

Global Migration Issues 3

Rudolf Anich
Jonathan Crush
Susanne Melde
John O. Oucho *Editors*

A New Perspective on Human Mobility in the South



International Organization for Migration (IOM)



Springer

A New Perspective on Human Mobility in the South

Global Migration Issues

Volume 3

Series Editor:

Dr. Frank Laczko

Head of Research and Publications, International Organization for Migration(IOM),
Geneva

This book series contributes to the global discussion about the future of migration policy through the publication of a series of books on emerging migration issues. Most reports on migration policy tend to focus on national or regional perspectives; books in this series will focus on global policy challenges, such as the impact of climate change or the global economic crisis, on migration.

This series is closely linked to the production of IOM's *World Migration Report*. Some of the books in this series will be based on research which has been prepared for the *World Migration Report*.

The series also includes a special focus on the linkages between migration and development, and the themes discussed each year at the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD), given the growing policy interest in harnessing the benefits of migration for development.

More information about this series at <http://www.springer.com/series/8837>

Rudolf Anich • Jonathan Crush
Susanne Melde • John O. Oucho
Editors

A New Perspective on Human Mobility in the South

 Springer

Editors

Rudolf Anich
IOM
Geneva 19
Switzerland

Susanne Melde
IOM
Geneva 19
Switzerland

Jonathan Crush
Balsilie School of International Affairs
Waterloo
Ontario
Canada

John O. Oucho
African Migration Development Policy
Centre
Nairobi
Kenya



ACP OBSERVATORY ON MIGRATION
OBSERVATOIRE ACP SUR LES MIGRATIONS
OBSERVATÓRIO ACP DAS MIGRAÇÕES

ISSN 2213-2511

ISSN 2213-252X (electronic)

ISBN 978-94-017-9022-2

ISBN 978-94-017-9023-9 (eBook)

DOI 10.1007/978-94-017-9023-9

Springer Dordrecht Heidelberg New York London

Library of Congress Control Number: 2014940756

© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2014

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed. Exempted from this legal reservation are brief excerpts in connection with reviews or scholarly analysis or material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the Copyright Law of the Publisher's location, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer. Permissions for use may be obtained through RightsLink at the Copyright Clearance Center. Violations are liable to prosecution under the respective Copyright Law.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

While the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication, neither the authors nor the editors nor the publisher can accept any legal responsibility for any errors or omissions that may be made. The publisher makes no warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Foreword

South–South migration has slowly but surely emerged as a key cross-cutting issue for migration and development researchers and practitioners. In 2008, when the European Union and the African, Caribbean, Pacific (ACP) Group of States called for the establishment of an observatory on migration, the idea of looking at migration from an exclusively “Southern” perspective was innovative and little explored. Reconsidering the issue in 2014, migration within the South of the world and its impact on development is accepted as a recognized topic by governments and institutions, supported by improved statistical evidence and socioeconomic data.

The global perception of migration and its dynamics have changed and will continue to change at a fast-growing speed, with the emergence of regional poles in the South playing increasingly important roles in shaping geopolitical, economic and social change, and as a consequence of the economic recession and slow or even reversed growth in the North.

Still, despite this backdrop, the quantity and quality of studies and analysis on South–South migration are scarce in number and limited in scope, with the recent research activities by the ACP Observatory on Migration aiming to fill part of this gap. The ACP Observatory was established in 2010 to produce data on South–South migration within ACP countries for migrants, civil society and policymakers; enhance research capacities and capabilities in ACP countries; and facilitate the creation of a network of research institutions and experts on migration research. Through a bottom-up approach, the ACP Observatory is linking research and data with a network of national stakeholders that includes representatives of governments, academia and civil society. These activities are supported by an academic consortium of research and university centers based in ACP countries and Europe.

