

**Archive of the Population-Environment Research Network (PERN)
Cyberseminar Discussions on Should Borders be Open?
The Population-Environment Dimension¹
30 September – 11 October 2002**

Date: Thu, 26 Sep 2002 12:06:52 -0400 (EDT)
From: PERN Lists Manager <pern-m@ciesin.columbia.edu>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>

Dear Participant,

WELCOME TO THE POPULATION ENVIRONMENT RESEARCH NETWORK
CYBERSEMINAR
"Should Borders be Open? The Population and Environment Dimension"
September 30 - October 11 2002

This cyberseminar takes off from the four papers from the migration debate
at the 2001 IUSSP General Conference in
Bahia.

"Why Borders Cannot be Open" by David Coleman;
"Should Borders be Open?" by Antonio Golini;
"Should Borders be Open?" by Charles Keely; and
"Should Frontiers be Opened to International Migration?" by Jorge Santibanez

The discussion paper is:

"Open Borders and the Environment: Externalities and Unexpected
Consequences" by Sara Curran

All papers and the discussion are online at
www.populationenvironmentresearch.org on the cyberseminars page.

The seminar itself will be opened by Alan Simmons, who was one of the
chairs in the original debate at Bahia.

Two weekly summaries will be written by the PERN Coordinator, Annababette
Wils.

STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

To ensure that the cyberseminar is successful and that we have a lively
intellectual discussion, we would like to ask all the participants to be
mindful of a few standards of conduct similar to those you might find in a
face-to-face meeting. Please remember :

Respectful disagreement is fine; impoliteness is not accepted. Opinions are welcome;
advocacy is not - this is an intellectual debate,
please refrain from using this forum for any advocacy purposes

¹ See <http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org/seminars.jsp>.

Respect other's email space: do not repeat something you have already said and limit yourself to a reasonable number of postings.

With these standards in mind, we look forward to your active participation in the seminar.

LOGISTICS OF THE SEMINAR

The listserv will be open as of September 30, 2002 at 9 AM Eastern U.S. time and will close October 11, 2002 at 5 PM Eastern U.S. time. To post a contribution, send it to pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu.

To unsubscribe from the seminar send an email to majordomo@ciesin.columbia.edu with "unsubscribe pernseminars" in the body of the text.

Registration is open throughout the seminar, please forward this welcome to a colleague who might be interested. For those who join later, the discussion will be archived on the website at www.populationenvironmentresearch.org on the cyberseminars page.

PERN seeks to facilitate scientific analysis about population and environment relationships.

PERN is sponsored by:

International Union for the Scientific Study of Population (IUSSP)

<http://www.iussp.org/>

International Human Dimensions of Global Change Programme (IHDP)

<http://www.ihdp.uni-bonn.de/>

Date: Fri, 27 Sep 2002 14:02:10 -0400 (EDT)
From: PERN Lists Manager <pern-m@ciesin.columbia.edu>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERNSeminar_GSP2] Welcome

Welcome to the Population Environment Research Network Cyberseminar
Should Borders be Open? The Population and Environment Dimension.

This seminar addresses an important, but often overlooked and complex aspect of international migration, namely the environmental. Sara Curran graciously offered to write a discussion on a number of ways in which the environment affects migration, and vice-versa, how migration can change the natural environment in both sending and receiving countries. Her discussion is based on four papers on whether borders should be open or not, by the well-known migration experts, David Coleman, Antonio Golini, Charles Keely, and Jorge Santibanez. These papers were originally discussed at the plenary session of the 2001 IUSSP General Conference and

were generously provided to us by the IUSSP. We are very happy that the organizer of that plenary session, Alan Simmons, has agreed to make the opening contribution to this cyberseminar.

We hope that this seminar will allow all of us to develop the participants' thinking on the relationship of migration and the environment, and ideally, lead to research initiatives in this area.

The seminar will run from 9 AM Monday morning Eastern U.S. time on September 30, and will close at 5 PM Eastern US time on October 11 2002. During this period, you will receive contributions via your email. The discussion will also be automatically archived on our website <http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org> so that you can easily find and refer to earlier comments. At the end of each of the two weeks, a summary of the discussion will be posted to you.

You may invite interested colleagues to join the seminar at any time. They can register by sending an email to majordomo@ciesin.columbia.edu with "subscribe pernseminars" in the body of the text. To unsubscribe, send an email to the same address with "unsubscribe pernseminars".

Please note that we have posted some standards of conduct to ensure a lively and interesting debate.

We look forward to your participation in a thought-provoking discussion,

Dr. Annababette Wils
Coordinator, Population Environment Research Network
Visiting Scholar
Tellus Institute
11 Arlington Street
Boston, Mass. 02116
tel. 617-266-5400
fax. 617-266-8303
<http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org/>

Date: Mon, 30 Sep 2002 09:08:11 -0400 (EDT)
From: PERN Lists Manager <pern-m@ciesin.columbia.edu>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERNSeminar_GSP2] Opening Comment

WELCOME TO THE PERN CYBERSEMINAR: "Should Borders Be Open? The Population and Environment Dimension."

OPENING COMMENT
Alan Simmons, York University

Serious reflection on the environmental impacts of international migration is most welcome. Sara Curran's paper provides an excellent launch pad for our seminar.

The papers from the 1991 Bahia debate on "Should Borders Be Open?" provide qualified answer. They conclude that opening borders more widely can be good or bad, depending various circumstances and on the criteria of success (such as greater global economic equity, or greater receiving country prosperity, for example). However, they said little about environmental impacts and hence indirectly drew attention to the need for more research in this area.

Even when the question is usefully narrowed to a particular outcome such as environmental impacts, current models suggest qualified hypotheses and the need for more refined answers. Sara Curran ends her paper with an important qualified hypothesis. She speculates that the impact of more open borders may depend on the magnitude of international capital flows. If these flows increase, then international migration should decline, and hence the environmental impacts of international migration will decline as well. This is in the spirit of Classical trade theory: in a world of free trade and unrestrained capital movement, why would labor move to capital if capital can flow more easily to labor? Sara Curran's conclusion is therefore clear. We should promote capital flows that will reduce poverty in sending countries, slow international migration, and create resources and levels of development that will allow countries to address environmental challenges.

But once a hypothesis or question is advanced it leads to new ones. For example, the long-term predictions of Classical trade theory may be valid. But the short and intermediate term impacts of free trade, continuing over several decades, always include the dislocation of workers (out of less productive sectors toward more productive ones) and related environmental impacts in both poor and wealthy nations. Whereas wealthy nations can better cushion the employment dislocations with social security measures and quickly develop new high productivity industry, poor countries are often unable to do so. Poor countries also have far more workers in low productivity enterprises. The result is a significant short to medium term increase in the desire to move from poor to wealthy nations.

Several new researchable hypotheses come to light from such an analysis. For example:

What volumes of job-creating capital movement are required to absorb dislocated labor in poor countries that arise through current patterns of trade expansion and international investment?

If job-creating capital flows to poor countries are insufficient, how will the environment be effected? What if those dislocated in poor countries cannot migrate to other countries because of frontier controls? What if to survive they engage in ever more resource destructive farming, cutting down more trees to generate new farm land and then moving on to repeat the

same cycle after they have exhausted the land they have been farming? What if the low incomes and retarded development in their countries lead to a greater reliance on dirty fuels in industry and for domestic heating?

I look forward to reading the comments and observations of others in the effort to refine research questions on the environmental impact of international migration.

Alan Simmons

From: "John Barker" <jbarker@gaiawatch.freemove.co.uk>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Cc: "John Barker" <jbarker@gaiawatch.freemove.co.uk>
Subject: [PERNSeminar_GSP2] seminar
Date: Mon, 30 Sep 2002 14:56:20 +0100

Dear fellow members,

I would like to inject a couple of ecological perspectives into this debate

1) I start with my own country. Many of us, at least in England, consider that we live in a crowded land. There is considerable concern for example at the relentless loss of countryside to housing. I don't have at hand the latest estimates of the percentage of England which is already urbanised (can anyone help me here?), but it is in the region of 12%.

The population of the UK, thought until recently to be 60 million, but according to the figures released from the recent census, 59 million, is projected to increase by 5 million by 2025. About two thirds of this increase will come from net immigration. A little over half the projected increase in the number of households will come from growth of the adult population. So we have the sequence:
immigration - increase in the population - increase in the number of households - increased dwelling construction - increased loss of green countryside.

Apart from this matter of housing, is it possible in any way to give substance to our feeling that we are a crowded island?

