

# International Migrants and Globalization: Contradictions, Conflict, and Unintended Consequences

14

*Kevin Keogan*

*Globalization involves a deepening of the linkages between nations, with international borders becoming both more and less relevant. As the flow of material and cultural goods and services accelerates over time and through space, human beings also become an important component of this exchange. Vulnerable populations in the developing world are increasingly sent into motion both within and across national boundaries by the forces of globalization, while nation-states and localities struggle to adapt to these flows. This chapter will explore the many contradictions and conflicts that arise from these conditions, with a specific focus on the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) as a case in point. The chapter concludes with a cautionary discussion of some possible ways to minimize the tensions inherent in current relations.*

Globalization may be defined in numerous ways, but the end result is often the same: an alteration of previously established ways. In the less developed areas of the world, traditional labor-intensive agricultural practices are in decline due to increased competition from abroad, while farming techniques are becoming more capital intensive due to a reliance on costly inputs and mechanization. This inevitably leads to a disturbance in labor markets, as relatively unskilled agricultural hands find that they are no longer a necessary ingredient in the production process. Likewise, the more technologically advanced countries, such as the United States, have seen long-stable, working-class industries close down and be outsourced to less developed countries as businesses look to gain competitive advantage in the global marketplace. Policies of free trade and the adoption of neoliberal economic models, an important aspect of globalization, have caused major disruptions in labor markets around the world.

Of course, this is only one side of the multifaceted process that is commonly referred to as globalization. The productive, or more broadly, the economic aspects of this process are linked to a complex bundle of other social, cultural, and technologic adjustments that are bringing about fundamental changes throughout the world. In many ways, it makes sense to think of this overall process as bringing humanity closer together, as we seem to be engaged in a similar form of economic production and consumption modeled on the Western experience (with some local variation and pockets of resistance). Likewise, we seem closer than ever before in terms of physical space due to advances in transportation and communication technologies.

However, globalization also entails major disruptions and dislocations that necessitate new social arrangements that sometimes create a physical closeness that is not welcomed by all involved. This often leads to the creation of *social* distance between individuals and

groups. While they may adapt to these spatial and social changes in a variety of creative ways, social relations are not always amicable. Thus, this process of globalization may be seen as similar to previous periods of turmoil and creative social change brought about by economic transformations and the often painful adjustment to new social realities.

This chapter focuses on international migration as it relates to globalization. Ironically, the movement of people across borders is less often thought of as a part of globalization than, say, the cross-border movement of information or capital. Nevertheless, people are oftentimes unwillingly swept into the rip currents of globalization, and policymakers often fail to make this connection, instead focusing on the supposed benefits that come from an increase in global market share. Due to the fact that both globalization and immigration are complex processes, it is difficult to specify a simple, general causal model for understanding their nexus (Castles and Miller, 2003; Sanderson, 2010; Sanderson and Kentor, 2009). Rather than delving into a general discussion of this complex relationship, the main intent of this chapter is to analyze some of the more salient issues related to immigration in contemporary American society. In order to elucidate the connections between globalization and international migration, our discussion will start with some historical background (neither globalization nor migration are new phenomena). A summary of some of the main theories of international migration are then discussed in relation to historical and contemporary trends. This will set the stage for a look at two of the most contradictory and conflict-ridden U.S. policy issues: NAFTA and undocumented immigration from Mexico. Finally, we will examine the unintended consequences of immigration policies that fail to understand the connection between globalization and international migration.

## Historical Patterns of Globalization and Human Migrations

The spread of economic and cultural systems around the globe has been a constant throughout history. Although today we can think of the global spread of information, development of relationships, even the exchange of commodities and services independent of *physical* proximity, this is a rather recent development. Previously, economic exchange, social relations, and cultural diffusion were heavily reliant on physical human interaction. Moreover, the very spread of civilizations around the globe was dependent on the movement of people. Human origins have been traced to Africa, and Native Americans migrated from Asia long before the development of international boundaries or concepts such as “immigration.” We must remember that the nation-state, international borders, and concepts of citizenship are social constructions dependent upon power relations and cultural definitions of belonging. Globalization has long been characterized by the flow of people around the world, although the nature and character of these flows have been diverse.