Approaching migration analysis from this standpoint, it is with great pleasure that the ACP Observatory welcomes this contribution edited by Rudolf Anich, Jonathan Crush, Susanne Melde and John O. Oucho. This publication thoroughly investigates critical issues of the migration debate, spanning from the terminological and contextual meaning of “migration” and “development”, and carefully moving the lenses from South–North and North–North to South–South. In this way, the edited volume questions our traditional conception of the migration paradigm and shedding innovative insights on South–South mobility, on critical realities such as dias-

pora communities living in the South, and on environmental change and its impact on development or child migration. This critical contribution will help to expand the debate and stimulate further research on this topic and, hopefully, promote future activities aiming at the protection of migrants and their families living in the South.

ACP Observatory on Migration

Monika Peruffo

Acknowledgments

This volume is the third in a book series launched in 2011 by Springer Science+Business Media in partnership with the International Organization for Migration (IOM) entitled *Global Migration Issues*. The overall editor of the new series is Frank Laczko, Head of Migration Research Division, IOM Headquarters in Geneva.

This third book has benefited from the encouragement of Laurent de Boeck, former Director of the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Observatory on Migration, and Monika Peruffo, ad-interim Director of the ACP Observatory on Migration.

The editors would like to thank all chapter authors for their valuable expert contributions, commitment and patience throughout the whole production process. We also give special thanks to IOM's copy editor Mylene Buensuceso, and to Livia Manente and Paula Maria Subia of the ACP Observatory on Migration, for their precious help in finalizing this publication.

The editors also wish to thank all colleagues and friends for their valuable comments and suggestions while peer-reviewing this book.

Contents

1 Introduction: The South–South Migration and Development Nexus	1
Susanne Melde, Rudolf Anich, Jonathan Crush and John O. Oucho	
2 Intra- and Extraregional Migration in the South: The Case of Africa	21
Bernard Mumpasi Lututala	
3 Labor Mobility, Regional Integration and Social Protection in Southern Economies	49
John O. Oucho	
4 Diasporas of the South	65
Abel Chikanda and Jonathan Crush	
5 Impact of Remittances in Developing Countries	89
Manuel Orozco and Caryn Gay Ellis	
6 Environmental Change and (Im)Mobility in the South	119
Eberhard Weber	
7 Migration of Children in ACP Countries: Of Their Own Free Will or by Force?	149
Olivia Tiffoche	

Contributors

Rudolf Anich International Organization for Migration (IOM), Geneva, Switzerland

Abel Chikanda Southern African Migration Programme (SAMP), Queen's University, Kingston, Canada

Balsillie School of International Affairs, Waterloo, Canada

Jonathan Crush International Migration TRece, Queen's University, Kingston, Canada

International Migration Research Centre, Balsillie School of International Affairs, Waterloo, Canada

University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa

Caryn Gay Ellis The Inter-American Dialogue, Washington, DC, USA

Susanne Melde International Organization for Migration (IOM), Geneva, Switzerland

Bernard Mumpasi Lututala University of Kinshasa, Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo

Regional Centre for Research and Documentation on Women, Gender and Peace Building in the Great Lakes Region, Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo

Manuel Orozco The Inter-American Dialogue, Washington, DC, USA

John O. Oucho African Migration and Development Policy Centre (AMADPOC), University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya

University of Nairobi and African Migration and Development Policy Centre (AMADPOC), Nairobi, Kenya

Olivia Tiffoche ACP Observatory on Migration Brussels, Belgium

Eberhard Weber The University of the South Pacific, Suva, Fiji Islands

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ACP	Africa, Caribbean and Pacific
AEC	African Economic Community
AU	African Union
BRICS	Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa
CEN-SAD	Community of Sahel-Sahara States
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
DRCMGP	Development Research Centre on Migration, Globalisation and Poverty
EAC	East African Community
ECCAS	Economic Community of Central African States
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
FOMP	Facilitation of Movement of Persons
FATF	Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GFMD	Global Forum on Migration and Development
GMG	Global Migration Group
HDI	Human Development Index
HLD	High-level Dialogue (on International Migration and Development)
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
ILO	International Labour Organization
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IOM	International Organization for Migration
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
MFI	Microfinance Institution
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSG	Melanesian Spearhead Group
MTC	Money Transfer Company
MTO	Money Transfer Operator
NESMUWA	Network of Surveys on Migration and Urbanization in West Africa
OAU	Organisation of African Unity
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

