



LA VOZ DE LOS ACTORES

PERSPECTIVES FROM GOVERNMENTS OF COUNTRIES OF ORIGIN AND MIGRANT ASSOCIATIONS

OLIVER BAKEWELL*

ABSTRACT. This paper draws on the oral presentations made by representatives of government and migrant associations at the Bellagio workshop, which gave valuable insights into aspects of the experience of migration and development which do not usually appear in the academic literature. It contrasts the changing perspectives of governments and migrant associations and their relationship. The former are increasing their engagement with migrants and encouraging their investment in the «homeland». Migrants associations are lobbying for migrant's rights in countries of settlement and origin and attempting to build up national and international networks that will strengthen their voice. The paper looks at some of the inherent tensions in the relationship between migrant associations and their states' of origin, which emerged at the workshop. It concludes by looking at some areas for further debate, research and action. These include strengthening «south-south» linkages on migration issues; questioning the enthusiasm for temporary worker programmes among policy makers and some academics; and, the need for research to understand the factors that shape migrants' different paths of settlement, integration and transnationalism. Both the migrant associations and government representatives had much more to say about improving migrants' quality of life and encouraging investments, rather than the role of migration in contributing to an explicit development agenda. There appeared to be little enthusiasm for linking them together in an instrumental way: considering migration as a policy lever to enhance development, or vice-versa, development as a policy lever to manage migration.

KEYWORDS. Sending states; migrant associations; integration; south-south networks.

* Research Officer. International Migration Institute. University of Oxford.



INTRODUCTION

This paper draws on the oral presentations made by representatives (or former representatives) of government and migrant associations at the Bellagio workshop.¹ These complemented the contributions of the academic participants and gave valuable insights into aspects of the experience of migration and development which do not usually appear in the academic literature. The comments of representatives of government and migrants associations were also taken into account by authors in preparing the final versions of their chapters for this book.

The representatives of government included civil servants currently in government service (Mexico, Turkey, Philippines) and ex-civil servants who had been working on migrant affairs through their careers (Morocco, India). Of the former, one was based at an embassy in a country receiving migrants, and two were working with government organisations supporting migrants.

Migrant associations were represented by individuals working for different types of organisation. Four were from organisations based in countries of settlement, two in the US (Mexicans and Indians), UK (Mo-

roccans), Germany (Turkish) and one was working with Filipino migrant women in Japan and on their return to the Philippines. The scale of the organisations ranged from a national alliance of migrant community associations, to a small non-profit organisation channelling funds from migrants to development projects.

None of the participants made any claim to offer the «official» line in the case of government representatives or to speak for migrants in general for those from migrant associations. They presented their individual views and insights. As a result they could speak with candour and frankness, which was very constructive in the workshop. This paper synthesises their presentations and discussions during the workshop, to draw out some of the common themes and highlight some points for further research and debate. It makes no claim to be an authoritative study of the perspectives of governments and migrant associations from the five countries, but rather aims to capture the partial picture offered at the Bellagio workshop.

The next two sections outline the perspectives presented by the government and migrant association participants respectively. The following section draws together some of the points arising from the subsequent discussion which highlighted the

¹ These participants at the workshop included Aditya Das, Aïcha Belarbi, Can Unver, Carlos González Gutiérrez, Carmelita Nuqui, José Molano, Krishna Kumar, Óscar Chacon, Oya Susanne Abali, and Souad Talsi-Naji. I am very grateful for their agreement to my preparing this chapter on the basis of their presentations and the subsequent discussions.



changing relationship between these two groups. The paper concludes by drawing attention to some of the issues for further debate, research and action which were raised by representatives during the workshop.