One of the most important periods for the global spread of economic and cultural systems was colonialism. During this period, European nation-states enforced new economic and cultural practices around the world. By bringing new colonies into their empire, the European powers were able to gain crucial resources. Creating wealth from the colonies during this period was dependent upon the extraction of natural resources and the cultivation of crops that would be linked through commodity chains being established in the expanding world system. Another essential ingredient for the colonial system was cheap, pliable labor.

Sometimes it was the colonized inhabitants who were forced to do the labor necessary for the extraction of wealth; other times it was necessary to introduce labor from other areas of the globe. For instance, slaves from Africa became essential on some Caribbean island colonies because disease and conquest annihilated the native inhabitants. These slaves and their descendants adapted to this new environment and became natives themselves. In other areas, such as present-day Mexico and Central America, native populations were often displaced from their communities and endured servitude, with an eventual mixing of European migrants and natives into a new race (mestizos). The overarching point is that the movement of people has always been a necessary component of globalization, and this movement has created diverse racial and ethnic hybrids as new streams were continually added to the mix.

Globalization has had many unintended and unforeseen consequences, often influencing change in distant times and places. Take, for example, the linkages that brought Irish immigrants to the United States *en masse* during the mid-19th century. Although many people believe the potato is indigenous to Ireland, it was actually brought to Europe as a result of the global commodity chains established by the Spanish empire during the 16th century. Potatoes originated in South America (present-day Peru, by most accounts) and were not common in Europe until after the 17th century. The crop was introduced into colonial Ireland as an easily cultivated and durable crop that required relatively little land to produce. As a result, it became a staple in the diet of Irish peasants. When a blight wiped out this subsistence crop in the mid-1840s, the British Empire failed to provide an alternate source of food for the starving peasants, many of whom had few, if any, choices other than starve or emigrate. Although the Irish immigrants who arrived in New York and other port cities were generally seen as a menace due to their humble origins and desperate conditions, they became an important source of cheap labor for an expanding industrial economy (Burrows and Wallace, 1999). This is but one example of how changes in social relations as a result of globalization can put people into motion in distant areas of the world.

## Theories of International Migration

One of the oldest and most influential theories of immigration has its roots in economics, and therefore, not surprisingly, it focuses almost exclusively on economic causes of migration. This neoclassical theory gained popularity due to its simple and compelling model of human behavior based upon the rational calculation of the costs and benefits involved in the decision-making process. However, its simplicity and failure to consider the noneconomic, social causes and conditions that increase the likelihood of one's emigration is also its greatest criticism.

One of the strengths of neoclassical theory is that it sees the factors that influence immigration as at least bilateral—the push (or supply side) in the country of origin, and the pull (or demand side) in the receiving country. This is obviously superior to views that see the issue unilaterally. Push-pull theories view international migration as the result of rational calculation on the part of individuals (or groups, such as households, in more recent versions). In order for the creation of a steady flow of immigrants, a number of conditions must be met. First of all, there must be a lack of gainful employment in the country of origin, thereby creating a pool of potential labor. Second, there must be a demand for workers in the receiving country, and the wage differential between the two countries must be sufficient so

that the benefits significantly outweigh the costs associated with the journey. Finally, there must be sufficient knowledge of these conditions so that the potential immigrants can make an informed decision.

