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7.1 Introduction

In discussing the theme of 'overcoming isolation' we are usually inclined to look at physical barriers preventing spatial interaction. Missing links in networks, infrastructure bottlenecks or geographical peripherality are the obvious examples of impediments to free movement in space. In such a context, interregional or international trade flows, commuting, congestion, accessibility and network performance are normally discussed. Far less attention has been given in Europe to the issue of international migration, either labour migration or forced migration as a result of geo-political developments in Southern, Central and East-Europe. In recent years we witness a concern on massive migration flows into the West-European space, a phenomenon which reflects the fact that Europe is still socially fragmented and only politically more open (see Nijkamp and Spiess 1993). Therefore, it makes sense in a publication on overcoming isolation to pay explicit attention to facts and backgrounds of international migration in Europe. The completion of the internal market by 1993 provoked much debate on the consequences of a free mobility of goods, people and information in the EC countries. Also the expected migration waves from former communist countries in Central and East Europe created an intensified concern on the EC as a magnet for international migrants (cf. Ghosh 1991). And finally, the increasingly important phenomenon of illegal migrants in Europe led to doomsday scenarios of the U.S. - Mexico border type. It seems as though Europe is now entering the 'age of migration' (see Castles and Miller 1993).

It should be noted that even without the above recent megatrends the EC countries in Europe - with the clear exception of Ireland - have in the past decade shown a significant rise in the share of foreign people. Given the current aging trends, the EC countries - again with the exception of Ireland - would in the future even lose population without immigration (see also Nijkamp et al 1991).

The debate on the extension of the European space provokes thus many policy issues on migration. The question whether economic integration in Europe will
generate significantly higher migration flows is not very easy to answer, but a somewhat older study by Böhning (1974) shows that in the past the demand for labour force for most European countries was a far more important motive than integration per se. In this context, Feithen (1986) has more recently demonstrated that for international labour migration in European push-pull factors (e.g. high unemployment rates in the country of origin) appear to be of decisive importance. Observations from recent years confirm that massive migration flows as a result of economic integration in Europe have not taken place, and as far as migration has taken place there is not a significant difference between less and more developed countries (cf. Garson 1992).

Apart from a concern on intra-EC migration, there is nowadays an increasing concern about migration into EC countries from so-called third countries. The past years have shown an increasing flow of third country in-migrants, subdivided into asylum seekers, Aussiedlers (ethnic Germans) and remaining migrants. Apparently, the EC countries have become less isolated from the remaining part of Europe and other parts of the world (see Muus and Cruyssen 1991).

In view of the rising flows of third countries in-migrants, all EC countries have adopted in the meantime a more restrictive in-migration policy. Consequently, the foreseeable future in-migration flows in EC countries will depend on various critical factors:

- the socio-economic conditions in the countries of origin
- the socio-economic perspectives (and needs) in the country of destination
- the socio-cultural distance between countries of origin and destination (e.g.,
  the existence in the country of destination of a critical mass of foreign
  people with the same cultural background or the existence of a favourable
  absorption mechanism for foreigners)
- the existence of regulatory policy regimes for foreign in-migrants (including
  enforcement of regulations against illegal migration).

The relative importance of the above factors is largely unknown as yet. International migration has therefore become an important issue in social science research, but it is a field fraught with many uncertainties. In light of the above observations, the present paper serves to address critical factors (including policy regulations) that impact on international migration in the European context, with particular emphasis on empirical information.

After the presentation of some trends and facts in Section 7.2, we will present in Section 7.3 a concise survey of relevant explanatory frameworks for international migration. This will be followed by a final section on absorption factors and policy factors regarding migration in receiving countries.
7.2 Past Trends

A glance at European migration in the past two centuries shows that by and large Europe may be characterized as an emigration continent. Before the Second World War it was not Europe that absorbed foreigners, on the contrary it was predominantly the Europeans who were mainly absorbed by the three big immigration countries, the United States of America, Canada and Australia (e.g. Borrie 1990). Talking about Europe - and especially Western Europe - as an immigration continent was certainly not possible before the Second World War. And even in the post-war period not all Western European countries have been immigration countries for this whole period, as is shown by Table 7.1 for the period 1960-1988.

For the year 1990, a comparison between selected European countries (see Table 7.2) shows that only Ireland - with negative net migration - may nowadays be characterized as an emigration country.

