

**UNITED NATIONS ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE
UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND**

ECONOMIC STUDIES No. 7

INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION: REGIONAL PROCESSES AND RESPONSES

Edited by
Miroslav Macura
David Coleman



UNITED NATIONS
New York and Geneva, 1994

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city, or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

The views expressed in signed papers in this publication are those of the individual authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the United Nations nor the institutions with which the authors are affiliated.

The following symbols have been used throughout this publication:

A dash (-) indicates nil or negligible;

Three dots (...) indicate not available or not pertinent;

An asterisk (*) indicates an estimate by the secretariat of the Economic Commission for Europe;

Use of a hyphen (-) between dates representing years, for example, 1989-1991, signifies the full period involved, including the beginning and end years.

References to dollars (\$) are to United States dollars unless otherwise stated

ECE / ECONOMIC STUDIES No. 7

UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATION
Sales No. GV.E.94.0.25
ISBN 92-1-100688-0 ISSN 1014-4994

Copyright © United Nations, 1994
All rights reserved
Printed at United Nations, Geneva (Switzerland)

Chapter 4

INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION IN LATIN AMERICA: PATTERNS, DETERMINANTS AND POLICIES

Alfredo Lattes and Zulma Recchini de Lattes

4.1 Introduction

The history of international migration in the Latin American and Caribbean (LAC) countries shows three important phases, and these are closely related to three key stages of development in the region. The first phase is a century-long trend of transatlantic immigration with the principal volume arriving between 1880 and 1930. This period of economic history is usually known as the period of "outward growth", because many countries of the region assumed the role of producers of raw materials for the international market. The process shaped the socio-demographic and economic structure of those countries, which today represent more than 75 per cent of the region's population.

In contrast with the first period, the strategy of the second stage was economic growth through the substitution of imports. The influence of Keynes also led to wider intervention by the State and encouraged the idea of development planning. The Great Depression as well as the Second World War notably reduced international immigration, but the new development model generated an enormous rural-urban redistribution of the population in many countries of the region.¹ Rural-urban migration often was intraregional migration as well – to get to the cities, the migrants crossed international borders.

The last wave of immigration from other continents arrived in the years following the Second World War. Overseas migration as well as the intraregional international migration mentioned above were closely related to population shifts to the cities. This period was also characterized by explosive population growth, rapid industrialization, major improvements in education, and a general process of social modernization that in a very few cases reached minimum levels of equity (ECLAC (1990)).

The end of the import substitution stage of Latin American development, which occurred in the 1970s, and the economic crisis of the 1980s gave way to a new

development model based on productive transformation, structural adjustment, and attempts to reopen domestic economies to international markets.² Recently there is de-industrialization, employment increasingly concentrated in precarious and informal jobs, a significant rise in urban poverty, and a drop in migration to large metropolitan areas.

The third phase of international migration in LAC countries began in the late 1960s. It has two outstanding features. First, the region no longer attracts immigrants from elsewhere on the globe. Instead it has turned into an emigration source. Those leaving go especially to the United States and Canada. Second, intraregional migration has increased. There are many changing flows, many of them cases of short-term labour migration, both legal and illegal.

Nowadays, international migration³ movements – intraregional as well as to the rest of the globe – are not the temporary "anomalies" described by many diplomats and politicians (Portes and Walton (1981)). These movements are responses to political conflicts, adverse living conditions, and pronounced inequalities between countries, as well as to the general setback in development suffered by the LAC during the 1980s.

Section 4.2 of this paper provides a brief historical overview of international migration in LAC countries up to the 1960s. Section 4.3 describes regional trends for the period 1960-1980. Section 4.4 discusses recent international migration in the Southern Cone (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, and Uruguay). Section 4.5 summarizes major factors influencing these movements, and considers migration policies in the Southern Cone Countries. Section 4.6 presents some final thoughts.

¹ Estimates are that about 100 million people moved from rural to urban areas between 1930 and 1980 (Lattes (1989)).

² The development setback experienced by the Latin American and Caribbean countries during the 1980s is referred to as the "lost decade". ECLAC (1990) states that "the 1980s represented, in historical terms, a turning point between the previous pattern of development of Latin America and the Caribbean and a phase which is not yet fully defined ...".

³ International migration includes the movement of permanent settlers, temporary workers, refugees, and illegal aliens.

4.2 Brief historical overview

Before the 19th century the region received three important immigration flows: Spanish, Portuguese, and African, the last mainly from Angola and Guinea. A smaller number of British, French, and Dutch went mainly to the Caribbean. Portuguese and Spanish continued arriving after several nations in the LAC achieved independence. Until around 1860, Africans also continued to arrive, as slaves, mainly in Brazil, Cuba, and Puerto Rico. The new states of the region promoted European immigration, but the results were meagre and irregular for some time. Immigrants started arriving in greater numbers in the last quarter of the century. There was a remarkable acceleration in Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese immigration to Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay. Chinese arrived in Peru while Indians continued arriving in Jamaica, Trinidad, and other colonies of the Caribbean. The high point for international migration was 1900-1915. During the last decades of the 19th century and the first decades of the 20th, immigration was one of the principal spurs of economic, socio-demographic, and cultural change.

After the First World War, immigration decreased sharply. It rebounded in the twenties, then diminished again during the Great Depression of the 1930s and during the Second World War. Later, a new – and last – wave of Europeans arrived. This time the main recipients were Argentina, with more than 800,000 immigrants, and Brazil and Venezuela, with more than 500,000 each.

Gross immigration between 1800 and 1970 is estimated at about 21 million. Of more than 1,000 flows detected from 30 origins to 34 destinations, almost all incoming population was concentrated in about 200. Of these, 43 major flows of more than 50,000 people each accounted for over 16 million people. Five flows surpassed 1 million. The Italian flow to Argentina was the largest (more than 3 million) followed by the influx of Spanish to the same country and by Italian, Portuguese, and African flows to Brazil.

A significant percentage of those immigrants returned to their home countries or migrated to other regions. Table 4.1 summarizes net migration to the region over almost 170 years. Seven countries received 92 per cent of the influx, with two – Argentina and Brazil – absorbed 73 per cent. As shown in table 4.2, more than 50 per cent of the migrants originated in four Latin European countries (France, Italy, Spain, and Portugal) while total European immigration accounted for 73 per cent of the overall total.

Ratios of net migration to population size of the destination country indicate that Argentina was the country most demographically changed by immigration, while Brazil was the fourth so affected (table 4.3); Cuba and Uruguay, with lower immigration volumes, had surpassed it.

Records and references indicate that intraregional population movements occurred prior to⁴ and after the arrival of large numbers of immigrants. On the other hand, the creation of new Latin American nations in many cases divided areas inhabited by groups sharing the same culture, so that traditional travel patterns turned into international migration.

TABLE 4.1

Estimated net migration to Latin America and the Caribbean from the beginning of the 19th century to 1970, selected countries and regions of immigration (Thousands)

<i>Main immigration countries and regions</i>	<i>Net migration</i>
Argentina	5 300
Brazil	4 800
Cuba	1 200
Uruguay	600
Venezuela	500
Mexico	200
Chile	150
Rest of LAC	1 050
Total Region	13 800

Source: Lattes (1985).

TABLE 4.2

Estimated net migration to Latin America and the Caribbean from the beginning of the 19th century to 1970, selected countries and regions of emigration (Thousands)

<i>Main migration countries or regions</i>	<i>Net migration</i>
Africa	1 950
Asia	1 550
Turkey, Syria and Lebanon	400
China, India and Japan	900
Other Countries of Asia	250
Europe	10 100
France, Italy, Spain and Portugal	8 000
Great Britain, Ireland, Germany, Austria and Switzerland	1 000
Czechoslovakia, Poland, Russia and Yugoslavia	650
Other countries of Europe	450
North America	200
Total	13 800

Source: Lattes (1985).

⁴ There are several examples in this respect. The first population censuses in Argentina show a significant number of Chileans in the South, Paraguayans in the Northeast and Bolivians in the Northwest. Other examples are Colombians in Ecuador and Venezuela, different movements in central American countries and even between Mexico and the United States.

Until the 1960s, Latin America had been a region of net immigration from other areas of the world. After that time overseas immigration diminished sharply and emigration, especially to the US and Canada, intensified. That became most apparent in the 1970s. Recent international migration involving the LAC is analysed in the following section.

TABLE 4.3

Ratio of net migration to population size (1910)
of the principal countries of immigration,
selected Latin American and the Caribbean countries
(millions)

Countries of destination	Net migration for the period 1800-1970	Total population in 1910	Ratio of net migration to total population, times 100
Argentina	5.3	6.8	77.9
Cuba	1.2	2.3	52.2
Uruguay	0.6	1.2	50.0
Brazil	4.8	22.4	21.4
Venezuela	0.5	2.4	20.8
Chile	0.15	3.3	4.5
Mexico	0.2	14.0	1.4

Source: Lattes (1985).

