Navigating the Ethical Maze:
State Sovereignty, Human Rights, and the Complexities of Immigration Policy in a Globalized World

Andrew Wai Phyo Kyaw[1]

Abstract

This article examines the intricate ethical and political implications of immigration policies, underscoring the tension between state sovereignty and individuals' rights to mobility. It suggests that immigration policies strike a balance between national interests, human rights, and global economic conditions in a progressively interconnected world. The aim is to evaluate various viewpoints on immigration control, ranging from restrictive measures that prioritize national security and cultural integrity to more liberal policies that adhere to humanitarian ideals. Key insights reveal the paradox of globalization, where goods and information circulate freely while human movement faces restrictions; the clash between realist and idealist immigration policy approaches; the repercussions of events like 9/11 on the tightening of migration laws; and the ethical dilemmas in balancing state sovereignty with humanitarian responsibilities. The article concludes that immigration policies are shaped by a complex interplay of factors, including national identity, economic imperatives, security concerns, and ethical considerations. It highlights the ongoing challenge of balancing states' legitimate interests with the rights of immigrants.

Keywords Globalization, Immigration Ethics, State Sovereignty, Human Rights

[1] Faculty of Political Science, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok 10330. E-mail: sawandrew410@gmail.com

1. Introduction

The immigration debate is among the most ethically complex and polarized issues, requiring thorough analysis of conflicting principles. This multifaceted topic intertwines vital concepts, including individual rights, state sovereignty, and national security, each steering the discussion in a distinct direction. The diverse perspectives and tensions that emerge while engaging with stakeholders, including migrants, refugees, asylum seekers, host country residents, policymakers, and the international community, highlight the complexities of immigration policy. Upon further exploration of this topic, it becomes evident that attaining equitable solutions requires a deep understanding of its diverse components and a willingness to confront intricate ethical challenges that lack straightforward answers.

Therefore, this article explores the various ethical arguments for open borders and immigration restrictions, the conflict between idealist and realist approaches to immigration policy, the economic and security dimensions of the debate, and the global context of migration. It also examines the practical challenges of enforcing immigration regulations and fulfilling humanitarian commitments for refugees and asylum seekers.

The article employs a multidisciplinary and analytical approach to integrate ethical arguments, political analysis, and empirical evidence in exploring the intricacies of immigration policy within a global context. It thoroughly investigates and compares philosophical viewpoints, emphasizing realist (restrictive, sovereignty-centered) and idealist (human rights-focused, open borders) frameworks by referencing political philosophy, international relations theory, and practical policy illustrations.

This article is structured in six sections. The first section examines how international migration in the era of globalization reveals a fundamental paradox between the unrestricted flow of goods, capital, and information and the limited mobility of humans. It examines how this contradiction generates new patterns of inequality and prompts nation-states to reconcile their sovereignty, economic interests, and ethical obligations toward migrants. The second section discusses the multifaceted challenges in migration governance, including inconsistencies in data collection, resource constraints, concerns about sovereignty, and the fundamental tension between restrictive policies and humanitarian obligations, while highlighting the limitations of current approaches in effectively managing transnational human migration.

Furthermore, the third section analyzes how globalization challenges traditional views of state sovereignty in managing international migration, highlighting the tensions between national border control, global economic interdependence, demographic pressures, ethical considerations, and evolving policy frameworks in an interconnected world. Additionally, the fourth section

examines the complex moral landscape of immigration policy by analyzing the fundamental tension between idealistic perspectives that prioritize universal human rights and pragmatic approaches that emphasize practical political constraints. The fifth section examines how restrictive immigration policies create human rights challenges, particularly by exposing migrants and refugees to harsh treatment, legal uncertainty, and violations of family unity and human dignity. Ultimately, the final section synthesizes the complex tensions between globalization and sovereignty in immigration policy while highlighting the need for balanced governance approaches that acknowledge the inevitability of migration and the competing ethical frameworks that shape border control decisions.

2. International Migration in the Era of Globalization

Globalization and migration are deeply intertwined phenomena fundamentally altering the world in the twenty-first century. As barriers to the movement of goods, information, and capital have lessened in an increasingly integrated global economy, crossing borders by people has become a defining aspect of modern society. This connection brings opportunities and challenges, reshaping economic structures, cultural interactions, and global political dynamics. Ultimately, international migration has become a pivotal issue in global politics, significantly influencing international relations and domestic policies as governments confront growing social and political challenges related to immigrant integration, cultural diversity, and economic consequences (Koudelka, 2014).

The concept of a globally interconnected social system, rooted in world systems theory developed in the 1970s (Wallerstein, 1974), provides a theoretical foundation for understanding these dynamics. Immanuel Wallerstein's world-system theory divides the world into core, semi-periphery, and periphery regions, each fulfilling distinct roles in the global economy. Core countries dominate economically and politically, exploiting peripheral areas for resources and labor, while semi-peripheral countries occupy a middle position. This hierarchy influences migration, prompting people from peripheral and semi-peripheral regions to migrate to core countries in search of better economic opportunities and living conditions. This theoretical framework provides the foundation for understanding the intricate interplay between international relations and global migration patterns in the contemporary era. Understanding migration through this lens reveals that population movements are not isolated phenomena but are embedded within broader global systems of economic, political, and social relationships that transcend national boundaries.

Moreover, state policies and cross-border relations shape international migration patterns. Hollifield's (2004) study examines the "liberal paradox,"

which highlights the tension between economic globalization, which encourages states to accept more migration for competitiveness and growth, and political forces
that seek to limit migration to protect national identity and security. Migration challenges state sovereignty by altering demographics and potentially disrupting the social contract between citizens and the state. Therefore, states balance the economic benefits of migration with political risks, leading to complex and often conflicting policies. The rise of rights-based politics and court involvement in extending migrant rights further complicates state migration management, underscoring the challenges of globalization to migration governance.

