

## [SLIDE 1] Globalization and Migration

First off, I'd like to thank you for the invitation to join you today. This is my first time in Palma, and I'm really delighted to be here. I'd also like to thank the American consulate in Barcelona for making my trip possible, with special thanks to Elena Pujol.

My discussion of globalization and migration is broken into two parts. Today, I'm going to focus on the broad issues concerning globalization and migration. Tomorrow, I will speak more specifically about the politics of migration that has been driven, in part, by the forces of globalization.

[SLIDE 2] In this first presentation I'm going to address the following questions.

First, why is international migration so important today? In more and more places around the world, migration is becoming more prominent in policy discourse. This is not only among traditional "countries of immigration" like the United States, Canada, or Australia. More and more we are seeing migration framed as a key component of both domestic and foreign policy.

The second question I'd like to address is: Is migration somehow different now than in the past? Clearly, the answer to this question varies by country. Some countries, including Spain for example, have shifted from primarily being countries of emigration to destination countries for immigrants. That is certainly a fundamental change. But also for traditional countries of immigration—such as the U.S.—there is a sense

that things are different now. Is this in fact the case? I'll consider this question by taking a very broad view of migration across time.

The third question I'll address—and the one that speaks most directly to the conference theme—is: How has globalization affected migration? As I'll discuss, globalization has had a tremendous impact on both the levels and characteristics of global migration. These dynamics, in turn, contribute to the increasing globalization of transborder flows, on the one hand.

The final question I'd like to address is: What are the political implications of the globalization of migration? I think it's safe to say that all facets of globalization have generated politics, including issues of trade and capital flows, as well as information technology. But I would also argue that the political implications of migration are often even more profound, speaking to issues not only of social identity, but even broader issues of world order.

[SLIDE 3] So, this brings me back to my first question: Why is migration important? The eminent economist, Jagdish Bhagwati, said: "International migration lies close to the center of global problems that now seize the attention of politicians and intellectuals around the world." More and more we see that migration is not something peripheral, but rather, central to many global problems. Among these are issues of population management, the solvency of the welfare state, border security, national identity, and even the institution of state sovereignty itself.

[SLIDE 4] Let's start by considering recent trends in migration. As we can see on this graph, we are seeing exponential growth in the volume of international migration. Over the past half-century or so, we've seen the number of foreign born increase from roughly 75 million in 1965 to about 200 million in 2008. More important than the overall volume, perhaps, is the distinct trend we see here in terms of rate of growth. In my work on immigration policies in Europe and the United States, I have often found that public opinion focuses as much on prospective flows as they do on the number of immigrants evident at the current time.

[SLIDE 5] We can also consider various aspects of this growing volume. Migrants now constitute about 3% of the global population. In addition to regular migration flows, we are also seeing a growing volume of unauthorized migrants. Current estimates suggest that there are some 20-30 million unauthorized migrants. This flow now comprises 10-15% of the overall flow of international migration. This trend is particularly important in terms of the politics of immigration. While public receptivity to immigrants varies in most immigrant-receiving countries, concern over growing numbers of unauthorized migrants dominates much of the politics associated with migration in general.

In addition to international migrants, we're also seeing rising numbers of internal migrants—or, internally displaced people. In 2007, there were about 26 million internally displaced people among 52 countries. These internal movements can be as politically volatile as international migration, depending on the strength and stability of the country in which they reside.

Refugees also must be considered when we account for overall movement of people around the world. In 2007, there were 11.4 million refugees across the globe. This flow, in particular, speaks to the level of political instability that often plagues certain regions of the world.

Clearly, when we look at statistics like these, we can see how fluid human populations have become. But they beg the question—is this really something new? Should we be concerned about the trends that we see today?

[SLIDE 6] In terms of volume, what we're seeing today is not necessarily unprecedented, historically speaking. Scholars like Steve Krasner have been quick to point out that there have been several large waves of migration over the past few hundred years. So in one sense, we can say that it's not necessarily transformative.

However, while the volume is not unprecedented, current levels do match some of the largest migration waves of past eras. We also need to remember that volume isn't the only thing that is important. We also need to consider the characteristics that modern flows have and how these compare with prior waves of migration.

Some of the largest waves of migration were a direct function of European imperialism and colonization. In what ways do the terms of migration matter? In this case, it's important to recognize how state power played into the migration equation. Migration associated with colonization reflected a sharp

disparity in power between European sending countries and migrant-receiving colonies abroad. Politically, the sending state largely dictated the terms of resettlement and backed this up with state power. The migration question during these times were focused on emigration—how much, and to where—more so than immigration.

Similarly, colonization also produced a migration flow that generally moved from more developed to less developed regions. At this point, long-distance migration was fraught with danger, and was relatively expensive to undertake.

[SLIDE 7] When we think about migration in historical perspective, like this, we see that there are some key differences with the current trends and dynamics. Although the volume of migration is not unprecedented, there are important differences in terms of characteristics.