4.3 Recent regional trends

There are basically two kinds of data available for the study of international migration in Latin America: flow statistics and census statistics. The latter have several shortcomings: (a) the general problems of census statistics, such as omissions, misreporting of age, marital status, economic activity, and other information; (b) the time lags between counts, which mean loss of the movements which take place during intercensus periods; (c) the impossibility of determining, through censuses, the timing of migrations unless additional questions for that purpose are added; (d) the underenumeration of undocumented migrants who purposely do not declare their origins; and (e) the loss of data on those migrants who do not survive until the census date. A comparative analysis of census data is further limited by the different dates of censuses conducted in different countries. This drawback is more critical in the analysis of emigration than of immigration: while different immigration streams into a country are combined in a single census, the number of emigrants for a given country results from the addition of its nationals enumerated and identified by censuses taken by various countries, often at different dates.

Imperfect as they are, censuses still constitute the only available data for establishing patterns and trends in the LAC region. Fortunately, the IMILA project (Investigation of International Migration in Latin America) of CELADE gives information for the 1970s and 1980s for

foreign born populations (stocks), classified by country of birth. These data are from census samples for most countries of the Americas – including the US and Canada – a few European countries, and Australia. Detailed tabulations include demographic and socio-economic characteristics of migrants usually not available in official publications (CELADE (1989) and Pellegrino (n.d.)). The analysis that follows is based mainly on IMILA data. Stocks for the period before 1965 are from censuses between 1950 and 1964 (Kritz and Gurak (1979)). Figures for the 1970s are based on censuses taken from 1970 to 1975, and those for the 1980s come from censuses taken from 1976 to 1985. Still, most reference dates fall within the periods 1970-1971 and 1980-1981.

(i) Overall patterns

Latin American stocks registered by available censuses of the US, Canada, and a few European countries give minimum estimates of cumulative emigration from the region around the years 1970 and 1980. The number of Latin American emigrants in those regions more than doubled in 10 years, going from 1.9 million in 1970 to 4.7 million in the early 1980s, as shown in table 4.4. But these figures are gross underestimates. First, it is widely known that among Latin American immigrants the proportion of illegals – usually not counted by censuses of immigration countries – is high.⁵ Second, other destination countries such as Italy and Israel are not included in the table, as data are not available. The number of immigrants of LAC origin in these countries and others is probably very high. For example, for Argentina the number of emigrant stocks in table 4.4, determined by a special study (Schkolnik (1987)), is 22 per cent higher than the unadjusted figures from IMILA as shown in table 4.7.

If allowance is made for all the groups not included in the calculations (illegals and emigrants to all countries where data is not available), and if the observed trend⁶ is projected to 1990, an estimate of a cumulative stock of at least 10 million LAC migrants around the world is not unreasonable, and probably is even conservative.⁷

⁵ Warren and Passel (1987) estimated a lower level of about 2 million illegal aliens in USA for 1980, the majority of whom would be Mexicans.

⁶ There are reasons to think that the trend observed from 1970 to 1980 in the LAC region accelerated during the 1980s due to the profound crisis and the increasing gap in wealth between the North and the South.

⁷ Additional information was acquired before this report went to press. According to the 1990 US census, a total of 8.4 million people in the US were born in the Latin American and Caribbean countries (CEPALC/CELADE, (1993)). A more realistic estimate of the total LAC migrant stock worldwide in 1990 is, then, 12 million.

TABLE 4.4

Immigrant and emigrant stocks from and in the Latin American and Caribbean countries and other regions
(Censuses from the 1960, 1970, and 1980 rounds, figures in thousands)

Country	Immigrant stocks ^a						Emigrant stocks ^a			
	Born outside LAC			Born in LAC ^b			Outside region		Within LAC	
	Before 1965	1970	1980	Before 1965 ^c	1970	1980	1970 ^d	1980 ^e	1970	1980
Southern Cone										
Argentina ^f	2 100	1 613	1 111	461	580	747	91	154	92	154
Bolivia	12	..	15	24	..	43	9	18	125	142
Brazil	1 328	1 158	1 002	76	71	109	38	57	105	173
Chile	72	59	46	32	30	39	24	67	158	277
Paraguay	17	16	19	32	64	150	2	7	252	279
Uruguay	126	95	71	40	37	32	9	22	74	144
Total Southern Cone	3 654	2 941	2 264	665	782	1 119	172	325	808	1 169
Other South America										
Colombia	19	51	67	155	197	569
Ecuador ^g	8	..	21	19	..	54	38	94	11	28
Guyana	5	1	12	87	3	2
Peru	..	44	43	..	23	24	25	65	11	46
Venezuela	381	361	424	161	222	651	24	47	6	7
Total Other S.A.	408	405	493	231	245	730	165	448	228	653
Central America										
Costa Rica	2	9	15	33	37	74	17	31	12	7
El Salvador	4	2	..	31	20	..	16	97	20	29
Guatemala ^g	14	10	10	37	27	30	18	66	12	3
Honduras	5	3	..	46	47	..	28	40	29	8
Mexico	88	166	233	122	25	36	769	2 217	14	19
Nicaragua ^g	11	5	..	3	16	..	16	45	29	54
Panama	9	29	16	36	28	32	21	62	8	8
Total CA	132	224	274	309	200	172	886	2 557	125	128
Caribbean										
Barbados	17	2	9	41	7	1
Cuba	119	98	..	33	32	..	459	628	20	20
Dominican Republic	11	11	..	34	21	..	63	171	5	18
Haiti	..	3	3	..	33	120	43	2
Jamaica	94	275	12	3
Trinidad & Tobago	..	50	10	..	38	105	5	7
Total Caribbean	130	162	17	67	66	2	695	1 341	92	51
Total region	4 324	3 732	3 048	1 272	1 293	2 023	1 919	4 671	1 248	2 001

Sources: 1950-64 and Honduras 1970: Kritz and Gurak (1979); 1970 round and 1980 round: CELADE (1989), except otherwise indicated.

^a Census dates for LAC countries can be seen in the Annex.

^b This information is underestimated since not all LAC countries have been included in each country's tabulations, but only the countries of birth presenting the largest numbers of foreign-born.

^c Stocks include LAC countries and North America.

^d The following censuses are included: USA (1970), Canada (1971), Australia (1971), Spain (1970), Norway (1970), FRG (1970), Sweden (1970), Switzerland (1970).

^e The following censuses are included: USA (1980), Canada (1981), Belgium (1981), Netherlands (1985), New Zealand (1981), FRG (1984), Australia (1971), Spain (1971), Norway (1970), and Sweden (1970). The last four censuses have been repeated due to lack of information from the 1980 round.

^f Argentina's emigrant stocks for 1970 and 1980 were taken from Schkolnik (1987).

^g For the 1960 round, total immigrant stock was distributed among "other regions" and "LAC" according to the proportions observed in the census of the following round.

What happened with flows into the LAC from outside the region? As previously mentioned, and as shown in table 4.4, immigrant stocks diminished sharply from about 1970 to about 1980. The trend probably continued during the 1980s. A quick calculation gives net migration numbers at these dates,⁸ with the following results:

<i>Migrant stocks to and from LAC</i>	1970	1980
	<i>(in thousands)</i>	
Immigration	3 732	3 048
Emigration	1 919	4 671
Net migration	1 813	-1 623

Some clarifications are needed to interpret these figures. Immigration flows reflected in the 1970 results occurred mainly in the 1950s and earlier, while emigration is a recent phenomenon. In other words, if instead of stocks at 1970, immigration and emigration for the period 1960-1970 were calculated, it would be possible that net migration was negative. If, on top of that, emigration figures were adjusted for underenumeration, negative net migration would be much greater, not only for the 1960s but also for the 1970s. Though more detailed analysis for individual countries follows later on, it is worth noting here that emigrant stocks from Mexico, Cuba, and Jamaica account for two thirds of the total population born in the LAC and enumerated outside the region. The South-to-North migration trend will probably continue if it remains linked to the desire of Latin Americans for better living conditions and opportunities. These are goals the Europeans themselves pursued when they came to the LAC in earlier times.

(ii) Principal immigration countries

Migrant stocks in Latin America from the 1960, 1970, and 1980 round of censuses indicate the main patterns of international immigration in the region at each time, while comparisons of two consecutive dates show the main changes during the 1960s and 1970s. Those born in other regions have been separated, for analytical purposes, from those born in foreign Latin American countries whose country of birth could be identified.⁹ If the *ratio* of population born outside the LAC to the total enumerated population in each of the countries at each date is taken as the indicator (table 4.5), at the three dates Argentina stands

out as the main overseas immigration country of the region with 10.5, 6.7, and 3.9 per cent of its population born in other regions (mainly Europe, though in recent times there is a significant Asian component). (Barbados has been left aside because of the small size of its population, but in 1980 it had by far the highest proportion of migrant stock from other regions.) Argentina is followed by Venezuela and Uruguay, which had much lower percentages on the first two dates. Trinidad and Tobago also stands out with 2.7 per cent in 1970. Cuba, Brazil, Chile, and Panama contain from 1 to 2 per cent of foreign-born population from regions beyond the LAC, either at the two first dates or only at the second. All other countries have much lower proportions at every date.