I think this can be done through the study of ecological footprints. The basic idea behind footprinting is the assumption that we can convert all man's impacts on the environment to land areas e.g. land for growing cereals, forest land to sequester carbon dioxide. For those unfamiliar with the idea, I have put an essay up on our web site:

www.gaiawatch.org.uk or www.population-growth-migration.info

(Note this essay was written before the publication of the revised Living Planet Report - Living Planet report 2002 (WWF and UNEP). I will

be updating the essay soon, but the basic ideas remain unchanged).

What is calculated are the components of the footprint (e.g. cropland footprint, grazing land footprint, etc) and these components are then summed to give a total per capita footprint expressed in 'global hectares (gh)' (my essay explains such terminology).

What is also calculated, and expressed in global hectares, is 'biocapacity':

the total biological production capacity per year of a biologically productive space, for example inside a country.

Subtracting biocapacity from footprint gives us the 'ecological deficit'. So, on the basis of the spread sheets behind the 2002 report (which uses 1999 data) we have the following for the UK:

Population: 59.495 million

Per capita footprint 5.345 gh per person

Available biocapacity: 1.641gh per person

Nations total footprint 318.001millions gh

Nations total biocapacity: 97.615 million gh

National total ecological deficit 220.386 million gh

We can say that if a country has an ecological deficit, its population is greater than its own land and sea area can support at present levels of affluence and current technology use.

To find that size of population which corresponds to the country's biocapacity area we simply divide the national total biocapacity area by the per capita ecological footprint. With the figures given above this becomes (in millions):

$97.615 \div 5.345 = 18.26$ millions.

So as at 1999, the biocapacity population was roughly 18 million, compared with the actual population of roughly 59 million, in other words, about a third of the actual population.

Now the Living Planet Report does not set aside any biocapacity land = for biodiversity. If we set aside 12%, which most environmentalists consider the bare minimum, the biocapacity population is decreased from about eighteen million to

$18.26 \div 1.12 = 16.30$ million.

Note. The results of footprinting analysis are only estimates, which will have margins of error. But whether or not the biocapacity of the UK was 15, 20, or 25 million hardly matters for the main point I am making here. The UK population at the time corresponding to these footprint studies was vastly in excess of the biocapacity population.

It is worthwhile here considering one possible future scenario. Suppose

the population of the UK reduced its level of affluence and improved its technology, so that the carbon dioxide energy footprint was reduced to two fifths of its existing value (a massive decrease), and no land was set aside for biodiversity. How would this affect the biocapacity population size?

Using the spread sheets behind the report to enable me to calculate to three places of decimals, the UK per capita CO₂ footprint component of the total per capita footprint was 2.995 global hectares per person (ghpp). The reduction would bring this down to 1.198 ghpp. The total per capita footprint was 5.345 ghpp. The revised footprint would then be

$$5.345 - 2.995 + 1.198 = 3.548 \text{ ghpp.}$$

Now the population corresponding to biocapacity would be once again national total biocapacity divided by per capita total footprint, i.e. $97.615 \div 3.548 = 27.51$ million. This is still far, far smaller than the actual population at the time.

I think that arguing along these lines, I can conclude that open borders, resulting in continued massive population increase, will be harmful to Britain. You might be interested in my essay on what I think our UK immigration policy should be, also at our web site.

If you get the Living Planet report 2002, you could perform rough calculations for your own country.

2). Now to look at things from a global perspective, and consider the migration of people from developing countries to developed countries. Such people will gradually adopt the standard of living of the host populations. So their individual ecological footprints will increase, collectively increasing the total global footprint.

We may think in term of the famous impact equation $I = PAT$ - human impact on the environment can be thought of as a product of the population's size (P), its affluence (A), and the environmental damage inflicted by technologies used to supply each unit of consumption (T). Some use consumption (C) instead of A (there is an essay on this equation at our web site). Significant movement of people from developing to developed nations will increase A in the equation.

But there is another point. Emigration can serve as a population safety valve for the donor population; and instead of fertility getting lower (which we all agree we need to see), fertility may remain high. This will be exacerbated if parents come to expect that some of their children might emigrate: Abernethy, V. (2000) Population Politics Transaction Publishers, pages 41 and 142.

I conclude that from the point of view of such movements, open borders is a bad thing.

My overall conclusions.

Obviously there should be some movement between nations -for example students going to university. But in general, borders should be closed. Entry and departure should be exceptional.

Note. I have not, in all the above, considered threats to social cohesion stemming from influx of aliens of different ethnicity and culture, which should also make us wary of making borders open.

Yours sincerely,

John Barker

From: "Salonius, Peter" <psaloniu@nrcan.gc.ca>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERNSeminar_GSP2] Canadian Immigration Policy vs Environmental, Social & Economic Health
Date: Mon, 30 Sep 2002 11:56:23 -0400

Hello fellow members,

I have copied (below) my brief to the Romanow Health Care Commission (the commission report will be published in November, 2002) which deals with the central issue of the effect of Canadian federal government immigration-centered population policy on the economic and physical health of Canadians.

The text below does not include the graphics that I used in my presentation in Charlottetown, in April, that dealt with:

1. COMPARISON OF CANADIAN AND WORLD POPULATION GROWTH SINCE 1500 AD.
2. TRAJECTORIES OF Gross National Product (GNP) and Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare (ISEW) SINCE 1950.
3. POPULATION GROWTH ATTRIBUTABLE TO natural increase AND immigration, 1976 TO 2001 AND Human Resources Development Canada (HRDC) PREDICTIONS TO 2046.
4. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HISTORICAL ENERGY ABUNDANCE (including recent temporary access to non renewable geological energy subsidies) AND HUMAN NUMBERS, AND PROJECTIONS OF FUTURE CONTRACTION OF HUMAN NUMBERS IN RESPONSE TO INEVITABLE GEOLOGICAL ENERGY EXHAUSTION (oil first and soon).

I do not have these graphics in electronic form, but I will send a hard copy of my brief to anyone who sends me their Postal mailing address.

My short brief identifies the population growth policy that is driven by

massive immigration and the misguided open-ended economic expansionism of successive federal governments as central roots of problems in contemporary Canadian affairs.

Sincerely
Peter Saloni

Presentation to the Commission on the Future of Health Care in Canada

Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, April 18, 2002

Peter Saloni
522 Route 8 HWY
Durham Bridge
New Brunswick E6C 1K5

Phone (506) 452-3548
Fax (506) 452-3548 / specify Saloni
Email petersaloni@hotmail.com

Damage Done to the Health of Canadians by Federal Policy and Recommended Solutions Population

SOCIAL DAMAGE

- federal government policy is aimed at a continuously increasing Gross National Product
- federal government equates increasing GNP with progress
- federal government links population growth to increasing GNP
- economic growth, when offset by population increase, results in lower per capita wealth
- new indices of social/economic welfare (eg. ISEW) show quality of life down since 1970
- between 1991 and 2001 our numbers grew at a third-world-like rate of about 1.6 % per year
- federal policy aims to increase our numbers by 300,000 per year indefinitely
- resident fertility drops in response to decreased economic well-being and prospects
- massive immigration continues in spite of economic downturns and increased unemployment
- massive immigration drives population growth as fertility of residents drops
- wealth creation, through technology, slows as stocks of natural resources are depleted
- wage decreases are due to combined economic slowdowns and rapid population growth

- native-born Canadians have not been rewarded for their reproductive self-restraint
- the capacity of the health care system is stretched by relentless population growth
- non-stop massive immigration stunts employment possibilities (especially at the entry level)
- decline in per capita share of resources usually leads to less equal distribution of wealth
- wage inequality and population growth (here and in the US) top other industrialized countries
- studies show countries with slowest population growth have lowest pay disparities
- unemployment of 6-10 percent (even during rapid economic growth) is now the norm
- oversupply of labour drives down incomes and increases unemployment
- historical studies show that employers benefit from rapid numbers growth, workers do not
- as per capita wealth decreases, more family members are drawn into the labour force
- one income per family was often adequate until the 1970s; now two incomes are often needed
- as the labour force has increasingly involved all family adults, real wages have fallen
- the erosion of the middle class signals the polarization into rich and poor
- middle class erosion increasingly exposes the very young to crowded day care facilities
- crowded day care facilities cause increased sickness incidence (youth and adult)
- real wage dilution results in increasing hours worked per family unit
- increasing work hours and less rest results in higher stress and decreased disease resistance
- falling real wages incrementally increase reliance on food banks by the working poor
- falling real wages result in increasing numbers of working poor slipping into homelessness
- escalating homelessness and poverty result in increased communicable disease (eg. TB)

ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE

- the proportion of Canadians who live in large cities increases annually
- the massive tide of federally orchestrated immigration gravitates, mainly, to large cities
- large cities already suffer from inadequate housing caused by mushrooming human numbers
- large cities suffer escalating traffic congestion in spite of subsidized public transport
- economic immigrants seek to raise their consumption to Canadian levels of excess
- Canada and the US (using 25% of world resources for 5% of its numbers)

are overpopulated

- Canada placed 26th out of 29 OECD countries with a 24.4% increase in numbers (1980-1998)

- total energy consumption growth matched population growth (20.3%, 1980-1997)

- in spite of federal efforts to decrease air pollution, smog levels continue to worsen

- worsening air pollution results in increasing poor health for citizens

- unhealthy citizens put increasing pressures on an already overburdened health care system

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Population growth has served us well throughout history as we sought to exploit what seemed to be limitless natural resources in a comparatively empty land, however insistence on such growth in today's world can be seen as an anachronistic, frontier mentality which has no place on a full and finite earth.