GOVERNMENT PERSPECTIVES

It is clear that over the last twenty years there has been a general shift in attitude towards emigrants among the governments of sending countries. Those countries which promoted labour migration are now increasing their interest in maintaining links with their respective diasporas. States that had a «policy of no policy» (as it was described by one workshop participant) are now actively engaging with migrants and their descendants. Where some countries such as Morocco had little interest in those who had left, today they are «courting the diaspora» for their investments (especially through remittances), their expertise and even their votes. While initial efforts by states have erred towards controlling migrants – for example, by government establishing migrant associations and trying to sideline political opponents in the diaspora – as such policies have failed, there has been a shift towards more dialogue and a stronger rhetoric of partnership. For example, in India a three stage process was described as the government moved from a policy

of indifference towards emigrants (pre-1973), through a period of encouraging their investment in India (1973–1994), to the government promoting a stronger multilayered relationship, which it recognises must be driven by more than just investment.

Different initiatives in working with migrants

These different policies have been implemented in a variety of ways across the five countries represented. Here these are grouped according to the stages of a migration process, from preparation for departure to re-integration when migrants return to their country of origin.

Pre-departure

Of the five countries, only the Philippines have developed a programme of support specially designed to prepare potential migrants for departure. The Commission on Filipinos Overseas,² a government agency, provides information and advice to migrants on destinations and arranges orientation seminars for those who are planning to leave.

Another key area of pre-departure activity has been tailoring the skills base of potential migrants to improve their job opportunities. The Philippines has a long-standing policy of

² www.cfo.gov.ph/



training nurses, care-workers and seafarers for employment in the international job market, but other countries have generally been less proactive. In recent years, the Indian government has become concerned about improving the skills of migrants to help them move into better jobs. The Ministry of Overseas Indian Affairs is currently working with the Confederation of Indian Industry to revise vocational training and other educational programmes in India to maximise the job opportunities for migrants, helping them to avoid the 3-D jobs – «dirty, dangerous and demeaning» – and move up the «value chain».

Ongoing support

A major concern for governments is the protection of their citizens while they are abroad. Many sending states draw on international law to provide an overall framework for the protection of migrant workers. With the exception of India, the countries represented at the workshop have ratified the 1990 International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. However, the form of protection extended to their citizens overseas varies widely between the different countries and even across different government departments.

Often the focus of protection

is on mediating in the relationship between the migrant and the host state. This protection may be provided through the routine medium of consulate support but it may also involve specialist migrant agencies. For example, the Commission on Filipinos Overseas takes up the cases of Filipinos who lose their citizenship in a new country; in particular, it helps restore nationality and repatriate women who give up their Filipino citizenship on marriage and then lose their new citizenship as a result of divorce. The Institute for Mexicans Abroad (IME)³ provides help to nationals who end up in jail in the US. It has also established a reference system for undocumented migrants who need health care.

Another aspect of protection is the safeguards required for migrants to prevent exploitation or other abuses by employers, agents and other intermediaries. For example, in 1983 India created the office of the Protector General of Emigrants with the task of regulating and licensing recruitment agents and providing emigration clearance for low-skilled workers. However, in practice, this role has remained unclear. There are inadequate punitive provisions in the legislation and weak enforcement. The penalties for infringement of the law are very small and out of all proportion to the massive profits to be made by the exploitation of migrants.

³ www.ime.gob.mx



An alternative approach to ensuring protection is to focus on «de-risking» the migrant, to minimise their exposure to exploitation and abuse and their need for explicit state protection. New initiatives being explored in India include working with insurance companies to provide cover for migrant workers to pay for legal protection and deal with crises while abroad. Other measures include improving migrants' awareness of their rights, enhancing their skills so they can get higher value positions, and developing bilateral agreements with receiving countries to ensure migrants have recourse to legal action to assert their rights.

Support for migrants' integration

Some of the sending states have been particularly active in supporting the integration of migrants into receiving states to enable them to become part of the host society and live secure future lives abroad. This has reached beyond the protection of migrants' basic rights and bilateral agreements on social security, pensions and access to services, to supporting migrants' access to cultural and religious resources.