In short, only the countries of traditional European migration plus Panama and Trinidad and Tobago show a significant proportion of immigrants from outside the LAC. In these countries the decline of such immigration from the 1960s to the 1970s and through the 1980s is chiefly the result of the halt of European movements and attrition by mortality of old migrant cohorts. The trend for the region as a whole reflects the behaviour of this small group of countries.

Table 4.5 also shows the ratios of immigrant stocks from LAC countries (of immigrants born within the region). For 1970 the main immigration countries for migrants of LAC origin were Paraguay, Argentina, Venezuela, Costa Rica, and Panama, with percentages close to or over 2 per cent, and Honduras with 1.8 per cent for 1970. For 1980 Paraguay and Venezuela stand out with 4.9 and 4.5 per cent, respectively. Costa Rica had 3.1 and Argentina 2.6 per cent.¹⁰ All other countries show lower proportions, frequently near zero. In other words, there are very few countries with a significant proportion of population born in other countries of the region. Those few show major increases over the 1970s, with the exception of Panama. For the region as a whole the proportion of LAC immigrants increased slightly from 0.5 to 0.6 per cent from 1970 to 1980.

The *size* of migrant stocks (table 4.4) indicates a picture quite different from the ratios given above. Argentina still shows the largest number of overseas foreign born persons, as identified by the three censuses. But Brazil, another major destination for European migrants, stands out as the second most important recipient during the same years, and Venezuela the third. Mexico is the fourth, and Uruguay, Cuba, and Chile follow. As for intercensus changes, four countries show significant

⁸ Immigrant stocks are missing for several countries (see table 4.4). As these countries are not countries of immigration, filling in the data for them would not have altered the overall trend.

⁹ Not every LAC country has been identified as country of birth by each census, but only those that are the most important countries of origin of the foreign born population. Because of this, migrant stocks from the LAC have been systematically underestimated and migrant stocks from other regions systematically overestimated. But errors introduced this way are, of course, insignificant in comparison with other data shortcomings, as expressed before. For the 1960s or previous censuses LAC immigrant stocks also include Canadians and North Americans. Stocks from these origins are meaningless in most LAC countries but Mexico and Panama.

¹⁰ As Paraguay has traditionally been an emigration country, this increase in the proportion – and in the number – of foreign born population in its territory is the consequence of nationals returning home with children and spouses born abroad, a movement related with the economic boom witnessed by this country in the late 1970s. The increase in the ratio for Costa Rica in the 1970s reflects political upheavals in Central America and the arrivals of refugees from this subregion. The increase in the ratio for Venezuela reflect gains from new immigration waves of foreign born population.

TABLE 4.5
Ratio of immigrant and emigrant stocks to total enumerated population
(Per cent)^a

Country	Immigrant stocks						Emigrant stocks			
	Born outside LAC			Born in LAC			Outside region		Within LAC	
	Before 1965	1970	1980	Before 1965 ^b	1970	1980	1970 ^c	1980 ^d	1970	1980
Southern Cone										
Argentina	10.5	6.7	3.9	2.3	2.4	2.6	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.5
Bolivia	0.4	..	0.3	0.8	..	0.9	..	0.4	..	3.1
Brazil	1.9	1.2	0.8	0.1	0.1	0.1	-	-	0.1	0.1
Chile	1.0	0.6	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.6	1.7	2.4
Paraguay	0.9	0.7	0.6	1.8	2.7	4.9	0.1	0.2	10.7	9.2
Uruguay	4.9	3.4	2.4	1.5	1.3	1.1	0.3	0.7	2.6	4.8
Total Southern Cone	3.5	2.2	1.3	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.1	0.2	0.6	0.7
Other South America										
Colombia	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.9	2.0
Ecuador	0.2	..	0.3	0.4	..	0.7	0.6	1.2	0.2	0.3
Guyana	0.6	0.1	1.7	10.0	0.5	0.3
Peru	..	0.3	0.3	..	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.1	0.3
Venezuela	5.1	3.4	2.9	2.1	2.1	4.5	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.1
Total Other S. America	1.0	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.5	1.1	0.3	0.7	0.4	1.0
Central America										
Costa Rica	0.2	0.5	0.6	2.4	2.0	3.1	0.9	1.3	0.7	0.3
El Salvador	0.1	0.1	..	1.3	0.6	..	0.5	..	0.6	..
Guatemala	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.9	0.5	0.5	0.3	1.1	0.2	..
Honduras	0.2	0.1	..	2.5	1.8	..	1.1	..	1.1	..
Mexico	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	-	0.1	1.5	3.1	-	-
Nicaragua	0.7	0.3	..	0.2	0.9	..	0.9	..	1.6	..
Panama	0.8	2.0	0.8	3.4	1.9	1.6	1.4	3.2	0.5	0.4
Total C. America	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.7	0.3	0.2	1.3	3.2	0.2	0.2
Caribbean										
Barbados	6.9	0.6	3.6	16.6	2.8	0.5
Cuba	2.0	1.2	..	0.6	0.4	..	5.4	6.5	0.2	0.2
Dominican Republic	0.4	0.2	..	1.1	0.5	..	1.4	3.0	0.1	0.3
Haiti	..	0.1	0.1	..	0.8	2.4	1.0	-
Jamaica	5.1	13.1	0.7	0.1
Trinidad & Tobago	..	2.7	0.5	..	2.0	9.9	0.3	0.7
Total Caribbean	1.5	0.8	0.1	0.8	0.3	-	3.3	5.6	0.4	0.2
Total region ^e	2.2	1.3	0.9	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.7	1.4	0.4	0.6

Sources: Table 3 and Annex.

^a Population and census dates can both be seen in the Annex.

^b Stocks include LAC and North America.

^c The following censuses are included: USA (1970), Canada (1971), Australia (1971), Spain (1970), Norway (1970) FRG (1970), Sweden (1970), Switzerland (1970).

^d The following censuses are included: USA (1980), Canada (1981), Belgium (1981) Netherlands (1985), New Zealand (1981), FRG (1984), Australia (1971), Spain (1971), Norway (1970), and Sweden (1970). The last four censuses have been repeated due to lack of information from the 1980 round.

^e The denominators are the figures given for the total region in Annex, with no allowance made for missing data.

increases in numbers of residents born outside the LAC: Costa Rica, Mexico, Paraguay, and Venezuela (table 4.6).

The size of LAC foreign born populations enumerated in LAC countries indicates a different picture (table 4.4). The six countries included under the heading of Southern Cone contain, at both dates, but especially in 1970, much more than 50 per cent of all LAC migrant stocks in the region. Argentina, Venezuela, and Brazil were the most important destination places for LAC foreign born migrants in the 1970s, in that order. In 1980 the number of LAC foreign born enumerated in Venezuela was much closer to the equivalent figure for Argentina, but

Paraguay was third. As for intercensus changes, Venezuela and Paraguay presented the largest increases in the number of foreign born migrants from the 1970 to the 1980 censuses: 193 and 134 per cent, respectively (table 4.6). They were followed rather closely by Costa Rica (100 per cent), and much more distantly by Brazil and Mexico. Argentina, with the largest number of LAC foreign born in its territory, presented a relatively modest increase of 29 per cent for the same period. The only country showing a decrease was Uruguay.

To summarize, these data show three main centres of attraction for intraregional migration in Latin America: (1)

Argentina was the most popular destination in the Southern Cone; (2) Venezuela received migrants mainly from neighbouring Colombia but also from practically all other LAC countries, whether close or distant; and (3) Costa Rica received migrants (mainly as refugees or displaced persons) from Nicaragua and other central American countries. The large number of refugees observed in recent years in several central American countries and Mexico (United Nations (1991)), will probably show in the data from the 1990 census round and thus a fourth centre of attraction for migrants is likely to appear, at least if efforts to repatriate them do not succeed.

The subregion presenting the largest number of intraregional migrants is, by far, the Southern Cone of South America, including Brazil. More detailed analysis, using the most recent information available, will be made afterwards for this area.

(iii) Main emigration countries

Analysis of emigration also has been divided between emigration to countries outside the region and emigration within the region. Around 1970, for most countries of the region, there was little loss of emigrants to areas beyond the LAC. These flows came on average to less than 1 per cent of national population. Only four countries showed ratios of 2 per cent or higher, and all were located in the Caribbean. In 1980 the situation changed markedly. Most countries saw increasing numbers leave for elsewhere in the world: only 9 out of 21 countries had ratios lower than 1 per cent, while another 9 had figures ranging from 2 to 17 per cent. In 1970, most of these countries were located in the Caribbean. Among Latin countries, Mexico and Panama stand out for their ratio of emigrants (3.1 and 3.2 per cent, respectively).

The largest stock of LAC migrants enumerated outside the region are from Mexico – whose total almost tripled from 1970 to 1980 – Cuba, and Jamaica (table 4.4). Stocks from all other countries were below 100,000 for 1970. The equivalent numbers for 1980 increased sharply for most Caribbean countries, amply surpassing this threshold. Argentina also showed a marked expansion of its population outside the region. Additional noteworthy emigration countries were Colombia, El Salvador, and Ecuador.

