

Closing The Gap By Opening Up

A Constructive Analysis Of the Migration Without Borders
Scenario From The Migrants' Perspective

Abstract

There are approximately 200 million international migrants in the world today as well as countless irregular migrants that would benefit from more open migration. Despite this, borders remain closed for many and the right to free mobility is only granted to a few. Theories speak of a hierarchy of power dictated by those who can move freely and those who cannot. Using this as a base, our study looks at the possibility of migration without borders.

This is achieved through constructive analysis. In the normative section, we pose the sovereignty of states against human rights, as viewed through liberal egalitarianism and realism. In the empirical part, we look at the economic consequences of migration in sending and receiving countries. These findings are then summarized and discussed in a concluding analysis.

We come to find that migration without borders is very much a possible as well as a desirable outcome, with certain reservations.

Key words: international migration, constructive analysis, state sovereignty, human rights, remittances, brain drain, labour conditions.

Words: 7193

Table of contents

1	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Background and motivation.....	1
1.2	Purpose and question	2
1.3	General Delimitations.....	2
2	Method, Material and Operationalization	3
2.1	Introduction	3
2.2	Method for Normative Analysis.....	3
2.3	Method for Empirical Analysis	4
2.4	Constructive summary.....	4
2.5	Operationalization	5
3	Normative Analysis.....	6
3.1	Human rights vs Sovereignty of states	6
3.1.1	Liberal egalitarianism.....	6
3.1.2	Realism.....	7
3.2	Discussion.....	8
4	Empirical Analysis: The consequences.....	10
4.1	Sending countries	10
4.1.1	Remittances	10
4.1.2	Brain Drain.....	12
4.2	Receiving countries	12
4.2.1	Labour conditions.....	12
5	Constructive Analysis.....	15
5.1	Normative summary	15
5.2	Empirical summary.....	16
5.2.1	Remittances	16
5.2.2	Brain Drain.....	16
5.2.3	Labour conditions.....	17
5.3	Concluding arguments.....	17
6	References.....	19

Acronyms

GCIM	Global Commission on International Migration
GEP	Global Economic Prospect
HDR	Human Development Report
MWB	Migration Without Borders
OECD	Organization of Economics and Co-Operation and Development
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

1 Introduction

1.1 Background and motivation

Migration is one of the most important issues in world politics today. People have migrated throughout the ages, but it is during this last century that it has become a phenomenon that so affects our view of the world. The Human Development Report estimates the number of international migrants as around 200 million, and this is not taking into account the number of irregular, or illegal, migrants living under the radar and are therefore difficult to estimate in numbers (HDR 2009 s.1).

In his book *Globalization: The Human Consequences*, Zygmunt Bauman discusses “the end of geography” (Bauman, 1999:12). Bauman implies that globalization divides as much as it unites, and in the center of this paradox lies the freedom of movement. The right to mobility is far from given for countless people, and Bauman argues that the underlying reason is a hierarchy of power, where those at the top can move about as they choose while those closer to the grassroots have to accept the fact that they will most likely be staying put. This theory is part of why we wish to conduct this study and why we see it as relevant not only to scientific circles but also to society as a whole.

The idea of Migration Without Borders (from hereon MWB) is the focus of a collection of essays edited by Antoine Pécoud and Paul de Guchteneire. UNESCO initiated a research project in order to gain a more comprehensive view of what a world without borders might entail. Although this scenario might seem unrealistic, Pécoud, de Guchteneire and their contributors work to change this outlook. They point to history as a way of showing that what seemed impossible fifty years ago is very much a reality today, for example free movement within the EU (Pécoud, de Guchteneire, 2007:2). Apart from global advantages of migration, the economic irregular migrants would also greatly benefit from this scenario. Currently, many people do not let themselves be stopped by borders or restrictions and attempt to cross them anyway. If borders were open, those people would be safer in their voyage. As an example of how many people this affects, we would like to draw attention to the fact that over 3,000 people have died trying to cross the U.S- Mexico border between 1995 and 2003 (Alarcón 2007:244). Interestingly, the US and Mexico are joined together by a free-trade agreement, yet their borders are patrolled at the thought of people crossing in the same manner the products they consume do. The only case in the world where the flow of products is equated by a free flow of people is the EU (Pécoud, de Guchteneire, 2007:14). Furthermore, it would be easier to control people smugglers, tax evasion, to name a few.

To consider the right to mobility a universal human right can be a stretch of the imagination as it challenges the idea of state sovereignty and citizenship, but maybe the future will show that it was a possible reality all along. Either way, we feel the topic cannot be discussed enough.

1.2 Purpose and question

We agree with Bauman that there seems to be a hierarchy of power between those who can't migrate and those who can. Furthermore, we feel that the amount of irregular migrants in need of protection as well as greater opportunities fully legitimizes the questioning of borders. We are also eager to find out how migration affects the world in reality.

The aim of this paper is to examine whether or not borders should be opened, thus allowing for the free movement of people; as well as what consequences on economics this would entail; resulting in our own suggestion of the most beneficial way forward based on the theories we've examined. The principal question we seek to answer is "Is a world without borders a desirable scenario?".