Though this theory has a good deal of explanatory power, it has been subject to a number of criticisms. The main objections have been that this theory fails to take into account the historical and social relations that have created clear patterns to the flow of people between nations. There are both macro and micro structures that can help us better understand why some people choose to migrate while others do not, despite similar economic conditions (see Castles and Miller, 2009, p. 28). Portes and Rumbaut (2006, pp. 15–16) point out that, contrary to the predictions of neoclassical theory, it is not the poorest countries in the world that are the major sources of immigration, nor is it the most destitute areas and people within the major sending nations that account for the main flows to the United States. Rather, the major sending areas are those that have established links with the United States—be they economic, political, or military. Southeast Asian refugees are an obvious example of the military link between the United States and migrant flows from that region, while the Cold War refugees from Cuba and the former Soviet Union are examples of how political policies can result in the establishment of international migratory patterns.

Economic linkages are another macro structure that directs human flows. The Mexico-U.S. relationship clearly illustrates this type of linkage. Starting with the military annexation of almost half of Mexico's territory into the present-day American Southwest, the U.S. has become heavily dependent upon its neighbor to the South. Well before the establishment of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), Mexico had been a crucial source of cheap labor for American agricultural and industrial production (Gonzalez, 2006). Whether during the expansion of the agricultural industry in the Southwest during the early 20th century, as a solution to the labor shortages resulting from World War II, or more recently as the result of NAFTA, Mexico has provided the necessary labor to expand, support, and restructure the American economy. A tradition of interdependence (whether recognized or not) has been established between Mexican labor and American employers—from large industries to small contractors and even individual households looking for cheap labor.

Aside from the macro-structural linkages that shape international migratory flows, there are micro structures created by international networks. Having a family member or a close friend in the United States creates an important social resource for those contemplating a journey abroad. Social networks can provide important information regarding opportunities within the United States. Though neoclassical economic theory assumes that information regarding job opportunities and wage differentials is rather equally distributed, research on networks demonstrates the important role that this social resource plays in the unequal access to such knowledge. The ability to take advantage of job opportunities is dependent upon the dissemination of this information in a timely manner. Moreover, the social networks of immigrant workers are often used by employers to find additional employees, thus further extending the reach of this social resource.

There is no doubt that the global movement of commodities and labor is influenced by classic push-pull factors. In fact, it is sometimes useful to think of labor as another input (i.e., commodity) in the production process. Marx understood this, as he pointed out the capitalist system's need for a "reserve labor army" for the maximization of profit and to fuel economic expansion. Whether slaves being pulled into the colonial system or European peasants pushed into the migrant labor flows as the result of economic, political, and military crises, the

historical development and expansion of economic world systems have been dependent upon international migration. However, it is important to note that human migratory flows, once established, tend to take on a life of their own as social networks and economic linkages tend to diminish the friction of international borders.

As the United States shed colonial status and embarked on its own economic and politico-military ascendance, it too established linkages that would create durable migratory pathways, for example, in the Philippines and Puerto Rico as a result of the Spanish-American War (Rumbaut, 1994). Likewise, U.S. military intervention in Southeast Asia created conditions for refugee flows and the establishment of social networks that continue to the present. Moreover, political policies during the Cold War automatically granted refugee status to anyone able to arrive on American soil from places such as the former Soviet Union and Cuba. While there are obvious contradictions in these policies regarding those that were included/excluded from entry, it is rather easy to see how global linkages between the United States and other countries created migratory pathways.

Although alarmist commentators are quick to point out that Mexicans have become the largest national origin group in the United States today, this is perfectly understandable once we take a look at the long historical development of linkages between the U.S. economy and Mexican labor. There has been a cyclical, almost schizophrenic pattern to relations between both countries—open borders and labor recruitment when the U.S. labor market was unable to meet the needs of domestic industry; closed borders and the politics of exclusion when these workers have been seen as no longer necessary or when public sentiment soured. In some ways, NAFTA has made these contradictions even more pronounced, enabling a clearer view of the connection between economic relations and migratory flows.