The previous section showed the increase of intraregional immigration in the 1970s. This means that intraregional emigration also increased in the same period. If the *ratio* of emigrants within the region to the country's enumerated population is taken as the indicator, Paraguay – one of the main immigration countries – stands out as the main emigration country with 10.7 and 9.2 per cent, respectively, in 1970 and 1980. All other countries were far below that level in 1970, with only Barbados and Uruguay showing more than 2 per cent (2.8 and 2.6). In 1980, most countries with relatively high proportions of emigrants within the region were located in the Southern

TABLE 4.6

Intercensal change^a of foreign-born stocks, 1970-80
(Per cent)

Country ^b	Born outside LAC	Born in LAC
Southern Cone		
Argentina	-31.1	28.8
Brazil	-13.4	52.8
Chile	-22.5	28.8
Paraguay	20.0	134.3
Uruguay	-25.3	-13.5
Other South America		
Peru	-2.9	5.3
Venezuela	17.5	193.1
Central America		
Costa Rica	63.0	100.5
Guatemala	0.7	11.7
Mexico	40.5	42.7
Panama	-46.3	14.8

Source: table 4.3

^a Stocks in 1980 minus stocks in 1970 divided by stocks in 1970, per 100.

^b Countries with information for the last two censuses only.

Cone: Uruguay (4.8), Bolivia (3.1) and Chile (2.4). The only other important case was Colombia, at 2 per cent. Colombia and all countries of the Southern Cone also stand out for the *number* of intraregional emigrants at both dates.

4.4 International migration in the Southern Cone

(i) Recent patterns

Table 4.7 presents, for the 1980 round of censuses, the numbers of people born in the six countries of the Southern Cone and enumerated elsewhere in those same six countries and other nations within and outside the region. As mentioned before, Argentina is, by far, the main destination country of the region, especially for those born in Bolivia, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay. The second most attractive Southern Cone country for intraregional migrants is Paraguay, mainly for people born in Brazil and Argentina. Another Southern Cone country which attracts numerous neighbours is Brazil – from Argentina and Uruguay, and from Chile and Paraguay to a lesser extent. In other words, intraregional migration among Southern Cone countries is very intense and the six countries form an almost closed system: there are very few immigrants from other LAC countries and, conversely, not many nationals from the Southern Cone emigrate beyond the area. Each pair of countries sharing borders interchanges large numbers of migrants, with a few exceptions (such as Bolivia and Paraguay). Brazil even attracts some remote migrants from Chile. On the other hand, certain streams, such as that of Argentines to Bolivia and Chile could very well reflect, as for Paraguay, return migration with spouses and children born in Argentina.

TABLE 4.7
Population born in the Southern Cone countries and enumerated outside the country of birth, around 1980
(Thousands)

Country /region of enumeration	Census year	Country of birth						Total Southern Cone	Other LAC	Total LAC
		Argentina ^a	Bolivia	Brazil	Chile	Paraguay	Uruguay			
Southern Cone										
Argentina	1980	-	116	42	207	259	110	734	13	747
Bolivia	1976	15	-	8	8	1	-	32	11	43
Brazil	1980	27	13	-	18	18	21	96	12	109
Chile	1982	20	6	2	-	-	1	29	9	39
Paraguay	1982	44	1	99	2	-	2	147	3	150
Uruguay	1985	20	-	12	-	-	-	32	-	32
Total S.Cone		124	135	164	234	278	134	1 070	49	1 119
Other LAC										
Venezuela	1981	12	2	4	25	-	7	51	600	651
Peru	1981	5	3	3	6	-	1	18	7	24
Mexico	1980	5	-	1	3	-	2	11	25	37
Other LAC ^b		3	1	1	8	-	1	15	178	193
Total Other LAC		25	6	10	43	1	10	95	810	905
All LAC		150	142	173	277	279	144	1 165	859	2 024
Non-LAC										
Canada	1981	7	1	4	15	3	4	35	230	265
United States	1980	69	14	41	35	3	13	176	4 056	4 232
F.R. Germany	1984	4	1	6	6	-	1	19	13	32
Other ^c		12	1	6	11	-	3	34	46	81
Total non-LAC		93	18	57	67	7	22	264	4 346	4 610
Total		243	160	231	344	285	166	1 429	5 205	6 634

Source: CELADE (1989).

^a Figures for Argentina differ from those in table 4.4. For comparative purposes information for this table has been taken from CELADE (1989) since corrected figures were not available for the other countries.

^b Colombia (1985), Ecuador (1982), Guyana (1980), Costa Rica (1984), El Salvador (1971), Guatemala (1981), Honduras (1974), Nicaragua (1971), Panama (1980), Barbados (1980), Cuba (1981), Dominican Republic (1981), Haiti (1982), Jamaica (1982), Trinidad and Tobago (1980).

^c Belgium (1981), Netherlands (1985), New Zealand (1981), Australia (1971), Spain (1970), Norway (1970), Sweden (1970), Switzerland (1970).

Emigration from the Southern Cone countries is also significant. The main destinations are the six countries themselves – they receive more than three quarters of all Southern Cone emigrants. The only countries that do not have three quarters of their emigrants originating in the Southern Cone are Argentina (51 per cent), Chile (68) and Brazil (71). Among other LAC countries the most notable recipient is Venezuela for Chileans and Argentines, although both flows are only small fractions of the stock of emigrants in Southern Cone countries. Outside the region, the US is the most attractive destination: it is the number one attraction for migrants from Argentina, ranks second for those leaving Chile and Bolivia, and is the third most common destination for migrants from Brazil and Uruguay.

The total emigrant stock varies from 160,000 for Bolivia to 344,000 for Chile (table 4.7). But the impact on the population of the country of birth differs much more widely. The ratio of emigrant stocks to those populations varies in percentage terms from a minimum of 0.1 in Brazil to 1 in Argentina, 3 in Chile, 3.5 in Bolivia, 5.5 in Uruguay and 9.4 in Paraguay (table 4.5). Still, these figures are rather misleading, as said before, because data are lacking for many important countries of destination outside the region. Studies of emigration available for Argentina and Uruguay permit us to add the details for

these countries and, at the same time, to extrapolate about the quantity and quality of data for other countries.

According to Schkolnik's (1987) estimates for 1980, more than 5,000 Argentine emigrants were enumerated in the following countries (that is, besides the countries included in table 4.7): Israel (20,000), United Kingdom (14,000), Spain (13,000) and Australia (5,000). Adding up the data for all countries of enumeration Schkolnik arrives at a total of 308,000 emigrants for 1980 – the number included in table 4.4 – instead of the 243,000 of table 4.7. Based on Schkolnik's calculations and a number of other reports, Lattes (1987) further concluded that 325,000 was the minimum stock in 1980 – in other words, the minimum figure was 34 per cent higher than that in table 4.7. It is thought that emigration continued after that time, but a number of Argentines returned home under the process of democratization that began in Argentina in late 1983, and especially during the first years of the legitimate government.

Similarly, the Uruguay Comisión Nacional de Migración (1990) estimates an intense migratory process of population born in that country to Europe, North America, and Australia, occurring parallel to flows to traditional countries of emigration such as Argentina and Brazil. Emigration would have reached the highest point in the mid-1970s as a consequence of the political crisis

TABLE 4.8
Distribution of migrant stocks in Argentina, 1980
and Paraguay, 1982
(by period of arrival)

Period	Country of birth		Total
	Southern Cone	Other	
Argentina			
Before 1960	36.3	81.5	54.1
1960-1969	22.1	9.0	17.0
1970-1980	41.6	9.4	29.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Paraguay			
Before 1960	5.5	37.7	10.0
1960-1969	6.0	8.7	6.4
1970-1982	88.5	53.6	83.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Own calculations from CELADE (1989), tables 3b and 11b.

suffered by the country. The massive exodus even provoked a decrease of the population of Montevideo, the capital and largest city of Uruguay. The total number of Uruguayans in foreign countries has been estimated at 300,000 about 1980 (Uruguay Comisión Nacional de Migración (1988)), – an enormous amount for a country with less than 3 million inhabitants in 1985, and also almost double the total in table 4.7. On the other hand, starting in 1981, and with increased intensity since 1985, a number of emigrants are returning home as national political institutions return to normal.

Detailed information on the period of arrival for the foreign born population in Argentina, Paraguay, and the US helps us to interpret the previous description better. Foreign born population from neighbouring countries constituted only 20 per cent of the total number of foreigners who arrived in Argentina prior to 1960, but they constituted 84 per cent of all those who arrived after that date (data from CELADE (1989) not shown). In other words, out of those 734,000 foreign born from neighbouring countries enumerated by the 1980 census, 64 per cent, or close to half a million, arrived after 1960 (table 4.8). During the same period, on the other hand, very few born in other countries arrived. If the 1970s are taken as the reference date, 42 per cent of neighbouring country foreign born arrived in those years. In other words, immigration to Argentina from neighbouring

countries started to intensify during the 1960s and did so even more during the 1970s.