We will now in a concise manner depict the different types of international migration flows in Europe since the Second World War (see Borrie 1992; Coleman 1993; Fassmann and Münz 1992; Zlotnik and Hovy 1990). Next, we will describe the present composition of foreign population in six selected countries of the European Community and explore whether it is possible to identify special patterns (see Fassmann and Münz 1992). Finally, we will take a short look at the distribution of various types of migration over selected European countries (see Coleman 1993).

A first type of migration flow into Europe, which has taken place in different time periods since 1950, is linked to the postwar decolonization process. Besides the return of European colonists and colonial officers, countries like Great Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Portugal, which had colonies in the past, recorded sizeable immigration flows by migrant workers from their former overseas territories.

A second type of immigration flows played a major role in the 1950s until the mid 1970s, when a number of countries - notably Switzerland, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Benelux countries and Sweden - started to meet part of their growing demand for labour by recruiting a labour force in several Mediterranean countries. In the initial period of hiring these guestworkers, Italy was the most important recruitment area, while in the 1960s Spain and Portugal became the most important recruitment and emigration countries. In the 1970s, Turkey, Morocco and Tunisia became increasingly supply countries of migrant workers. In the early 1970s, the employment of foreign labour reached a peak in the post-war period. In 1970, West Germany was leading with nearly 2.1 million foreign workers.

After the oil price shock and the economic recession in the mid 1970s the recruitment of foreign labour drastically declined and in many countries restrictive immigration regulations were imposed. In view of the reduced absorption capacity of the labour market, the aim was to stop further immigration. But these policies had only a short term effect. This is especially true for Germany, where the average annual net migration flows of foreigners
Table 7.1. Average annual migration flows (citizens and foreigners) to and from selected European countries, 1960-1988

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigrants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>69,056</td>
<td>65,583</td>
<td>64,688</td>
<td>58,271</td>
<td>47,862</td>
<td>48,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany, Fed. Rep.</td>
<td>576,211</td>
<td>706,144</td>
<td>873,051</td>
<td>527,483</td>
<td>502,179</td>
<td>554,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>57,746</td>
<td>71,009</td>
<td>89,140</td>
<td>97,571</td>
<td>79,419</td>
<td>88,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>29,226</td>
<td>45,404</td>
<td>43,342</td>
<td>41,368</td>
<td>32,212</td>
<td>41,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>186,600</td>
<td>186,400</td>
<td>227,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emigrants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>35,271</td>
<td>41,503</td>
<td>47,615</td>
<td>52,990</td>
<td>58,663</td>
<td>54,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>51,218</td>
<td>60,329</td>
<td>61,179</td>
<td>59,737</td>
<td>61,962</td>
<td>54,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>15,226</td>
<td>19,842</td>
<td>35,697</td>
<td>23,897</td>
<td>27,396</td>
<td>22,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>207,600</td>
<td>214,000</td>
<td>208,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Migration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>33,785</td>
<td>24,080</td>
<td>17,073</td>
<td>5,281</td>
<td>-10,801</td>
<td>-6,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>6,528</td>
<td>10,679</td>
<td>27,961</td>
<td>37,833</td>
<td>17,457</td>
<td>34,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>25,562</td>
<td>7,644</td>
<td>17,472</td>
<td>4,816</td>
<td>19,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-21,000</td>
<td>-27,600</td>
<td>19,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Zlotnik and Hovy (1990, Table 1)
Table 7.2. Recent gross inflows of migrants into selected European countries, 1990, by type (thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of destination</th>
<th>Labour migrants</th>
<th>Ethnic migrants</th>
<th>Asylum seekers (gross inflow)</th>
<th>All foreign (excluding asylum seekers, includes some EC)</th>
<th>Total gross inflow, including asylum seekers</th>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>Gross immigration per 1,000 (includes asylum seekers)</th>
<th>Net migration per 1,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>103.4</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>123.1</td>
<td>145.9</td>
<td>7,660</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>9,948</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>5,135</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>117.8</td>
<td>117.8</td>
<td>56,304</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>138.6</td>
<td>397.1</td>
<td>193.1</td>
<td>649.5</td>
<td>1239.7</td>
<td>62,679</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,057</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,506</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57,576</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>14,893</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>4,233</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,337</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>38,925</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>8,527</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>137.2</td>
<td>6,674</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>57,323</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>353.2</td>
<td>397.1</td>
<td>426.8</td>
<td>2027.1</td>
<td>353,778</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Blanks indicate that data are not available. Data on labour migrants to EC countries do not usually include citizens of other EC countries.