On the one hand, governments utilize migration policies as tactical instruments to shape their relationships with other countries and manage their standing in the global system. These policies range from restrictive approaches aimed at reducing immigration to more open strategies designed to attract specific categories of migrants, such as highly skilled professionals or investors (Castles et al., 2014). The strategic deployment of migration policies reflects states' dual pressures: maintaining sovereignty while engaging in an increasingly borderless global environment economy.

In the modern, interconnected era, globalization has lowered barriers to the movement of capital, information, goods, and services across borders (Stiglitz, 2002), fundamentally reshaping the international business environment, communication channels, and cultural exchanges. This heightened mobility has emerged as a key characteristic of a global economy, revolutionizing industries and promoting unparalleled international trade and collaboration (Friedman, 2005). Enhanced transportation and communication technologies facilitate global cultural exchange and stimulate international migration by connecting distant regions and making various destinations more visible and accessible (Bali, 2005).

Despite the expansion of global interconnectedness, a striking paradox remains. While goods, information, and capital flow freely across borders, human mobility remains substantially restricted (Pecoud & Guchteneire, 2006). This discrepancy is particularly notable given that the free movement of nearly everything else has become the standard in a globalized society. Simultaneously, limitations on human migration persist as a significant exception (Castles et al., 2014). This paradox reflects the tension between the economic imperatives of a globalized market and the political reality of nation-states attempting to maintain control over their borders and populations (Sassen, 1999; Hollifield, Martin, & Orrenius, 2014).

This uneven distribution of mobility rights generates new forms of global inequality and stratification (Appadurai, 1996), as the ability to freely cross borders has become a valuable form of capital with significant implications for individual opportunities and life chances (Shamir, 2005). The disparity creates a world where inanimate objects and digital information enjoy greater freedom of

movement
than the humans who create and utilize them, raising fundamental questions about the nature of globalization and its consequences for human society. This mobility gap perpetuates existing inequalities while creating new hierarchies based on citizenship and access to legal migration pathways.

Nevertheless, nationhood remains a central topic of debate in globalization theory, with ongoing discussions about how individual countries can maintain their power and influence in an increasingly interconnected world (Dauvergne, 2004). While states have lost specific governing capacities (Hirst & Thompson, 1999), nations still play a vital role in shaping global affairs and migration policies. Furthermore, international migration challenges pose substantial dilemmas for states worldwide, requiring a delicate balance between sovereign interests and ethical considerations. Countries maintain a legal right to manage migratory flows, particularly when these movements potentially threaten national interests or social cohesion (Weiner, 1996). However, effective migration policies require a comprehensive approach that acknowledges both the benefits and potential concerns associated with international movements (Castles, 2004), including their impacts on labor markets, social services, and cultural dynamics.

The intricate relationship between globalization and migration highlights a crucial tension in modern international relations, where growing connectivity and enduring obstacles to human mobility exist. This contradiction highlights that nation-states continue to maintain sovereignty over cross-border movements despite their diminishing governance capabilities in other areas. The resulting mobility stratification from strict immigration policies fosters new forms of global inequality, where access to lawful migration routes becomes essential to life opportunities. As states confront these challenges, they must strike a balance between upholding sovereignty and promoting social cohesion while also acknowledging the economic benefits of migration and the ethical responsibilities toward migrants. Resolving the disparity between the unrestricted flow of goods, capital, and information and people's limited mobility is likely to continue as a key challenge for international governance frameworks and theoretical models that aim to make sense of the shifting dynamics of an increasingly interconnected yet divided world.

3. Challenges and Limitations on Migration Management

Human migration is a global challenge, presenting significant difficulties in accurately quantifying and managing it. One major obstacle in data collection is the diverse recording practices adopted by different countries, which obstructs comparative analysis (Willekens et al., 2016). This lack of methodological uniformity, alongside the clandestine nature of irregular migration, hampers the

ability to determine precise global migration rates, forcing researchers and policymakers to rely on estimates rather than exact figures (Seglow, 2005).

Migration management involves more than just gathering data; it includes complex governance systems that require significant resources. Governments must allocate funding across various activities such as visa processing, combatting illegal immigration, conducting workplace inspections, imposing employer sanctions, assessing refugee claims, and identifying unauthorized residents (Castles et al., 2014). Despite substantial financial commitments to these areas, the continued influx of undocumented migrants underscores the ineffectiveness of current regulatory strategies (Pecoud & Guchteneire, 2006).

Moreover, the paradoxical relationship between migration restrictions and governance capabilities has intensified in recent years. As Bhagwati (2003) observes, while the need for effective migration governance has increased, the ability to regulate migration flows has diminished. This contradiction highlights governments' growing struggles to maintain border integrity and manage population movements, leading many nations to implement increasingly stringent anti-immigration measures.

Unauthorized migration impacts perceptions of national sovereignty, as irregular entry is often interpreted as evidence of a state's inability to control its borders (Dauvergne, 2004). This sovereignty concern drives restrictive policies that may compromise humanitarian obligations, particularly in the context of refugee protection. The conflation of irregular migration with refugee movements has resulted in more stringent approaches toward asylum seekers, potentially undermining international protection frameworks for vulnerable populations (Dauvergne, 2004).

The global migration landscape from developing nations continues to evolve rapidly, shaped by complex push factors, including human rights violations, economic disparities, and political instability. Millions flee persecution, discrimination, and violence in search of safety and opportunity (Castles et al., 2020), creating significant challenges for receiving countries attempting to balance humanitarian obligations with domestic concerns.