Immigration to Paraguay, traditionally an emigration country, is even more concentrated: 89 per cent of all migrants arrived between 1970 and 1982 (table 4.8). The 1970s also witnessed the largest emigration from the Southern Cone to the US. From 43 to 65 per cent of all immigrants from these countries to the US arrived during the 1970s (table 4.9).

To summarize, intraregional migration in the Southern Cone intensified during the 1960s and even more so during the 1970s. At the same time the number of emigrants going overseas – especially to the United States – escalated to the highest numbers ever observed. But it is imperative to underline, once more, that the data are affected by many significant problems. Migrant stocks give gross estimates of migration phenomena in countries with large numbers of illegal migrants, such as Argentina. Since flows are short-term responses to economic and political shifts, they may change very rapidly.

(ii) Characteristics of selected migration streams

As seen in the previous section, intraregional migration in the Southern Cone is heavy, probably much heavier than the census figures can show. All countries have in their territories populations of people born in adjacent countries. For each migration stream there is a counterstream, though of different size. But are these streams interchanging people of similar characteristics? Is there any similarity between immigrants and emigrants of the same country? Not at all. Tables 4.10 and 4.11 show, for the main migration streams, how different they are.

Let us first observe migrant stocks in Argentina. Different streams arrived at different times: migrants from Uruguay were especially numerous in the 10 years previous to the 1980 census; migrants from Chile came in lower concentrations in the 1970s than did migrants from Bolivia and Paraguay, which are the two oldest neighbouring-country streams into Argentina. Most other characteristics also differ. Bolivians and Chileans in Argentina are predominantly male and have median ages of 37.7 and 36.3 years. Only a small proportion are highly educated, and those in the labour force work mostly as manual non-agricultural and agricultural workers, although

TABLE 4.9
Distribution of migrant stocks from Southern Cone in the US in 1980 by period of arrival

Period	Country of birth						Total
	Bolivia	Brazil	Chile	Argentina	Uruguay	Paraguay	
Before 1960	11.8	20.6	11.3	16.5	5.7	11.1	15.1
1960-1969	33.7	31.3	26.8	40.3	28.8	38.3	34.1
1970-1980	54.5	48.1	61.9	43.2	65.4	50.6	50.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Calculations from CELADE (1989), table 16c.

TABLE 4.10
Some demographic and socio-economic characteristics of selected stocks of international migrants
enumerated in Argentina, Brazil and Paraguay, 1980 census round

Characteristic	Enumerated in Argentina				Enumerated in Brazil			Enumerated in Paraguay	
	Born in				Born in			Born in	
	Bolivia	Chile	Paraguay	Uruguay	Argentina	Paraguay	Uruguay	Argentina	Brazil
Number of migrants	115 616	207 176	259 440	109 724	26 633	17 560	21 238	43 336	97 961
Per cent arrived during 1970s ^a	32.1	47.2	34.1	65.4	73.6	94.0
Mean age	37.7	36.3	39.5	36.8	40.8	35.2	38.9	21.0	23.8
Sex ratio	123.4	109.5	85.6	93.3	101.4	99.8	107.6	97.6	115.3
Per cent 10+ yrs of education ^b	13.0	14.5	11.2	30.4	45.5	19.4	32.0	19.6	2.8
Activity rate ^b	57.3	56.0	54.1	51.9	48.7	56.3	54.2	47.8	55.4
Per cent professionals ^c	4.1	3.3	3.4	8.3	24.9	9.3	15.1	8.7	0.9
Per cent manual non-agricultural workers ^c	48.8	50.2	50.6	36.0	10.7	20.5	18.2	20.6	10.4
Per cent agricultural workers ^c	22.3	12.6	9.8	1.8	3.4	21.3	8.8	27.2	75.7
Personal services ^c	9.0	14.8	18.0	17.9	11.8	14.1	9.9	7.2	2.8

Source: Pellegrino (n.d.), tables 14, 16, and 18.

^a Arrived between 1970 and the census date early in 1980s.

^b Per cent of the population aged 10 years and over.

^c Per cent of the total labour force.

among those born in Chile, 15 per cent are employed in personal services, a majority of them women (data not shown).¹¹ Paraguayan and Uruguayan immigrants, on the other hand, are predominantly female and their median age is older than for the first group. Paraguayans are even less well educated than Bolivians and Chileans. Migrants from Uruguay, meanwhile, include a much higher proportion with at least 10 years of education – reflecting the generally higher level of education in that country as well as the inability of Uruguay's labour market to absorb all qualified potential employees. The educational characteristics of each migrant stream are reflected in the occupational distribution: 51 per cent of workers from Paraguay are manual non-agricultural workers and 18 per cent are employed in personal services, while the proportion of manual workers is much lower for Uruguayans and the proportion in professional occupations is higher.

Argentines in Brazil and the US have completely different characteristics from most Latin Americans in Argentina: they are predominantly male, with median ages of 40.8 and 37.2, respectively, are well-educated (especially those in the US), and work mainly in professional activities. Argentines in Paraguay are younger, since the stream would be composed to a large extent of the children of return migrants. Their level of education is very low in comparison, and the proportion working in agricultural activities is relatively high.

Paraguayans and Uruguayans in Brazil also are different from those in Argentina. Paraguayans in Brazil are younger; there are almost equal numbers of men and

women; their levels of education are somewhat higher, and they have a completely different occupational distribution from that of their countrymen in Argentina. Only 21 per cent are manual non-agricultural workers; an equal number are engaged in agricultural activities; and 9 per cent are professionals. Uruguayans in Brazil, meanwhile, are predominantly males, and are slightly older and more educated. A higher proportion are in professional activities and a lower proportion are in manual occupations than are their counterparts in Argentina. One of the counter streams, Brazilians in Paraguay, consists mainly of agricultural workers. There is a very high sex ratio (115) and a very young median age. These migrants arrived mostly in the 1970s and are poorly educated. They undoubtedly reflect the colonization of border zones mentioned above.

The difficulties of migrating to distant countries, where language and culture differ more widely than in nearby countries, are clearly reflected in the characteristics of those who go. Southern Cone immigrants in the US are much more highly educated than those in Argentina, Brazil or Paraguay. A proportion varying from 62 to 85 per cent have at least 12 years of education. The proportion of immigrants with similar education in the Southern Cone ranges from 3 to 46. Activity rates also are much higher among immigrants to the US, and from 12 to 20 per cent of those in the labour force are engaged in professional activities.

Sex ratios differ among streams. While in the US women largely predominate among migrants from Brazil, whatever the period of their arrival, the contrary is true among migrants from Argentina. Among Bolivians and Chileans, women predominated in the 1960s and men in the 1970s (data from CELADE (1989) not shown). A more profound analysis is needed to interpret these results.

¹¹ It is also worth noting that, though men traditionally predominate among Chilean stocks in Argentina, women are prevalent during the 1970s.

In short, streams differ very widely. Argentines abroad tend to be much more highly educated and to work in occupations requiring higher qualifications than migrants from other countries to Argentina. The only exception would be Argentines in Paraguay, whose characteristics are similar to other streams with origin and destination in the Southern Cone. However, Argentines in the US are different from those in Brazil. The former, travelling a long distance, follow the above-mentioned general trend and are thus more highly educated and more likely to work in jobs calling for high qualifications. Chileans, Brazilians, and Uruguayans migrating within the region also are very different from those migrating outside it, the latter being more extensively educated and working in more highly skilled professions. No two streams or counterstreams are similar. In other words, different people are attracted to different destinations. In general terms these data confirm the view mentioned earlier that short distance movements are composed of less-qualified people than those going to the countries of the "North". Another way of looking at this is that the Southern Cone countries are giving some of their best trained citizens to the North. What is happening is yet another transfer of resources from the developing to the developed world.

4.5 Main determinants and policies

(i) Determinants

As many authors have already noted, the results of analyses of the causes and consequences of international migration are, intrinsically, expressions of the theoretical approaches adopted. Zolberg (1989) cites the emergence of a variety of new "historical, structural, globalistic, and critical" approaches as alternatives to the classic micro-analytical approach. The same author, in a previous work, suggests that "the evaluation of costs and benefits of migration requires a discussion of the relation between two types of accounting: that of individuals and that of the collectivities" (Zolberg (1981)). But authors who take a

macro-social approach note that the problem of how social processes are to be tied in with the actions of individuals is unresolved.

Portes and Fernández Kelly (1989), referring to the framework of push-pull factors – one of the most popular for analysing the causes of migration – highlight the following. In the orthodox economic perspective – according to which labour is a commodity responding to the law of supply and demand – push factors are underestimated. The opposite position, by which push factors such as poverty, unemployment, and political persecution, are emphasized, is not useful, either. Moreover, factors that determine – or could determine – the movements of people, such as unemployment and salary differentials, do not explain why only some of the possible destinations receive migrants, or why only a fraction of all potential migrants actually migrate. Portes and Fernández Kelly urge that more attention be paid to structural changes in the world production system, of which international migration is only one of many elements.