Austria: 'All foreign' figure is an estimate of net migration.


Germany: data refer to the area of the Federal Republic before re-unification. The total of ethnic migrants refers only to 'Aussiedler' from Eastern Europe and the USSR, not from the former East-Germany, of whom there were 238,282 from January 1990 to June 1990.

All foreign figure is for 1989. 'Total inflow' for 1990 includes that figure (Meyer 1992).


Net migration includes persons of all citizenship. Foreign immigrants excludes asylum seekers.

Source: Coleman (1993, Table 1)
decreased from 297,040 in the period 1970-74 to -32,370 in the period of 1975-79 (Zlotnik and Hovy 1990). The long-term effect however, shows no reduction in immigration flows: after 1985 almost all Western European countries experienced a recovery of their annual immigration flows of foreigners.

Despite the formal cessation of labour migration, it is noteworthy that in the meantime this situation has led to a rise in migration for family reunification. This third type of European post-war migration, namely family migration, makes up one of the major migration flows in the recent past and present time. Furthermore, a new phenomenon has emerged in this context, viz. family formation migration, that means a marriage with a foreign partner. Finally, an important side-effect of the increasing restrictive immigration regulations since the mid 1970s should be added, viz. the rising number of illegal immigrants into Western Europe.

Since the 1980s a new pattern of labour migration developed. Besides the North-West European countries also most Southern European countries, particularly Italy, have become countries of immigration. In addition it is noteworthy that, much of the 'official' labour migration within and into Europe at present is "high level manpower [...] and to a lesser extent, with high level manual skills" (Coleman 1993 p.14).

With growing political conflicts, civil wars and economic crises in the Middle-East, South America and Africa in the recent past - in addition to the above mentioned increasing flows of foreign labour and family migration -, the flow of asylum seekers into Western Europe is increasing since the 1980s. In 1991, Western Europe received 539,000 applications for asylum (Coleman 1993). As a special case, the emigration flows in 1991/1992 out of the former Yugoslavia - mainly as a result of the war between Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina - has to be mentioned, as this is the largest single wave of emigration since 1946/47 (Coleman 1993).

The above mentioned types of migration may mainly be characterized as south-north migration. East-west migration within, in and out of Western Europe has almost never played a significant role in the post-war European migration history. East-west migration was largely suppressed for 40 years due to the political division of Europe. Mass migration has only occurred in cases of political crisis. With the end of the socialist regimes in Central and Eastern Europe however, east-west migration flows have been intensified. Particularly the large flows of people with a German origin out of Poland, the former Soviet Union, and Rumania should be mentioned in this context.

Besides these main patterns of European postwar migration, Fassmann and Münz (1992) mention also another pattern in European migration: the migration between hinterlands and home countries. This means that European migration clearly shows privileged social and geographical relationships between different countries. A further demonstration of this statement can be found in an analysis of the share of foreign resident population in six major receiving countries in Western Europe.

As Table 7.3 indicates, almost all Algerians, Tunisians, Portuguese and Moroccans in these six countries live in France. The vast majority of migrants
from East-Central Europe is to be found in Germany, while in addition, some 72 per cent of all ex-Yugoslavs and 74 per cent of Turks reside in Germany. Nine of the ten Greeks living in the six major receiving countries also reside in Germany. Most Finnish emigrants moved to Sweden, while most Austrian migrants emigrated to Germany. Although not in Table 7.3, it is well-known that the United Kingdom absorbs almost all Irish (outside Ireland), and almost all Indians, Pakistanis and Bangladeshis living in Europe. Migrants from Italy and Spain follow a less specific pattern. Italians outside Italy, who are registered in the six major receiving countries are mainly spread over Germany (37.8 per cent), Switzerland (26.7 per cent) and France (17.5 per cent). The majority of Spanish foreigners can be found in France (44.4 per cent), Germany or Switzerland.