The Canadian population has responded to decreased economic prospects by reducing its fertility, however its federal government continues to force population growth with massive immigration.

The temporarily increased effective carrying capacity, that results from fossil fuel subsidization, results in Canada's ability to import carrying capacity from other countries to serve its enormous per capita ecological footprint. This large ecological footprint, as we process a share of resources disproportionate to our numbers, has increasingly caused our urbanizing population to live in more and more congested and polluted environments. This escalating pollution and congestion result in poor health and increasing pressure on the health care system.

As a society, we have not considered the repercussions of the imminent and certain termination of the 'petroleum interval'. We are continuing to expand our population and our economy as if the energy to support them will always be available.

Future per capita reductions in energy availability, whether planned so as to effect a gradual transition to less plentiful renewable sources or in response to decreasing conventional supplies, will translate into long-term falling living standards. The health of Canadians will suffer and the pressure on the health care system will increase as our population continues to skyrocket in the present and as the per capita energy availability diminishes in the near future.

Meanwhile if the Canadian federal government does not come to understand the impoverishment and poor health that its expansionist policies produce for its citizenry, then the health care system will continue to experience increased pressures and the requirement for a curtailment in service levels on a per capita basis.

The Canadian federal government should use immigration as a tool, first to stabilize population numbers in the context of native-born fertility that has fallen below replacement levels, and second to orchestrate a gradual shrinkage in our numbers over time so that the sum total of our economic activity can be supported by the true carrying capacity of the country at the end of the 'petroleum interval'.

Peter Saloni

SCIENTISTS FOR POPULATION REDUCTION

<http://www.scientists4pr.org>

Abstract Submitted, January 24, 2002 by FAX to (613) 233-4766

And Mailed to:

Commission on the Future of Health Care in Canada

P.O. Box 160, Station Main

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7K 3K4

January 24, 2002

From: "carlos reboratti" <creborat@arnet.com.ar>

To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>

Subject: [PERNSEminar_GSP2] some comments from C. Reboratti

Date: Mon, 30 Sep 2002 19:11:38 -0300

Some comments on open and closed environmental borders

I think that a good point for beginning this ciberseminar is to discuss what are we talking about, because it seems to me that there are too many understatements and/ or misunderstandings about what "open frontiers" means when we talk about the environment in the wider possible meaning (including environmental resources and services). I think that Ms. Currant is right when she speaks about natural and unnatural (human made??) frontier environmental flows. It is clear for everybody that Nature itself has no respect for human boundaries, and that the scale of the natural phenomena is normally beyond our common sense grasp. But the human society has been moving environment's elements since the early history, becoming (unwittingly?) a kind of environmental transporter. We have moved many thousand of species from one place to another, some times adapting them forcibly to new environments, some times just acting as involuntary porters of pests, weeds and diseases (see Crosby, Cronon or Worster). This exchange has been growing faster and faster, and since the existence of the global scale of trade has took an incredible size (here in Argentina, as an example, we are growing millions of hectares of a species - soybean -, which was unknown until 1960!!). But I think that there is an aspect of the problem that Currant does not consider: the force of the market

economy in a world driven by the neoliberal doctrine. For the global economy frontiers do not exist or, if they do, they are a limitation for the market flows, a problem to be solved and not a fact of the social structure that has to be taken into account. So, the environmental problem seen in a "frontier" perspective needs to consider not only the states (their frontiers and their people) but also de global economic forces, forces that normally open the environmental frontiers for natural resources and services trade, whether the local societies want it or not.

Carlos Reboratti
University of Buenos Aires

Date: Mon, 30 Sep 2002 16:54:13 -0700 (PDT)
From: brad bartholomew <brad_bartholomew@yahoo.com>
Subject: [PERNSeminar_GSP2] Globalization ain't globalization
To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu

Greetings,

The words immigration and its counterpart emigration should be expunged from the English language. These words are a carry over from the days when poor people embarked on hazardous journeys lasting weeks or even months in sailing ships to reach the new world.

With modern transport and communications people no longer need to remove themselves from their country of origin to engage in commercial/intellectual/social activity anywhere in the world.

These days an arab living in a palestinian enclave in East Jerusalem can be the Emeritus Professor of Arabic Studies at Rockefeller University in New York. A person living in Ganeshpuri, India can be Vice-President in charge of IT at the General Motors plant in Detroit, Michigan.

Families can retain close bonds through email, webcams, videoconferencing, or simply hopping an airplane and go visit their loved ones in other countries for three months.

The whole mentality of leaving ones country of origin and moving permanently to another country in search of a better life is obsolete.

But current immigration attitudes are not just obsolete, they are elitist and immoral. The whole

concept that people with money, work skills, or relatives in the host country will be accepted as immigrants and those without these attributes are branded as illegal is blatantly discriminatory.

Current immigration policies are not working for this very reason that they are discriminatory and unenforceable. What is required is the one law for everybody which can then be strictly enforced. All people should be treated equally.

That well intentioned academics can come out with statements to the effect that people in developing countries should be allowed to immigrate to a wealthy country to seek a "better" life simply underscores the elitist and supremacist attitudes that permeate this debate at every level.

In effect what happens is that people with half a life are allowed to immigrate to seek a better life while people with no life at all are not allowed to immigrate. Indeed they are greeted by troops and gun boats as if they were hostile invaders. Words escape me that current attitudes can condone man's inhumanity to man at this level.

Because of current immigration attitudes people in developing countries are made to feel that they are losers if they don't migrate to California and score a big job in Silicon Valley.

Also with the demographic transition some 23 countries in Europe as well as the new world countries are all looking to leech everybody with money, education or work skills out of the developing countries simply to keep their own work forces at current levels and maintain their own growth and prosperity. It is a testament to the mercenary, self-serving smugness of developed countries that they are not even questioning their right to do this.

The solution is to ban all permanent immigration for everyone. Not even your Rupert Murdochs with billions of dollars should be allowed to immigrate to the U.S permanently.

All people should be granted a temporary visa to visit for any legitimate reason - tourist, employment, sporting, educational, visit relatives or whatever. The same law and the same conditions of entry should apply to everyone, without exception.

Yours truly,
Brad Bartholomew
President
Scientists for Population Reduction, Inc.
<http://www.scientists4pr.org>

Subject: RE: [PERNSeminar_GSP2] Globalization ain't globalization
Date: Tue, 1 Oct 2002 10:12:29 -0400
From: "Jack Martin" <jmartin@fairus.org>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>

The argument from Scientists for Population Reduction, Inc. that all permanent immigration should be ended for the United States as well as all other countries is novel and does make some sense in a world which has become much smaller because of developments in communications and transportation. I would have liked to see the argument developed more along the lines of the demographic argument about carrying capacity and stressing the need to hold governments accountable for their population policies or lack thereof.

However, the reason for this response to the position advanced by Mr. Bartholomew is to take exception to the fact that he has ignored the issue of refugees. Persons fleeing their homelands because of persecution may include people who are never safe in returning home. The current U.S. policy for the intake of refugees and asylum claimants (those applying from within the United States) is overly broad because of politically motivated programs (e.g., for Cubans and Chinese), but there still remains a core of the refugee resettlement program that most people would agree merits humanitarian treatment. Those people should be accommodated permanent resettlement in a safehaven country - a concept that would appear to be eliminated by the no-immigration argument.