Unlike the imperial era, migration now generally flows from less developed sending countries to more developed receiving countries. Some 60% of global migration flows to a relatively small number of highly developed receiving countries.

With this reversal, receiving countries now face inflows from a more diverse set of sending countries. Though most regions have concentrated flows—particularly where an advanced industrial country is bordered by a less developed country—these are accompanied more and more by inflows from around the globe. Because of this, inflows are more diverse—ethnically and culturally.

Migration has become a truly global phenomenon. It is in this sense that we might talk about the globalization of migration. It has become a central characteristic of globalization more generally.

[SLIDE 8] While we can speak of contemporary migration as constituting a dimension of globalization, we can also recognize the important linkage between globalization and current migration trends. The key here is to recognize how various facets of globalization have contributed to the globalization of migration that I just outlined.

What becomes clear when we look at the historical evidence is that current migration dynamics are largely a function of globalization. But what elements of globalization have had the greatest impact on international migration flows?

[SLIDE 9] The most obvious is probably the reduction in transportation costs that have accompanied the industrialization that drives much of globalization. It is now both faster and cheaper to move longer distances—making migration more of an option for a growing number of people. This is particularly important given the shift of migration emanating from less developed countries.

The rise of information technology is also a key element of globalization with important implications for migration. Its effects are not limited to one factor, but rather, many. Information technology—starting with the telephone and now expanding exponentially with the internet—facilitates the creation of what sociologists call “social capital.”

First, social capital might come in the form of information about possible destination countries. Using information technology enables potential migrants to learn about opportunities for them abroad, as well as how to go about moving from one place to another. This not only clarifies the push-pull dynamics between sending and receiving country, but it also reduces the risk facing migrants by reducing the degree of the unknown.

Information technology is also very useful in connecting ethnic kin in receiving countries with potential migrants in their home country. It facilitates the creation of ethnic immigrant enclaves in receiving countries, further reducing risks associated with migration. Using information technology in this way gives migrants important contacts in the receiving country, information regarding employment and living opportunities, and also reduces the social costs of migration. By connecting migrants with ethnic kin, issues of acculturation and language can be buffered.

Information technology associated with globalization also functions in more nefarious ways as well—and contributes to the rising proportion of unauthorized migration. Technology has made it easier to migrants—or their agents—to forge documents necessary for travel.

Migrant smuggling networks have also been able to make effective use of information and communications technology. What has emerged is a cat-and-mouse game with law enforcement agencies in receiving countries. Unfortunately, law

enforcement often finds itself playing catch-up with smuggler's innovations to evade control mechanisms.

Lastly, we also need to consider the long-term implications of these dynamics. If these various elements of globalization have facilitated migration at certain points in time, over time they will be compounded. Migration itself facilitates migration. Sociologists refer to this as “chain migration.” Each iteration of migration becomes one link in the chain. As I mentioned before, prior migration can contribute to the creation of social capital that generates increased levels of future migration. Clearly, this can be fostered by both technology and state policies, such as labor recruitment programs.

[SLIDE 10] In addition to contributing to the globalization of migration through the long-term effects of periodic labor recruitment programs, the state has also shown itself to be an integral part in contributing to globalization dynamics. Often we seem to think of the state as challenges by the forces of globalization. But we have to remember, too, that the state has played a key role. In addition, some elements of globalization not directly related to migration have “spill-over” effects that loom large in the migration equation.

I think it's safe to say that when most people think about globalization, they think about the vast increase in the flow of goods and money around the world. We have seen the emergence of a truly global economy—one that is highly interdependent. While markets may have served as the primary engine of globalization in this area, states have played a key role in facilitating the creation of a global market.

This has been particularly the case after World War II, when the Bretton Woods institutions created a framework for the expansion of markets. These institutions represent a sea-change in state strategies regarding the accumulation of economic power. Richard Rosecrance described this phenomenon as the “rise of the trading state.” It reflects the re-emergence of classical economic strategy as a central element of state grand strategy. In other words, states were increasingly convinced that power was best accumulated by open markets than by military conquest.

Now, it’s beyond the scope of this lecture to discuss the “why’s” and “how’s” that led to a more open international economy. Instead, I think it’s important to recognize some of the effects this process has had in other areas—including migration. Probably the most important impact is that, although openness tends to be associated with growth, this growth is not even.

The increasing economic divide between the global North and South have increased pressures for economic migration. In other words, this effect has increased both the “push” and the “pull” factors that generate international migration.

Economic restructuring associated with Post-WWII openness also facilitates international migration. Contrary to the predictions of the Stolper-Samuelson factor-price equalization theorem, the evidence suggests that free trade industrialization often produces more migration rather than less. This runs against the conventional wisdom that free trade will equalize wages and economic opportunities between countries, and thus,

will reduce migration. In practice, however, it doesn't seem to work this way.