In the mid 1980s, as it became clear that Turkish immigrants in Germany were not likely to return, the Turkish government realised that it needed to provide more than consular support to them. While immigrants wanted to settle permanently in Germany, they also wanted to be able to speak their own languages, practice

their own religion and pass these and other aspects of their culture on to their children. In response the Turkish government set up initiatives that promoted Turkish culture and religion. It sent over 500 imams and 500 teachers to Germany to work with migrants and their children. It also supported the establishment of over a thousand Turkish migrant associations in Germany and paid the stipends of imams to lead the mosques that these associations started.

The Mexican government by means of IME has also actively supported the integration of its emigrants into the United States through education. It sends Mexican teachers to the US and donates Spanish textbooks for US schools. It has established distance education programmes in 30 US states and funds non-profits to provide adult education scholarships for Mexican immigrants in the US. Such measures are designed to improve Mexicans' levels of education and their opportunities to gain a better standard of living in the US. The Commission on Filipinos Overseas is also supporting education for its emigrants by funding schools for Filipinos working in Gulf countries.

Another strand of IME's support for the integration of Mexicans is to facilitate contacts between Mexican associations in the US. In particular, it is trying to build links between associations of settled Mexican immigrants and emerging communities of new migrants. It aims to create a network of Mexican immigrant and Mexican-American leaders within the



US to ensure that Mexicans play a full role in US society.

Maintaining links with «home country»

There appears to be a growing recognition of emerging forms of transnationalism that embrace settlement and integration while developing migrants' ties with the country of origin. Hence, these policies of encouraging migrants' integration are running in parallel with sending states' attempts to foster ongoing relationships with their emigrants and their descendants. This is made most explicit by the Institute for Mexicans Abroad which aims «to encourage a sense of belonging to our nation among people who *will never reside in our territory* (among 1st, 2nd, 3rd and further generations)» (workshop presentation, emphasis added). All the receiving countries represented at the workshop share a common concern about maintaining, strengthening and deepening links between migrants and their country of origin. A number of different strategies have been adopted in order to facilitating these links and perpetuate them through new generations.

In many cases, migrant associations are seen as a crucial hub for passing on this sense of belonging. The governments of Turkey, Mexico and Morocco have all supported the creation of associations and their activities. For example, over many years, Morocco has been particularly active in ensuring that its migrants remain

connected to the «homeland», starting in the 1970s when King Hassan called on the diaspora to remain Moroccan; this is enshrined in Moroccan law, under which it is not possible to renounce ones Moroccan nationality. The Moroccan government's policy towards migrants used to be focused on control of its nationals abroad – in particular political control – but over the last fifteen years, there has been a marked shift towards finding ways of working with them on a more collaborative basis. The government has started to work with migrant associations as an important avenue for implementation of such policies. It has stimulated the establishment of migrant associations in recent years and in the 1990s it created a foundation to organise cultural and education activities for second generation Moroccans abroad. In 2002, it launched an annual forum in Morocco to bring together representatives from migrant associations and encourage the ongoing engagement in the country.

States have supported specialist media and information channels targeted at their diaspora. IME produces journals, email bulletins and radio messages for the Mexicans in the US. The CFO publishes Filipino Ties, a newsletter for migrants and a Handbook for Filipinos Overseas to giving information on relevant government policies and programmes.

A third strategy to foster links with migrants is through the creation and promotion of investment opportunities in the country of origin. This has not always been straightforward



as the motivations for such initiatives have been open to question. For example, the Turkish government created a special fund for investment by migrants in agriculture and small business but this became identified with Germany's efforts to persuade immigrants to return to Turkey. In any case, these investments rarely led to positive outcomes, due to bureaucracy and lack of adequate infrastructure. More recent initiatives by the Turkish central bank to attract migrants' savings reinforced the perception of some migrants that the state is only interested in them because of the remittances that they generate. The Philippines government has also taken concrete steps to attract migrants' savings. It has recently established an overseas bank and introduced tax exemptions for non-resident Filipinos.