Despite the unsatisfactory situation of the state of the art, it still seems clear to most experts that in the LAC region the main determinants of international migration include the agrarian situation, modernization of agriculture, urban growth, rapid demographic growth, more widespread education, changes in cultural values, heightened individual aspirations, huge differences in living standards between sending and receiving countries, political instability and persecution, informal networks linking migrants in origination and destination countries, increasing interdependence among nations, and technical advances in communications and transportation.

The agrarian situation (uneven land distribution, land fragmentation, soil exhaustion, etc.) is a crucial determinant of migration. Several studies (Galeano (1978), Gillespie and Browning, (1979), Díaz-Briquets

TABLE 4 11
Some demographic and socio-economic characteristics of selected stocks
of international migrants in the US, 1980
(by country of birth)

Characteristic	Argentina	Brazil	Chile	Uruguay
Number of migrants	68 887	40 919	35 127	13 278
Per cent arrived during 1970s	43.2	48.1	61.9	65.4
Mean age	37.2	..	34.7	34.9
Sex ratio	102.5	79.7	97.3	99.8
Per cent 12+ years of education ^a	72.4	71.5	85.0	61.8
Activity rate ^b	69.1	60.5	72.5	74.4
Per cent professionals ^c	19.3	18.0	19.9	11.9
Per cent manual non-agricultural workers ^c	30.2	26.1	26.1	41.4
Per cent in personal services ^c	13.1	..	19.6	14.2

Source: Pellegrino (n.d.), tables 22, 23 and 30, and own calculations from CELADE (1989).

^a Per cent of the population aged 20 years and over.

^b Per cent of the population aged 16 years and over.

^c Per cent of the total labour force.

(1980), Marshall and Orlansky (1981), Díaz y Gómez (1985)) indicate that a complex combination of factors in such countries as Paraguay, Bolivia, Chile and Colombia forces the poor peasants to move, principally to Argentina and Venezuela.

Colonizations of bordering zones through international migration also are registered in the region. For example along the vast Brazilian border (Díaz-Briquets (1980)) peasants from each side dispute the possession of frontier areas. A relevant case of international migration and colonization has occurred since the late 1970s between Brazil and Paraguay. Thousands of Brazilian agricultural workers and their families, encouraged by Paraguayan policies and funded by Brazilian private resources, have settled on Paraguayan land of better quality and lower price (Díaz-Briquets (1980) and Maletta (1992)). These settlements, over time, have attracted permanent and seasonal workers from Paraguay as well as from Brazil.

As mentioned earlier, the presence of Brazilians in Paraguay and northern Argentina is related to the search for better or cheaper land, as the high proportion of agricultural workers observed among those stocks indicates. By contrast, there was an economic boom in Paraguay in the late 1970s related to large hydroelectric projects on the frontier with Argentina and Brazil, which helped to halt the emigration that had characterized the country in previous decades¹² and to create some return migration. Recent political changes in Paraguay have had a similar effect.

According to Marshall (1988) and other authors, intraregional migration in the Southern Cone is mainly due to push factors. There is a relative excess of labour, mainly agricultural, which cannot be absorbed by the rural or urban labour markets. This is particularly so in less urbanized countries such as Bolivia and Paraguay.¹³ Although push factors predominate they do not hinder the coexistence of pull factors such as higher wages and better employment opportunities. These traditionally are found in Argentina.

Moyano (1980) noted some structural conditions that turned Argentina into an attraction pole: diversified production, complex occupational structure, abundant natural resources, reduced subsistence agriculture, and, in certain areas of the country such as Patagonia, chronic labour shortages. Other structural non-economic conditions are low demographic density, low population growth, early retirement, and a tolerant migration policy – a subject that will be considered in the next section.

The information furnished by several studies (Díaz-Briquets (1980) Murillo y Silva (1984), Marshall (1984)) indicates that migrants earn higher wages in host countries than in their own. They clearly benefit from wage differentials during situations of economic expansion in the receiving country as well as during times of contraction, where wages are low for local workers albeit comparatively high for immigrants. This kind of situation has been verified in the Southern Cone at different periods and among different migratory streams.¹⁴

Another outstanding fact in the region was the creation of some labour markets extending beyond national frontiers and reaching regional or sub-regional levels. As seen before, Venezuela was the most remarkable case: it attracted immigrants from rural and urban areas of neighbouring and nearby countries as well as from distant ones such as Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay¹⁵, and even from Europe. Venezuela launched, during the oil boom, an immigration policy which attracted migrants with very high wages at all skill levels until 1970. In Argentina, the labour market of Buenos Aires, one of the largest cities of the world, also attracted large numbers of internal migrants, as well as international migrants from neighbouring and European countries; the boom occurred approximately from 1945 to 1960. In the early 1990s the economic deterioration of the LAC region affected these two countries.

The literature often refers to high natural population growth as a determinant of international migration, but this relationship is neither simple nor direct and for that reason opposing cases can be found. For example, Paraguay and Uruguay, which experienced the highest emigration rates of the Southern Cone, had, respectively, high and low natural increase rates. A similar contrast occurs between immigration countries such as Venezuela and Argentina.

Though in most countries of the region the rates of natural increase of urban and total populations are decreasing, the increments in the urban population are growing. Thus, the build-up of demographic pressure in urban areas is well under way and will continue for a long time, particularly among young cohorts. And this will happen in a context where economic opportunities grow at a slower pace.

People have learnt to use spatial mobility as a resource to improve their living conditions. No doubt, all do not succeed; the "failures", however, are seldom registered and are hardly ever taken into account. New

¹² Traditionally the cotton harvest in northern Argentina was done by temporary Paraguayan migrant workers. During the summer of 1990, as Paraguayan workers did not go, the local authorities had to resort to using internal migrants from Buenos Aires for the harvest.

¹³ The percentage of urban population estimated for 1990 is 51.4 in Bolivia, 47.5 in Paraguay and 86 in Argentina (United Nations (1988)).

¹⁴ Maletta (1992) emphasizes that wage differentials between countries and the possible consequences on savings and remittances depend on several factors, such as the cost of living of each country and the exchange rate. For example, \$600 is a low monthly salary for a worker in Argentina at times of relative economic stability and good money at the present time (1991). A small fraction of that amount (\$60) was also a low salary at times of hyperinflation, such as 1989. By contrast, in Paraguay the acquisition value of the dollar was almost unchanged over the same period (1989-1991).

¹⁵ These specific movements coincided with political emigration from those three countries.

perceptions have been developed on migration and conveyed by society as positive values: "If there are no alternatives here you should go out and look for them somewhere else just as our parents and grandparents did". Migration to look for better working conditions, to study or to develop the capacity of adapting to new situations, is highly appreciated today. At present a significant proportion of the large LAC city populations are migrants or descendants of migrants (internal or international). Recent literature shows that in the region, with the exception of bordering zones, international migration is mostly of urban origin. In many cases it is connected with the accelerated urbanization processes of recent decades (Pessar (1986) and Balán (1985)).

The expansion of educational systems in the LAC region shows more than one paradox in terms of international migration. Education is a strategy for improving one's economic opportunities. Nevertheless, several countries of the region lack the capacity to absorb the professionals and technicians trained by their own schools. Several authors have demonstrated the existence of this overpopulation of qualified professionals. They describe the situation as modernization without development, the consequence of which is emigration, an alternative that already has been adopted by thousands of youths from the LAC region. In general, there exists abundant evidence that people with medium or high levels of education are more prone to emigrate outside the region. As education has spread widely, men and women are more and better informed and their aspirations are defined according to international standards.

Available evidence suggests that the relationship between international migration and development is intricate and highly complex. Low levels of development may generate emigration, and so may development policies and programmes. In general, both countries of origin and destination are largely unaware of this fundamental paradox – as qualified by Teitelbaum (1993). According to this author, economic development diminishes the causes of emigration over the long term, while in the short term – which in migration analysis means 10 to 20 years – the effect may be the opposite. Similarly, many of the domestic policies of countries trying to diminish immigration produce precisely the opposite effect. In this regard, the same author mentions the example of what a protectionist policy – for instance, the sugar-support system – might produce in a country of high emigration largely dependent on sugar exports, such as the Dominican Republic (see United States Congress (1990)).

Various studies based on census information, surveys of bordering areas, population arrivals and departures, and other migrant records, including reports on periodic amnesties offered to migrants, show that different types of border migration to Argentina co-existed at different stages (Marcenaro-Boutell and others (1974), Balán (1985)). In general, three principal types were identified: (a) temporary or stationary, oriented at transitory rural jobs; (b) permanent migration generally also occurring in rural

areas, replacing natives who move to urban areas, and (c) temporary and permanent migration to the Buenos Aires Metropolitan Area to perform manufacturing and service activities, either stable or transitory.¹⁶

Dandler and Medeiros (1991) show a common pattern of circular migration among Bolivians to Argentina. Migration of selected members of the family unit is part of a general strategy to diversify family income. These authors also mention that this strategy is by no means restricted to rural families; in fact it occurs mainly in families established in urban environments. Balán (1988) shows how, by means of information networks, the Bolivian immigrants manage to overcome Argentina's restrictive immigration policies. The community networks, created by the migrants themselves, are important components – they maintain and develop international migratory movements in Latin America as well as in other regions.