Jack Martin
FAIR Special Projects Director

From: "Salonius, Peter" <psaloniu@nrcan.gc.ca>
To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
Subject: [PERNSeminar_GSP2] RE: Carlos Reboratti and globalism
Date: Tue, 1 Oct 2002 10:14:49 -0400

Reboratti (below) speaks of "the force of the market economy in a world driven by the neoliberal doctrine." He also says that " For the global economy, frontiers do not exist".

Reboratti and many others accept the present global trading excesses as

normal. The world marketplace has become accustomed to the TEMPORARY energy subsidy from exhaustible fossil fuels. Distortions in historically normal trading patterns are possible, in the context of unsustainable supplies of cheap and (for now and probably the next decade or so) abundant finite geological energy , such as North American industries buying bulk commodities from overseas that are just slightly cheaper than those same commodities that are available in the local market.

The global economy runs on a geyser of fossil fuel production , the peak of which is now looming as a result of the intersection of rising energy demand (driven by skyrocketing population and increased global trading patterns) and decreased supplies of these fuels that were produced millions of years ago (NOTE: nature is not making the stuff anymore).

Preparations should begin now for the time when rapidly increasing demand for non renewable energy overtakes production (some geologists suggest this will occur during the next decade for petroleum which is the first in the lineup of geological energy sources facing exhaustion, see:

The World Petroleum Life-Cycle at: <http://dieoff.org/page133.htm>
and The Post Petroleum Paradigm-and Population at:
<http://dieoff.org/page171.htm>

Reboratti concludes by stating that we must recognize "global economic forces that normally open the environmental frontiers for natural resources and services trade, whether the local societies want it or not".

I am suggesting that the human family would be well advised to recognize the transient nature (a couple of hundred years) of these finite-energy-subsidized "global economic forces", and to begin planning for the economic, social and philosophical changes that must accompany the end of the 'petroleum era'.

Peter Saloni
Scientists for Population Reduction
<http://www.scientists4pr.org>

From: "carlos reboratti" <creborat@arnet.com.ar>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERNSeminar_GSP2] from Carlos Reboratti
Date: Tue, 1 Oct 2002 19:41:28 -0300

A short answer to Saloni comments

When I was talking about the main economic forces which drive the environmental exchange I was only accepting a fact, not taking it for granted. I think that the first step in the design of a strategy against the global market forces is to accept their sheer existence. But I do not think that wagging the century old phantom of non renewable resources depletion is the better way of dealing with it. Geologist has been warning us about the oil scarcity since 1910, and this scarcity is each time farther away in the future. The capitalist system is not

suicidal and when the time came for the use of another energy source, there we will find the multinational companies selling it to us. I do think that a better way of thinking about the environmental problems is answer to the question about who gets what now and why.

Date: Tue, 1 Oct 2002 16:37:04 -0700 (PDT)
From: brad bartholomew <brad_bartholomew@yahoo.com>
Subject: RE: [PERNSEminar_GSP2] Globalization ain't globalization
To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu

Greetings,

I thought we were talking about immigration. To me that has the meaning of a person making a voluntary decision to leave his/her country of origin and move permanently to (and adopt the citizenship of) another country where work prospects are perceived to be better.

I did not mention the issue of refugees in my previous post because I simply don't believe them to be relevant to this discussion.

Obviously refugees (persons displaced due to war, persecution, pestilence or famine) would have to be relocated. For these people I would like to see the United Nations take the responsibility of firstly certifying that they are genuine refugees and then allocating them equitably to host nations.

The current attitudes of developed countries towards refugees leaves a lot to be desired. In Australia for instance boat loads of people arrive claiming refugee status. They are normally crowded into the boat in appalling conditions having risked all to leave their country of origin, not to mention the perils of their journey. They are literally fighting for survival.

Typically the Australian government greets them with gun boats, and if they are allowed to come ashore at all they are herded into camps which bear a close resemblance to the Stalags of the Third Reich. Needless to say there is a very strong (almost irrefutable) presumption that they are not genuine refugees unless they prove otherwise.

Once it is established that they are not real refugees, but just poor people desperately trying to find a better life for themselves and their children, their application for residency is refused and they

are sent packing.

These situations could be avoided if all developed countries adopted a rigid policy not to allow permanent immigration. The multi-nationals would be forced to adapt to this policy by providing jobs (menial through to management level) in the developing countries. This is where globalization is headed anyway.

Currently the very poor and desperate know that some people are being accepted for permanent immigration and it encourages them to literally risk their lives in order to try to get in as well. In their own way they are fighting against these discriminatory policies which is their god-given right.

All countries that belong to the United Nations bear an equal responsibility to accommodate genuine refugees on the basis that they are actually displaced, and have not made a voluntary decision to emigrate.

Kind regards,
Brad Bartholomew

From: Anna Babette Wils <awils@tellus.org>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERNSeminar_GSP2] Your research on migration -- what have you learned?
Date: Wed, 2 Oct 2002 09:56:56 -0400

Dear Participants,

I am very happy you have joined us for this seminar on the population and environment dimensions of migration. Thus far, we have seen a number of contributions with important broad questions and some broad answers. Before we continue further down this line, I would like to encourage you to tell us about empirical studies of the effects of emigration on the sending countries, along the lines suggested by Curran and Simmons. Does emigration alleviate local pressure from the poor on the environment? Does it reduce the perceived need for fertility reduction? Do remittances lead to less or more environmental damage?

As an example, I had the opportunity to study the Cape Verde islands in 1994/5, which thank an appreciable portion of their subsistence to emigration. Like all empirical studies, this one provides some valuable insights.

1. Many of the migrants maintain close ties to Cape Verde, send remittances, and/or return to the islands eventually. In the late 19th century emigration and remittances with which to import food did allow the

population to grow beyond earlier levels - because of higher survival rates (fertility remained unchanged). From the mid to late 20th century food aid had the same result. Whether the higher population resulted in local more environmental damage locally however, is debatable, since it appears to have led to villagers and urbanites dependent on foreign food rather than to increased or intensified local food production and therewith erosion or deforestation. Globally, however, the higher consumption levels do lead to more resource consumption - although at Cape Verde's income level (\$1300 p/cap) one can hardly argue that this is undesirable.

2. Regarding the effect of emigration and food aid on fertility - that important population growth --> environment variable - we can say that presently the effect is probably negative: Cape Verde is in the middle of one of the faster fertility declines of low to medium income countries and this is caused by a dedication to education of women/ girls and a functioning basic health system - financed by the country's strong links to the rest of the world! One can even venture the idea that emigration presently lowers fertility because many of the migrants are women who postpone childbirth and bring back the ideal of the small family.

3. All of Cape Verde's leaders emigrated and were educated abroad, many of them in democracies. Most of Cape Verde's emigrants, with their strong ties to the mother country, live in democracies. This may be one of the reasons that Cape Verde is one of the stable, functioning democracies in Africa.

So, in summary, on Cape Verde, emigration - lowered death rates and raised population growth; raised national income to finance education and health which lowers fertility and population growth; has probably strengthened the democracy.

I look forward to hearing about more, different cases, which may perhaps enable to achieve some kind of synthesis from the evidence.

Greetings,

Dr. Annababette Wils
Coordinator, Population Environment Research Network
Visiting Scholar
Tellus Institute
11 Arlington Street
Boston, Mass. 02116
tel. 617-266-5400
fax. 617-266-8303
<http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org/>

Date: Wed, 2 Oct 2002 16:03:16 -0700 (PDT)
From: brad bartholomew <brad_bartholomew@yahoo.com>
Subject: [PERNSeminar_GSP2] Love & Marriage
To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu

Greetings,

So what would happen to love and marriage between citizens of different countries once full globalization has been achieved.

For starters there would be no presumption that one country is better to live in than the other, nor that citizenship of one country is preferable to the other.

If people of the opposite sex or the same sex meet, fall in love, and decide to get married they would retain their own citizenship and would be allowed to live in either country as long as the marriage lasts.

When and if the marriage breaks up each has to live in their country of origin. Each would retain all their entitlements as citizens of their country of origin - retirement benefits, deserted wives benefits, supporting parents benefits and the like.

If they have or adopt children, the children have dual citizenship. If the marriage breaks up the children, by virtue of their dual citizenship, would be entitled to live with either parent or as the Court orders or indeed can alternatively live with both if they so choose. Again its only a matter of catching a flight and they can be with the other parent within hours.

Each parent will be able to communicate with their children with all the technology currently available and which can only improve, and it will be not uncommon for children to spend regular access periods with a parent on the other side of the world.