Perhaps the most significant measures to maintain migrants' links with their county of origin have been those that enable them to engage in the domestic political process. Many sending states have taken steps towards allowing them dual citizenship and voting rights. For example, the Philippines introduced legislation to grant the right to dual citizenship and voting rights to migrants in 2003. From 2006, India offered a form of overseas citizenship to members of the Indian diaspora who are citizens of other countries and it is also considering offering voting rights to Indian citizens working abroad. Morocco has encouraged the participation of migrants in elections since 1984, but it focused on those who were supportive of the

regime. Today, there is the promise of legislation which will give migrants the right to vote, but it has yet to be enacted (see Castles in this volume for a more detailed comparison).

Finally, IME also highlighted the role of Mexican migrants in helping reach foreign policy objectives. One element of its mandate is to facilitate migrants becoming a «bridge of understanding» between Mexico and receiving countries. It recognises the role of the diaspora not only in creating new relationships and business opportunities out of Mexico, but also in representing the interests of this country in foreign policy.

Support for return

There were very limited references to support for the return of migrants in the presentations of the government representatives at the workshop. The return of migrants can reflect their success in building up a new life through migration, or their failure to make their way in the destination society, or anything in between. The two initiatives mentioned in the workshop were at either end of this spectrum from «success» to «failure» return. For the former, the Turkish government supports the return of highly qualified migrants by offering them €10,000 if they return to a new job in Turkey. For the latter, the Commission on Filipinos Overseas provides assistance for the reintegration and re-establishing nationality for returning Filipinos, especially those who have been lost their



naturalised citizenship overseas. This has been a particular problem for Filipino women who have taken on a new citizenship on marriage and then been stripped of it on divorce.

MIGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT

In general the governments represented at the workshop no longer officially regard migration as a pillar of their formal development policy – although in the past this was sometimes the case. Even in the Philippines, where the government has most actively supported migration, the Migrant Workers and Overseas Filipinos Act or Republic Act 8042, Section 2c provides that: «the State does not promote overseas employment as a means to sustain economic growth and achieve national development» (see www.pmrw.org/agenda.asp point 1). However, some Filipinos treat this statement with scepticism, arguing that the Government is more concerned with exporting labour than with protecting its nationals abroad. It remains to be seen whether the current international debate on migration and development may encourage sending country governments to re-emphasise this aspect of emigration.

The Moroccan government sees migration changing family and gender relations, rather than making a major contribution to overall poverty alleviation. It does, however, recognise the role of migrants in developing smaller cities through remittances. The Indian government sees development

as the responsibility primarily of the national government and communities. The «transnational community» of Indians resident overseas will only support development activities of their own choice rather than necessarily following government priorities. Despite such practical limitations, all the states are increasingly aware of the potential impact of migration on development and are attempting to adopt policies that maximise its benefits. In particular, they emphasised the importance of creating the appropriate conditions for investment and return, such as building up infrastructure and services, and improving the regulatory framework. These broad measures lay beyond the scope of the workshop. A few concrete steps taken to encourage migrants' investments and support the return of highly qualified migrants were raised and these are outlined in the country case-studies above.

Other programmes that are explicitly aimed at promoting development were also discussed in the workshop. The Mexican *Tres por uno* (Three for one) programme is perhaps the best known of any scheme for encouraging migrants to contribute to development projects. For each dollar invested in development initiatives, the Mexican government (federal, state and local) contributes one dollar each. However, while migrants have contributed nearly \$20 million per year through this scheme, this represents a tiny proportion (less than one per cent) of the \$20 billion overall remittances. The programme operates through home town associations and



the investment does increase both their financial and political weight. The government is also facilitating migrants' investment in housing in Mexico in association as part of a broader housing initiative in the country (known as CONAFOVI).

The Indian government is working with professional bodies to support development projects. For example, the American Association of Physicians of Indian Origin is undertaking basic health care projects in the states of Andhra Pradesh and Bihar.