From a total of 13.4 million foreigners in the EC in 1989, 49 per cent were citizens of non-European countries, 38 per cent citizens of other EC states, while only 13 per cent were citizens from other European countries. Among the non-European countries the Turkish people are, with 31 per cent of all Non-European citizens in Europe, by far the largest group, while all Africans represent about 36 per cent. Migrants from Asia and South and North America together represent about 33 per cent of the foreign citizens of non-European countries (Coleman 1993).

Finally we will focus upon the question, whether special types of migrants can be associated with special countries. A look at Table 7.2 containing data on the gross flows of migrants into Western Europe by types of immigration (labour migrants, ethnic migrants and asylum seekers) shows that ethnic migrants are only to be found in Germany. Muus and Cruijzen (1991) also mention in this context the ethnic Greeks coming from Eastern Europe. For the group of asylum seekers, it is noteworthy that Germany - followed by France - seems to be the most attractive country for them. The majority of labour migrants also seems to prefer Germany as the most attractive country of destination. Austria appears to be positioned on the second place in terms of absolute numbers of labour migrants. These high (absolute) numbers of all types of migrant inflows to Germany is paralleled by the fact that this country has in absolute numbers the largest foreign population, even without taking the ethnic Germans into account. In a relative sense however, by taking the foreign population as a percentage of the total population, Switzerland is with 16.5 per cent foreign population, the European country with the highest percentage of foreigners among its population (Coleman 1993).

7.3 Analytical Frameworks for Explaining International Migration: A Concise Survey

There is not a single theory for the explanation of international migration. There are different causes for international migration, there are different views on backgrounds and motives of migrants and hence there are different explanatory frameworks. We will only give a concise overview here.
7.3.1 The Equilibrium Approach

Table 7.3. Foreign resident population in six major receiving countries of Western Europe: Percent distribution of foreign residents by country of origin within the total foreign population of that origin residing in six receiving countries, and total foreign resident population by country of origin and country of residence, 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>Country of residence</th>
<th>Six-country total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>76.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-Central Europe</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (percent)</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (1,000s)</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>3,608</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Asterix indicates no data are available.
Sources from Fassmann and Münz: OECD.SOPEMI (1992, several tables)
Source: Fassmann and Münz (1992, Table 3)

The equilibrium approach to international migration represents a main direction in the explanation of international movements of people (see for an evaluation Wood 1982 and Bach and Schraml 1982). The equilibrium model of migration focuses the attention primarily on the rational calculus of the individual action.
Migration is in general regarded to be an individual choice process which can be cast in the framework of a neoclassical explanatory model. Migration streams are seen as the cumulative result of individual decisions based on a rational evaluation of the benefits to be gained and the costs entailed in moving. In the long run, migration will lead to a gradual convergence in the level of economic growth and social well being. In the context of labour market absorption it should be noted that the equilibrium approach seeks critical success absorption factors mainly in employment opportunities with higher returns.

7.3.2 The Historical Structural Approach

A second main direction of migration theories, the historical-structural approach, focuses on the origin of the costs and benefits faced by the potential migrants (see for a review again Bach and Schraml 1982; Wood 1982). Migration is seen as a macro-social process. Even though this approach is - because of the variety of considerations included - not so easy to characterize as the above equilibrium approach, in general this approach considers migration from a broader context of socio-economic and political changes. The bases of the structural perspective are mainly to be found in the historical materialism, according to which migration is deeply rooted in the pressures and counter-pressure in national economies, which lead to changes in the organization of production. Structural factors influence labour mobility through their impact on the degree and the spatial distribution of the demand for labour. Patterns of migration are thus explained in terms of changes in the organization of production which unequally affect the fortune of different classes. Critical success absorption factors are in general structural factors like socio-economic and political developments of capitalist economies.

7.3.3 The Utility Maximizing Approach

The utility framework offers a more modern version and extension of the economic equilibrium approach to migration (see, for instance, Borjas 1989). The author points out that this more recent approach to the economics of (im)migration is based on main assumptions of neoclassical theory. This means that the individual is a utility maximizer, whose behaviour is constrained by the financial situation of the actor and by the migration policies of the source country and the immigration policies of potential host countries. Based on the assumption that exchanges among various players lead to an equilibrium in the market place, Borjas discusses extensively the existence of an immigration market, which is acting as a sieve for migrants across potential host countries. In this immigration market, the different host countries function as the suppliers, making migration 'offers' in respect to a certain set of immigration regulations from which individuals on the demand side compare and choose, and so allocate themselves in the end nonrandomly among countries. Especially
interesting in our context is his assumption that host countries with a certain set of immigration regulations attract different types of persons. Based on these main assumptions, Borjas concentrates then on three questions, the determinants of the size and skill composition of immigrant flows to any particular host country, the process of assimilation of migrants in the host country, and the adjustment process after immigrating in the host countries’ labour market.