PAC	Pacific Access Category
PICTA—TIS	Pacific Island Countries Trade Agreement—Trade in Services
REC	Regional Economic Community
RSE	Recognized Seasonal Employer
SACU	Southern African Customs Union
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SAMP	Southern African Migration Project
SLA	Sustainable Livelihood Approach
SME	Small- and Medium-sized Enterprise
SMS	Skills Movement Scheme
SQ	Samoa Quota
UN DESA	United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCAP	United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
UN.GIFT	United Nations Global Initiative to Fight Human Trafficking
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children’s Fund
THB	Thai Baht

Chapter 1

Introduction: The South–South Migration and Development Nexus

Susanne Melde, Rudolf Anich, Jonathan Crush and John O. Oucho

Introduction

The year 2013 was marked by the second United Nations High-level Dialogue (HLD) on International Migration and Development which took place in October in New York (UN 2012; Omelaniuk 2013). The HLD is the latest global event in what has been a remarkable decade for the migration policy and research community. Since 2000, there has been an avalanche of conferences, workshops, commissions and research examining the links between migration and development. None of this seemed likely in the late 1990s when international migration was far more likely to be a source of tension and conflict between states than an arena for dialogue and cooperation (Castles 1999). Key moments in the movement of migration and development up the global governance agenda since 2000 include the Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM 2005), the first UN HLD in 2006 (UN 2006), the establishment of the annual Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) (Omelaniuk 2008, 2012), the formation of the multi-agency

S. Melde (✉) · R. Anich
International Organization for Migration (IOM), Geneva, Switzerland
e-mail: smelde@iom.int

R. Anich
e-mail: ranich@iom.int

J. Crush
International Migration TRece, Queen's University, Kingston, Canada
e-mail: crushj@queensu.ca

International Migration Research Centre, Balsillie School of International Affairs,
Waterloo, Canada
e-mail: jcrush@balsillieschool.ca

University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa

J. O. Oucho
African Migration and Development Policy Centre (AMADPOC), University of Nairobi,
Nairobi, Kenya
e-mail: joucho@uonbi.ac.ke; john.oucho@amadpoc.org

R. Anich et al. (eds.), *A New Perspective on Human Mobility in the South*,
Global Migration Issues 3, DOI 10.1007/978-94-017-9023-9_1,
© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2014

Global Migration Group (GMG 2010, 2013), the establishment of the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Observatory on Migration in 2010, and the production of key publications such as the 2009 UN Human Development Report on international migration (UNDP 2009), the 2010 GMG Handbook on Mainstreaming Migration into development planning and more than 50 Migration Profiles produced by developing countries.

The international policy dialogue on the migration–development nexus is based on a small number of core issues on which constructive debate has been possible. These include the benefits of financial transfers by migrants (impact of remittances, cf. Orozco and Ellis, this volume), the role of diasporas in development (cf. Chikanda and Crush, this volume), circular temporary migration and return migration. More politically sensitive issues—such as the brain drain, the protection of migrant rights and freedom of movement—are, by common consent, generally avoided (Crush 2013).

