IMMIGRATION POLICY AND INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS: A THREAT TO NATIONAL SECURITY

VICTOR C. JOHNSON*

The horrific events of September 11, 2001, changed many things, but they didn’t repeal the law of unintended consequences. There is today a clear and present danger that some of the well intentioned actions that the United States is taking in response to those events will make it more difficult, not less, to build a safer world.

Nowhere is that clearer than in the field of student and scholarly exchanges. The federal government is beginning, however unintentionally, to dismantle an industry that we spent 50 years establishing in the conviction that the presence of international students and scholars serves the national interest. If things continue as they are, we may wake up in a few years and realize that our country has done lasting damage to this investment in foreign policy.¹

Those words of mine appeared last April 11 in an opinion piece in The Chronicle of Higher Education. Regrettably, it is a statement that has stood the test of time.

We have been successful at changing the nature of the debate on international students since the immediate aftermath of 9/11. Political leaders and editorialists now routinely recognize the importance of international students to our country.² But day-to-
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day practice, decision-making on the ground, often by the employees of the very people giving the nice speeches, continues to thwart students and scholars who seek to come here and to paint America with an unwelcoming face.

I cited three problems in the Chronicle article, and I will again address them here. First, there is the problem-plagued international student monitoring system; second, overzealous enforcement; and third, an inefficient visa system.

The United States monitors international students, scholars, and exchange visitors more extensively than any other non-immigrants outside the penal system. This highly publicized monitoring system, unique to the United States, for which the students have to pay, has done nothing to enhance the reputation of the United States as a welcoming country in which to study. And there is no question that SEVIS has been, and continues to be, problem-plagued and, as such, has been a huge and expensive burden on colleges and universities. But our worst fears have not been realized because the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") has been conscientious in working around the problems in the system.

Thousands of students experienced problems at ports of entry last fall because, for some reason beyond their control, they were not in SEVIS. Anticipating this problem, DHS had set up a quick-response capability that enabled inspectors to resolve these cases on the spot. As a result, in 97 percent of these cases, the student was admitted to the United States and was able to enroll in school. Without the quick-response team, these students
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would likely have been sent back home. We appreciate DHS's responsible approach to this problem.

But in this business, there is always another shoe that is ready to drop. The next SEVIS-related problem, which will reinforce the negative impressions of international students who want to study here concerns the fee that they will have to pay to finance the system. The government refuses to meet its obligation to make the fee easy to pay. A final rule is due out in May that will require payment online with a credit card, or by mail with a U.S. dollar check, before the student can obtain a visa. For students in many parts of the world, those are not easy options. They will join the growing ranks of those who are finding it too much of a hassle to get into this country.

The second problem is overzealous enforcement. Again, DHS leadership has been able to mitigate the worst effects of the problems we were experiencing a year ago. The call-in re-registration portion of the special registration program was rescinded before we had to again face the chilling scenes of Arab and Muslim males lined up outside of immigration offices wondering if they would emerge once they got in. Students were among the thousands detained a year ago under special registration.

Now, mercifully, this will not be an annual spectacle; but the damage was done.

Another enforcement problem concerns what happens to people who are in technical, administrative, or inadvertent violation of
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SEVIS. It is very easy to be in that situation. The system is ridden with glitches; schools have a hard time keeping up with myriad reporting deadlines; the requirements are complex; and nineteen year olds tend to have a fairly easygoing attitude toward requirements like this. According to DHS, there were 25,000 such violations during SEVIS’s first year.

In some of those cases, enforcement officers showed up at a student’s door at dawn, handcuffed her, and hauled her off to jail for a crime such as dropping a course without permission. Fortunately, these have been isolated cases. DHS has gone out of its way to install fail-safe mechanisms to override the system. This is a noble attempt to make a system, which makes no sense, make sense. But more work is needed. We need to get to the point where detention is not an option for administrative, technical, or inadvertent violations.

This is a serious problem. Before 9/11, people were not used to associating the term “arbitrary detention” with the United States. Now they do make this association, and it cannot help but play on their incentives to come here. We hear over and over again about students who had wanted to study here but ultimately chose another country because they felt more welcome and less at risk.
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According to *The Washington Post*, there is talk of adding so-called “student visa violators” to the National Crime Information Center database.\(^ {17}\) Would you go study in another country if you knew that you could end up in a criminal database, one that includes convicted sex offenders and violent gang members, for the rest of your life, due to an innocent mistake or a technical infraction? I cannot think of a quicker way to halt educational exchange in its tracks.

Let me finish with our biggest problem: the visa system. The Department of State, the agency that issues visas, has been under severe attack since 9/11 for granting visas to the terrorists.\(^ {18}\) As a result, the State Department has not had the political space to be able to exercise reason and discretion to get around visa problems the way that DHS has done with respect to SEVIS and enforcement. Secretary of State Powell understands the importance of educational exchange very well,\(^ {19}\) but he has bigger battles to wage, and it seems clear that he has decided not to spend a chit trying to construct a rational visa policy. In this situation, the State Department cannot be viewed as doing anything that would open it to the charge that it is creating loopholes for terrorists. The result is a visa system that simply does not work.

People do not like being fingerprinted. They do not like what they perceive and refer to as “being treated like criminals.”\(^ {20}\) They do not like to wait for weeks or even months for a personal visa interview and then travel long distances for it, especially if they only plan a short visit.\(^ {21}\) They do not like to see their visa
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applications languish for months in Washington just because they happen to be Muslim or scientists. And they do not like the arbitrary nature of the system. Consequently, they are voting with their feet. A survey that our colleague associations and our organization did last fall suggests that international student enrollments at U.S. colleges and universities are, at best, leveling off. For certain important parts of the world, including China and the Islamic countries, they are falling fast. Next year we may actually see an unprecedented decline in enrollments. At the graduate level, according to another survey that we released on Wednesday, February 25, 2004, international graduate student applications for this coming fall are way down compared with last fall.

We desperately need what we do not have: a visa policy, which maximizes national security by focusing not only on keeping objectionable individuals out, but also on letting legitimate individuals in. Under the Homeland Security Act, DHS acquired responsibility for visa policy. It is a responsibility that cries out to be exercised because the State Department is too vulnerable to solve this problem on its own. You have our recommendations in your packets. We look forward to working with DHS to implement them.
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The bottom line is that despite the best intentions of DHS to manage the SEVIS problems and the enforcement problems, we appear to be witnessing the beginning of a shift in the attitudes of people around the world towards studying and researching in the United States. This does not augur well for the future of American world leadership or for our national security. For 50 years, everyone wanted to come here. Now we continually hear that people are turned off by the process of getting here.

The situation is not good. As deputy secretary of state Richard Armitage conceded in an interview with CNN last month, the pendulum has swung way too far in the direction towards making people feel unwelcome.27 We have to go beyond congratulating ourselves on fixing each particular SEVIS problem. As a matter of national policy, we must recognize that international students are part of the solution to terrorism, not part of the problem, and act to restore the reputation of the United States as the primary destination for international students.
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