indicates they are legally obligated to return all border crossers under a bilateral agreement signed in 1986 between North Korea and China. (Feffer, "The Forgotten Lessons of Helsinki: Human Rights and U.S.-north Korean Relations"). Recent years have shown a trend of refugees fleeing into the northern mountains to escape into Russia. Though, the Russian government has taken the same stance as their Chinese neighbors on the defectors and label the escapees as economic migrants. The motivations behind these two regional super-powers refusing to recognize North Korean defectors as refugees are frequently criticized by human rights organizations.

Over the decades, interviews with former North Koreans show that motivations for leaving have somewhat fluctuated. During times where North Korea faced great famines and food shortages, it was to no surprise that immigrants were fleeing the country in order to find more food as a push factor. (Good Friends, "1694e"). Human Rights Watch released a report in 2002 detailing that loss of status, inability to find opportunities, and the desire to live like those living outside

of North Korea were greater factors that pushed defectors from their homes in North Korea. (Human Rights Watch, "Asia Overview"). "The refugees were asked whether they left for economic, political, or other reasons. For the group of refugees interviewed for this study, the economy was the overwhelming reason for leaving North Korea (95 percent); political dissatisfaction and repression were a very distant second (4 percent)" (Haggard, *The North Korean refugee crisis: human rights and international responses*, 2006 p. 19-20). These factors would seem to confirm the Chinese and Russian beliefs the defectors from North Korea leave in order to pursue a better way of life. If 95 percent of North Koreans who defect into China are presumably not running for their lives but fleeing to pursue greater opportunity, it would make sense to not label them as refugees.

There is a grim outlook for the fate of escapees and defectors captured by China and Russia. Defectors largely flee into China to make the 5,000 to 7,000 mile journey to South Korea. If caught, the prisoners are promptly returned to North Korea prison camps without question or concern for the defectors' safety or well-being. When an escapee is returned to the North Korean prison camps, they are reintroduced by intense and brutal torture if they are fortunate. Most escapees face death by a firing squad or hanging in front of prison crowds to prevent future prisoners from attempting to escape. North Korean women who are collected from China suffer from routine torture during interrogations and the practice of forced abortion of infanticide inflicted upon babies borne by women who were unfortunate enough to become pregnant while fleeing to South Korea. (Hawk, *The hidden gulag: exposing North Korea's prison camps: prisoners' testimonies and satellite photographs*, 2003, p. 15).

The argument becomes should China and Russia continue to label the North Korean defectors as economic immigrants or do the trials and tribulations that the escapees will face upon return qualify them as refugees? Over the last 20 years, China has forced tens of thousands of North Korean defectors to return home. In truth, an escapee sent back to North Korea will most certainly face torture and death within the *Kwan-li-so* in front of crowds of other prisoners. The most moving argument as to why the North Koreans should not be forcibly collected and returned to North Korea is that escapees fit the qualifications to be considered 'refugee *sur place*'. The UNHCR defines refugees *sur place* as a person or group of people who may not have qualified as refugees before they left their home but who become refugees later on after they leave because they have gained a valid fear of persecution upon their return to their home country. As we have seen in the previous reports and examinations, North Korean migrants have a very valid and real fear of persecution and punishment even if the majority of them had honestly left their homes for economic prosperity. (Cohen, "Forced Migration Review").

It is apparent that North Korea needs to become more involved in repairing their human rights violations because it has only gotten worse in the *Kwan-li-so* camps. Shockingly enough, the international community sheds little light on the atrocities that North Koreans face within the prison camps and how desperate the

conditions are. That being said, the defectors also qualify to be considered as *sur place* refugees and for very understandable reason. When a North Korean immigrant is collected and forcibly sent back home, they are most certainly being sent to their death. China will need to honor the international treaties its government has signed and help the refugees that face these human rights violations rather than condone the actions of North Korea. The governments of China and Russia continuously view the North Korean defectors as sources of trouble and conclude that they are an unwanted expense. The outlook for the North Korean migrants remains grim as they are not able to garner the recognition and status they need to survive. Until the region and international community gives more publicity to the mass amounts of human rights violations happening within the *Kwan-li-so* and to the escapee who qualify as refugees, there may be little hope for the North Korean citizens.

Works Cited

1. Lankov, Andrei. 2004. "North Korean Refugees in Northeast China". *Asian Survey* 44 (6). University of California Press: 856–73. doi:10.1525/as.2004.44.6.856.
2. Feffer, John. 2004. "The Forgotten Lessons of Helsinki: Human Rights and U.s.-north Korean Relations". *World Policy Journal* 21 (3). Sage Publications, Inc.: 31–39. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40210234>.
3. "1694e." Good Friends. September 15, 1998. Accessed November 25, 2015. <http://goodfriends.or.kr/eng/report/1694e.htm>.
4. "Asia Overview." Human Rights Watch World Report 2002: Asia.: 2002. Accessed November 25, 2015. <https://www.hrw.org/legacy/wr2k2/asia.html>.
5. Castles, Stephen, and Mark J. Miller. "Introduction." In *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*, 7. Fifth Edition ed. New York, New York: Guilford Press, 1993.
6. Cohen, Roberta. "Forced Migration Review." *North Koreans in China in Need of International Protection*. December 1, 2012. Accessed November 25, 2015. http://www.fmreview.org/preventing/cohen#_edn4.
7. Haggard, Stephan. *The North Korean Refugee Crisis: Human Rights and International Responses*. Washington, D.C., Washington D.C.: U.S. Committee for Human Rights in North Korea, 2006. 19-20.
8. Hawk, David R. "The North Korean Gulag I: Kwan-li-so Political Penal-Labor Colonies." In *The Hidden Gulag: Exposing North Korea's Prison Camps : Prisoners' Testimonies and Satellite Photographs*, 24. Washington, D.C., Washington D.C.: U.S. Committee for Human Rights in North Korea, 2003.
9. Hawk, David R. "Introduction." In *The Hidden Gulag: Exposing North Korea's Prison Camps : Prisoners' Testimonies and Satellite Photographs*, 15.

Washington, D.C., Washington D.C.: U.S. Committee for Human Rights in North Korea, 2003.

10. Killalea, Debra. "Save Us China, You're Our Only Hope" NewsComAu. November 22, 2015. Accessed November 17, 2015. <http://www.news.com.au/world/asia/north-korean-refugees-beg-china-to-save-them-from-death/news-story/54f181f0682f1fa34f86eede56400404>.
11. Lee, David. "North Korean Human Rights: A Story of Apathy, Victims, and International Law." May 21, 2004. Accessed November 20, 2015. <http://web.stanford.edu/group/sjeaa/journal42/korea1.pdf>.
"What Is a Refugee - USA for UNHCR." USA for UNHCR. Accessed November 16, 2015. <http://www.unrefugees.org/what-is-a-refugee/>.