Most of the policy thinking and dialogue about the relationship between migration and development has also been dominated by a focus on international migration from developing to developed countries, from South to North. The basic question is whether South–North migration is harmful or beneficial to the development prospects of the South. The emerging consensus is that managed migration is a “triple win” for countries of origin and destination and for migrants themselves. As with the policy dialogue, the bulk of the contemporary research literature on migration and development focuses on South–North movements. A recent example is the June 2012 anniversary edition of the flagship journal *International Migration* entitled “Migration and Development Buzz? Rethinking the Migration Development Nexus and Policies” (Brønden 2012). While many of the contributors are relatively skeptical of the “buzz”, the papers focus almost exclusively on migration from South to North. No explanation is offered as to why South–North migration is the focus of a special issue on a global phenomenon. Castles and Delgado Wise’s (2008) edited volume *Migration and Development: Perspectives from the South* is the first to systematically examine the migration and development issue from the standpoint of the South. They persuasively argue that the migration relationship between South and North cannot be divorced from the broader set of interactions between the two regions: “Adopting ‘perspectives from the South’ ... means developing a comprehensive analysis, which examines each specific phenomenon (such as migration) in the broad context of the overall dynamics of North–South relationships, and the interactions of the various spatial levels (local, regional, transnational, etc.)” (Castles and Delgado Wise 2008, p. 9). For all its strengths in foregrounding a Southern perspective as corrective, the volume still focuses primarily on North–South relationships and the policy response to South–North migration.

The possibility that migration within the South has development consequences for countries of origin and destination was all but ignored until very recently. In 2007, two publications highlighted the need to pay much greater attention to South–South migration. Ratha and Shaw (2007) demonstrated that migration within the South was numerically as important as that from South to North. In some regions

(such as Africa) it was much more significant. Hujo and Piper (2007) suggested that it was time to consider whether migration between developing countries had development impacts and to expand the definition of those impacts to include social and economic development. Since 2007, the idea of South–South migration has gained greater traction, with an increasing number of publications adopting the terminology in a wide variety of contexts (Gindling 2009; Hujo and Piper 2010; Lee 2010; Schiff 2010; Bartlett 2012; Gagnon and Khoudour-Castéras 2012; Fachhini et al. 2013; Mohan 2013). However, when analysing migration patterns within the South, attention was predominantly given to forced migration, such as the cases of internally displaced persons, asylum-seekers and refugees, although these movements only represent a minority of people migrating between developing countries. Conscious of the knowledge gaps about the relationship between South–South migration and development, the ACP Observatory on Migration began implementing a systematic program of research in 12 pilot countries in 2010 (de Boeck 2012, Melde 2012a; ACP 2013). This volume is one of the products of that endeavor. Drawing on the ACP Observatory-sponsored research, as well as other literature, the volume focuses on South–South migration patterns and how these subvert and challenge the dominant South–North migration and development paradigm. While recognizing that the majority of migrants in developing countries move within their countries, this publication focuses on cross-border movements within the South as they represent one of the most overlooked issues in the global migration debate.

Interpreting “Migration” and “Development”

Both “migration” and “development” are often seen as self-evident concepts that do not require detailed scrutiny or definition. “Development” itself has been subject to a vast array of interpretations over the years. As a result, it tends to be left largely undefined and unexamined in the migration and development debate. In development studies, the idea of “development” is generally dated to the 1940s and the attempts by colonial powers to move beyond the naked exploitation of their territorial possessions and to quell the growing tide of anti-colonial protest and disorder. However, the contemporary idea of development has a much longer historical pedigree, dating back to the Industrial Revolution in Europe. As Cowen and Shenton (1995, p. 29) argue, “it was in Europe that development was first meant to create order out of the social disorder of rapid urbanization, poverty and unemployment.” In post-World War II Europe, development was defined in a more narrow technocratic sense as denoting economic growth in gross domestic product (GDP) (absolute or per capita) and progression along a path which would see the “developing” countries of the South take on the attributes of the “developed” countries of the North. Whether this is possible, or even desirable, is the question at the heart of a vast literature on development theory (de Haas 2010).

More recently, measures of development have expanded to include human security, capabilities and freedoms, and individual autonomy—all under the rubric of “human development” (Castles 2009). United Nations Development Programme (2010), for example, defines human development as:

A process of enlarging people’s choices ... achieved by expanding human capabilities and functionings. At all levels of development, the three essential capabilities for human development are for people to lead long and healthy lives, to be knowledgeable and to have a decent standard of living. But the realm of human development goes further: essential areas of choice, highly valued by people, range from political, economic and social opportunities for being creative and productive to enjoying self-respect, empowerment and a sense of belonging to a community. The concept of human development is a holistic one putting people at the centre of all aspects of the development process.