Eventually, migration pressures are transforming approaches to border security and defense, with many nations investing heavily in advanced surveillance technologies and control mechanisms. This security-focused response has profound implications for international relations as governments negotiate agreements on migration management and burden-sharing arrangements (Adamson & Tsourapas, 2019), creating new diplomatic challenges and opportunities. Moreover, regional dynamics are increasingly shaped by migration pressures, with neighboring countries navigating complex diplomatic situations as they address refugee populations and the underlying drivers of migration. These regional interactions fluctuate between collaboration and tension depending

on resource availability, capacity differences, and political will to address migration challenges comprehensively (Betts & Collier, 2017).

Therefore, the effectiveness of migration restrictions remains questionable despite substantial investments in enforcement mechanisms. Ongoing irregular migration highlights the limitations of purely restrictive approaches (Pecoud & Guchteneire, 2006), underscoring the need for more comprehensive strategies that address the root causes while facilitating safe and orderly migration pathways. This implementation gap between policy intentions and outcomes underscores the inherent complexity of managing human mobility in an interconnected world.

Migration management challenges ultimately reflect fundamental tensions between state sovereignty, humanitarian obligations, and the practical difficulties of regulating human movement across borders (Dauvergne, 2004; Castles et al., 2014). Addressing these challenges requires innovative governance approaches that acknowledge the inevitability of migration while developing systems that can effectively manage its impacts on sending and receiving societies. Such approaches must strike a balance between security concerns and human rights protections while fostering international cooperation on this inherently transnational issue.

Overall, migration management faces significant challenges arising from inconsistent data collection, complex governance requirements, and the ongoing issue of irregular migration. The irony of increased governance alongside reduced regulatory effectiveness highlights the challenge of maintaining border integrity while fulfilling humanitarian obligations. Furthermore, the global migration landscape is shaped by various push factors and evolving policy responses, leading to conflicts between national interests and international cooperation.

4. Globalization, International Migration, and Sovereignty

Globalization has profoundly impacted international migration, challenging traditional notions of sovereignty and border control. To comprehend the interplay between migration laws and the nation-state system, it's essential to understand sovereignty- the right of a nation to govern itself. As globalization strengthens connections across borders and cultures, each sovereign nation generally retains the inherent authority to regulate foreign entry, which is vital for its governance and safeguarding national interests, even if it results in restricting access for peaceful and vulnerable individuals from other countries.

International migration has become deeply intertwined with the economic and social factors of most countries, making it increasingly difficult for governments to control or halt population flows. Pecound and Guchteneire (2006) noted that various business sectors depend on immigrants for low-cost labor, establishing economic ties that cross national borders. Bader (2005) contends that this economic interconnection strongly advocates for more open immigration

policies. Meanwhile, the demographic changes in several wealthy countries further complicate the migration narrative. These nations face significant challenges due to an aging population and declining fertility rates, which impact their social welfare systems and economic development. Consequently, immigration is viewed as a potential solution to address labor shortages in various sectors, including industry, services, and agriculture, while contributing to cultural diversity and entrepreneurial expertise (Dauvergne, 2004).

As global connections expand, traditional border control methods encounter significant challenges. Dauvergne (2004) notes that this interconnectedness complicates how countries historically managed border control and regulated entry, resulting in a substantial shift in migration discussions within public and political contexts. The notion that countries retain complete control over who enters their territory, reflecting their sovereign and independent status, has grown increasingly complicated in the current globalized landscape. Therefore, immigration law has become one of the few domains where governments can exercise independence and sovereignty (Dauvergne, 2004). This shift affects the formation and application of laws within each country, influencing the incorporation of international concepts into national policies. As a result, migration regulations have become crucial for countries seeking to maintain their sovereignty in a more interconnected global landscape.

Moreover, Meilaender (1999) contends that immigration policies are notably distinct from other governmental policies due to their profound effects on a nation's identity. By determining who may enter and live within their borders, countries make choices that gradually shape their cultural, social, and demographic landscapes. Conversely, the ethical aspects of immigration policies pose significant challenges for policymakers. Carens (1999) asserts that the right to unrestricted mobility should be seen as a fundamental human right, advocating for open borders to allow free passage. However, Carens (1999) also recognizes that border control can be essential for safeguarding affluent communities from mass immigration. This ethical conflict is further examined by Isbister (2000), who argues that completely prohibiting immigration lacks moral justification, especially for wealthy nations that have obligations towards individuals in desperate need.

Therefore, proponents of state-controlled immigration emphasize several vital points. These points include concerns about population density, anxieties over immigrants taking advantage of government aid, potential rises in crime or terrorism, effects on local culture, and economic concerns about job competition and lower wages. Freeman (1992) highlights that governments in major receiving countries are under growing pressure due to significant migrant inflows, including refugees and asylum seekers, leading to stricter policies intended to reduce illegal immigration and prevent fraudulent asylum requests.

At the same time, proponents of more open immigration policies emphasize both the economic benefits and the ethical responsibilities. Carens (2000) asserts that while viewing everyone as morally equal doesn't imply identical treatment across all scenarios, the principle of free borders reveals prevailing injustices today. When countries restrict people from moving, they constrain individuals' choices and opportunities. Nonetheless, Bader (2005) warns that allowing unrestricted movement will not eliminate global poverty, as only a tiny fraction of impoverished individuals can migrate and gain from such policies.

The tension between immigration control and state sovereignty highlights a complex interplay of moral, economic, and political elements within a globalized context. While states possess the legal authority to manage their borders, this power is challenged by global economic ties and humanitarian issues. The traditional perspective on immigration policy as solely domestic is shifting as migration becomes integral to the economic and social dynamics of numerous nations. Cox (2017) also states that although nation-states have the right to define their admission criteria, this does not exempt them from the moral considerations that should inform these decisions in an increasingly interconnected world.