7.3.4 The Welfare State Approach

An interesting class of migration analyses refers to the importance of the welfare state in connection with international migration (cf. Freeman 1986). Freeman’s approach, which may be characterized as a welfare state approach, may be positioned in the field of political economy. The starting point of his analysis is to understand the development of a welfare state as a dialectic phenomenon between the distributive logic of closure and distributive logic of openness. The former is related to the fact that the welfare state has to restrain entry to preserve the advantages of itself; it has to restrict benefits and rights only to members. But at the same time the welfare states are on the other hand deeply embedded in the global political and economic order, and it is to this fact that the latter logic refers. The national economies of the welfare states are engaged in systematic exchanges with this larger global system.

In this openness however, Freeman sees several problems for the welfare state as well. Looking at the wide inequalities between the benefit levels and living standards that exist both among welfare states themselves and between them and the outside world, he notes that these inequalities are the main reason for external pressure from the international economy to disrupt and threaten the privileges that the welfare state represent. As the most important and directly relevant external economic factor from the point of view of the welfare state, Freeman addresses the issues of foreign labour. In line with the classical economic migration approach, Freeman seeks the explanation for migration in wage differences. But in contrast to the classical economic approach, he underlines the importance of indirect wages in the context of international migration. "Along with the high real, direct wages the social wage is part of the package of compensation that exerts an attractive pull on workers in less prosperous societies drawing them to the rich countries in anticipation of better lives" (Freeman 1986, p.55). But for Freeman it is not just a simple attraction of migrants by the welfare state, but rather the availability of the welfare state benefits to indigenous workers which helps the sequence of events which create the demand for foreign labour. In this context foreign labour is seen as the only real alternative to the elimination of the privileges of indigenous work force, but only if new workers are excluded from the rights of the welfare state. In this inflexibility of the welfare state’s labour market, Freeman looks amongst others for an explanation of the guest worker systems.
7.3.5 The Regulatory Approach

Migration is not just a free movement of people, but is strongly influenced by various physical and non-physical barriers. Zolberg (1989) has drawn attention to the importance of borders and regulations for migration. His approach aims to deal with the question that migration theories in general ignore the political dimension of migration. According to him it is the political perspective which helps to overcome the limitations of the historical-structural and the economic equilibrium approach. This political approach should - in this view - be macro-analytical and historical in nature. His framework consists of a world of individuals who maximize their welfare by exercising a variety of choices from which migration is only one. A second element of this world are exclusive societies acting as organized states to maximize collective goals by controlling the exit or entry of individuals. In Zolberg's approach it is very important that the character of international migration is related to a fundamental tension between the interests of individuals and societies and in addition between the sending and receiving countries.

Taking into account the fact that several states interact as parts of a larger whole - a situation which Zolberg calls an international social system - he takes the overall structural configuration of the international social system to provide and approximate an analytical matrix for analyzing migration policies. He illustrates his framework by two topics, labour migration from the Third World and refugee flows from new states.

Concerning the first topic the author studies the conflicting interests of industrial societies to maximize labour supply and to protect cultural integrity. He comes to the conclusion that, wherever economic expansion grinds to a halt, other concerns - like the integrative - get a greater impact on policy-making. The tension of migration may be found in the fact that it is quite evident for the population of less favoured regions to migrate to more desirable countries, but on the other for the more fortunate countries it is rational to preserve their favourable endowment by restricting entry. Only the self interest of the more favourable regions to obtain labour can in the end lead to entry possibilities.