Migrant associations

There are a huge variety of migrant associations of which only a minute proportion was represented at the workshop. As noted above, this ranged from a large network of associations to a very small community organisation. All were organisations established by migrants, with the exception of the German Körber–Foundation,⁴ which is working intensively with the Turkish community in Germany to strengthen the dialogue between the two countries and their people. However, they were all represented at the workshop by migrants or children of migrants. These individuals spoke not only from their organisations' perspectives but also from their personal experience of migration.

While they shared some common

areas of interest, there were also some illuminating differences. The geographical focus of the various organisations fell on a spectrum between the country of origin and the country of settlement. For example, the activities of Development Action for Women Network (DAWN)⁵ are particularly concerned with supporting migrant women returning to the Philippines from Japan. At the other extreme, the Körber–Foundation is working with migrant associations which are increasingly oriented towards Germany. This is a reflection both of a new generation of leaders who are the children of Turkish immigrant (rather than migrants themselves) and also the expectation within Germany that these associations will facilitate the integration people of Turkish origin in German society. Likewise, Mexican associations in the US are focusing on strengthening the position of Mexican–Americans in US society rather than activities in Mexico.

While all the migrant groups were concerned with issues of development in the sending countries, there are clearly differences in the extent to which they are actively engaged in explicit development activities. For those represented at the workshop, the emphasis of their work is on supporting migrants in improving their quality of life, often through better access to rights and political voice in both receiving and

⁴ www.koerber-stiftung.de/english/index.html

⁵ www.dawnphil.org



sending countries. They are focused on improving the environment for development – in terms of conditions for investment, legal and political reform and so forth – rather than running development projects. One of the few exceptions mentioned during the workshop was the India Literacy Project,⁶ which channels \$1.5 million of remittances each year to 22 NGOs across India to support literacy work.

This heterogeneity was a useful reminder of the need for caution in using the term migrant (or diaspora) association without adequate qualification. However, there were common areas of interest that emerged in the workshop and these are presented below. It is important to emphasise that this is not an attempt to describe fully the aims and activities of the different organisations mentioned. More details of the organisations can be found in their respective websites.

DIFFERENT AREAS OF ACTIVITY FOR ASSOCIATIONS

Migrants' rights

The rights of migrants with respect to both sending and receiving countries were a major concern of the migrant associations. In particular, associations have been lobbying sending states to recognise their role as duty bearer to uphold the rights

of their nationals overseas. For example, migrants' group have calling on governments to reach bilateral agreements with host countries and to sign international agreements such as the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families. In the Philippines, DAWN has been particularly active in providing legal services and counselling for migrant women. It has also played a very active part in Philippines Migrants' Rights Watch and supported the development of its agenda for the protection and empowerment of migrants (see box below).

The National Alliance for Latin American and Caribbean Communities (NALCC)⁷ is working with migrant groups across the US to lobby on the immigration debate. It is still in the early days of building up a network of associations and it noted the difficulty of finding consensus among migrant groups. For example, there are marked differences between Mexican migrants (born in Mexico) and Mexican heritage groups which need to be recognised. In the recent lobbying on the US immigration reform, the latter played a much stronger role in organising the campaign than the former.

Socio-economic support

Closely associated with the issue of

⁶ www.ilpnet.org/

⁷ www.nalacc.org



PHILIPPINE MIGRANTS' RIGHTS WATCH
TEN POINT AGENDA FOR THE PROTECTION AND EMPOWERMENT OF
THE MIGRANT SECTOR

1. Upholding the state's policy of not pursuing overseas employment as a development strategy;
2. Prioritizing the protection of overseas Filipino workers and their families
3. Improving/enhancing government's services and resources for overseas Filipino workers and their families;
4. Participation of the migrant sector and civil society in governance;
5. Implementation of gender-sensitive programs and approaches;
6. More attention to issues affecting Filipino seafarers;
7. Pursuit of more bilateral agreements and Memoranda of Understanding with countries where Filipinos work;
8. Providing interventions for the welfare of migrants' families;
9. Strengthening re-integration programs for returning migrants,
10. Certification of priority bills and ratification of international conventions in the interest of overseas workers and migrants.