We have come to find that often, the discourse on migration is infected with prejudice and preconceptions without a genuine appreciation of the problems at hand. Our aim beyond the academic ambitions we have is to gain a truer understanding of the underlying aspects of migration –past, present and future.

1.3 General Delimitations

Due to the limitations of the space and time allotted, we decided that an in-depth discussion of the history of migration would be superfluous. Our focus is mainly on the effects of migration today and what that may imply for a world without borders tomorrow. Although we try to present a balanced discussion on the different types of migrants, we concentrate on the irregular, economic migrants as these are the ones that would be the most affected by the MWB scenario. Furthermore, we decided to center our empirical analysis on the economic consequences of migration. We realize that we leave out a vital part in not dealing with the social issues but we feel that due to the extent of our essay, it is preferable to discuss just one empirical aspect.

2 Method, Material and Operationalization

2.1 Introduction

Our method of choice is a constructive analysis of the theories at hand, as outlined by Lennart Lundquist. Lundquist describes that constructive theory consists of both a normative (should-question) and an empirical (is-question) aspect, which then forms the constructive theory, or in some cases, a political recommendation (Lundquist, 1993:85). The reason we opted for this method is that we didn't want to base our entire paper on only empirical or normative analysis, but rather present an overview of the two combined, as achieved through constructive analysis. Furthermore, as Lundquist points out that constructive analysis is rare in political research today, we felt it would be a welcome challenge (Lundquist, 1993:63).

In order to maintain reliability as well as external and internal validity in our study, we want to point out that our constructive analysis is conducted from the point of view of the migrants themselves. We chose to do this because it seems that the discussions on migration take place on such a global, interstate level that the people at question are often left out.

One assumption we are working from is that if we open all borders migration would not explode. Philip Cole maintains that "the sense of panic that is forming the rhetoric of state governments concerning immigration has little basis on facts" (Cole, 2000:24). Several studies point out that most of the world's population is immobile, and if people move it is to broaden their experience or earn money on a temporary basis (Harris, 2007:47).

2.2 Method for Normative Analysis

The first part of this paper, examines the question from a normative perspective. We've adhered to the guidelines for conducting a normative analysis as outlined by Badersten. He explains that normative analysis deals with that which is right or wrong, desirable or detestable; it seeks to answer how things *should* be (Badersten 2006:6). Furthermore, Badersten points out that a good way of conducting such an analysis is to put different values against each other and compare how different values answer the same question differently. We've chosen to focus on human rights and the sovereignty of states as we feel these two values make up the most interesting opposition on the subject of migration.

Also, they are both examples of what Badersten refers to as ‘ethics of duty’ where the value at hand is never to be compromised (Badersten 2006:32ff). We struggled with how to pose these two values against each other in a rewarding discussion. Ultimately, we decided to analyze whether human rights or the sovereignty of states should be viewed as having the most authority on the discussion on open borders through different political ideologies.

The material used is theories on human rights vs. the sovereignty of states from the perspective of different political ideologies. We chose to look at the conflict of values from political ideologies for two reasons. First of all, because we wanted to see how different values reach different conclusions on the same topic which in this case means looking at the conflict of human rights vs. the sovereignty of states and the values we view it from are those of the liberal egalitarian perspective and those of the realist perspective. The second reason for doing this is to raise the external and internal validity of our study. If we carry a discussion on values based on ideologies, it’s easier for others to duplicate than were we to use our own ideals as basis.

2.3 Method for Empirical Analysis

The empirical analysis is an attempt to summarize the research on how current migration has affected economics in the sending and receiving countries. We have chosen to use mainly the empirical studies of the HDR and OECD report from 2009 as well as the GCIM report from 2005. The strength of these reports is that they are supranational so they do not deal with migration from the perspective of a specific country. We have tried to gather as recent material as possible and complement this with relevant theoretical approaches. As much as we try to avoid it, we realize that in a study such as ours it is almost impossible to completely avoid certain values even in the empirical analysis.

We chose to focus on sending and receiving countries, leaving out the transit countries as well as the aspect that almost all countries play all three roles (sending, receiving, transit) in one way or another (GCIM 2005 p.5; Pécoud, de Guchteneire, 2007:59). Still, we concentrate on these two perspectives, bearing in mind that the sending country is more likely a poorer than the receiving country.

From the empirical material of the economic consequences of migration today, we try to deduce possible consequences of the MWB scenario tomorrow. As outlined in the previous sections, this hypothetical analysis is done from the perspective of the migrant. Our analysis is global because our question is of a global character. We strive to look at the people behind the numbers, and finally suggest ways in which their fates can be improved.

2.4 Constructive summary

In the third and final part, we will summarize our conclusions from our normative and empirical analyses in a constructive discussion. As outlined by both Badersten and Lundquist, we will also attempt a suggestion on *how* the borders of migration ought to look, based on what we've learnt in the two previous sections (Badersten 2006:38, Lundquist 1993:85). Christian Fernandez writes in his dissertation *Medborgarskap efter nationalstaten* that a constructive analysis implies unifying the ideal with the realist, to combine criticism with suggestions of improvement (Fernandez 2005:18). We hope to adhere to this in our constructive analysis.