Therefore, globalization has made the relationship between international migration and national sovereignty more complex, undermining traditional border controls and states' ability to manage migration independently. Economic and demographic linkages have intensified the demand for more liberal immigration policies while simultaneously heightening worries about social welfare and national security. Ultimately, the enduring conflict between global integration and state sovereignty continues to shape migration laws and policies worldwide.

5. Contemporary Debates on Restrictive Immigration Policies

This section explores the complex and contradictory landscape of immigration ethics, advocating for a balanced approach that reconciles an individual's freedom to migrate with a state's sovereign right to regulate its borders. It highlights the historical underrepresentation of philosophical discourse on migration, which has primarily focused on empirical data and statistics while overlooking the moral implications of immigration policies. Moreover, this discussion highlights the contrast between the idealistic belief in open borders as a fundamental human right and the realist perspective, which advocates for actual, enforceable immigration rules that reflect the present political and socioeconomic reality.

5.1 *Realist and Idealist Approaches to Immigration Policy*

Stanley Hoffman (1981) argues convincingly that a persistent gap exists between reality and ideals in laws and ethics, a point that starkly emerges in immigration policy discussions. This divide manifests as two opposing

philosophical perspectives: realism, which focuses on practical constraints and the current political landscape, and idealism, which values moral principles and aspirations. The conflict between these viewpoints shapes contemporary immigration debates, highlighting essential contradictions between individual rights and state sovereignty, moral obligations and practical limitations, and universal principles versus specific conditions contexts.

Realism in immigration policy emphasizes understanding how political systems operate rather than how they should ideally function. Miller (2016) argues that realism is a perspective that focuses on the genuine workings of politics in the world, eschewing idealized interpretations. This viewpoint acknowledges the practical constraints and limitations that governments face. Advocates of immigration realism push for policies that are feasible within existing political realities, especially in Western democracies, aiming to develop ethical frameworks that are viable within real-world constraints (Pearson, 2023). The realist viewpoint analyzes migration issues within historical and social contexts, focusing on practical aspects rather than theoretical moral principles (Kreutz, 2023).

In contrast, idealism or liberalism views immigration through universally valid principles, ignoring practical limitations. Kreutz (2023) describes liberalism in migration as moral principles that stand apart from contextual realities. This perspective prioritizes human dignity, equality, and freedom as crucial factors. Carens (1996) describes the idealistic approach as one that interprets the world through its highest values and aspirations. For idealists, immigration policy reflects core moral commitments to human rights and global justice, advocating for more open borders based on universal moral equality (Pearson, 2023).

The tension between these perspectives reveals a core moral dilemma in global migration governance. Pecound and Guchteneire (2006) emphasize that while many regard emigration (the act of leaving one's country) as a fundamental human right, countries assert their right to regulate who can enter their borders. Weiner (1996) notes that this results in an unavoidable conflict between an individual's right to migrate and a nation's right to enforce border control. This fundamental contradiction complicates the development of coherent and equitable migration regulations, exposing the disparity between the rhetoric of universal rights and the reality of specific implementations.

Immigration realists take a pragmatic stance when formulating policies. They recognize that completely open borders are politically impractical for the near future, so they prioritize creating ethical and feasible policies that align with current political limitations (Pearson, 2023). Gibney (2004) highlights the need to account for the practical limitations governments and political figures face, questioning what responsibilities states can realistically uphold. This methodology prioritizes practical discussions over purely theoretical ones,

favoring policies that are sensitive to context and strike a balance between ethical values and political realities.

Idealists, meanwhile, ground their approach in universal moral principles that extend beyond specific contexts. Carens (1987) argued that armed forces effectively sustain borders, a truth often concealed from citizens in wealthy democracies. Viewed in this way, border controls emerge as moral compromises that require solid justification. Kymlicka (2001) points out that liberals feel uneasy about national borders because liberalism's core value of moral equality appears to be undermined when rights are granted based on citizenship rather than shared humanity. Thus, the idealist viewpoint questions the ethical basis of restrictive immigration policies.

Critics argue that idealism provides limited guidance for addressing genuine immigration issues. Miller (2016) suggests that idealist theories do not offer practical solutions to the immigrant selection, especially when border controls are necessary, and admission is capped. Little and MacDonald (2015) argue that ideal theory is often too abstract to address specific immigration challenges, as their models of a perfectly just society are disconnected from reality and do not inform practical policy decisions. Sartori (2005) warns that liberal governments risk weakening the foundational structures of liberal pluralism when they focus on idealistic visions over maintaining these essential systems.

Implementing immigration policies uncovers significant practical difficulties, irrespective of their theoretical basis. Hayter (2003) notes that migrants and refugees endure severe challenges primarily because of stringent immigration controls, underscoring the human cost associated with existing methods. Koudelka (2014) emphasizes the importance of realistic strategies that balance the needs of immigrants with the capacities and readiness of host countries to accommodate them. These practical factors illustrate why realists emphasize the importance of feasible solutions over merely abstract ethical considerations in policy development.

Moreover, liberal democratic nations encounter specific challenges when developing immigration policies. As Weiner (1996) argues, these democratic nations find it difficult to enforce strict immigration controls due to their core values, which require them to offer benefits to both legal and illegal immigrants, including asylum seekers. Kymlicka (2001) points out the resulting tension: the principle of moral equality inherent in liberalism clashes with the distribution of rights based on citizenship. Although democratic countries uphold freedom of movement domestically, international law lacks a similar provision for cross-border migration (Weiner, 1996). This discrepancy highlights the conflict between liberal ideals and the governance of migration.