See www.pmrw.org/agenda.asp for full statement.

rights, many migrant associations are providing welfare support for migrants in countries of settlement or countries of origin. For example, the Al-Hasaniya Moroccan Women's Centre⁸ in London, offers advice and support on health, welfare, education and training for migrant women and their families, and provides referral advice to help women get access to mainstream services. In both Japan and the Philippines, DAWN supports Filipino migrant women to develop alternative livelihoods and avoid exploitation and abuse.

A major concern raised by migrant associations is the challenge of dealing with ageing in the migrant population. People may aspire to return to their country of origin on retirement but there are few facilities for the support of older people in

developing countries, especially when compared to the services to which they have had access in the destination country. This was identified as a particular concern among Moroccans and Turkish migrants in Europe and migrant associations were lobbying to make pensions and benefits more portable and to make more culturally appropriate services available in receiving countries. For example, the first old people's home for Turkish residents was recently opened in Berlin.

*Building bridges between
sending and receiving countries*

The work of the Körber-Foundation with Turkish migrant associations is aimed at strengthening German-Turkish dialogue, recognising the role

⁸ www.al-hasaniya.org.uk



of migrants and their descendants as natural links between the two countries. Others are creating a different type of bridge between different ethnic or cultural groups now scattered across continents as well as the country of origin. For example, the North American Bengali Conference⁹ initially started as a cultural conference presenting literature, art, cinema, theatre and music of West Bengal to the diaspora in the US, but now aims to reach Bengalis across the world to stimulate «the exchange of ideas to create a cohesive Bengali identity».

Lobbying

As noted above, many of the migrant associations are pressing for improvements in migrants' rights. They are also lobbying on other issues, not directly related to migrants and migration. Migrants have engaged in fundamental debates about the conditions of people living in their country of origin and argued for political reform, democratisation, freedom of speech and so forth. Despite the Moroccan government's attempts to control migrant associations, Moroccan migrants have been critical voice in pushing for change and highlighting abuses of human rights in the country. For example, it was migrant groups that helped to bring the plight of Moroccan prisoners held by the Polisario in Tindouf in southwestern

Algeria into the spotlight and put pressure on the government to negotiate their release.

Mexican migrant associations are also active in domestic politics and the government courts them as an important strand of civil society. However, at times the government appears to give them exaggerated weight over civil society within Mexico as they do not present the same immediate challenge to government power as internal civil society organisations arising from mass movements.

Networking

One of the common concerns about migrant associations raised at the workshop was their disparate nature and lack of co-ordination. This has tended to weaken their voice and make them more vulnerable to co-optation by both sending and receiving governments. In the US, many Mexican migrant groups were formed as hometown associations organised locally in US states (especially southern California, Chicago, Illinois, and Texas) and drawing in migrants from particular home areas of Mexico. However, there is no national Mexican migrant association in the US. Arising out of leadership summits of immigrant led organisations in the US. The NALCC was established in 2004 as a national umbrella body with Latin American and Caribbean

¹⁰ www.nabc2006.org/index.htm



immigrant groups as members. It aims to give a coherent national and international voice on issues affecting

transnational communities as part of a strategy of migrant empowerment (see below).

STRATEGIES FOR MIGRANT EMPOWERMENT

1. Better job education, mobilising communities;
2. Confront lack of leadership – strengthen leaders, build new leaders;
3. Engage decision makers in countries of origin, countries of residence and international organisations;
4. Access and mobilise resources, especially money;
5. Build multi-dimensional, multi-purpose alliances – interest based;
6. Work with research and analysis centres,
7. Impact media and communication environment.