7.3.6 The Tension Approach

There are only a few approaches to international migration which try to explain migration in the context of one general, global theory. The approach of Hoffmann-Nowotny (1981) is an example of such an attempt, which we may characterize - according to Penninx (1986) - in comparison to other more inductionistic-oriented attempts a deductionist approach. Hoffmann-Nowotny (1981) aims to explain international migration as a specific field of social reality only by means of the general Theory of Societal Systems. His System Theory Approach allows for a discussion of migration on the level of three different system units: the individual, the class and the collective system unit. Characteristic for Hoffmann-Nowotny's analysis on all levels is that migration is seen as the result of structural and anomic tensions. Structural tensions are
seen as the result of a divergence of power and prestige, which are themselves regarded as central theoretical concepts corresponding to the dimensions of societal systems conceptualized via structure and culture. Anomic tension is seen as the empirical consequence occurring at the moment when structural tensions exceed a certain threshold level, which is not further specified. From in this theoretical context, Hoffmann-Nowotny is analyzing migration as a process by which tensions are transformed and transferred.

7.3.7 The System Approach

The approach which has been discussed most in the most recent past and has increasingly gained attention is the system approach. This approach is based on the recognition that to capture the changing trends and patterns of contemporary international migration (see Section 7.2) requires a dynamic- instead of a static- perspective. Besides this emphasis on dynamics, a further main characteristic of the system approach is that a so-called migration system is used as the basic system of analysis (Kulu-Glasgow 1992). A migration system is defined as two or more places or more specific countries connected to each other by flows and counterflows of people.
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Fig. 7.1. A system framework of international migration
Figure 7.1 presents a scheme of a system approach to international migration by Kritz and Zlotnik (1992) indicating that besides flows of people also other flows link countries together in a system. Such flows occur within national contexts whose political, demographic, economic and social dimensions are changing partly in response to the feedbacks and adjustments that stem from the migration flow itself. In general, receiving countries are characterized by higher wages and better welfare, while sending countries with high numbers of emigrants have as - Kritz and Zlotnik (1992) note - usually lower wages and poorer conditions. If international migration is analyzed as embedded in a system like the one described in Figure 7.1 it is evident that micro- and macro-elements are both involved in the analyses. The role which the individual has in this system is the role of an active decision-maker, who develops strategies to migrate which are embedded in the different influences of the system.

At the end of this concise overview we may conclude that a system framework has - compared with the other approaches - the big advantage that it tries to take into account the variety of factors which play a role in the migration process. This approach is not restricted to a special type of migration and it does not only explain the existence of migration but also their size and composition over time. The special emphasis on networks - and especially on social networks - has a far greater importance if we recognize the fact that nowadays a majority of migration flows may be characterized as family migration. But on the other hand, also the system approach like most of the above approaches has only a framework character, which in the end does not allow to specify functional relationships or to offer directly testable hypotheses in empirical research.

7.4 Absorption Factors in International Migration

In this final section we will address the issue of the necessary conditions for a successful migration; in other words, which attraction and regulatory forces play a critical role in choosing a specific country of destination?

At the outset it should be noticed that the current scientific knowledge on critical success absorption factors is so far not very well developed. In most cases various aspects of critical success absorption factors in migration are analyzed as only one element next to many others, while empirical studies are not abundant in number. Important contributions can be found in studies by Engelbrektsson (1982) and Boisvert (1987), who focus on the role of social networks in the migration process, respectively regarding Turkish migrants to Sweden and Portuguese migrants to France.

For a meaningful classification of critical success absorption factors we refer here to an article by Fawcett and Arnold (1987). In their approach - which belongs to the broader group of system approaches - they present a migration system operating in a set of structural and contextual factors. The authors point out three different groups of such structural and contextual factors, namely
7.4.1 state to state relations and comparisons, 7.4.2 mass culture connections and 7.4.3 family and social networks. These structural and contextual factors may according to Fawcett and Arnold (1987) explain the diversity of Asian and Pacific immigrants to the United States. These three broad classes of contextual factors will now briefly be discussed.

7.4.1 State to State Relations and Comparison

Since in general economic aspects play a major role in explaining migration, it seems plausible to look first at a higher level of economic development as an indicator related to 'state to state relation and comparison'. The characterization of this factor as an critical success absorption factor is underlined by the observation that all major receiving countries have higher developed capitalistic economies and at least the image of an open economic system. As Fawcett and Arnold (1987) point out, the difference in economic development between origin and destination may be even more pertinent than the structure of the economic system.

Not mentioned by Fawcett and Arnold (1987), but of great importance from the angle of the welfare state approach is another critical success absorption factor, viz. a higher level of the development of the welfare state (e.g., a highly developed social security system in one country may attract migrants from a country with a less developed system). In the context of European migration this factor may play a role in migration from East to West and to some degree also from South to North.