United Nations Development Programme’s annual *Human Development Reports* all adopt this broader framing of development (UNDP 2009). The GFMD also claims to take a human development-based approach (Omelaniuk 2008). The real challenge is that in adopting a less economic and more holistic definition of development outcomes, the links between migration and development become that much harder to unravel. For example, the process of “expanding people’s choices” (which is seen as integral to human development), would mean enlarging their freedom to live where they choose. This, in turn, would mean relaxing border controls that dissuade and prevent people from exercising this freedom. As the Gallup World Poll found, about 16% of the world’s adults—which translates to roughly 700 million people worldwide—would like to move to another country permanently if they had the means (IOM 2011a).

On the migration side of the nexus, the main problem is not so much conceptual confusion as a lack of terminological consistency. The terms *migration* and *immigration* are often used interchangeably, for example. Some object to the use of the terms *migrant-sending countries* and *migrant-receiving countries*, preferring the more neutral terms like *migrant origins* and *migrant destinations*. Even this binary classification is problematic since many countries are origin and destination as well as transit points to other destinations. Most researchers seem to agree that talking of migrants’ countries of origin as their “home countries” undermines their standing and integration in their countries of destination, even though many migrants themselves make free use of the term. The term *international migrant* is defined differently in many countries and often also between ministries within the same countries. In many developed countries, the term *migrant* carries negative connotations, referring to someone from another, often developing, country who is unwanted (as in illegal “immigrant” or “illegal migrant”). Developed countries also shun the use of the word *migrant* to describe their own citizens who migrate abroad, preferring to use the term *expatriate* instead (Hugo 2012). Within the migration and development debate, the term *diaspora* is growing in currency. However, there is no agreement on what constitutes a diaspora, whether all migrants are members of diasporas, and whether an interest in development is a prerequisite for being a diaspora member. To bring greater clarity and uniformity to the lexicon of migration, the International Organization for Migration (IOM) (2011b) has provided a basic set of working definitions for a range of migration concepts and terms.

An additional source of conceptual confusion is what Castles (2009, p. 2) calls the “fragmentation and narrowness of migration studies” and the fact that research “does not build on shared concepts and questions, and does not, on the whole, lead to an accumulation of knowledge”. One of the problems is an absence of interdisciplinary conversation and the proliferation of terms and concepts that only make sense to those within disciplinary walls. One exception to this generalization is the large and vibrant interdisciplinary field of transnational studies (Vertovec 2009). With some exceptions, ideas about transnationalism have not penetrated very far into discussions about the relationship between migration and development, however (Sorenson 2007; Glick Schiller and Faist 2010; Faist et al. 2013). One of the reasons for this is that transnationalism potentially undermines the centrality of the nation-state as the core unit of analysis and object of development (Amelina and Faist 2012). Going even further, Faist (2008) suggests that adopting a transnational approach would mean abandoning various binary distinctions that are central to the current migration and development debate: “sending versus receiving”, “origin versus destination”, “emigration versus immigration” and so on. The real challenge is actually not to dispense altogether with state-centered concepts but rather to integrate them with the understanding of migrant behavior, practices and attitudes.

Newland (2007) has observed that “the evidence base for the links between migration and development is still very weak”. Castles (2009), on the other hand, argues that migration research findings do exist on this issue but are not being listened to by policymakers. In the early stages of the current optimistic phase of the migration and development debate, there was a growing rapprochement between policymakers eager to learn more from researchers who themselves perceived an opportunity for influencing policy. This conversation has increasingly run aground. Governments and international organizations seem to feel that they know all there is to know about migration and development or they do not care for the critical arguments of researchers. Researchers, on the other hand, have become increasingly disenchanted with the whole migration and development debate, seeing the hidden hand of neoliberal ideology at every turn (Skeldon 2008; Raghuram 2009; de Haas 2012; Mullings 2012). Expert debates are increasingly confined to a narrowing circle of academic publications which policymakers neither read nor heed.