Source: Oscar Chacon, NALCC

In addition, to networking between migrant associations, others also highlighted the importance of working with other actors. DAWN is actively engaged in both national and international networks and conferences on migration issues. For example, it is involved in the Philippines Migrants Rights Watch, which brings together migrant associations, academics and international NGOs to lobby for migrants' rights in the Philippines and abroad.

It was observed that these organisations and networks are largely based on national lines, either focused on one country of origin or destination. What has been missing to date has been any co-ordinated attempt at dialogue between migrant groups from different countries settled in different destinations. As international migration becomes the subject of global debate and governance, the voices of migrants are likely to

be sidelined if they do not organise themselves to ensure they have some space at the negotiating table. The NALCC is building up a network of Latin American migrant associations from around the world. It is also exploring how to extend this to a global migrant network, including migrant associations from all continents.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MIGRANT ASSOCIATIONS AND STATES OF ORIGIN

While the workshop provided a rare opportunity for dialogue between representatives of governments and migrant associations from different countries, participants emphasised that the constructive dialogue should not disguise the inherent tensions between migrants and the governments of countries of origin. While they have different and often conflicting interests, they are tied into a relationship as



long as migrants and their descendants claim a link to their country of origin. This relationship was described as a «bad marriage but a Catholic marriage», with no option for divorce. While the discussion at the workshop revolved around low-key areas of dispute, it is important to observe that in many cases there much deeper and more sensitive conflicts between migrants and sending states, especially where migrants are drawn from political opponents or ethnic minorities seeking asylum. These issues were not raised in the workshop but some are covered in the country case-study papers.

Migrants have found that the approaches by governments in countries of origin have tended to be patronising and are often associated with attempts to control migrants' behaviour. For example, in the Philippines the government refers to migrant workers as «heroes» but this means little to migrants, who argue that the government does not take enough action to invest in services for migrants or to enforce laws protecting their rights. Likewise, the Mexican government highlights its *Tres por uno* programme as a contribution to development, but from migrants' perspectives this is a minimal effort that is dwarfed by the scale of their overall remittances.

In some cases, governments have been instrumental in establishing migrant associations as a channel for dialogue with migrants. The underlying motivation has been mainly concerned with control of nationals overseas and maximising their contributions to foreign currency reserves

through remittances. As a result governments have controlled the agenda and such dialogue has had little space for disagreement. The Moroccan government established associations in the UK but it was argued that these are overwhelming led by men and fail to represent the broad range of (male and female) migrants' interests. This is changing as sending governments are slowly realising that they cannot control migrants and their descendants – especially as they change nationality – and they have started to woo them as autonomous social actors instead. However, major problems of trust have yet to be overcome. As the more powerful actors, governments were seen as having the primary responsibility to take the first steps in addressing this crisis of trust.

Building an open relationship between migrants and states based on trust does not mean that the two parties should agree with each other. They have different interests and perspectives and the relationship is «necessarily adversarial». The challenge is to create the space for dialogue, debate, disagreement and negotiation. For the migrants' part, they have to organise themselves autonomously, in order to build such a productive relationship with states.

TRANSNATIONALISM AND INTEGRATION

There is a growing recognition of the importance of long-term transnationalism among migrants and sending



states. The idea of migration as an act of disloyalty and abandoning the homeland is being left in the past. Sending states are maintaining or rekindling relationships with migrants and their descendants, even those who have already declared their loyalty to another state by changing nationality.

It is striking that one of the sending states' core strategies for encouraging transnational links is the promotion of integration in the country of origin. The discussion about integration during the workshop was focused around initiatives to support migrants' maintaining their language and culture and also establishing a distinctive presence (social, cultural, economic and political) in the receiving society. It was therefore based on an implicit idea of a multicultural society, which migrants would help to shape, rather than any notion of their being assimilated into a given «native» society. From the perspectives of the sending states and migrants represented at the workshop, there is no contradiction between integration and transnationalism (echoing the finding of Portes in this workshop that better established and more economically secure migrants are more likely to engage in cross-border initiatives). As one of the participants observed, within receiving states and societies, it is common to hear the argument that transnationalism impedes or postpones the process of integration and creates conflicts of loyalty. The question is how far this argument is being weakened as states slowly accept people with a migration background as fully fledged members of the society.