The choice of migrants in favour of a specific country may next also be the result of economic dependency or dominance of the country of origin on the country of destination.

Another factor in the European context may be the existence of economic and technical assistance programmes in the country of destination, as it is well known that Western European states offer economic, financial, and technical assistance to members of Eastern European countries as well as to those from developing countries. Such migrants are - even though their migration streams do not play an important role in a quantitative sense - very often the bridgeheads for further migration flows.

Political dependency and dominance - as a result of former colonial linkages between some West European States and South-American, African and Asian countries - may also be seen as another critical success absorption factor. Especially in the case of refugees it is noteworthy that they were often attracted by stable democratic systems with more guarantees for social rights, so that essentially the difference in the internal political system between the country of destination and origin plays an important role. Given the politically unstable situations in the majority of the East European countries, it seems plausible to state that the political situation in West-European countries will - at least in the near future - be an important absorption factor. Finally, as mentioned already in the discussion of the regulatory approach, a very important factor in the first group of critical success absorption factors is immigration policies. Because of
the growing importance of the role of policies concerning international migration in Europe, we will discuss this factor separately later on.

7.4.2 Mass Culture Connections

The second group of critical success absorption factors refers in particular to cultural similarities and value systems of the country of origin and destination. The above described European migration patterns - especially the migration between hinterlands and homelands (see Section 7.2) - are at least to some extent the result of this fact.

Similar to this first factor is cultural dependency or dominance - the so called 'Westernization', especially in non-European states - as a component of the second group of absorption factors.

The media diffusion of cultural life style in television, radio, and press in the country of destination mainly plays a role as an art information source available in the country of origin. With the ever increasing importance of the mass media (especially in the developing world), the importance of information transferred by these media as an absorption factor, is also increasing.

The existence of a common language, common religion, compatible religious beliefs as well as similarities of the educational systems are further factors attracting and absorbing migrants. However, the latter group of factors clearly illustrates that some factors only play a complementary role next to other factors in the absorption process.

As a last absorption factor face-to-face contacts through international travel should be mentioned, especially in light of the growing international mobility.

7.4.3 Family and Social Networks

The third group of absorption factors refers to the fact that connections with relatives, friends and former community members in destination countries are also strong elements in prompting a move and facilitating settlement by providing help with jobs and housing. A first factor to be mentioned in this context is the geographic dispersion of relatives and friends, which quite often is characterized as a geographic clustering of relatives and friends in the country of destination.

Besides these connections of relatives and friends it is the connection with members of the home country or community - who are not necessarily relatives or friends - which plays a major role as social networks and consequently as a critical success absorption factor.

As a third factor we point to the historically grown depth and intensity of family and community relationships. In this context, we stress the fact that the duration of migration streams established in the past influences the effects of family and other social connections with the country of destination.

Also visiting and communication patterns of family and friends in the country of destination can stimulate new migrants in the country of origin to enter a specific country of destination.
The social and economic status of previous migrants and the frequency and amount of remittances may give potential migrants in the country of origin important signs and information on the possibilities for foreign migrants in a specific country of destination.

Normative household and family structures and normative family obligations and commitments may in a way also be considered as critical success absorption factors. The fact that some cultures place more emphasis on the welfare of members of immediate family (direct kinship), while other cultures stress obligations to virtually all relatives is also important in this context. An interesting difference may then arise, if immigrants accumulate resources in order to expand the inflow of eligible members (leading to an absorption of new migrants) or where resources are accumulated only for the immediate family and therefore do not - at least directly - attract new migrants.

As a conclusion on this last group of absorption factors 'family and social networks', we emphasize here the strategic importance of informal information transfer from the former migrants in the country of destination given to potential migrants in the country of origin, which leads the latter to prefer a specific country to another country. The importance of these kinds of 'personal' information needs to be analyzed in more detail (see for example Brown et al 1981 for internal migration into Columbus, Ohio).

7.5. Policy Issues

Finally, we will pay attention to policy questions. Each European state has its own immigration policy. This diversity leads to some divergences which are mirrored in the absorption of different types of migrants from different countries. Two classes of such diverse regulations or policies in different European countries affecting absorption may be distinguished, namely those referring to the stage of entering a country and on those referring to the stage of adaption (see Fawcett and Arnold 1987).