2.5 Operationalization

When discussing the MWB scenario, we refer to the scenario illustrated in *Migration Without Borders*. The editors, Antoine Pécoud and Paul de Guchteneire wrote an essay later to be reproduced with minor tweaks as an introduction to *Migration Without Borders: Essays on the Free Movement of People*. In this text, they explain that their project prefers to speak of 'migration without borders' as opposed to open borders. This is to convey that the topic is migration specifically and not all other topics associated with borders (Pécoud, de Guchteneire 2005:2).

3 Normative Analysis

What borders should be in place to restrict the movement of people? Should it be a human right to exit and enter any country? Or should state control be regarded as the first and foremost authority in order to maintain security and stability in the world? There are several values at play within the field of migration, but the two that will remain in focus here is that of human rights and the sovereignty of states. We discuss this through two different political ideologies: liberal egalitarianism and realism.

3.1 Human rights vs Sovereignty of states

The Declaration of Human Rights was approved in 1948 by the General Assembly of the United Nations, and is often regarded as a standard of achievement for all peoples and nations. Article 3 states that “Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person” (UN Declaration of Human Rights). One point of view is that this liberty is expressed by the freedom to move and live wherever one wants.

The Human Development Report puts forth that “mobility is a freedom – movement is the exercise of that freedom” (2009:15). Another, more specifically formulated human right concerning migration is part 2 of Article 13 which states that “Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country” (UN Declaration of Human Rights). This concerns emigration and not immigration, and there are plenty of disagreements on whether this is contradictive or not. Either way, the UN’s view that it is a right to move about freely is contradicted by the unwillingness of states to allow open and unlimited immigration onto their territory. In *Global Politics*, Stuart Elden discusses Max Weber’s view on the state as a particularly human grouping living in a specific area in which it can exercise complete control without the concern of other forces (Elden 2009:197). This absolute right for states to govern their own territory constitutes the counterpart to human rights as universal and absolute.

Our conclusion from this is that free mobility should be a human right so we want to further examine this clash of free movement and the sovereignty of states.

3.1.1 Liberal egalitarianism

In regard to both aforementioned human rights, Joseph Carens states that from a liberal egalitarian perspective, the freedom of movement is central. He argues:

First the right to go where you want to go is itself an important freedom. [...]

Second, freedom of movement is essential to equality of opportunity. You have to

be able to move to where opportunities are in order to take advantage of them. Third, freedom of movement would contribute to a reduction of political, social and economic inequalities.

(Carens, 1992:26)

In essence as a representative of the liberal egalitarian view, Carens argues that human rights need to take priority of states' sovereignty, with very few exceptions. While advocating free mobility and the importance it carries, he goes on to point out that certain countries like Japan may wish to conserve their cultural heritage which he feels is a legitimate interest. He draws a distinction between this and racial policies of other countries (such as the White Australia policy) in that it is universal and applies to all non-Japanese (Carens 1992:36ff).

In a way, his arguments lose substance when he argues that free movement is a universal right to be recognized by all. Except the Japanese. James Woodward who was given the task to critique Carens' paper encapsulates the discussion both of Carens and of this part of our paper by explaining the moral problem as one of altruism vs. self-interest (Woodward 1992:64ff). It is beneficial for the greater good to recognize the human right to let people move freely but from a selfish point of view it might be detrimental to one's country.

Woodward also sees other fundamental problems with Carens' arguments. For example, he poses the hypothetical: "suppose all have a fundamental human right to enter, but the consequences of allowing everyone to act on this right are judged to be morally unacceptable" (Woodward 1992:61). He continues to point out that the only way forward based on the assumption that all are equal in the egalitarian point of view, would be some sort of immigration lottery as preferential treatment of certain individuals more in need than others contradicts the values Carens strives to uphold.

In *Ethics, economics and governance*, Mehmet Ugur argues that the liberal egalitarian view doesn't take into account the importance of state interaction and diplomacy, both which can be seen to have their roots in states being respected in their control of their own country as well as respecting others in theirs. There are plenty of views that equality between countries would decrease migration and that this equality comes from cooperation. So although human rights are meant to be universal, the liberal egalitarian perspective leaves out a very vital factor.

3.1.2 Realism

The GCIM says that the discussion on state sovereignty when it comes to migration revolves around security (GCIM 2005:66). This has become more significant as the threat of terrorism has become more prevalent in recent years. When discussing security in international relations, it would be imprudent not to factor in realist theories on the subject. David C. Hendrickson writes in *Political realism and migration in law and ethics* that while realist theories and theorists could certainly recognize the benefit free movement across borders would have for human values, the issue of security does not pass by lightly (Hendrickson 1992:217). This entails not only the security of the state but also the personal safety and well-being of those already living there.