The answer may hinge on whether those involved in the debate share a common definition of integration.

EMOTIONAL AND BUSINESS INVESTMENTS

While sending states are keen for migrants to invest in their countries of origin, there was a consensus that they cannot rely on emotional attachments as the rationale for investment. Even when it comes to investments in family businesses, migrants are sending their funds to enterprises where they will achieve a good return, rather than sinking cash into lost causes. The key responsibility of states is to improve the conditions for investment by building up infrastructure (including education and health services), providing an appropriate legislative framework. For example, the growth of businesses established by the diaspora in Morocco has only been possible because the government created the right conditions.

AREAS FOR FURTHER DEBATE, RESEARCH AND ACTION

The discussions at the workshop touched on a range of other issues, many of which are covered in detail in the other papers presented by academic participants. Others contrasted with the academic papers or reached similar points from a different angle. In this final section, some of these issues which leave considerable scope



for further debate, research and action are presented.

It was repeatedly observed that there is insufficient dialogue and co-operation between developing countries on migration. NGOs have made more attempts than developing states to establish south-south linkages but they are still very limited. As a result the agenda is being set and dominated by wealthier receiving countries that are collaborating intensively over migration issues. Establishing mechanisms for facilitating this south-south dialogue was seen as an area for urgent action.

In the discussion at the workshop, both migrant and government representatives criticised some of the current policy trends and academic arguments. In particular, there was a broad unease about the renewed enthusiasm for temporary worker programmes among policy makers and some academics. They rejected the numbers versus rights argument (Martin 2003: 29), i.e. industrialised states will only accept larger numbers of migrants, if they are able to offer a lower standard of rights for them, conversely, better conditions means fewer migrants.

The participants also expressed unease about the emerging discourse of migration. Terms such as «migration management» or even worse «diaspora management» are largely associated with industrialised states controlling the numbers of people migrating to meet their labour needs. From the southern perspective presented at the workshop, the notion

of migration management should also focus on ensuring workers' rights are protected through the migration process. There was also some concern that the term «diaspora» is used too indiscriminately and this tends to smother the differences between people included within the diaspora. NALCC highlighted the important differences in perspectives between people of Mexican heritage in the US and migrants who were born in Mexico; these differences are rendered invisible if they are all described as the «diaspora».

While the workshops marked a step forward in bringing together migrant representatives from developing countries, it was pointed out they could only hope to represent current migrants. In order to achieve a more rounded debate which took account of the views of all the major actors, it is important to consider how potential future migrants can be included in the discussion.

There was a general sense that little is known about the variations between and within different migrant groups and the reasons for them. Why is it that some migrant populations seem to organise themselves more effectively than others? It was observed that Mexicans form the largest group of immigrants in the US, but are much less organised than other Latinos. Filipinos appear to integrate very effectively and disproportionate numbers reach high office in their new country of residence. There is a need for much more international research to analyse and understand



the factors contributing to migrants' different paths of settlement, integration and transnationalism.

Finally, it was interesting to note that in general the migrant associations and government representatives had much more to say about improving migrants' quality of life, migrants' rights, integration and encouraging investments, rather than the role of migration in contributing to an explicit development agenda. All the participants recognised that migration

will have an impact on development and vice versa. However, there appeared to be little enthusiasm for linking them together in an instrumental way: considering migration as a policy lever to enhance development, or vice-versa, development as a policy lever to manage migration. This perspective from the south is perhaps important to note as migration and development are getting increasingly intertwined in a growing number of policy and academic arenas.

REFERENCE

- MARTIN, P. (2003), «Managing Labour Migration: Temporary Worker programs for the 21st Century», *Special lecture on migration*, Geneva: International Institute for Labour Studies, International Labour Organisation.