The first class of policies and regulations related to the stage of entering a country contains issues like: regulations and/or policies about entry conditions and political asylum, family immigration, deportation and categories of immigrants protected from deportation. For example, regulations on family immigration stress the question, whether immigration is allowed (or admission procedures are necessary) for spouses and children and which conditions have to be fulfilled in addition (see Costa-Lascoux 1990). For a more detailed comparison of the above mentioned regulations and/or various policies between France, Germany, Italy and the Netherlands we refer to Costa-Lascoux (1990) and for a comparison between Germany, Belgium, France, Great Britain and the Netherlands to Groth and Just (1985).

As an example of the second group of regulations concerned with the stage of adaption, the following issues may be mentioned: political rights for foreigners in comparison to nationals, the possibilities for foreigners to get a working or
residence permit, the possibilities to participate in the social security system of a country and general adjustment policies for immigrants. In order to illustrate the latter - general adjustment-policies, the example of the Netherlands, where positive discrimination and the emancipation of minorities is advocated, may be mentioned in contrast to the example of Germany, which develops vocational education, social aid and the idea of participation in local life (Costa-Lascoux 1990). Integration policies in France in part seek active participation in the national community by encouraging naturalization and not by recognizing ethnic communities (Coleman 1993).

A comparison, for instance, between France and Germany with respect to political rights of foreigners in comparison to nationals shows, that in France only French nationals are entitled to vote and be elected (with the additional regulation that immigrants can be elected by their compatriots as delegates to some municipal councils). In Germany, in principle the same regulation can be observed, with the exception that foreigners have voting rights at communal elections in some municipalities (Costa-Lascoux 1990).

The effect of different nationality rights in Europe may be illustrated by means of the example of Great Britain. In 1983, three different categories of citizenship with British nationality have been created: the British citizenship (which applies to persons born in the United Kingdom itself), the British citizenship of the dependent territories (which applies to persons born in one of the dependent territories) and the British overseas citizenship (which apply to nationals of former British colonies). Only British citizens can reside in the UK and have the right to free circulation and residence in the UK. Also the examples of the ethnic Germans shows that absorption is dependent on the rights resulting from different definitions of a 'foreign' immigrant or a 'national' immigrant (Costa-Lascoux 1990).

Finally, some remarks on convergence emerging in European states have to be added (see also Velling 1993; Van de Kaa 1993; Meijers 1991). Mainly because of increasing flows of immigrants into Europe and the related problems (such as racial trends in the countries of destination, integration problems etc.), in all Western European countries entry conditions for non-Europeans are becoming more restrictive. For EC-Europeans on the other hand migration between the member countries of the EC becomes much easier with the unification of Europe.

Until now migration between EC countries is jointly regulated by the order 90/364/EWG, which restricts the right to stay in a given EC-country only for people who cannot afford their own living costs. In addition, people who stay more than three months in a country need an allowance. With the agreement for the European Economic Area however, the freedom of movement between the EC countries is extended to the EFTA countries. In addition, migration between Scandinavian countries is to be characterized by freedom of movement. Concerning migration from outside the EC, general trends towards a more strictly coordinated immigration policy may be observed, even though it is not yet entirely clear on which level (for example, the European or national level) this coordination should be effectuated. Besides, some bi-lateral and multi-lateral agreements do exist between countries concerning a coordinated
immigration policy. One of these agreements is the Schengen Agreement (1990) signed by Germany, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg. The main purpose of this agreement is a gradual abolition of migration controls at the common (internal) borders and free circulation of citizens of countries which are a party in the agreement, although the competence of migration authorities at the supra-national level will increase. A comprehensive Schengen information system will be developed in order to be able to control the external borders effectively. Introduction of a uniform visa and specification of criteria under which an alien can be given permission to enter the joint territory is also laid down in the Schengen Agreement.

In conclusion, regulatory systems will play an increasingly important role in international migration in Europe. Such systems will have a dual function: to encourage economic efficiency through free movement of people in the EC (and associated) countries and to discourage aliens (non-EC members) to enter the EC territory by introducing more strict regulations and absorption mechanism. Consequently, future international migration flows in Europe will be determined by two main factors: socio-economic disparities, both inside the EC countries and between the EC countries and the rest of world, and migration regulations. Thus, socio-political isolation of European citizens will at the end be determined by economic and regulatory conditions.
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