As described by Hendrickson, a state doesn't need to justify the barring of certain individuals beyond possibly claiming national security, public health, domestic order, racial or ethnic affinity, and internal welfare, all of which are broad enough to encompass most people. While there's no integral concern with humanitarian duties among realists, in an ethical discussion such as this, certain issues like individual freedom and protecting people from possible persecution have to play a part. However, many realists would argue that if a state at all has to compromise its control in order to adhere to a greater good, its right as a nation is jeopardized (Hendrickson 1992:218).

The drawback of this argument is that states used to have complete control of the exit of people as well and the relinquishing of power over exits doesn't seem to have weakened the nation-state. Interestingly, Hendrickson points out that it's been found that "those states with the best claim to restrict exit exercise it the least, and that those states with the worst claim to restrict exit exercise it the most" (Hendrickson 1992:226). This, it can be hypothesized is due to the fact that people don't try to leave countries who prohibit exit legally unless they feel they will succeed. If this is the case, it can be argued that the system works, but it still leaves our query unanswered.

3.2 Discussion

If states move to adhere to human rights when it compromises their own rules and exercise of control over its own people and territory, it can be argued that the very existence of the nation-state itself is questioned. If, on the other hand, human rights are altered according to states' wishes, doesn't that also make them obsolete in their entirety?

In a way though, one could contend that both the sovereignty of states and human rights are utopian and unrealistic when it comes to international cooperation. But what's the alternative? If either side was to alter their stance due to empirical actualities, it can be seen as justifying them. For example, if human rights conform to better suit the sovereignty of states then states could take advantage of this development and start ignoring other human rights as well, under the protection that it's been done before. Human rights become an alibi for states' behaviour. This is what states do and states are sovereign, which is absolute, so no one gets a say. And if states let human rights influence their sovereignty, as mentioned above, then what is the point of nations?

From the migrants' perspective, human rights are vital, so from our point of view, this should be prioritized before the sovereignty of states. However, since not all agree that free mobility is a human right, this too is problematic. But since everyone has the right to life, liberty and freedom and if liberty is expressed through mobility, the human rights aspect cannot be ignored. It could be argued that the safety of states lie within the migrants' interests as well, either due to their new home country or family left in the sending country. So the problem of sovereignty vs. human rights remains also from the migrants' point of view.

Where, then, can they meet? One conclusion that can be drawn from the discussion above is that since neither side can be compromised in its current condition, they may need to be redefined. Jack Donnelly, a professor at the University of Denver argues that the idea that the legal idea of countries being totally able to determine their own internal policies is “nonsense” (Donnelly, retrieved 2010-01-02). He goes on to point out that some scholars argue that sovereignty has become less absolute, and that internationalism is inescapable even for the super powers. Furthermore, he redefines the issue in pointing out that neither states nor sovereignty per se are a threat to human rights, but the actions of certain states in certain circumstances may be. He also asserts that:

More states than ever before respect a wider range of human rights, and fewer states than ever before engage in the sort of gross and persistent human rights violations that were the statistical norm just a quarter century ago. [...] In the end, [people, states, and the society of states] seem satisfied to leave sovereignty tempered and modestly humanized by, but in no serious way subordinated to or eroded by, human rights. This has left human rights not a challenger to but deeply embedded within state sovereignty

(Donnelly, retrieved 2010-02-01)

Working from this redefining of state sovereignty as formulated by Donnelly, it seems plausible that letting human rights take priority over the sovereignty of states in some aspects does not necessarily imply as great of a compromise that it originally seemed. From the migrants’ point of view, this would entail a significant improvement of life. This, because illegal migrants that had worked under the radar before would under this new system be eligible to rights, liberties and safety previously unattainable for them. Having found that the values at hand no longer pose as serious of an obstacle as imagined, we now turn to the empirical discussion to see if this is plausible from a practical point of view.

4 Empirical Analysis: The consequences

4.1 Sending countries

The collection *Migration Without Borders: Essays on the free movement of people* argues that migration redistributes wealth at the world level and plays a central role in development and poverty reduction in the sending country (2007:i). Based on this, we begin our discussion on the impact migration has on sending countries on development. We think this discussion is relevant for both the sending and receiving countries as a lot of effort is carried out in traditionally receiving countries to send aid to traditionally sending countries. Since migration flows can have either a positive or negative effect on development depending on the government policies in place, this becomes relevant for all actors. The OECD report states that all impacts migration has on the economy, both positive and negative, can be summed up in three areas: changes in labour force; changes in productivity; and supply of remittances.

The changes in labour force are considered beneficial by some and detrimental by others. People migrating from the home country can lead to a higher supply of jobs for those left which lowers unemployment rates (O'Rourke 2003). This is something the GEP report argues can alleviate poverty because the reduced supply of low-skilled workers in the sending country in turn, can get new jobs and higher wages (GEP 2006:66). The changes in productivity are often the result of high-skilled emigration, but also that a certain kind of workers emigrate. This can have a negative impact on the economy known as brain drain (*Ibid*). The supply of remittances is estimated to be around three times greater than foreign aid to developing countries which makes it very significant in this discussion (OECD 2009:114).