Finally, the profound political and institutional instability that has affected different countries of the region at different times has been an important spur for international emigration. The establishment of democratic forms of government in recent years may reduce the numbers of politically motivated emigrants.

(ii) Policies

In Argentina, the regulation of international migration is as old as the institutional life of the country. As a traditional immigration country, it originally designed its laws and regulations to attract Europeans to populate the country. The "open door" policy started to close early in this century, and the process became clearly selective in the 1930s, both for economic and ideological reasons (Lattes and Recchini de Lattes (1990)). Restrictions on immigration grew after the Second World War (the period when immigration from neighbouring countries started not only to intensify but to be perceived as the numerically dominant stream). Since entering Argentina is extremely easy for nationals from neighbouring countries – and a number of bilateral agreements have facilitated the flow of people across national boundaries – restrictive immigration laws cannot stop foreigners from entering, extending their stays, and/or working and thus becoming illegal. Six different amnesty decrees were implemented from 1949 to 1992, lasting from 6 to 72 months, to permit the regularization of undocumented migrants. Thus, restrictive rules have alternated with regularization periods.

In Argentina – and to a certain extent in other countries of the region such as Paraguay, Bolivia, and Uruguay – there appears to be a gulf between migration patterns affecting these countries and legislation enacted in connection with them. Argentina continued legislating to

¹⁶ It is frequently the case that immigrants from Paraguay alternate jobs in Argentina and their own country, according to market conditions. Those in this situation have dual legal residence.

attract Europeans long after the international conditions that made their settlement possible had changed. Recently, when efforts were being made to speed the socio-economic integration of Argentina with Brazil, Uruguay and Paraguay (MERCOSUR), Argentina's president declared priority for the planned settlement of agricultural workers from central and eastern Europe (IOM (1991)). It is not just a matter of legislation lagging behind migratory dynamics. As Romagnoli (1982) says, not only do the implications of international migration overwhelm ability to legislate on it, but there seems to be something cultural or ideological behind the policy. Furthermore, legislation on migration is frequently discretionary, leaving plenty of room for the authorities to take decisions when applying it that reflect established policies on other matters such as employment and domestic security.

Furthermore, migration legislation ignores emigration. That is the case in practically all the Southern Cone countries: in Argentina, where the occurrence of significant emigration only arose a few decades ago and where emigration was never larger than immigration; Uruguay, where emigration surpassed immigration between the mid-1960s and the mid-1980s (OAS (1986)); and in traditional emigration countries such as Paraguay (Fogel (1982)) and Bolivia. This is a serious gap, since the State fails to protect important rights of its nationals settling abroad, ignoring such matters as civil rights, equal access to social services, and the keeping of cultural bonds with the motherland.

The return of emigrants has been promoted by legislation or by the creation of special commissions in Argentina, Chile and Uruguay. In Argentina, several administrations implemented policies to attract emigrants back to the country, but these generally lasted only for short periods. A Commission for the Return of Argentines, with an advisory role, also was created soon after democracy was restored (1984), but it was never really functional and soon ceased to exist. In Uruguay, a policy for the return of emigrants started to be implemented in 1972, was changed in 1984, and was redefined in 1990. The National Commission for Repatriation, created in 1985, which was to last for three years, executed the main programmes to assist the return of Uruguayans from abroad (Uruguay Comisión Nacional de Migración (1988) and (1990)). In general, the number of emigrants who returned was relatively small.

And so migration policies in the region have been mainly immigration policies. Argentina and Uruguay, both traditional countries of European immigration, used to have open-door policies. Both changed to selective immigration policies, applying criteria such as skills and/or capital requirements, taking into account national development. In Argentina, the main recipient of intraregional migration in the Southern Cone, very restrictive policies have alternated with periods permitting the regularization of numerous undocumented migrants accumulated during these periods of restricted entry. Bolivia and Paraguay also legislated or signed bilateral

agreements to promote immigration,¹⁷ sometimes with limited success (Balán (1985)).

4.6 Final thoughts

Traditionally Latin America was a region of net immigration. That situation changed during the 1960s, when overseas immigration diminished sharply. In the 1970s emigration to other regions – especially to the US and Canada – began to intensify. Intraregional migration also increased during the 1960s and even more during the 1970s. Though available figures are generally underestimated and outdated, they show that the volume of emigration, particularly to the North, is growing and includes diversified movements, and that intraregional migration flows keep changing in response to economic and political changes.

Experts claim that the extent of international migration is smaller than could be expected: "the question is not why this has taken place but rather why it has not been larger" (Petersen (1985)). As mentioned in previous sections, in the LAC region the volume as well as the relative size of international migration is small, with the exception of a few countries. Neither immigration nor emigration in recent years is comparable, for instance, with the immigration experienced by the region in the past. Therefore, the question arises: Is it the effectiveness of immigration controls which prevents international migration from growing to its full potential? If this is so, what is that potential?

Recent studies show that more strict immigration policies in countries of destination may increase the "cost" of migration, and, consequently, control and diminish it. Should this be the case – some have pointed out – immigration countries may face other costs resulting from the increased political and economic tensions that restrained migration may cause.

Why is international migration seldom on the agenda of inter-governmental fora on development? Kritz and Keely (1981) asked themselves this question a decade ago and suggested that one of the reasons could be that the issues do not cut along traditional North-South lines. These days it is difficult to support that view. The common response of government representatives is that pressing immediate matters have forced the authorities to focus on short-term policies and that this prevents them from paying attention to international migration, which requires medium- and long-term perspectives. Another possible explanation is the widespread "economic" bias of development analyses.

In recent years several economic integration agreements have been reached among the countries of the

¹⁷ According to United Nations (1992) only five countries in the LAC region are seeking to increase immigration: Argentina, Bolivia, Guyana, Paraguay and Uruguay.

Americas with the aim of achieving economic complementarity. It is a new political reality: the conflict hypothesis is being replaced by integration and cooperation. ECLAC (1990) refers to the potentials offered by regional integration and to the frustration felt by ever-increasing numbers of people who are trying to enter the labour force under existing circumstances. However, to the surprise of the academics, the international movement of people is a subject entirely absent from ECLAC's strategies for development. Politicians prefer to talk in economic terms. It seems easier to them to discuss investment and trade (Bach (1992)) than to open questions on international movements of people. But international migration could be a strong mechanism for integration and long-term cooperation among LAC countries.