## **NAFTA and the Contradictions of Regional Integration**

The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) formalized the longstanding international economic interdependence within the region. This “free” trade zone followed a similar logic to that of the European Union (EU) and other regional agreements in trying to open up markets that previously had been inaccessible due to nationalist strategies of development. Regional trade agreements are similar to far-flung processes of globalization, with the crucial advantage of proximity—often spatial contiguity. The idea is a regional de-bordering of the flow of capital in order to increase competitive advantage by further expanding markets in terms of raw materials, labor, and consumers. In other words, the “domestic” economy would be extended to the supra-national scale. However, there are important differences between NAFTA and the EU regarding labor migrations. Whereas the EU allows for a relatively free flow of people within its borders, NAFTA has exclusionary rules for Mexican labor on the one hand, and free markets for virtually everything else (Fernandez-Kelly and Massey, 2007).

A powerful symbol of this difference is how citizenship is defined and the rules and regulations enacted regarding the flow of people within these regions. Whereas an EU passport enables a citizen of any country within the region to travel relatively freely in search of employment, NAFTA has created a hierarchy of privilege based upon country of origin and type of worker. As Gabriel and MacDonald (2004) have argued, NAFTA tends to perpetuate the inequalities inherent in the region by creating an informal mobility regime that privileges highly skilled workers

and American businessmen while denying access to low-skilled workers. This creates unequal access to markets for all Mexicans, especially the working class.

This contradiction is clearest in terms of how U.S.-based corporations take advantage of cheap Mexican labor by exporting production plants just across the border into Mexico (*maquiladoras*). While the U.S. government goes to great expense to create barriers to Mexican laborers attempting entry into the United States, the *maquiladora* industry makes possible the exploitation of Mexican workers in the border region. U.S.-based capital is able to migrate freely into Mexico and set up shop in order to profit from the low-wage workforce and lax labor and environmental regulations there. They then simply ship the commodities back into the U.S. economy for consumption. NAFTA enables Mexican labor to be exploited within Mexico, while undocumented workers in the United States are criminalized and forced into an underground labor market where they are likewise subject to exploitation. Of course, there are important differences between the European and North American regions. The U.S.-Mexico border is perhaps one of the starkest bifurcations in the wealth among nations. But this should have been recognized and dealt with by those involved in the drafting of the treaty. Not surprisingly, we see the status quo being reproduced as powerful interests both in the United States and Mexico profit from the present arrangement.

Fernandez-Kelly and Massey (2007) describe at length the many contradictions inherent in the current U.S.-Mexico relationship. As mentioned, they point out the key contradiction within NAFTA—that “free” trade was not extended to labor. This aspect of NAFTA was contradictory for a number of reasons. First of all, it failed to recognize the integral role that Mexican laborers have played in the U.S. economy since the early 20th century. Although Mexican labor has been repeatedly treated as an expendable part of the U.S. labor market during periods of political or economic unrest, the cumulative effect of this long-term relationship has been the establishment of deep and intricate linkages. For example, the Bracero guest worker program was created in the 1940s to recruit Mexican laborers due to shortages within the U.S. domestic workforce as a result of World War II. By the time the program was terminated in the 1960s, 4.5 million Mexican workers had gained intimate experience in the U.S. labor market. It’s no surprise that the linkages between the U.S. economy and Mexican labor persisted despite the official termination of this 22-year arrangement.

A second key contradiction was the failure to recognize the effects that NAFTA would have on the Mexican labor market. This policy failure had two significant aspects—a failure to address differences in development between NAFTA member countries and a failure to anticipate the significant internal dislocations that would put large numbers of Mexican peasants on the move in search of work. This policy failure is clearest when compared to the European Union’s efforts to harmonize markets among countries within the trading bloc. Specifically, labor was seen as a key part of market integration in Europe, and efforts were made to level the playing field for all members through specific regional policies (Castles and Miller, 2009, pp. 199–201; Fernandez-Kelly and Massey, 2007). Rather than delay integration of the regional market until such inequalities were addressed, NAFTA policies actually had the opposite effect, at least in the short term—the exacerbation of economic inequalities as a result of neoliberal economic mandates (Delgado Wise, 2006; Russell, 1997).