4.1.1 Remittances

One natural outcome of economic migration is remittances, money migrants send to their country of origin. Often, migrants are part of a household strategy aiming to improve the income of the extended family and remittances play a crucial role in this strategy (HDR 2009:71). But to what extent does this improve the development in the sending country?

The HDR estimates that around US\$300 billion arrives in developing countries in the form of remittances (HDR 2009:72). This is an official number, and unofficially it is impossible to know how much money people send to their

relatives, since many ways in which people send remittances are rarely controlled. Philippe Legrain explains that there are also other kinds of remittances funnelled through informal channels, examples of these are unregistered agents like *hawala* in the Arab world, or *hundi* in India. These people don't leave a trace in the official statistics so the remittances are probably significantly higher than estimated (Legrain, 2007:167).

There is no doubt that remittances play a crucial role in the development of countries and the sustainability of local and national economies (GCIM, 2005:26, HDR 2009:72). On a microeconomic level, it is clear that the direct recipients of the remittances profit. This money is often used to buy local products or even better, to invest in the community or education which then furthers the impact beyond the family of the migrant (GCIM 2005:26). But do remittances really benefit the poorest within a country or the poorest countries? According to the GCIM, remittances “evidently provide the most direct and immediate benefits to the people who receive it, many of whom, the World Bank has established, are among the poorest members of society” (GCIM 2005:35). This is important as our argument relies strongly on the fact that remittances reach those who need it in order to further development in the sending countries.

Legrain puts forth the effectiveness of remittances, since they go directly to those who need it. If we compare it to foreign aid, which is often sent through the governments of developing countries that are at bureaucratic at best but at worst, corrupt. Also, aid tends to be construed according to the specific wishes of the sending agent. This can range from certain conditions needed to be met in order to receive the aid, to self-promotion of the sending program or strategy. Either way, it often fails to reach those who need it the most. As quoted by Legrain: “not enough aid gets through to ordinary people in poor countries who need it most” (2005:168-169).

A countering argument is offered by the HDR: “More generally, [...] restrictions imposed by the limited opportunities of the low-skilled to move across borders mean that remittances do not tend to flow directly to the poorest families, nor to the poorest countries.” (2009:72).

The effects on the macroeconomic level are debated more than those on the microeconomic. Fischer et al. (1997:124ff) describe that empirical studies have shown that remittances generally carry positive effects but in almost all cases people don't invest enough which means the possible effects aren't realized to their full potential. However, there are also cases where remittances have a negative impact, for example due to inflationary pressure. Fischer et al. state that “remittances on their own are therefore unlikely to propel countries to a higher level of development” (1997:126). The GEP disagrees, based on a poverty simulation they conducted. This study showed that the absence of remittances would greatly impact poverty in the sending country. For example, in countries where remittances constitute a large part of the economy, they carry the potential to reduce poverty rates by a third. In countries where remittances constitute a smaller part, removing them would increase poverty rates by a fifth (GEP 2006:120).

In the MWB scenario, remittances would continue to play an even more crucial role in the development of poor countries, but the policies around remittances can halt this progress. From the migrants perspective, remittances are very important

as many leave their country of origin so that they can earn more money to better financially support their families.

4.1.2 Brain Drain

The theories regarding brain drain focus on the fact that mostly well-educated people have the possibility to emigrate in order to search for better opportunities in richer nations. The argument behind these theories is that if the most well-educated in a society leave, that society is emptied of its most valued resources when it comes to development (Carens, 1992:32). This is reiterated by the OECD report. However, as is asserted by Woodward, there is no telling that had they stayed, the migrants would've made important political or social changes anyway (Woodward, 1992:33).

The OECD report goes on to explain that brain drain can also be a cause of difficulties in delivering education or health care to those left in the sending countries if there is a shortage of educated workers (OECD 2009:118). Fischer et al. argue that the relation between development and high-skilled people is complex and not as straightforward as the advocates for brain drain claim. Legrain explains that in some cases, the high-skilled migrants who leave can create better conditions for those who stay, by creating a higher supply of jobs and opportunities. One example where this is common is India. Legrain also argues that many migrants return home and that their experience may be an incentive for others to get an education so that they too can travel. Another point of argument is that migrants often try to “pay back” the benefits they've received from their education by investing in as well as creating production in their country of origin. Finally, Legrain says that if countries of traditionally high emigration, like India, China and Cuba, pressure other countries to accept more temporary high-skilled workers it is because they realize the benefits of emigration (Legrain 2007:182ff).

According to the research above, brain drain is a fact of today but it's not necessarily as detrimental as some argue. In a MWB scenario, we think it's important to maximize the positive benefits that come with high-skilled emigration all the while working against the draining of a sending country's resources. From another point of view, the HDR argues that many migrants feel that their skills and credentials go unrecognized in the receiving countries (HDR 2009:64). This is more tragic from the migrants' perspective as it may take away some of the incentive to educate oneself.