The debate between realist and idealist perspectives on immigration ultimately reflects Stanley Hoffman's insight about the ongoing disparity between the descriptive and normative aspects of politics. Carens (1996) suggests that

practical limitations may hinder a grasp of morality, advising that moral expectations should remain realistic and attainable. In contrast, Starr (1999) argues that Weber's concept of responsibility offers a rational framework for ethical choices, emphasizing outcomes over intentions or rigid principles. This implies a possible compromise that acknowledges moral duties and practical limitations while accepting that immigration policy inevitably requires navigating complex trade-offs between conflicting values and interests in a context where borders are ethically dubious and politically solidified.

To summarize, the debate between realist and idealist approaches to immigration policy centers on the tension between practical constraints and universal moral principles. Realism emphasizes the necessity of addressing migration within the boundaries of state sovereignty and existing political realities, focusing on feasible solutions and policy outcomes. In contrast, idealism, or liberalism, prioritizes human rights and ethical commitments, advocating for policies that reflect universal values even when they challenge current political structures. Ultimately, effective immigration policy often requires a pragmatic balance that integrates ethical aspirations with the realities of state capacity and global migration pressures.

5.2   Open Border and Closed Border: Navigating Ethical, Political, and Practical Dimensions

The discussion surrounding open and closed borders underscores a fundamental tension in immigration policy, where ethical considerations frequently clash with political realities. Considering historical and contextual elements is essential rather than relying solely on theoretical abstractions. This focus highlights the tangible impacts that affect people's lives (Finlayson, 2020). The European Union's free movement policy exemplifies that the widespread belief that immigration control is critical for safeguarding national identity is more about political interests than truth. The EU's approach demonstrates that collaboration and open borders can coexist with national sovereignty, enabling citizens to travel and work across member states while preserving their distinct cultures and political systems (Carens, 1999).

However, historical context significantly influences current border discussions, especially illustrated by shifts in immigration narratives after the September 11, 2001 attacks. This key event shifted European countries and the United States to view immigration mainly as a security concern (Boswell, 2007). In US-Mexico relations, political pressures and public opinion have led to stricter border enforcement and the merging of immigration control with anti-terrorism efforts despite scant evidence suggesting that these actions have enhanced actual security (Cornelius, 2005). This focus on security often obscures other essential aspects, such as economic and humanitarian considerations, which could profoundly impact border policy.

The liberal philosophical tradition offers contrasting perspectives on border control. Isbister (2000) challenges proponents of border restrictions by asking them to validate the moral relevance of national borders, suggesting they might be arbitrary divisions without inherent ethical value. However, this same tradition endorses immigration restrictions based on two principal arguments: first, nations possess the right to prioritize assistance for their vulnerable populations. Second, unchecked immigration could adversely affect the poorest residents in wealthier countries. This tension within liberalism highlights compelling arguments for more open and restrictive border policies within the same philosophical context.

The notion of distributive justice adds complexity to discussions on border policies. Miller (2016) argues that distributive justice is relevant only within defined political communities rather than on a global scale and that a community's historical context should influence its distributional choices. In contrast, Laegaard (2007) posits that principles of fair distribution may apply to immigration if they transcend national borders, suggesting that immigrants' claims can be justified on the grounds of justice. Benhabib (2004) takes a more nuanced view, recognizing that while strong international ties exist, the global landscape does not function as a fully cooperative system where universal justice principles can be applied easily. This creates potential conflicts between the ideals of international justice and democratic self-governance.

A democratic theory presents compelling justifications for open borders. Abizadeh (2008) contends that the principles of democracy inherently support open borders, as border restrictions unjustly limit potential immigrants, who ought to have a say in these regulations. Similarly, Carens (1987) argued that borders should typically remain open, permitting individuals to leave their home countries and relocate elsewhere, subject to the same rules that apply to current citizens. In a scenario with open borders, individuals would be free to reside, work, and settle in any country they choose, pursuing economic opportunities, reuniting with loved ones, or immersing themselves in diverse cultures without encountering restrictive immigration barriers.

Critics of open borders emphasize the importance of safeguarding cultural uniqueness, upholding national identity, and preserving the right to selective association. Wellman (2008) argues that the wish to defend native culture justifies immigration restrictions, driven by the fear that a substantial influx of immigrants could dilute or alter established cultural practices. Huemer (2010) suggests that some individuals consider immigration controls essential for preserving a nation's culture and way of life. Nevertheless, Huemer (2010) recognizes that these restrictions seem to infringe upon the rights of prospective immigrants. However, the arguments for cultural preservation only remain convincing if one accepts specific assumptions regarding the moral authority of states and the ethical importance of national identities (Higgins, 2015).

Restrictive border policies have a significant adverse effect on refugees and asylum seekers. Although the Refugee Convention offers legal safeguards for refugees, it does not assure the right to enter a nation to apply for refugee status, leading many to attempt illegal entry. The Convention mentions that refugees should not be penalized for unlawful arrival. Yet, public resentment towards illegal migration often spills over to affect refugees, resulting in detention, negative perceptions, and misunderstandings regarding proper asylum procedures. Furthermore, intensified border security encourages economic migrants to falsely assert refugee status, which adds further pressure on asylum systems and can negatively impact legitimate refugees (Dauvergne, 2004).

Additionally, border control measures often clash with human rights considerations, even though states claim they cannot fully manage migration flows. Restrictive policies can lead to family separations, endanger asylum seekers, and subject migrants to harsh treatment, highlighting the conflict between a nation's border management goals and the need to uphold human dignity (Pecound & Guchteneire, 2006). Bauder (2012) argues that border restrictions result in unequal treatment of fundamentally similar individuals, disrupt free market operations, and allow various forms of oppression by reinforcing segregation between workers in affluent and poorer countries. This criticism suggests that border controls can exacerbate global inequalities rather than alleviate them.