This should come as no surprise, as there are many studies showing a clear pattern of increased economic inequality within nations that adopt neoliberal policies as a precondition for direct foreign investment and trade liberalization (McMichael, 2004). The “structural adjustments” called for within the Mexican economy meant that agricultural subsidies were

abolished and traditional collective farming techniques gave way to privatization. This, in conjunction with a general reduction in social programs for the poor, forced many Mexican peasants to leave the rural areas and migrate to cities—and sometimes to the United States—in search of alternative means to support themselves and their families.

The massive increase in trade and investment in the wake of NAFTA has been impressive. Commercial transactions as well as cross-border business ventures and economic cooperation are forging a truly integrated North American economy (Fernandez-Kelly and Massey, 2007). However, as this process of economic integration advances, the U.S. policy of exclusion toward Mexican workers also increases in intensity. As Massey and Riosmena (2010, p. 295) point out, the Mexico-U.S. border has become “the most militarized frontier between two peaceful nations anywhere in the world.” This militarization of the U.S.-Mexico border has also had unintended consequences. Huge amounts of resources have been wasted on both sides of the border. While the U.S. government keeps increasing spending on enforcement, undocumented immigrants pay increasingly stiff sums of money in order to cross into the United States to work. In fact, an informal “migration industry” has formed on the Mexican side of the border to help circumvent the increase in border enforcement (Castles and Miller, 2009, pp. 201–205; Massey and Riosmena, 2010). Importantly, many more migrants are now paying the ultimate price, as smuggling routes shift to more desolate and dangerous areas along the 2000-mile boundary. Deaths as a result of border crossings have increased dramatically in the current era.

Once safely within the United States, immigrants maintain important economic, social, and even political ties to their countries of origin, while also gaining knowledge and experience within U.S. society. Immigrants have become an important source of revenue through remittances to their home country. Though not easy to calculate, the World Bank has estimated remittances from Mexican immigrants in 2004 at \$18.1 billion. Moreover, some developing countries have become largely dependent on remittances as a source of revenue (Castles and Miller, 2009, pp. 59–62). A related issue is how governments in the country of origin and the host society define immigrants in the political realm. Though Mexico and other sending countries have extended dual citizenship and voting rights to their citizens abroad, they have also lobbied within the United States for the rights of their immigrant communities. This is both an attempt to protect an important source of foreign revenue as well as an effort to counter nativist tendencies within the United States that have been fomented by the media, politicians, and anti-immigrant groups, resulting in an increasingly hostile environment.

Ironically, U.S. policies of exclusion that have been adopted in relation to undocumented immigrants have actually increased the odds for permanent residency. Migratory patterns between Mexico and the United States had become cyclical during the 20th century. Seasonal migrations from Mexico to U.S. agricultural areas, for example, became a tradition in certain regions of Mexico. In essence, returning to their communities was always an attractive option for Mexican immigrants as long as re-entry to the United States was not seen as too costly or dangerous. But as the many costs associated with return migration increase, undocumented immigrants feel less comfortable taking the risk of leaving the United States (Massey and Riosmena, 2010).

A related consequence is that the grounding of undocumented Mexican immigrants in the United States gives further momentum to those left behind. The establishment of large communities in cities such as Los Angeles and Chicago (and increasingly throughout the United States) creates flexible networks that drastically increase the potential for further

immigration. Commenting on this dynamic, Massey and Philips (1999) estimated that nearly 50% of Mexicans have a member of their extended family living in the United States, and the influence that this stock of social capital has on decisions to migrate cannot be easily countered by border enforcement policies. So what is to be done? Recent political reactions to this reality within the United States have been more of the same—calls for further militarization of the border, increased deportations, and the further criminalization of immigrants and their supporters. Unfortunately, such reactions seem destined for failure and further unintended consequences.