4.2 Receiving countries

4.2.1 Labour conditions

In a MWB scenario, one of the fears is that the economic impact on the receiving countries would be damaging, causing the labour market to change significantly for the worse through a raise in unemployment, for example. According to Khalid

Khoser, the impact of immigration is something highly debated in academic and political circles (2007:91ff). It seems that researchers tend to focus on specific aspects as there isn't a clear picture of the overall effect immigration has on the receiving countries, even today (OECD 2009:91).

Since immigration is only a small portion of the economy, the impact it carries on the economy of the receiving countries doesn't seem to be as deep as one might have thought. The HDR presents that most of the OECD reports, as well as studies in Europe, state that immigration's influence on native's wages is fairly small in the long term (HDR 2009:84) One example of this is in the 2009 OECD report, which states that "there is some evidence that migrants do push down wages, but many economics argue that the impact is pretty small and that it doesn't last all that long" (2009:92).

A common misunderstanding is that immigrants 'steal' the jobs of the natives. This fear seems more prominent in Europe, where rate of unemployment is already relatively high (Khoser 2007:92). However, the research points out two factors: first, immigration doesn't increase the level of unemployment (Ugur 2007:80; Khoser 2007:94; Legrain 2007:94), and if it does, it harms mostly the low-skilled native workers leaving the rest of the labour market intact (Pécoud and Guchteneire 2007:80, Castles and Miller 2003:184; Woodward 1992:70). The reason for this is that immigrants often take the so-called 3D jobs: Dirty, Dangerous and Difficult (OECD 2009:92). Thus, they are not in direct competition with most native workers who, as education and welfare improves, tend to avoid those kinds of jobs if possible. Those types of jobs, incidentally, can be the most beneficial to society. BBC Online reports that studies have shown that in the UK, hospital cleaners, create £10 for society for every £1 they are paid. Other jobs that create net wealth for the nation are child minders and waste recyclers, positions also often held by migrants. For comparison, bankers, on the other hand, destroy £7 for every £1 they earn. Ugur argues that immigrants are either complementary (taking jobs that natives don't want) or substitutes (competing with natives over the same type of work). The second case doesn't have to imply only negative effects on the labour market, even if it means that wages may be lowered. This is because if wages fall, the employers can hire more people for less money which in turn creates more jobs (Ugur 2007:78).

Roy Beck puts forth that due to the large increase in immigrants to the United States during the 1970s and 1980s, whole industries came to exploit foreign labour which resulted in ever-deteriorating conditions for all workers in those industries (Beck, 1996). He further argues that this also contributed to decreasing trends of U.S. wages, a trend that has previously gone in the opposite direction. Also Khoser presents possible negative effects in the receiving countries like that of the high level of unemployment among immigrants and the potential welfare cost of migrants' families. He presents the same argument as Beck, but extends it further by claiming that a large pool of low-skilled migrants may be taken advantage of by being put in sweat shops, undermining efforts by labour unions to create better conditions (2007:92ff).

A counterargument for the idea that immigrants take away jobs from natives is that there isn't a fixed number of jobs in society and that those who migrate also create work for others (Stalker 2001:64). One way of doing this, apart from what's been mentioned above is often taking work as child minders or house

cleaners, therefore allowing both parents to work, or work more hours (OECD 2009:91). Obviously this has serious social consequences which we leave out of our study due to our focus on economic aspects.

From the migrants' point of view, the MWB scenario with access to labour markets in other countries, would entail enormous gains for the migrants themselves. This is especially true for irregular migrants, because if the work they do is legalized, they would be able to reap benefits like union deals on safety, social welfare and regular payment.

5 Constructive Analysis

In this constructive analysis, we strive to summarize the discussions and conclusions from the normative as well as empirical analyses. Our aim is to through these summaries, devise suggestions for a possible way forward. Again, this analysis is conducted with the best interest of the migrants in mind. We opted for a free discussion in this part, where our suggestions are embedded in the text.

5.1 Normative summary

In the normative analysis, the main issue examined was the clash between the sovereignty of states and human rights, if free mobility is a human right (which we assume as a basis for this essay). Discussing the issue from the perspectives of liberal egalitarianism and realism, and then through the view of the migrants, we found that the conflict still remained. Our solution to this was to work to redefine the state and its sovereignty. To do this, we turned to Donnelly and his view that states as well as people are content to see sovereignty ‘humanized.’ This suggested to us that the issue of values, such as presented by us, can be overcome which in itself implies that the MWB scenario may be plausible from a normative perspective.