The effectiveness of immigration restrictions remains a topic of debate. Strict policies often fail to address the root causes of migration and tend to shift migration patterns rather than reduce the total numbers (Czaika & Haas, 2013). For example, increased enforcement may drive migrants to pursue family reunification options or use irregular entry methods rather than dissuading them from migrating altogether. Sachs (2018) advocates for a more refined approach, emphasizing that migration policy should foster conditions that enable individuals to prosper in their home nations while allowing them the freedom to move out of choice, not necessity. This viewpoint respects the right of countries to control entry while recognizing the critical role of human mobility.

A thorough examination of border policies necessitates expanding an ethical framework beyond simplistic binary perspectives. As Sager (2016) points out, it is essential to consider not only destination and origin nations but also transit countries, as stringent border controls in one region reverberate across families and communities globally. Koudelka (2014) emphasizes the tension in modern liberal democracies between acknowledging the fundamental rights of all individuals and implementing effective immigration management systems. Ultimately, the discourse surrounding open versus closed borders encompasses a range of ethical principles, political realities, economic considerations, and issues related to social cohesion. This indicates that nuanced approaches that

respect sovereign rights and human dignity may be more effective than strict ideological positions.

6. Restrictive Immigration Policies and Human Rights Challenges

The connection between strict immigration policies and human rights reveals an ethical dilemma in modern governance. While countries have the legal right to regulate their borders, this authority increasingly collides with international human rights obligations that extend beyond citizenship. Pecoud and Guchteneire (2006) note that stringent border policies often interfere with human rights, resulting in family separations, putting asylum seekers at risk, and exposing migrants to harsh treatment that diminishes human dignity. This conflict between state sovereignty and humanitarian values embodies what Weiner (1996) defines as an inevitable conflict between the right to mobility and the state's power to control borders, posing a governance challenge with serious moral consequences.

The human costs of restrictive immigration policies are apparent in how vulnerable migrants are treated. Hayter (2003) points out that migrants and refugees endure significant challenges mainly because of strict immigration controls, emphasizing that border enforcement often fails to differentiate between economic migrants and those escaping persecution. Dauvergne (2004) notes that while the Refugee Convention provides legal protections for refugees, it does not guarantee the right to enter a country to seek refugee status, compelling many to attempt illegal entry. This lack of legal clarity leads to a scenario where genuine asylum seekers face detention and criminalization, misunderstood by host communities that confuse them with irregular economic migrants.

Family separation represents another critical human rights issue stemming from restrictive policies. Immigration regulations disrupt family unity, violating Article 16 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which defines the family as the fundamental unit of society deserving protection. Kymlicka (2001) points out that the liberal democratic principles highlighting human dignity and family integrity often clash with immigration enforcement practices that lead to the division of parents from children and spouses from one another. These separations can inflict profound psychological harm and hinder the social integration of migrants who gain legal status, leading to long-term societal costs that extend beyond immediate humanitarian concerns.

Thus, detention practices linked to immigration enforcement raise other serious human rights concerns. Castles et al. (2014) note that criminalizing irregular migration has resulted in the growth of detention centers in many host countries, lacking sufficient oversight and maintaining conditions that breach basic human dignity standards. The arbitrary nature of administrative detention for immigration offenses, which can persist indefinitely without judicial review, undermines essential due process principles that liberal democracies claim to

support. Benhabib (2004) also highlights that this contradiction demonstrates the conflict between universal rights and the particular enforcement mechanisms tied to citizenship and territorial sovereignty.

Moreover, the non-refoulement principle, preventing the return of individuals to circumstances where they risk persecution, torture, or inhumane treatment, is fundamental to international refugee protection, which clashes with strict border policies. Dauvergne (2004) observes that heightened border security leads economic migrants to inaccurately claim refugee status, putting strain on asylum systems and harming genuine refugees. Eventually, this situation results in a damaging cycle in which states enforce stricter verification processes, delaying assistance for those who genuinely need it and potentially exposing them to ongoing danger, thus undermining the humanitarian principles that underpin refugee law.

Furthermore, stringent immigration policies often interact with and can intensify discrimination and xenophobia in host countries. Bauder (2012) posits that border controls result in unequal treatment of fundamentally similar individuals, obstructing free market mechanisms and promoting various forms of oppression by widening the gap between workers in affluent and impoverished nations. This viewpoint aligns with Carens' (1987) claim that borders are upheld through military force, a reality that is often obscured for citizens in prosperous democracies, who may remain unaware of the moral quandaries that such restrictive immigration policies entail. When policies frame migrants as threats rather than as valuable contributors, they risk reinforcing prejudiced perceptions that undermine social cohesion and democratic values.

The disparity between international human rights obligations and national immigration enforcement practices highlights the weaknesses in existing governance frameworks. Miller (2016) notes that while realist perspectives on immigration policy must acknowledge practical limitations, they should also strive to develop ethical frameworks applicable to real-world situations. Nonetheless, this pragmatism should not justify human rights abuses that are defended solely through appeals to sovereignty or security. Castles et al. (2014) note that the ongoing arrival of undocumented migrants, despite significant investments in enforcement strategies, illustrates the inadequacy of strictly restrictive methods. This suggests that policies neglecting human rights concerns also overlook their practical goals of discouraging irregular migration.

On the one hand, democratic values may be compromised when harsh enforcement measures are implemented without sufficient safeguards for human dignity and due process. Abizadeh (2008) contends that democratic principles inherently support more open borders, as border restrictions unjustly limit potential immigrants who should have a voice in regulations that profoundly affect them. This democratic deficit in immigration policy formation highlights what Koudelka (2014) describes as the tension in modern liberal democracies between

acknowledging the fundamental rights of all individuals and implementing effective immigration management systems. When enforcement practices contradict the core values of equality, dignity, and fairness, they risk eroding the moral authority of democratic institutions, both domestically and internationally.