## National and Local Political Responses to Immigration

Because they wield little collective power, undocumented immigrants are the perfect scapegoat, as politicians do not have to fear that they will lose votes or monetary support from this group. Unauthorized immigrants (or “illegals” as anti-immigrant forces insist on labeling them) have become the most excludable segment of the foreign-born population. Therefore, it should come as little surprise that these immigrants have become the focal point for those who wish to restrict the number of immigrants to the United States.

Globalization is a process that is not experienced equally around the world. Moreover, the repercussions of globalization are not evenly distributed through the physical space within nations, and this is clearly the case regarding international migration to the United States. While the U.S. Southwest has a long tradition of immigration from Mexico, cities such as New York have been historical gateways for European immigrants. Still other areas within the United States have little experience with large foreign-born populations. Immigrants from specific countries of origin tend to concentrate within specific cities in order to take advantage of social networks and find comfort within familiar co-ethnic communities. In addition, immigrant flows tend to peak during certain decades. Thus, immigrant flows tends to be concentrated within certain times and places.

As immigrant flows to the United States increased during the 1980s, calls for immigration reform became louder, especially in areas where Mexican immigrants tended to concentrate, such as southern California. This resulted in the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA). This legislation was noteworthy for a number of reasons. For the first time, it specifically targeted the demand side of international migration by calling for sanctions against employers who hire undocumented immigrants. Moreover, this legislation recognized the fact that many undocumented immigrants had become *de facto* permanent residents and should be given the chance to legalize their status. This has resulted in the large-scale amnesty of nearly 3 million, mostly Mexican, undocumented immigrants (Zolberg, 2007). Although this legislation may have been well intentioned, it resulted in unintended consequences that created the conditions for more extreme measures.

The IRCA failed to effectively deal with the issue of undocumented immigration for two main reasons: employer sanctions were never adequately enforced (Castles and Miller, 2009, pp. 181–184; Portes and Rumbaut, 2006, pp. 362), and a one-time legalization policy did not adequately address the issues of regional integration and the increasingly profound linkages between Mexican workers and the U.S. economy. As undocumented immigrants continued to answer the demand for their labor, calls for more exclusionary policies became louder,



especially at the local level in areas like southern California that had seen the largest increases in the foreign-born population as a result of the IRCA amnesty.

State-level initiatives such as California's Proposition 187 in 1994 and more recent legislation in other states such as Arizona can be seen as a local reaction to the failure of federal immigration reforms and NAFTA. Local anti-immigrant sentiments and political reactions have percolated up to the national level, with increasingly draconian legislation being proposed. During 2006, massive pro-immigrant rallies were held in cities throughout the United States in response to a bill that passed the House of Representatives (HR 4437) that would make undocumented immigration a felony and criminalize anyone giving assistance to these immigrants within the United States (Chavez, 2008; Portes and Rumbaut, 2006). Unfortunately, it appears that there is no end in sight regarding the political rancor over the issue of undocumented immigration.

Some experts in the study of immigration have called for a new approach that takes into account the integration of Mexican labor within the U.S. economy. Although immigration policy often has unintended consequences, only by recognizing the inherent contradictions in current policies can we hope to overcome the present stalemate and create more effective policies. For example, Portes and Rumbaut (2006, pp. 366–369) have argued that it is necessary to bring undocumented immigrants into formal channels of control so that this labor pool may be regulated and monitored. A new type of guest worker program is proposed, with those playing by the rules and demonstrating their worth able to legalize their status after six years. There is a mixture of fees and monetary requirements in order to qualify for permanent residency, as well as incentives to return home in support of their families and communities in Mexico.

The policy recommendations by Massey and Fernandez-Kelly (2007) are similar in that they also call for a new guest worker program for Mexican laborers in the United States and for hefty fees to be charged to guest workers. However, they point out that such payment would still be much more economical and humane than the fees paid within the underground economy to unscrupulous smugglers, and those selling counterfeit documents. Moreover, the revenue generated could be used for social programs and to fund enforcement policies aimed at the truly dangerous. Finally, they call for an increase in permanent resident visas to Mexican nationals from 20,000 to 100,000. This is seen as necessary due to the intimate linkages between Mexico and the United States, both historically and as a result of NAFTA. Without such measures, the contradictions inherent within the region will continue to fester, increasing conflict and resentment on both sides of the border.