The Report of the Global Commission on International Migration (from hereon referred to as GCIM) maintains that “state sovereignty is the very basis for international cooperation” (GCIM 2005:66). The Report further puts forth four challenges of national governance of international migration: lack of coherence, coordination of policy-making and its implementation, capacity and cooperation of other states (GCIM 2005:65). The issue of cooperation between states is problematic as states need to find a balance of cooperating with others without compromising themselves. The right countries have to control who visits their territory has in recent years become more significant as the threat of terrorism has become more prevalent (GCIM 2005:66). A number of differing points of view are presented by the GCIM to overcome this challenge. First of all, the report feels that states need to “regulate both the content and degree of formality of cooperative interstate mechanisms, and thus exercise –rather than relinquish – their sovereignty in the act of cooperating with each other” (GCIM 2005:66). The report’s second recommendation is that instead of viewing state sovereignty as an exercise of control, one should see it as a responsibility, expected of states as members of the international community. Third, we should remember that cooperation strengthens national competitiveness instead of threatening it. The report puts forth the EU as an example of states maintaining their autonomy all the while cooperating across national borders (GCIM 2005:66).

From the standpoint of the migrants, the recognition of human rights ‘over’ the sovereignty of states would be life-altering. First of all, irregular migrants would be able to work in a safer environment and under better conditions. Second, the deaths of those irregular migrants that never even make across the border could be greatly reduced, if not eliminated. Third, in a globalized world such as today’s, if migration borders are completely open, it could be argued that issues like the people smuggling would be easier to control. Finally, even though many would not seize it, the opportunity for people everywhere to work anywhere is itself a sign of mutual respect, trust and care from the international community.

5.2 Empirical summary

5.2.1 Remittances

Turning now to the empirical analysis, it seems that remittances are an important aspect of the development in sending countries. Remittances do not pose a challenge to either the sovereignty of states or the human right of free mobility. In order to maximize the benefits for the migrants, we think several changes or improvements can be suggested.

Without forgetting the person-to-person aspect of remittances, we agree with the GCIM that government policies should work to lower the transfer cost, increase transparency and encourage competition in the transfer institutions of remittances. Also, we feel that the prospect of offering education to migrants on how to wire money safely as well as if migrants are educated in the long-term benefits of investing in a community they’re then left and finally train migrants in financial aspects to increase their understanding. (GCIM 2005:27). Our point of view is that this is something that could be improved without jeopardizing neither the human rights or the sovereignty of states, and still have important impact on the migrants life.

5.2.2 Brain Drain

We think it is not productive to prohibit people from migrating. Instead, we think that sending countries should do their best to encourage their high-skilled citizens to stay in order to contribute to development. Andrew Green explains that “doctors will settle for lesser wages here than they can obtain overseas if their service is respected, and their working conditions are conducive” (“Should borders be open?” BBC News 2004-04-13). This does not mean that high-skilled people should not be encouraged to migrate on a more temporary basis in order to achieve a personal economic boost as well as deepening their skills through a different experience. A way to draw them back to their country of origin could be by working to create more attractive job opportunities in the sending countries, which we realize is easier said than done. If sending countries can’t compete with receiving countries when it comes to economic resources, research or the

possibility to advance, maybe they can offer viable alternatives. Examples of this could be respected jobs with a high status in society that don't necessarily come with a high pay check, or jobs that let people be close to their extended family. Also, jobs that offer the possibility to impact society may be attractive enough to make people want to return. As stated in the introduction, most people want to stay in their country of origin and with a constructive policy in place in the sending country, both the migrants and the development are to benefit.

Whether brain-drain is a real danger or not, we think that the waste of human capacity is something that in all ways should be avoided. Unlike remittances, brain-drain could be a challenger of human rights, as well as an advocate for it. The human right that "Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person" is both upheld and discarded by the high-skilled migrants in focus. If they stay in their country of origin, it could be argued that they're not realizing life to its full potential but if they leave, they're hindering others from realizing theirs.

5.2.3 Labour conditions

When it comes to receiving countries, we feel they should view international migration as a resource instead of as a problem. People are, in most cases, resources of knowledge, ideas, creativity as well as labour force. We think the best combination in the MWB scenario is to admit high-skilled as well as low-skilled migrants. High-skilled people benefit the receiving countries with their expertise and, as callous as the argument may seem, there are plenty of jobs in receiving countries the natives are unwilling to take on that make for a better option for many low-skilled migrants.

5.3 Concluding arguments

The development in the sending countries depends on the co-operation between countries, and we agree with the GCIM report that international governance in this area is crucial not just for the migrants but for the countries involved as well. Because of this, we think it's important for countries to realize the positive benefits of improved global governance in the field of migration. The HDR states that the main reason for the lack of cooperation between countries is the asymmetric position of developing, or in this study, sending, countries (2009:39). This argument goes hand in hand with Zygmunt Bauman's view on migration as expressed through a hierarchy of power. The receiving and sending countries are at opposite ends of the totem pole.

Since people have, and will always, migrate, we think that it is better to improve the conditions for the migrants rather than ignoring or denying the reality of the situation.

The aim of this paper was to examine whether Migration Without Borders is desirable, or even possible. From what we have come to learn, both from a

normative and empirical point of view, we feel that open migration is very much a conceivable reality. There are certain reservations to this recommendation, as outlined above, but overall we see little reason why the MWB scenario should not play a more considerable role amongst the leaders of today. If it did, migration might be utilized for its contributions, not shunned for its stereotypes.