Overall, restrictive immigration policies pose a significant ethical dilemma, prioritizing state sovereignty and border control over human rights and dignity. Such policies result in family separations, mistreatment of migrants, and a lack of clarity regarding economic migrants versus asylum seekers, leading to breaches of international human rights standards. The conflict between security and humanitarian duties underscores the need for immigration systems that respect human dignity, uphold legal protections, and prevent causing undue suffering to vulnerable groups.

7. Conclusion

The ethical maze of immigration policy reveals a persistent tension between state sovereignty and human mobility rights in this interconnected world. This article demonstrates that immigration policies evolve from complex interrelationships among national identity, economic interests, security concerns, and ethical considerations. The paradox is evident: while globalization has enabled the free movement of goods, capital, and information across borders, human mobility remains heavily restricted (Pecoud & Guchteneire, 2006). This inequality gives rise to new forms whereby citizenship and access to legal migration routes become significant assets that shape life opportunities (Appadurai, 1996; Shamir, 2005). The philosophical divide between realist viewpoints, which focus on practical political limitations, and idealist perspectives, which emphasize universal moral values, further complicates the governance of immigration (Kreutz, 2023; Carens, 1996).

Current immigration challenges vividly illustrate these conflicts. The security framework established in the aftermath of 9/11 has transformed immigration discussions, intertwining border enforcement with counter-terrorism, despite a lack of compelling evidence for its effectiveness (Boswell, 2007; Cornelius, 2005). Concurrently, the demographic shifts in affluent countries with aging populations drive economic motivations for more permissive immigration rules, even as political opposition intensifies (Dauvergne, 2004). The human costs of restrictive measures are becoming increasingly clear, with instances of family separations, controversial detention practices, and the criminalization of asylum seekers presenting significant human rights issues (Pecoud & Guchteneire, 2006; Hayter, 2003; Kymlicka, 2001). These circumstances highlight the inconsistencies within liberal democracies that profess to uphold universal human rights yet implement

policies that often contradict these very values (Benhabib, 2004; Koudelka, 2014).

The inadequacy of current approaches is evident in real-world results. Despite significant investments in enforcement, irregular migration persists, indicating that restrictive approaches alone are insufficient to address the underlying causes of human mobility (Castles et al., 2014; Pecoud & Guchteneire, 2006). The European Union's experience with free movement illustrates that open borders can coexist with national sovereignty (Carens, 1999), contradicting the belief that stringent immigration controls are essential for maintaining cultural identity. This suggests that migration governance requires more nuanced strategies that recognize both the inevitability of human movement in an interconnected world and the valid concerns of host societies regarding social cohesion and resource distribution (Wellman, 2008; Huemer, 2010).

Looking forward, effective immigration governance requires frameworks that transcend the binary thinking of "open versus closed" borders. These frameworks must recognize migration as an inherent aspect of the global system while developing mechanisms that fairly manage its impacts (Sager, 2016). This involves addressing the underlying causes of forced migration, such as economic disparities, political instability, and human rights violations in the countries of origin (Castles et al., 2020). At the same time, receiving nations need to create integration policies that maximize the benefits of diversity while reducing social tensions that may arise from rapid demographic changes (Dauvergne, 2004). The challenge lies in crafting policies that balance national interests with humanitarian obligations in a manner that enhances rather than undermines human dignity (Pecoud & Guchteneire, 2006).

Ultimately, the complex ethical landscape of immigration policy presents significant questions regarding justice, identity, and community in a world where national borders conflict with economic and social realities. Future studies and policy advancements should explore innovative governance models that fairly distribute responsibilities among sending, transit, and receiving nations. This necessitates transcending ideological extremes and embracing evidence-based strategies that acknowledge both states' rights to regulate entry and the ethical commitment to protecting human dignity. With growing global interdependence, addressing these conflicting values will become more challenging, requiring creative solutions that respect the distinct qualities of national communities while upholding our shared humanity that transcends borders.

References

Abizadeh, A. (2008). Democratic Theory and Border Coercion: No Right to Unilaterally Control Your Own Borders. *Political Theory, 36*(1), 37-65. https://doi.org/10.1177/0090591707310090

Adamson, F. B., & Tsourapas, G. (2019). Migration Diplomacy in World Politics. *International Studies Perspectives, 20*(2), 113-128. https://doi.org/10.1093/isp/eky015

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bader, V. (2005). The Ethics of Immigration. *Constellations, 12*(3), 331-361. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1351-0487.2005.00420.x

Bali, S. (2005). Migration and Refugees. In White, B., Little, R., & Smith, M. (Eds.). *Issues in World Politics* (pp. 173-193). Crescent: Red Globe Press.

Bauder, H. (2012). The Possibilities of Open and No Borders. *Social Justice, 4*(130), 76-96. https://www.jstor.org/stable/24361623

Benhabib, S. (2004). *The Rights of Others: Aliens, Residents, and Citizens.* Connecticut: Cambridge University Press.