However, the current political climate within the United States does not appear conducive to such policies, especially during a protracted recession with high levels of unemployment. Despite the sensible nature of these recommendations, it is unlikely that there is sufficient positive political will to make them reality. Nevertheless, an inclusionary political orientation toward undocumented immigrants is within the realm of possibility, as typified by New York City (Keogan, 2010). Although New York City seemed to be heading down the nativist path in the early 1980s, since then, political leaders have consistently defended the rights and praised the positive contributions of all immigrants—including the undocumented. Even a fiscally conservative, tough-on-crime Republican Mayor such as Rudy Giuliani has defended the rights and lauded the benefits of immigrants and has extended this narrative to the undocumented. New York City thus provides an informative case study of the necessary political conditions for substantive immigration reform.

There are many possible explanations for the positive political orientation toward immigrants in New York City. For example, it could be argued that immigrants were seen as an important source of new residents to stabilize the sharp population decline in the city during the 1970s. Also, the diverse origins of New York City's foreign-born population—and the continuation of relatively strong European immigrant flows—may muffle anti-immigrant voices that tend to focus on the Latino threat (Chavez, 2008). Importantly, New York City has come to narrate its past-present-future as a burgeoning, multiethnic melting pot that has grown and flourished as the result of successive waves of immigrants, thus becoming the symbolic center for the commemoration and celebration of the “Nation of Immigrants” origin mythology (Keogan, 2002, 2006). Multiple landmarks clustered within Manhattan—such as Ellis Island, the Statue of Liberty, the legendary Lower East Side and adjacent ethnic neighborhoods such as Little Italy and Chinatown, and the United Nations—provide a critical mass of symbolic resources for the construction of a cosmopolitan cultural orientation. This is a crucial point, as a cosmopolitan worldview has a rather strong, positive association with attitudes toward immigrants (Haubert and Fussell, 2006). This should come as no surprise, as the Greek term *cosmopolite* literally means “citizen of the world.”

Of course, most New Yorkers do not see themselves as “citizens” of the world. Moreover, those who do adopt a cosmopolitan identity are not forced to abandon their allegiance to the nation or their locality. Rather, these identities are nested, just as are multiple identities such as American, Italian-American, New Yorker, and so forth. However, this sort of worldview may be an important antidote to the anti-immigrant impulse that espouses an us/ them, inside/outside cultural logic. A cosmopolitan orientation may be necessary to avoid the many conflicts that arise when processes of globalization run up against provincial attitudes. This is not to say that we should simply adapt to the trends of globalization. But it would appear counterproductive to disengage or simply react at the local or national scale to what are powerful international forces. It should be remembered that the nation itself is a social construction, and identification with it was not automatic; rather, it was something that had to be cultivated over time (Anderson, 1983).

## Conclusion

Globalization and international migration are inextricably linked. There is a profound contradiction in policies that encourage economic integration with other nations while, at the same time, attempting to curtail the exchange of people. The conflicts inherent in such relations are clearly and poignantly evidenced in U.S.-Mexico relations, especially in the post-NAFTA era. The European Union is an example of regional economic integration that better addresses the political and civic adjustments necessary to avoid such conflicts and promote a truer model of supra-national integration. Rather than adopt policies such as a North American concept of citizenship and a free market that includes labor, NAFTA and U.S. domestic policies have exacerbated the conditions that lead to undocumented immigration. Moreover, recent anti-immigrant legislation at the federal and local level has actually increased the odds of permanent residency for undocumented immigrants within the United States. A more productive approach must recognize the historical links between nations that encourage human flows. In addition, regional economic integration must coincide with a re-definition of belonging to include political, social, and cultural dimensions.