The idea that there is a migration and development “nexus” is designed to convey that the relationship between the two is reciprocal in nature (Crush and Frayne 2007; Faist 2008; Faist et al. 2013; Sørensen 2012; Geiger and Pécoud 2013). In practice, the migration policy debate has paid much more attention to the impact of the movement of people on development rather than vice versa (Castles 2009). When policymakers do turn to the influence of development on migration, they invariably get caught in the “root causes” trap. This is the argument that migration is undesirable and an expression of the “failure” of development. Only new development can act as an antidote to migration by addressing its root causes such as poverty, unemployment and food insecurity (Bakewell 2008). However, the research evidence does not generally support this view. For example, the concept of the “migration hump” (de Haas 2007) suggests that rising levels of economic development actually lead to increasing migration. Industrialization means fewer

employment opportunities in rural areas, comparatively low wages and more people leaving a country. If industrialization and economic development continue, workers can become in short supply, which leads to higher wages. This, in turn, affects emigration levels, which begin to decline.

A recent exception to the general disregard for the influence of development on migration is the GMG's (2010) *Mainstreaming Migration into Development Planning: A Handbook for Policy-makers and Practitioners*. The handbook discusses a broad range of economic, governance and public services factors, social and political freedoms, demographic imbalances, and conflict and transnational factors which can affect migration flows. The handbook also discusses environmental factors leading to major internal displacements and population movements within the Global South. Another exception is the policy-oriented work of one of the ACP Observatory partners, the Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR). The Institute's Development on the Move project, conducted in partnership with the Global Development Network, mapped eight areas where development can affect migration and vice versa (Chappell and Srisikandarajah 2007). These areas include economics, education, health, gender, wider social impacts, governance, environmental sustainability and disaster relief. This matrix has been developed further to look at concrete impact indicators and also includes the impact of development on human rights (Melde 2012b).

Towards South–South Migration

Until recently, the global migration and development policy debate focused almost exclusively on migration from the South to the North and the potential contribution of migrants in the North to development in the South. There are a number of reasons for this. First, as Crush and Ramachandran (2010) suggest, the focus on South–North migration “is perfectly consistent with the idea that what matters most in development is how the South can become more like the North and whether South–North migration hinders or helps that process”. The global migration and development agenda therefore calls on countries in the South “to recognize the benefits that accrue to them from the migration of their citizens to the North”. Second, South–North migration has been a long-standing source of attention and grievance in the South where governments have complained about the negative consequences of the “creaming off” of their talent and skills. By viewing South–North migration through a migration and development lens, it has been possible to reframe migration as having a largely positive outcome for countries in the South and for migrants themselves. However, the focus still remains on South–North movement. Third, the countries of the North have a particular concern with unregulated South–North migration and how “development” in the South can stem the flow of unwanted migrants (Walters 2010). Furthermore, the media ensures that the “myth of invasion” (de Haas 2008) in the case of African migrants trying to “reach” Europe remains uppermost in the public mind. This concern, indeed obsession, has the effect of keeping the focus squarely on policies to control South–North movement.

Finally, most funders of migration and development research are European and North American. For example, the European Union plays a key role in funding of research (not just in the social sciences) and appears to prioritize only migration studies strategically relevant to its Member States. Berriane and de Haas (2012, p. 2) state that “[t]he high dependency on commissioned research is a more general problem of migration research, which is often guided by the short-term policy interests to ‘solve’ what are perceived as ‘migration problems’ or ‘migration challenges’, rather than trying to achieve a more profound understanding of the nature, causes and consequences of migration”. South–South Migration does not (at least not directly) affect societies in the North and is thus not of immediate concern to the general public or funding agencies.