6 References

Alarcón, Rafael. 2007. "Free circulation of skilled migrants in North America" i *Migration Without Borders: Essays on the free movement of people*. Paris: The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, and New York: Bergbahn Books.

Badersten, Björn. (2006) *Normativ Metod – Att studera det önskvärda*. Denmark: Studentlitteratur.

Bauman, Zygmunt. (1998) *Globalization – The Human Consequences*. Cambridge: Polity.

Carens, Joseph H. (1992) *Migration and morality-A liberal egalitarian perspective* (p.25-47) I: Barry, Brian and Robert E. Goodin (red.) *Free movement: ethical issues in the transnational migration of people and of money*. New York: Harvester/Wheatsheaf.

Castles, Stephen and Mark J. Miller. (2003) *The Age of Migration – International Population Movements in the Modern World*. New York and London: The Guilford Press.

Cole, Phillip. (2000) *Philosophies of exclusion-liberal political theory and immigration*. Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press.

Donnelly, Jack. *State Sovereignty and Human Rights*. [Electronic] Available: <http://mysite.du.edu/~jdonnell/papers/hrsov%20v4a.htm>. [Retrieved 2010-01-02].

Elden, Stuart. (2009) *Why is the world divided territoriality?* (p.192-219) In: Edkins, Jenny and Maja Zehfuss (red.) *Global Economics – A new introduction*. London and New York: Routledge

Fernandez, Christian. (2005) *Medborgarskap efter nationalstaten? Ett konstruktivt förslag*. Lund: Lunds Universitet

Fischer, Peter A., Reiner Martin and Thomas Straubhaar. (1997) *Interdependencies between Development and Migration* (p. 91-133) In: Hammar, Tomas; Broochmann, Grete; Tamas Kristof and Thomas Faist. *International Migration, Immobility and Development*. Oxford/New York: Berg

Global Economic Prospect. (2006) *Economic Implications of Remittances and Migration*. The international Bank for Reconstruction and Development/World Bank. [Electronic]. Available: www.worldbank.org

Harris, Nigel. (2007) "The economics and politics of the free movement of people" (p.33-50) In: Pécoud, Anotine and Paul de Guchteneire (red.) *Migration*

Without Borders: Essays on the free movement of people. Paris: The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, and New York: Bergbahn Books.

Hendrickson, David C. (1992) *Migration in law and ethics: a realistic perspective.* (p.213-232) In: Barry, Brian and Robert E. Goodin (red.) *Free movement: ethical issues in the transnational migration of people and of money.* New York: Harvester/Wheatsheaf

Human Development Report 2009: “Overcoming Barriers: Human mobility and development”. United Nations Development Programme. [Electronic]. Available: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr2009/>

Koser, Khalid. (2007) *International Migration - A very short introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Legrain, Phillipe. (2007) *Immigrants, your country needs them.* London: Little, Brown.

Lundquist, Lennart. (1993) *Det vetenskapliga studiet av politik.* Lund: Studentlitteratur.

OECD, Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development. Keeley, Brian (2009) *International Migration – The human face of globalization.* [Electronic]. Available: <http://www.oecd.org>

O'Rourke, Kevin H, 2003. *The Era of Free Migration: Lessons For Today.* Prepared for presentation at conference on *Globalization, the State and Society.* [Electronic]. Available: http://www.tcd.ie/Economics/TEP/2003_papers/TEPNo15KOR23.pdf

Pécoud, Antoine and Paul de Guchteneire, 2005. “Migration without borders: an investigation into the free movement of people” in *Global Migration Perspectives.* Geneva: Global Commission on International Migration.

Pécoud, Antoine and Paul de Guchteneire, 2007. “Introduction: the migration without borders scenario” in *Migration without borders: Essays on the free movement of people.* Paris: The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, and New York: Bergbahn Books.

Sassen, Saskia. (2001) *Gäster och främlingar.* Göteborg : Daidalos

Shankleman, Martin. “Cleaners ‘worth more to society’ than bankers” *BBC Online.*

Shankleman, Martin. “*Cleaners ‘worth more to society’ than bankers*” BBC Online. Last updated on 2009-12-14. [Electronic] Available: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/business/8410489.stm> [Retrieved 2009-12-16].

Stalker, Peter. (2001) *The no-nonsense guide to international migration*. London: Newint/Verso Book

UN Declaration Of Human Rights. *UN Homepage*. [Electronic] Available: <http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/> [2009-12-07].

Ugur, Mehmet. *The ethics, economics and governance of free movement* (p. 65-96) In: Pécoud, Antoine and Paul de Guchteneire (red) (2007). *Migration Without Borders: Essays on the free movement of people*. Paris: The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, and New York: Bergbahn Books.

“Viewpoints: Should Borders be Open?” i *BBC News Online*, 2004-04-13. [Electronic] Available: http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/2/hi/in_depth/3512992.stm [2009-12-07].

Woodward, *Liberalism and migration* (p.59-86) I:Barry, Brian & Goodin, Robert E. (red.) (1992). *Free movement: ethical issues in the transnational migration of people and of money*. New York: Harvester/Wheatsheaf.