Under no circumstances will Judges award custody of children to one parent on the grounds that that parent is the citizen of a country with higher living standards or more opportunities available for advancement (it is presumed under globalization that people can advance regardless of their physical location).

When children with dual citizenship grow up and become of legal age they can choose themselves to live in either country which has always been the case.

Kind regards,
Brad Bartholomew

From: Anna Babette Wils <awils@tellus.org>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>

Subject: [PERNSeminar_GSP2] FW: Reminder: PERN seminar provides the opportunity to discuss your ideas/results with a large audience

Date: Fri, 4 Oct 2002 09:44:36 -0400

Dear Participants,

I would like to remind you that we are in the middle of the two-week cyberseminar "Should Borders Be Open? The Population and Environment Dimension".

There are almost 250 scholars subscribed to the seminar, located in all continents of the globe, many of them you new to the field, and many of you distinguished experts. Sharing your ideas, and your research results, opening questions you might have about those or other results via this temporary listserve/seminar, gives you the opportunity to talk with almost 250 colleagues. I do encourage you to take advantage of this opportunity. In particular, the debate would be strengthened if you contributed your ideas and questions concerning either your own empirical work on migration and the environment or questions that you have concerning studies by others that you have read or heard at a conference.

To contribute, just send an email to pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu. We have one week remaining; I look forward to your contributions,

Greetings,

Dr. Annababette Wils
Coordinator, Population Environment Research Network
Visiting Scholar
Tellus Institute
11 Arlington Street
Boston, Mass. 02116
tel. 617-266-5400
fax. 617-266-8303
<http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org/>

From: "Laura Murphy" <murphyll@bellsouth.net>

To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>

Subject: [PERNSeminar_Migration] what are the environmental dimensions of cross-border flows?

Date: Sat, 5 Oct 2002 16:53:14 -0500

I have enjoyed the comments so far, but I want to suggest that the title of the seminar could be usefully rephrased as the manageable (if less elegant) question: "What are the environmental dimensions of international migration that we need to think about in order to comprehend approaches to answering the question: 'Should borders be open?' . "

As phrased, participants cannot fruitfully answer it directly, and even the original IUSSP debate speakers side-stepped (but did not all totally avoid) a direct response. This is an ethical question ('should we.?) and

such which demands additional information: Which ethical framework should be used to determine the right thing to do? From whose standpoint should it be decided? Who counts? The environmental dimension adds a further complication and many added spatial and temporal dimensions to an already complex issue involving economic, security and humanitarian dimensions.

Thus, the useful questions that Babette Wils posed to seminar participants (among them, "What do we know from empirical research already?") might be supplemented by "How should we even think about the 'environment' in relation to the 'open borders' debate? and Can we develop conceptual models that can guide research?. Parts of these emerge from the background papers already, particularly Sara Curran's note. Observations from the background papers point to, for example:

- the impossibility of dealing with this issue in a general sense, since the answer depends on specific borders and the type of migration flows and environments, economies, politics and history of the countries in question. A framework should probably consider a range of specific sending and receiving nations and their relationship to each other;
- the answer depends on the standpoint of a stakeholder, receiving nations vs. the migrants themselves, for example, who perceive benefits and costs differently, so perhaps a framework needs to consider specific different perspectives;
- the scale of international migrant flows is smaller than a century ago, proportionally to the size of both sending and receiving countries. Do we need to look at absolute numbers of emigrants/immigrants, or the proportion of migrants, or people's actual behaviors and uses of remittances, or other asset flows ...?
- migration (international or domestic) is 'natural' (to humans seeking niches), it is the borders which are artificial (social/political constructs). Borders existing now are not long-lived in the larger geological, environmental scheme -- so what temporal scale is relevant? Is it even feasible to even consider closing borders, whether or not there is justification, or should we think about controlling and managing them, and to what end?
- Sara Curran's introduction of 'asset flows' is useful. The 'open borders?' question concerns much more than (simply) the permanent immigration of people from poor countries to richer 'developed countries'. In addition to outward flows of people generally from poor places and inflows generally to richer places, we see return flows of remittances (and other goods/capital), ideas & innovations (including ideas about smaller family size, women's roles, democracy, mentioned by Wils). This concept clearly has a role in a broader framework.
- Migrants, their ideas and resources, consumption behaviors, lead to various impacts on the environment, and changes in the receiving societies, as well as in their sending country. The environmental concerns raised so far seem to focus on carrying capacity of receiving societies. Carrying capacity is probably inadequate for this purpose; it does not incorporate these larger intangible asset flows and the boundaries of the system are not clear or fixed. Transnational associations (see Curran), which I think encompasses (transnational) social capital, can alter these.

--Open borders encompasses the idea of 'migration' (resettlement) as well as 'mobility' for education, business, leisure, etc. What does this mean for border & environment studies? What are we concerned with and what are the environmentally-relevant behaviors apply to these different behaviors? The distinction should be further examined and elaborated.

Looking at Central America and US connections (from literature, this is not my area of research) there is emigration, remittances, transnational associations and other asset flows, and greater mobility within the hemisphere. Clearly remittances receive much attention, especially at the national level (as foreign income earner) and at the household level (as survival strategy). Throughout Central America (specifically El Salvador, Nicaragua, Honduras, Guatemala) economies are bolstered by the remittances from expatriate citizens resettled to the US (escaping violence, seeking better lives, joining relatives). These remittances (as in Cape Verde islands, and other small countries) are a major source of export earnings often only # 2 or 3 nationally after agro-exports, tourism. How can we think about remittances in relation to environmental impacts-in sending and receiving areas, in the short run and longer term? In the US, consumption levels for the emigrants rise as they enter a fossil-fuel based and urban economy (despite their having much lower living standards than US averages). In home countries, remittances from relatively poor US immigrants (working as house painters, in construction, etc.) help sustain families and rebuild economies and lands devastated by internal conflicts, Hurricane Mitch, etc. and might have long term positive benefits for environmental management, as in Machakos, Kenya (the famous case by Tiffen and Mortimore). Remittances can also help build shopping malls and purchase microwave ovens and other consumer goods, increasing the dependence on shipping, transport, etc and local sprawl, pollution and having negative impacts. So, however, do dollars earned by exports of shrimp, for example, which are having devastating impacts on mangrove ecosystems, although might serve to provide some jobs. Can we say that emigration/remittances are 'worse' than shrimp farming, or vice versa, or are both problematic? Migration is simply one among many aspects of global integration that are making local, national and hemispheric environmental management difficult. Meanwhile, high inter-hemispheric mobility (not necessarily emigration per se) especially among upper class citizens of these sending countries, as well as due to increasing tourism, contributes to greenhouse gases. Air travel, vehicles and standards of living are at a US level, in otherwise poor societies.

>From an environmental perspective, neither increased population size/carrying capacity in receiving areas nor the dollar flows and impacts on sending area fertility and the environment are sufficient topics to study. We must look at many levels and over time, at the associated flows of ideas and technology, (improving?) local environmental management. Furthermore, think about the dynamic nature of both sending and receiving locations which complicate simplistic static calculi. Environmental impacts can be, we hope, reduced by

slowing consumption, greening ecology, etc. to cut down the major environmental impacts of US high living (standards), for example.

Thank you for your attention,

Laura L. Murphy, PhD
Clinical Assistant Professor
Department of International health and Development, School of Public =
Health & Tropical Medicine, and the=20
Roger Thayer Stone Center for Latin American Studies
Tulane University
1440 Canal Street, Suite 2200
New Orleans, LA 70112
(504) 584-2681
lmurphy2@tulane.edu

From: "Daniel Joseph Hogan" <hogan@reitoria.unicamp.br>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERNSeminar_Migration] cyberseminar comments
Date: Mon, 7 Oct 2002 15:14:30 -0300

Sara Curran's notes suggest that the question has no single answer, except in purely ideological terms. The research agenda outlined is a useful point of departure for deepening our understanding of the relationships between international migration and environment. Her concluding reservations on the "smoothness" of the debate are well taken, but surely redirecting international investment a desirable goal from many points of view will be, even in the best of worlds, gradual. In other words, "smoothness" would be a desired outcome but the importance of the open borders debate will be with us for some time.