The bottom line here is simply to recognize that states are not just affected by globalization—they have been integral in fostering it. In some areas this has been welcomed. In others, including migration, the effects have generally been seen as problematic.

[SLIDE 11] So what's problematic about it? Well, among others, I can point to two areas that have complicated the politics associated with international migration. The first is very broad: it involves a tension between globalization and sovereignty. Now, this tension is not limited to the issue of migration. However, it would seem to be more deeply complicated. This is because it is not just an issue of state sovereignty, but also other dimensions, including popular sovereignty and societal sovereignty. Each carries with it significant political implications that figure more prominently in the politics of immigration in receiving countries.

Another implication of globalization is that it seems to be altering the relative power between societies—represented by a state—and individuals. In this case, the individuals I refer to are migrants. The factors I discussed earlier that have made movement easier and less risky for migrants represent a direct challenge to states that have increasingly sought to gain control over flows. What has ensued is a growing game of cat-and-mouse. When we look at this from the broad perspective, however, it becomes clear that this change in power—

increasingly favoring migrants—represents a significant difference from the past that has strong political implications.

I don't think that these factors benefit refugees in quite the same way. I'm speaking here primarily of economic migrants.

[SLIDE 12] So, what exactly are some of these “political implications”? At the level of the state, this shift in relative agency—or power—challenges its ability to manage flows in ways that reflect the national interest. More and more, we're seeing “control” becoming a bigger and bigger imperative for the state.

This doesn't necessarily only refer to closure. I'm speaking more broadly. Control can involve both openness as well as closure. Though this is a gross simplification, what we're increasingly seeing is “effective control” being defined as being able to attract highly-skilled individuals, while concurrently being able to stop the entry of those who try to go around official channels of entry.

One of my colleagues—Jim Hollifield at Southern Methodist University in Dallas—has suggested that the interests associated with these trends are significant. In fact, he suggests that this may be so much so that the relative power of states may increasingly hinge on their ability to maximize their ability to manage migration effectively. Hollifield suggests that this may bring the rise of what he calls the “migration state”—one that parallels the significance of the “trading state” of the twentieth century.

Interests for more effective control are not limited to the state level. Migration offers both gains and costs. Who gains and who loses in the process can generate significant political interests domestically. Depending on how insulated the government is from such pressures, this can generate significant political pressure to alter flows in ways that mitigates costs to aggrieved parties or to maximize those who are gaining. The end result here is the same—simply to logic of where this interest for control comes from is different.

Lastly, there is simply the issue of control. As volume increases, pressures for state action grow accordingly. And yet, the ability to match policy outcomes with public and state demands has become increasingly difficult. In one of the most often cited books on comparative immigration policy, Cornelius, Martin and Hollifield suggest that not only are states increasingly interested in control, but there is a growing gap between goals and outcomes.

[SLIDE 13] This has led to talk about globalization leading to a loss of state control. It also happens to be the title of one of Saskia Sassen's often cited book dealing with the subject of globalization and migration. If states are, in fact, losing control of their borders, this clearly has tremendous implications for governance.

On the one hand, a loss of control suggests a threat to the institution of popular sovereignty—or the link between society and the state. By definition, the state exists to represent and realize the interests of a given society. A loss of the ability to respond effectively to these interests represents a break in this

link between state and society. Instead, societies would become more fluid, as movement is facilitated.

At lower levels of analysis, a similar tension grows between community interests and individual interests. Without a means of control, community interests must necessarily give way to individual interests. In this case, this is represented by migrant interests.

Politically, this can generate something of a cyclical perception of threat in receiving societies. If the state fails to provide demanded levels of control, concerns about sovereignty, ways of life, and community interests are likely to be exacerbated. This will likely generate increased political pressures and demands for even higher levels of state control. In this way, public concerns and state difficulties ratchet up what can be a very volatile politics of immigration.

[SLIDE 14] As we learn more about migration and its implications, it becomes clearer how important it can be to manage it effectively. There is a lot at stake.

Migration offers both potentially large gains, as well as costs. These can be economic, political, and social. In addition, these gains and costs don't have an easy answer—it's much more complicated than it's often framed: either as "pro-immigration" or "anti-immigration." Like other aspects of globalization, the problem is how to achieve the greatest gains while mitigating the costs. As we see with other transborder flows—including trade—we're still working on the answers.

Socially, migration can generate social and political unity, but can also generate social balkanization. Again, I think it's becoming clear that it's not migration itself that produces either a positive or negative effect—but rather, how the migration process is conducted that matters most.

When we think about how globalization figures into these questions, what becomes clear is that it generally complicates them rather than making them simpler.

[SLIDE 15] Now, this has been a lot of ground to cover, but I hope that I've been able to provide a sense of the “big picture” that is involved when we think about the relationship between globalization and migration.

Why is migration important?