References

- R. L. Bach, (1992), "International Migration, States and Regional Integration", *Conference on International Migration and Regional Integration: Paraguay and the Southern Cone*, Asunción, 13-15 August.
- J. Balán (1985), *Las Migraciones Internacionales en el Cono Sur*. Proyecto de Migración Hemisférica, Universidad de Georgetown, Comité Intergubernamental para las Migraciones, Washington, D.C.
- _____ (1988), *Immigration Policies, Community Networks, and the Development of a Migratory System in the Southern Cone*. Buenos Aires, Centro de Estudios de Estado y Sociedad, Documento CEDES 16.
- J. M. Carrón (1980), "Factores de atracción de la inmigración de origen limítrofe en la Argentina", in *Migraciones Internacionales en la América*. Caracas, Centro de Estudios de Pastoral y Asistencia Migratoria, Vol. 1, pp.114-131.
- CELADE (1989), *Demographic Bulletin*, Year XXII, No.43, Santiago, Chile, January.
- CEPALC/CELADE (1993), *Poblacion, Equidad y Transformacion Productiva*, Santiago, LC/G. 1758 (Conf. 83/3); LC/DEM/G 131.
- J. Dandler and C. Medeiros (1991), "Migración Temporal de Cochabamba, Bolivia, a la Argentina: Patronos e Impacto en las Areas de Envío", in P.R Pessar (ed.), *Fronteras Permeables, Migración Laboral y Movimientos de Refugiados en América*, Buenos Aires, Planeta.
- L. M. Díaz and A. Gomez (1985), "Recesión económica, migración laboral internacional y sus efectos en el área fronteriza Colombo-Venezolana", *CIM-Georgetown University Hemispheric Migration Project*, Bogota.
- S. Diaz-Briquets (1980), *International Migration Within Latin America and the Caribbean: A Review of Available Evidence*. Washington, D.C., Population Reference Bureau, Inc.
- ECLAC (1990), *Changing Production Patterns with Social Equity. The Prime Task of Latin American and Caribbean Development in the 1990s*, Santiago, Chile.
- G. Fogel (1982), "Migraciones Laborales Internacionales en el Paraguay", *Seminario Técnico sobre Migraciones Laborales en Argentina, Chile, Paraguay y Uruguay*, OAS, CIM and Labour Ministry (Argentina), Buenos Aires, 1-3 December.
- L. Galeano (1979), *Desarrollo Regional y Migraciones en Paraguay*, Asunción, Paraguay, CPES-PISPAL (mimeo).
- F. Gillespie and H.L. Browning (1979), "The Effect of Emigration upon Socio-economic Structure", *International Migration Review*, Vol. XIII (3).
- IOM (1990), "La migración en los procesos regionales y subregionales de integración en América Latina", *Seminario Regional Latinoamericano*, La Paz, Bolivia, 22-25 October (LPZ/90/9).
- _____ (1991), *Despacho mensual*, Geneva, No.147, May.
- M. M. Kritz and D. T. Gurak (1979), "International Migration in Latin America: Research and Data Survey", *International Migration Review*, Vol. XIII (3), pp.407-427.
- M. M. Kritz and C. B. Keely (1981), "Introduction", in M. M. Kritz, C. B. Keely and S. M. Tomasi, *Global Trends in Migration: Theory and Research on International Population Movements*, Staten Island, N.Y., The Center for Migration Studies of New York.
- A. E. Lattes (1985), *Migraciones hacia América Latina y el Caribe desde principios del Siglo XIX*, Buenos Aires, Cuaderno del CENEP No.35.
- _____ (1987), "Conclusions", in A. E. Lattes, and E. Oteiza, *The Dynamics of Argentine Migration (1955-1984): Democracy and the Return of Expatriates*, Geneva, UNRISD and CENEP.
- _____ (1989), "Emerging Patterns of Territorial Mobility in Latin America: Challenges for Research and Action", in *International Population Conference*, New Delhi, IUSSP, vol.2, 20-27 September.
- A. E. Lattes and Z. Recchini de Lattes (1990), "El impacto de las migraciones internacionales en la población de Argentina desde la segunda posguerra", preliminary version of paper presented to the Second Meeting, Collaborative Research Project on the Impact of International Migration upon Receiving Countries, IOM/CICRED, Geneva, 14-16 May.
- H. Maletta (1992), "Migración internacional en Paraguay e integración del Cono Sur: Una agenda de investigación", *Conference on International Migration and Regional Integration: Paraguay and the Southern Cone*, Asunción, 13-15 August.
- R. Marcenaro-Boutell and others (1974), "Trabajadores inmigrantes en la Argentina", *Seminario Regional Tripartito sobre la situación de los Trabajadores Migrantes en Sudamérica*, ILO-Dirección Nacional de Migraciones de la República Argentina, Buenos Aires, 4-11 November.
- A. Marshall and D. Orlansky (1983), "Inmigración de países limítrofes y demanda de mano de obra en la Argentina, 1940-1980", *Desarrollo Económico*, Vol. 23, No.89, pp.35-57.
- A. Marshall (1984), "Las migraciones de países limítrofes a la Argentina", in UNAM-EL COLEGIO DE MEXICO-PISPAL, *Memorias del Congreso Latinoamericano de Población y Desarrollo*, México, El Colegio de México (Vol. II).
- _____ (1988), "Immigrant workers in the labour market: a comparative analysis", in C. Stahl (ed.), *International Migration Today, Vol. 2: Emerging Issues*. Paris, UNESCO, University of Western Australia.
- C. Moyano (1980), "Migrantes limítrofes en la Argentina", Master thesis presented to FLACSO-CELADE, Santiago.
- G. Murillo and G. Silva (1984), "La migración de los trabajadores colombianos a Venezuela: Antecedentes y perspectivas", in UNAM-EL COLEGIO DE MEXICO-PISPAL, *Memorias del Congreso Latinoamericano de Población y Desarrollo*, México, El Colegio de México (Vol. II).
- OAS (1986), "Recuento histórico de las políticas migratorias en el país y propuestas de nuevas políticas", *Seminario-Taller Nacional sobre Migraciones Laborales*, OAS-CIM-Government of the Republic of Uruguay, Montevideo, 24-28 November.
- A. Pellegrino (n.d.), *Migración Internacional de Latinoamericanos en las Américas*, Universidad Católica

- Andrés Bello, CELADE, Agencia Canadiense para el Desarrollo.
- P. Pessar (1986). "Border Migration in the Americas", report prepared for the *Inter-American Dialogue*, Washington, D.C.
- _____ (1988), *When Borders don't Divide: Labor Migration and Refugee Movements in the Americas*. New York, The Center for Migration Studies.
- W. Petersen (1985), *The Future Migration from or to Developed Countries*, IUSSP Seminar on Emerging Issues in International Migration, Bellagio, Italy, 22-26 April.
- A. Portes and J. Walton (1981), *Labor, Class and the International Systems*. New York, Academic Press, Inc.
- A. Portes and P. F. Kelly (1989), "Images of movement in a changing world: A review of current theories of international migration", *International Review of Comparative Public Policy*, Volume 1, 15-33, JAI Press Inc.
- G. D. Romagnoli (1982), "Aspectos Jurídicos de las Migraciones Internacionales", *Seminario Técnico sobre Migraciones Laborales en Argentina, Chile, Paraguay y Uruguay*, OAS, CIM and Labor Ministry (Argentina), Buenos Aires, 1-3 December.
- S. Schkolnik (1987), "Main features of Argentine Emigration as Revealed by Foreign Censuses", in A.E. Lattes and E. Oteiza, *The Dynamics of Argentine Migration (1955-1984): Democracy and the Return of Expatriates*, Geneva, UNRISD and CENEP.
- United Nations (1991), *World Population Monitoring, 1991 With a special report on age structure*, Draft, New York (ESA/P/WP.114).
- United Nations (1992), *World Population Monitoring, 1992*. New York: United Nations, Department of International Economic and Social Affairs, Population Studies No.126, ST/ESA/SER.A/126.
- Uruguay Comisión Nacional de Migración (1988), "La migración internacional en Uruguay", *Octavo Seminario del CIM sobre las Migraciones*, Geneva, 13-16 September, Information Paper No.8.
- _____ (1990), "La migración del Sur al Norte", *Noveno Seminario de la OIM sobre la migración*, OIM, Geneva, 4-6 December, Paper No.1.7.
- United States Congress (1990), *Unauthorized Migration: An Economic Development Response*, Report of the Commission for the Study of International Migration and Cooperative Economic Development, July.
- M. S. Teitelbaum (1993), "Effects of Economic Development on Emigration Pressures in Sending Countries", In *The Changing Course of International Migration*. Paris: OECD.
- R. Warren and J. S. Passel (1987), "A Count of the Uncountable: Estimates of Undocumented Aliens Counted in the 1980 United States Census", *Demography*, Vol. 24 (3), August, pp.375-393.
- A. Zolberg, (1981), "International migration in political perspective", in M. Kritiz, C. Keely and S. Tomasi (eds.), *Global Trends in Migration: Theory and Research on International Population Movements*, New York, Center for Migration Studies.
- _____ (1989), "The Next Waves: Migration Theory for a Changing World", *International Migration Review*, Vol. 23 (87), Fall.

ANNEX

Population enumerated by Latin American and Caribbean censuses, 1960, 1970 and 1980 rounds
(Thousands)

Country	Census round					
	1960		1970		1980	
	Census year	Population	Census year	Population	Census year	Population
Southern Cone						
Argentina	1960	20 006	1970	23 962	1980	28 237
Bolivia	1950	3 019	--	--	1976	4 613
Brazil	1961	70 191	1970	95 847	1980	121 286
Chile	1960	7 374	1970	9 504	1982	11 330
Paraguay	1962	1 819	1972	2 358	1982	3 035
Uruguay	1963	2 593	1975	2 829	1985	3 008
Total Southern Cone		105 002		134 500		171 509
Other South America						
Colombia	1964	17 485	1973	22 552	1985	27 838
Ecuador	1962	4 525	1974	6 522	1982	8 061
Guyana	--	--	1970	702	1980	865
Peru	1961	9 907	1972	13 538	1981	17 005
Venezuela	1961	7 524	1971	10 722	1981	14 517
Total Other S.America		39 441		54 036		68 286
Central America						
Costa Rica	1963	1 336	1973	1 872	1984	2 417
El Salvador	1961	2 511	1971	3 555	--	--
Guatemala	1967	4 288	1973	5 160	1981	6 054
Honduras	1961	1 885	1974	2 657	--	--
Mexico	1960	34 923	1970	52 771	1980	70 416
Nicaragua	1963	1 536	1971	1 878	--	--
Panama	1960	1 076	1970	1 487	1980	1 956
Total C.America		47 555		69 380		80 843
Caribbean						
Barbados	--	--	1970	238	1980	249
Cuba	1953	5 829	1970	8 520	1981	9 724
Dominican Republic	1960	3 047	1970	4 423	1981	5 648
Haiti	--	--	1971	4 330	1982	5 054
Jamaica	--	--	1970	1 849	1982	2 096
Trinidad & Tobago	--	--	1970	1 869	1980	1 058
Total Caribbean		8 876		21 229		23 829
Total region		200 874		279 145		344 467

Source: 1960 census round: Kritz and Gurak (1979); 1970 census round: CELADE (1989); 1980 census round: CELADE (1989), except for Colombia, Ecuador and Costa Rica: United Nations (1988).