My notes are in the direction of the objective Alan Simmons announces in his comments: to begin to refine research questions on the environmental impact of international migration. Two aspects of this mobility as yet unstudied:

- Trans-border movements which are similar to internal migration to new agricultural frontiers, such as the movement of brasiguaios from Parana State to Paraguay, which is an extension of movements underway for decades within Brazil, or of Brazilians to Bolivia, in the wake of soybean expansion. What is the role of land exhaustion in Parana or Mato Grosso in promoting these moves? Do these alternatives reduce pressure for environmental control (e.g., environmental zoning) in Brazil? Are the environmental controls of Paraguay and Bolivia less rigorous than Brazil, encouraging moves? Are soil exhaustion, deforestation and biodiversity loss part of the population/economic resources shifts to these countries?

- The environmental vulnerability of international migrants

to large cities. Migrants, especially the undocumented, find work in sweatshops where environmental standards are non-existent. Koreans and Bolivians in the garment industry of São Paulo are at greater environmental risk because they are clandestine migrants. They find housing in the most environmentally sub-standard neighborhoods and, in general, their environmental burden is greater than natives or internal migrants.

Daniel Joseph Hogan
Universidade Estadual de Campinas

Dean of Graduate Studies
State University of Campinas
tel: 55 19 3788-4729
fax: 55 19 3788-4885

From: "Kathleen Dowd-Gailey" <kdowdgailey@yahoo.com>
To: "Laura Murphy" <murphyll@bellsouth.net>, <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: RE: [PERNSeminar_Migration] what are the environmental dimensions of cross-border flows?
Date: Mon, 7 Oct 2002 13:18:58 -0700

Greetings from the Yucatán Península in Mexico.

I appreciate Laura Murphy's comments on the subject and thank her for the contribution. It seems to me that much of the previous dialogue regarding halting all international migration was, in my opinion, simply not politically feasible. And like it or not, to make the most of this conference, it is necessary to take into consideration the political reality.

Furthermore, no matter how connected we are electronically, there is still much movement of people throughout the world, both nationally and internationally, and to presume that everyone is as connected as we are at this point is in ignorance of the reality of the majority of the world.

I think these discussions are not the point of this conference.

>From my work in the region of the Calakmul Biosphere Reserve in the southern part of the Yucatan Peninsula, I can make the following contributions. I would state first that I am not a researcher, I am a practitioner and these observations come not from in-depth studies on the topic, but rather observations made during work with local communities in the region.

First, it seems to me that international migration cannot be viewed in isolation. Internal migration and other opportunities regionally seems to also be an important factor in the decision making web. The Calakmul region initially saw much in-migration from many other parts of the country as land

was open and relatively easy to obtain. As it stands right now, however, this region has a growing number of migrants, (most illegal) to the US, who in turn send back remittances to their families; indeed a good portion of the Mexican GDP comes from remittances from the US.

One interesting component of this population dynamic is that often when men go to the US to work and leave wives with young children, the family who stays behind either can no longer do the work required to maintain agricultural fields (lacking the main work force), and/or they no longer need to because the remittances sustain them just fine. This leads to a drop in number of acres of land being cultivated, most of it therefore slowly returning to secondary growth forest. This reliance on remittances can also lead to increase in consumption of non-food goods, or goods that are beyond those of basic needs such as TV, microwaves, etc.

What are the environmental implications, positive and negative, of these dynamics?? That is a good question for further research, which seems to be needed in this area.

Thank you for your time, I hope these comments are helpful for the conference.

-Kathleen Dowd-Gailey

Kathleen M. Dowd-Gailey
International Development Associate
Pronatura Peninsula de Yucatan, A.C.
Calle 17 #188-A x 10
Colonia Garcia Gineres
Mérida, Yucatán 97070, Mexico
Tel/fax: 52.999.925.3787,
52.999.920.4641
52.999.920.4647
efax: 1.810.821.2907

Date: Mon, 07 Oct 2002 14:05:51 -0700

To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu

From: Robin Marsh <rmmarsh@nature.berkeley.edu>

Subject: [PERNSeminar_Migration] more on int'l migration and remittances

Dear cyberspace colleagues:

Will just add some confirming evidence to the recent comments. While at FAO, we worked with a research team at UNAM/CRIM in Mexico City to look at local institutions and sustainable livelihoods in forest communities of the Sierra Norte, Oaxaca. In a careful historical analysis of the local economy, it was clear that agriculture and even grazing were in decline as they could not compete with the opportunities of out-migration, primarily to the U.S. but also to Mexico City and Sonora/Sinaloa. As a result, there was a slowing process of deforestation/land conversion, and greater

reliance on remittances to set up small businesses, and support local governance institutions. Another occupation - community forest enterprises, was stable but under threat from Canadian competition under NAFTA. Interestingly, profits from the community forest enterprises in this indigenous region were invested in public works and cultural traditions - electricity, roads, religious festivals.

Aggregating over many communities like those in the Sierra Norte - particularly steep sloped rural areas not apt for intensive agriculture, I believe that investigators would surely conclude that the net environmental impacts for Mexico of out-migration have been positive.

We also looked at migration associations in Los Angeles and connections with the sending communities in Oaxaca, but did not examine the environmental impacts of immigration to Los Angeles, or the environmental conditions for migrants in LA. It would be wonderful to do this kind of full flow analysis that Laura Murphy has suggested. Look forward to your comments, Robin

Dr. Robin Marsh
Center for Sustainable Resource Development (CSRSD)
Co-Director, Beahrs Environmental Leadership Program
University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720
Tel: (510) 643-1042 Fax:(510)643-4483/642-4612
rmarsh@nature.berkeley.edu
<http://cnr.berkeley.edu/csrd>
<http://cnr.berkeley.edu/BeahrsELP>

Date: Mon, 07 Oct 2002 18:45:02 -0400
From: Steve Kurtz <kurtzs@freenet.carleton.ca>
To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
Subject: Re: [PERNSeminar_Migration] what are the environmental dimensions of cross-border flows?

Greetings,

In response to the post by Kathleen Dowd-Gailey, I have some comments and questions.

Regarding:

- > First, it seems to me that international migration cannot be viewed in
- > isolation. Internal migration and other opportunities regionally
- > seems to also be an important factor in the decision making web. The
- > Calakmul region initially saw much in-migration from many other parts
- > of the country as land was open and relatively easy to obtain. As it
- > stands right now, however, this region has a growing number of
- > migrants, (most illegal) to the US, who in turn send back remittances
- > to their families; indeed a good portion of the Mexican GDP comes from

> remittances from the US.

>

This seems to reflect the fact that humans have always sought 'greener pastures'. Of course the Tragedy of the Commons (G. Hardin) shows that the pasture doesn't remain green once there are too many occupants.

Since the pastures globally are finite, is it not the case that a 'spiral down' is the necessary result of this sort of behavior (which is directly tied to 20thC 400% population growth)? In other words, can anything good (on average for all humans) come of these continual migrations? Re-arranging the deck chairs on the Titanic comes to mind.

> One interesting component of this population dynamic is that often
> when men go to the US to work and leave wives with young children, the
> family who stays behind either can no longer do the work required to
> maintain agricultural fields (lacking the main work force), and/or
> they no longer need to because the remittances sustain them just fine.

>

So long as there is food available: one cannot eat credits/tokens. Local production is more sustainable and reliable than out-sourcing.

> This leads to a drop in number of acres of land being cultivated, most
> of it therefore slowly returning to secondary growth forest. This
> reliance on remittances can also lead to increase in consumption of
> non-food goods, or goods that are beyond those of basic needs such as
> TV, microwaves, etc.

>

> What are the environmental implications, positive and negative, of
> these dynamics??

>

Increased consumption of 'consumer goods' cannot increase habitat well-being, ceteris paribus. Economic privation drives migration; yet success in individual betterment increases global economic throughput, increasing systemic stress. This is similar to the dilemma posed by proposed redistribution of the savings of the rich to the needy.

Consumption and waste production would immediately rise since latent consumption becomes immediate. And the demographic transition (where/when it seems to work) takes several generations to kick in. So, migration may help individuals/families in specific cases, but the sum total of seems unavoidably negative until populations are shrinking instead of growing.

Steven Kurtz

Ottawa

--

<http://populationinstitute.ca>

<http://www.scientists4pr.org/>

Anyone who believes exponential growth can go on forever in a finite world is either a madman or an economist.--Kenneth Boulding

From: "Salonius, Peter" <psaloniu@nrcan.gc.ca>

To: <murphyll@bellsouth.net>, pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu,
"Kathleen Dowd-Gailey" <kdowdgailey@yahoo.com>
Subject: [PERNSeminar_Migration] Remittances to Mexico from the U.S.
Date: Tue, 8 Oct 2002 09:09:51 -0400

Dowd-Gailey states (below) that "a good portion of the Mexican GDP comes from remittances from the U.S." and that " agricultural fields [are]returning to second growth forest."