Bhagwati, J. (2003). Borders Beyond Control. *Foreign Affairs, 82(*1), 98. https://doi.org/10.2307/20033431

Boswell, C. (2007). Migration Control in Europe After 9/11: Explaining The Absence of Securitization. *Journal of Common Market Studies, 45*(3), 589-610. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2007.00722.x

Carens, J. H. (1987). Aliens and Citizens: The Case for Open Borders. *The Review of Politics, 49*(2), 251-273. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0034670500033817

Carens, J. H. (1996). Realistic and Idealistic Approaches to the Ethics of Migration. *The International Migration Review, 30*(1), 156. https://doi.org/10.2307/2547465

Carens, J. H. (1999). A Reply to Meilaender: Reconsidering Open Borders. *The International Migration Review, 33*(4), 1082. https://doi.org/10.2307/2547364

Carens, J. H. (2000). Open Borders and Liberal Limits: A Response to Isbister. *The International Migration Review, 34*(2), 636-643. https://doi.org/10.1177/019791830003400232

Castles, S. (2004). Why Migration Policies Fail. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 27*(2), 205-227. https://doi.org/10.1080/0141987042000177306

Castles, S., De Haas, H., & Miller, M. J. (2014). *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Collier, P., & Betts, A. (2017). *Refuge: Rethinking Refugee Policy in a Changing World*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cornelius, W. A. (2005). Controlling 'unwanted' Immigration: Lessons from the United States, 1993-2004. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 31*(4), 775-794. https://doi.org/10.1080/13691830500110017

Cox, A. B. (2017). Three Mistakes in Open Borders Debates. *Immigration, Emigration, and Migration, 57*, 51-68. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26387593

Dauvergne, C. (2004). Sovereignty, Migration and The Rule of Law in Global Times. *The Modern Law Review, 67*(4), 588-615. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2230.2004.00501.x

Freeman, G. P. (1992). Migration Policy and Politics in the Receiving States. *The International Migration Review, 26*(4), 1144-1167. https://doi.org/10.2307/2546878

Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The World Is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-first Century*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.

Gibney, M. J. (2004). *The Ethics and Politics of Asylum: Liberal Democracy and the Response to Refugees*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hayter, T. (2003). No Borders: The Case Against Immigration Controls. *Feminist Review, 73*(1), 6-18. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.fr.9400071

Higgins, P. (2015). The Ethics of Immigration and the Justice of Immigration Policies. *Public Affairs Quarterly, 29*(2), 155-174. https://www.jstor.org/stable/44713984

Hirst, P., & Thompson, G. (1999). *Globalization in Question: International Economy and the Possibilities of Governance*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Hollifield, J. F. (2004). The Emerging Migration State. *The International Migration Review, 38*(3), 885-912. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2004.tb00223.x

Hollifield, J., Martin, P., & Orrenius, P. (2014). *Controlling Immigration: A Global Perspective*. Standford California: Stanford University Press.

Huemer, M. (2010). Is There a Right to Immigrate? *Social Theory and Practice, 36*(3), 429-461. https://doi.org/10.5840/soctheorpract201036323

Isbister, J. (2000). A Liberal Argument for Border Controls: Reply to carens. *The International Migration Review, 34*(2), 629-635. https://doi.org/10.1177/019791830003400231

Koudelka, J. (2014). The Role of Political Philosophy in the Process of Creating Immigration Policies. *Czech Journal of Political Science*, (1), 25-36. https://doi.org/10.5817/PC2014-1-25

Kreutz, A. (2023). On Being a Realist About Migration. *Res Publica, 29*(1), 129-140. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11158-022-09564-1

Kymlicka, W. (2001). Territorial Boundaries: A Liberal Egalitarian Perspective. In Miller, D., & Hashmi, S. (Eds.). *Boundaries and Justice* (pp. 249-275). New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Laegaard, S. (2007). David Miller on Immigration Policy and Nationality. *Journal of Applied Philosophy, 24*(3), 283-298. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5930.2007.00374.x

Little, A., & Macdonald, T. (2015). Introduction to the Special Issue: Real-World Justice and International Migration. *European Journal of Political Theory: EJPT, 14*(4), 381-390. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474885115584832

Meilaender, P. C. (1999). Liberalism and Open Borders: The Argument of Joseph Carens. *The International Migration Review, 33*(4), 1062-1081. https://doi.org/10.1177/019791839903300410

Miller, D. (2016). How 'realistic' Should Global Political Theory Be? Some Reflections On the Debate So Far. *Journal of International Political Theory, 12*(2), 217-233. https://doi.org/10.1177/1755088215626940

Pearson, J. S. (2023). Realism in The Ethics of Immigration. *Philosophy & Social Criticism, 49(*8), 950-974. https://doi.org/10.1177/01914537221079676

Pécoud, A., & de Guchteneire, P. (2006). International Migration, Border Controls, and Human Rights: Assessing The Relevance of a Right to Mobility. *Journal of Borderlands Studies, 21*(1), 69-86. https://doi.org/10.1080/08865655.2006.9695652

Sachs, J. D. (2018). *Managing Migration. A New Foreign Policy: Beyond American Exceptionalism*. New York: Columbia University Press. https://doi.org/10.7312/sach18848

Sassen, S. (1999). *Globalization and Its Discontents: Essays on the New Mobility of People and Money*. New York: The New Press.

Seglow, J. (2005). The Ethics of Immigration. *Political Studies Review, 3*(3), 317-334. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1478-9299.2005.00026.x

Shamir, R. (2005). Without Borders? Notes on Globalization as A Mobility Regime. *Sociological Theory, 23*(2), 197-217. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0735-2751.2005.00250.x

Starr, B. E. (1999). The Structure of Max Weber's Ethic of Responsibility. *The Journal of Religious Ethics, 27(*3), 407-434. https://doi.org/10.1111/0384-9694.00025

Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). *Globalization and Its Discontents*. New York: WW Norton.

Wallerstein, I. (1974). *The Modern World-System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century.* New York. Academic Press.

Weiner, M. (1996). Ethics, National Sovereignty, and The Control of Immigration. *The International Migration Review, 30*(1), 171-197. https://doi.org/10.1177/019791839603000114

Wellman, C. H. (2008). Immigration and Freedom of Association. *Ethics, 119*(1), 109-141. https://doi.org/10.1086/592311

Willekens, F., Massey, D., Raymer, J., & Beauchemin, C. (2016). International Migration Under the Microscope. *Science, 352*(6288), 897-899. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaf6545