Mapping the South

A key initial question when beginning to articulate a research and policy agenda for South–South migration is the usefulness of the concept of “the South” itself. Some have suggested that the term is too simplistic to be of much utility. Bakewell (2013), for example, argues that other categories are far more useful than “North” and “South” when it comes to international migration. He maintains that terms such as “intra-regional migration”, “regional and global labor hubs” (such as the Gulf countries, and cities in China, India, Brazil and South Africa) and “migration patterns based on historical ties” (such as in the Lusophone African countries) are of far greater utility. The suggestion is interesting, but it does not mean we should abandon the concept of South–South migration, which has both analytical and heuristic value as a way of distinguishing between what are often very different kinds of global migration flows.

The term “South” inevitably encompasses a very diverse group of countries and is generally used very loosely, almost metaphorically. What it dispenses with, though, is the hierarchical nature and connotations of inferiority inherent in terms such as “Third World” and “developing countries” (Chant and McIlwaine 2009). But there is certainly no unanimity on which countries should be considered part of the South. The World Bank, for example, distinguishes low- and middle-income countries of “the South” from high-income countries. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development refers to the category of “least developed countries”. UNDP uses the Human Development Index (HDI) to determine which countries belong in the South. The advantage of using the HDI is that it is not just based on income but also includes other variables such as life expectancy and education. All countries without a very high HDI are considered part of the South. Countries that fall within the HDI definition of the South are still very heterogeneous, however: at one end of the spectrum are countries like Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa (BRICS), while at the other are extremely poor and deprived states like Haiti, Lesotho or Timor-Leste.

While the South–North dichotomy is a somewhat artificial divide, it does serve to highlight the importance of increasing mobility among countries within those regions that are largely ignored in the migration and development policy debate. While certain South–South migration systems, such as those in Southern Africa and West Africa, are well documented and studied, others tend to go unnoticed despite increasing evidence of their importance (Crush and Tevera 2010, Gagnon and Khoudour-Castéras 2012). Malaysia, Thailand and India, for example, are all important regional attraction poles. Little information also exists on the Maghreb countries becoming de facto immigration destinations and how transit periods are lengthening, sometimes up to a few years duration (Brachet 2012; Cherti and Grant 2013). Similarly, much more needs to be known about transit regions in the Sahel states (Brachet 2012).

South–South Mobility

One of the aims of this volume is to highlight what is currently known about South–South migration and its relationship to development. At the aggregate level, there can be little doubt about its numerical significance. According to latest data from United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA) (2013), about 59% of the world’s 2013 migrant population of 232 million (defined as people who changed their country of usual residence) were living in the North and about 41% were living in the South. However, since these figures are projections from census data, it is likely that they underestimate the size of the migrant population in the South since they exclude many short-term, temporary (as well as undocumented) movements. Looking at origin and destination, the *World Migration Report 2013* (IOM 2013) highlights that—regardless of the definition used for “South” and “North”—movements between countries in the South (ranging between 34 and 41% of the global total) represent the major migration pathway together with South–North migration (35–45%). These figures are similar to estimates generated by the Gallup World Poll collecting information from 25,000 migrants in more than 150 countries (cf. IOM 2013).

The relative importance of South–North and South–South migration differs considerably from region to region (Table 1.1). For example, intraregional migration in Africa accounts for 15.5 out of 29.2 million (or 53% of the total) compared with 9.4 million African migrants in Europe and North America (UN DESA 2012) (cf. Lututala, this volume). Comparing various subregions of the continent, 76% of all West African migrants resided in a different country in West Africa in 2010. Intra-regional migration, as a proportion of the total, was 56% in Asia but only 14% in Latin America and the Caribbean.

Mobility among countries in the South is likely to continue to increase, as the barriers to immigration in the North are raised higher and many countries part of the South represent emerging economies with greater job and employment opportunities (such as Brazil, India and China). New migration corridors have opened in the South–South context such as West Africans crossing the Atlantic to Argentina or