Here we have a stable (if not grand) peasant agriculture being transformed and having the skills to carry it out lost because of inflows of money that can not be counted on.

The subsidies to the local Mexican economy in the form of remittances and their continuation are predicated on the continued prosperity of the United States and its willingness to employ migrant labour.

The continued prosperity of the United States and indeed the entire globalized world economy, which are almost completely dependent on petroleum for most domestic energy and transportation and entirely dependent on petroleum for international trading, rely on the continued access to the subsidy offered by cheap and abundant, BUT FINITE (with no obvious substitutes) geological energy sources.

These energy sources are not infinite and in fact petroleum (the first in line for exhaustion and/or price shocks ----see my post RE: Carlos Reboratti and globalism, October 1, 11:14 AM) may fail the existing global economy within the next decade.

Ergo, the increasing dependence of the Mexican economy is both non-sustainable and dangerous in that extant peasant agricultural skills and landbase will fade in the face of inflows of manna from an external economy that is living on borrowed time.

Peter Saloniis

Scientists for Population Reduction
<http://www.scientists4pr.org>

From: "carlos reboratti" <creborat@arnet.com.ar>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERNSeminar_Migration] from Carlos Reboratti
Date: Tue, 8 Oct 2002 10:45:33 -0300

A problem of scale: hay many migrants and what kind of environmental = problems?

I think that much of the comments so far show that we still do not have = a clear view about the large quantity of relationships between migration = and environment. As Robin and Dan show, if we go to the local or =

regional scale, we can find both "positive" and "negative" = relationships (we have also found in Northwest Argentina that rural = outmigration has a positive environmental effect over pastures and = vegetation). But how do we relate this scales to the original question = about open or closed frontiers? If it is true that in a local scale we = can find that migrants have a negative effect on the human environment = via a stronger pressure over the natural and social resources, what is = this effect related, let say, to the natural increase of the local = population? Can me calculate an overall environmental effect of = migration to a given country? Or are the mediating factors (social, = economic and cultural) much more relevant for answering this question? = How can we link large and already existent environmental problems = (contamination, erosion) with changing migration flows? We can easily = fall into a Harding like trap, blaming the victim because we overlook = the complexity of the problem. Population/environment questions always = tend to fall in a simplistic Malthusian dilemma, forgetting the web of = human social relations.

Cheers

Carlos

Date: Tue, 8 Oct 2002 11:10:13 -0400 (EDT)
From: "Salonius, Peter" <psaloniu@nrcan.gc.ca>
To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu,
"\"Laura Murphy\" <murphyll@bellsouth.net>
Subject: [PERNSeminar_Migration] Environmental impacts / Slowing consumption / Hope

Laura Murphy ends her October 5, 6:53 PM post by stating " Environmental impacts can be , WE HOPE, reduced by slowing consumption, greening ecology, etc. to cut down the major environmental impacts of US high living (standards), for example."

Extant consumption and its continued increase are driven and facilitated by access to a temporary energy subsidy that is afforded by finite, unsustainable geological energy deposits whose exhaustion looms in the future (oil first and soon).

The Kyoto Accord will make only minuscule changes to existing patterns of energy utilization, even if (and this is unlikely) all of its goals are met.

Rather than HOPING for "slowing consumption, greening ecology, etc. to cut down the major environmental impacts", I have been crafting a scheme (copied below) for an international agreement on the gradual escalation of non renewable energy taxation that (if adopted) would alter the energy utilization driver of human excess by increasing the price of unsustainable polluting sources and increasingly favouring sustainable non polluting sources.

PRICE WORKS as was shown by the behavioural changes that were occasioned by

the OPEC orchestrated oil price escalation in the 1970s. The price of petroleum decreased as Norwegian, British and other discoveries countered the market control that OPEC was able to exert for a short time. Worldwide, discoveries are becoming fewer and smaller as the end of the 'petroleum era' approaches. The historical solution of having new discoveries to offset scarcity has past. The future of humanity appears to be one of economic contraction, scarcity, population collapse and a gradual shrinkage toward an existence that can be accommodated by the real carrying capacity of the earth in concert with the energy that our ingenuity will allow us to capture from the sun.

Peter Salonijs

September 10, 2002

I am intrigued with the apparent total reliance that the Canadian federal government appears to be placing on REGULATION, PENALTIES, SUBSIDIES, GRANTS and other economic micromanipulations as it moves toward ratification of the Kyoto Accord. This avenue is reminiscent of the gross interference in the specifics of commerce of the 'command and control' planned economy of the soviet era, and it would be expected to include all of the negatives that a rejection of the resilience and innovative capabilities of the capitalist market system incurs. Winners in commerce in this scenario are those who can best curry favour with government officials. Competence, in this system, is not rewarded.....while influence and graft are. Universal experience, with episodes of gross government interference in marketplace specifics, gives reason for great caution with this approach.

I have been developing a taxation PROPOSAL for the international community that will leave as much of the specifics of the development of renewable energy alternatives to the MARKETPLACE as possible, after redirecting that marketplace by initiating a gradual program of gradually escalating taxation to allow more expensive renewables (ultimately the only sustainable energy sources) to become increasingly more competitive.

My PROPOSAL encourages the orderly transition from non renewable energy sources (these may be thought of the DISEASE that is causing the atmospheric pollution problem) as opposed to targeting emissions reductions (which may be thought of as the downstream SYMPTOMS of the disease).

I have considerable faith in the ingenuity of markets to produce solutions to 'HASTENING THE TRANSITION OFF UNSUSTAINABLE AND POLLUTING NON RENEWABLE ENERGY SOURCES, AND TOWARD SUSTAINABLE RENEWABLE ENERGY SOURCES'. The latter have little real chance in a marketplace that values concentrated, BUT finite, conventional energy according to the cost of its extraction from the Earth ---- with some taxation (very little taxation in the United States and

Canada) added on.

Canada could play a role in popularizing the taxation/market driven avenue whose ultimate goal is as smooth a transition as possible away from the geological energy sources that will, in the passage of time (oil first and soon), be exhausted by the juxtaposition of diminishing production capacity and skyrocketing demand.

We can all have an influence on those participating in the upcoming federal-provincial discussions that must precede the final ratification of the Kyoto Accord (with its minuscule, inconsequential effects on the energy utilization behaviour of humanity -- EVEN IF IT IS COMPLETELY SUCCESSFUL) by Canada.

I encourage you to put forward ALTERNATIVES TO KYOTO such as my PROPOSAL (below) which can then be carried forward into the international forum as realistic means of achieving a low or no carbon economy worldwide.

DISCLAIMER: The PROPOSAL and my arguments to support it are the products of independent thought and do not represent the policies of my federal government department employer.

Peter Saloni
Research Scientist
Natural Resources Canada
P.O. Box 4000
Fredericton, New Brunswick
E3B 5P7 Canada
Ph (506) 452-3548
Fx (506) 452-3525
email psaloni@nrcan.gc.ca

June 7, 2002
Hello

I have sent most of you one or several serial emails that dealt with the centrality of abundant, cheap energy in relation to human dilemmas concerning population, economics, survival AND the necessity of stimulating the transition to renewables by international taxation structures, that favour market intrusion of renewable energy sources, in advance of inevitable future scarcities.

The more concise and reworked version of this POLICY PROPOSAL below, may now be ready for consideration by the international community (possibly at the Earth Summit / Rio + 10, in Johannesburg, September 2002).

PREAMBLE

There is a tight linkage between:

1. The advent of abundant, cheap, convenient fossil energy since 1850
2. The population growth from 1 to 6 billion since 1850
3. The environmental degradation produced by 1. and 2. since 1850

POLICY PROPOSAL

Modifying Human Excess with International NON RENEWABLE ENERGY TAXATION

The debate about worldwide energy consumption behaviour should not be about climate warming. (The labyrinthine political maneuvering that has been associated with the Kyoto Protocol and the regulatory maze that this process will engender, both within nations and internationally in response to Kyoto's very modest goals indicates that another approach is necessary).