---

**Kevin Keogan** currently teaches Sociology at Montclair State University. His research focuses on the areas of immigration, political culture, and urban studies. His recently published book, *Immigrants and the Cultural Politics of Place*, compares divergent political orientations toward contemporary immigrants within American society.

---

## DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. How does an historical perspective on globalization help us to better understand international migration in the current era?
2. What are the basic assumptions of the neoclassical, or “push-pull,” theory of international migration?
3. What are some limitations of the neoclassical approach, and how do other theories address these issues?
4. What are some of the main contradictions brought about through NAFTA and current U.S.-Mexico relations regarding immigration?

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections of the Rise and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso.
- Burrows, Edwin, and Mike Wallace. 1999. *Gotham: A History of New York City to 1998*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Castles, Stephen, and Mark Miller. 2009. *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World* (4th ed.). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Chavez, Leo. 2008. *The Latino Threat: Constructing Immigrants, Citizens, and the Nation*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Delgado Wise, Raul. 2006. “Migration and Imperialism: The Mexican Workforce in the Context of NAFTA.” *Latin American Perspectives*, 33(2): 33–45.
- Fernandez-Kelly, Patrica, and Douglas Massey. 2007. “Borders for Whom? The Role of NAFTA in Mexico-US Migration.” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 610: 98–118.
- Gabriel, Christina, and Laura McDonald. 2004. “The Hypermobile, the Mobile, and the Rest: Patterns of Inclusion and Exclusion in an Emerging North American Migration Regime.” *Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, 29(57–58): 67–91.
- Gonzalez, Gilbert. 2006. *Guest Workers or Colonized Labor? Mexican Labor Migration to the United States*. London: Paradigm Publishers.
- Haubert, Jeannie, and Elizabeth Fussell. 2006. “Explaining Pro-Immigrant Sentiment in the US: Social Class, Cosmopolitanism, and Perceptions of Immigrants.” *International Migration Review*, 40(3): 489–507.
- Keogan, Kevin. 2002. “A Sense of Place: The Politics of Immigration and the Symbolic Construction of Identity in Southern California and the New York Metropolitan Area.” *Sociological Forum*, 17(2): 223–253.

- . 2006. "Between the Past and the Future: The 'Present' Politics of US Immigration." In Michael Borer (ed.), *Varieties of Urban Experience: The American City and the Practice of Culture*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- . 2010. *Immigrants and the Cultural Politics of Place: A Comparative Study of New York and Los Angeles*. El Paso: LFB Scholarly Publishing.
- Massey, Douglas, and Fernando Riosmena. 2010. "Undocumented Migration from Latin America in an Era of Rising U.S. Enforcement." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 630: 294–321.
- Massey, Douglas, and Julie Phillips. 1999. "Engines of Immigration: Stocks of Human and Social Capital in Mexico." *Social Science Quarterly*, 81: 33–48.
- McMichael, Philip. 2004. *Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective* (3rd ed.). London: Pine Forge Press.
- Portes, Alejandro, and Ruben Rumbaut. 2006. *Immigrant America: A Portrait* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Rumbaut, Ruben. 1994. "Origins and Destinies: Immigration to the United States since World War II." *Sociological Forum*, 9: 583–621.
- Russell, James. 1997. "Mexico's Rising Inequality." *Monthly Review*, 49(7): 28–33.
- Sanderson, Matthew. 2010. "Reconsidering the Study of International Migration: A Way Forward for Macrostructural Migration Research." *International Migration*, 48(3): 179–193.
- Sanderson, Matthew, and Jeffrey Kentor. 2009. "Globalization, Development and International-Migration: A Cross-National Analysis of Less Developed Countries, 1970–2000." *Social Forces*, 88(1): 301–336.
- Zolberg, Aristide. 2007. "Immigration Control Policy: Law and Implementation." In Mary Walters and Reed Ueda (eds.), *The New Americans: A Guide to Immigration Since 1965*. London: Harvard University Press.