The debate should be about the present availability of cheap and abundant geological energy (FOSSIL and NUCLEAR) , and how this temporary driver of human excess has fostered a philosophy that does not recognize the fact that open-ended expansion of human populations and their total economic enterprise can not continue indefinitely on a finite Earth. As the central role of readily available geological non renewable energy, in facilitating the rise of humans as the most habitat demanding species on Earth, is appreciated then a recognition of the transient nature (a few hundred years) of this energy subsidy should materialize. Preparations should begin now for the time when rapidly increasing demand for non renewable energy overtakes production (some geologists suggest this will occur during the next decade for petroleum which is the first in the lineup of geological energy sources facing exhaustion, see:

The World Petroleum Life-Cycle at: <http://dieoff.org/page133.htm>
and

The Post Petroleum Paradigm-and Population at:
<http://dieoff.org/page171.htm>

The starting point for discussions about the implementation of International Non Renewable Energy Taxation would be to take as a BENCHMARK the highest taxation rates for energy, presently imposed by the federal governments of countries with more than 35 million people. Each country with lighter energy taxation rates would be asked initially (year 1) to agree to raise its Non Renewable Energy Tax rates by FIVE PERCENT OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ITS PRESENT RATE AND THE BENCHMARK. This taxation increase on non renewable energy would be most politically acceptable if it were to be revenue neutral so that incomes from other federal taxes decreased by the same amount as non

renewable energy taxes increased revenue (tax shifting).

In this manner countries like the United States, which has the lowest energy taxes on the planet, would be asked to raise federal Non Renewable Energy Taxes by the greatest (though rather modest) amount, while countries which are already at the BENCHMARK or close to it would not be asked to alter taxation at all initially.

After a number of annual renewals (perhaps 20) of the International Agreement on Non renewable Energy Taxation, when all countries had finally reached similar tax levels, then future annual conferences could focus on how rapidly taxation rates should be escalated for all signatory countries.

This process of international gradualism is designed to effect as orderly a transition as possible from fuel sources that will unquestionably be exhausted toward those renewable energy sources upon which humanity will ultimately be dependent.

Slowly escalating non renewable energy costs will encourage research, development and market intrusion of sustainable renewable energy sources that have very little chance of competing in the present marketplace wherein energy is priced according to its cost of production as opposed to its impending scarcity.

The transition to renewables would be orchestrated by the MARKET forces of trillions-upon-trillions of purchase decisions based on PRICE as opposed to the COMMAND AND CONTROL arrangements that have proved largely unacceptable in connection with the Kyoto process.

Peter Saloni

Fredericton, New Brunswick, Canada
email psaloni@nrca.gc.ca

Date: Tue, 08 Oct 2002 11:01:02 -0400

From: "Michael Vlassoff" <vlassoff@unfpa.org>

Organization: UNFPA

To: "Saloni Peter" <psaloni@nrca.gc.ca>

CC: "Laura Murphy" <murphyll@bellsouth.net>,

pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu,

"Kathleen Dowd-Gailey" <kdowdgailey@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: [PERNSeminar_Migration] Remittances to Mexico from the U.S.

Any argument that suggests that certain pockets of the world's population should continue to be based on "peasant agriculture" is untenable and unfair. If there is one sure trend in the world today it is the trend of ever-increasing economic interdependence. If some of us have chosen lifestyles based on a possibly unsustainable economic model (petroleum based etc.), then others have the right to make the same choice. We are all in this together.

People who have given up a lifestyle based on peasant agriculture (or whose forefathers have) should not extol the virtues of this form of economic organization when they themselves live in a world of personal computers, television, central heating, vehicles and jet planes.

From: "John Barker" <jbarker@gaiawatch.freeserve.co.uk>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERNSeminar_Migration] Re: [PERNSeminar_GSP2] Canadian Immigration Policy vs Environmental, Social & Economic Health
Date: Wed, 9 Oct 2002 07:50:00 +0100

Dear Peter,

Thank you very much for sending the hard copy which arrived safely.

I am very tied up with some urgent other business at the moment. I have read through what you wrote. Most of it makes good sense to me. As for the rest, I do not mean it does not make sense, rather, I need to find time to look at it more carefully, which I will do eventually.

I have been disappointed in the PERN seminar so far. Some of the contributions seem to me to be just statements of aspects of the 'politically correct' position.

Also, I sent a contribution right at the beginning (30th September) on ecological aspects. I thought ecology was at the heart of environment! But my contribution provoked no response whatever.

Finally, I wonder if you know about our new web site. I would be interested to have your views on immigration policy which is in an essay of mine attached to the "Comments and Analysis" page.

The site is www.gaiawatch.org.uk
or www.population-growth-migration.info

Finally, I wanted to ask you if you would in principle, be willing to contribute an essay to our site - as you will see from the site, we hope to get other people to contribute short essays.

Yours sincerely,
John Barker

Date: Tue, 8 Oct 2002 16:49:47 -0500
From: HIzazola <haydea@attglobal.net>
Subject: [PERNSeminar_Migration] Contribution from Haydea Izazola

I have enjoyed the seminar's discussions and I would like to take part mainly

through posing some questions that I think are urgent to address:

1. Why in an increasing globalized world are we still thinking about closing frontiers? The open borders must not be exclusive for merchandises and financial resources. As capital has increasingly free access around the world so should human beings be free to move everywhere.
2. After some -although few- years of research on population and environment, there are still some colleagues who worry about the carrying capacity of individual countries, oversimplifying the complexity of the interrelationship. Can't we move further with our research questions?
3. There are pros and cons regarding the environmental impacts of international migration, as Sara, Laura and Babbette have stated. Apart from the dimensions raised by them and other colleagues, which are the elements that must be taken into account in future research? Besides spatial and temporal aspects of both migration and environment, what are the socio-demographic characteristics of the people involved in migration flows and their families, before and after moving? What are the subjective factors that drive people to out-migrate? Are they related to environmental factors?
4. Not all migration flows respond to economic pressure, there are also many migrants that move because of environmental stress (environmental refugees/migrant), both in rural and urban areas, and within and across countries. Does migration alleviate those pressures in origin and exacerbates them in destination areas? I also want to stress that increasingly migrants from urban origin, and also women, engage in international migration flows. This poses additional complexity for future research.
5. Many colleagues have pointed to the effect remittances have on the environment in countries of origin. The way people spend these resources depends on a variety of factors, included economic, social, political, cultural and even familiar, that must be addressed in future research. Although they gained importance in the last years, they count, at least in Mexico, for just over 1% of GNP and around 5% of all foreign income.
6. The impact of international migration on the environment will depend on the settings involved: ecosystems in rural areas (deserts, rain-forest, etc.) and size of urban areas, for example, both in origin and destination regions.
7. As the contributions to the seminar demonstrate, there is an urgent need to deepen our understanding on the relationship between international migration and environment, to move forward linear and simplistic explanations.

Thank you very much for your attention,
Haydea Izazola
Depto. de Métodos y Sistemas
Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Xochimilco

From: Anna Babette Wils <awils@tellus.org>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>

Subject: [PERNSeminar_Migration] Some issues to focus on
Date: Wed, 9 Oct 2002 16:24:15 -0400

Dear Participants,

We have had a number of very good points raised in this week, and the discussion as it is unfolding may be paving the way for a number of new research directions, or considerations in existing research.

I would just like to highlight a few -

Is the international scale relevant, when in fact, all migrants make a choice in a complex web of opportunities including local migration (Dowd-Gailey). Some types of migration, which we typically think of as internal, such as movements to forest frontiers, can also be international, as it is Latin America. In view of such observations, perhaps the more fruitful question, as Murphy brought up, is the general environmental dimension of migration, regardless of whether borders are crossed or not. This newer approach may also help us to focus on the actual effect of migrant flows, rather than on the more political question of whether migrants ought to be allowed in the North or not.

We have seen some important contributions concerning on the decline of local, traditional agricultural systems as the population becomes more dependent on remittances and connection to the larger world. This may have positive local environmental effects. The interconnectedness some say is here to say, others say makes those populations vulnerable.

I would like to invite you to send us some of your considerations on these issues,

Greetings,

Dr. Annababette Wils
Coordinator, Population Environment Research Network
Visiting Scholar
Tellus Institute
11 Arlington Street
Boston, Mass. 02116
tel. 617-266-5400
fax. 617-266-8303
<http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org/>

Date: Thu, 10 Oct 2002 12:19:01 +0200
From: cife.it@tin.it
Subject: [PERNSeminar_Migration] Should borders be closed?
To: pernsminars@ciesin.columbia.edu

Raimondo Cagiano de Azevedo (IUSSP member)
University of Rome

1 ? Let me put a first question in this way :

? Should borders be closed? ?

Is there somebody in our global demographic seminar who answers yes? I

hope not.

2 ? Now a second question:

? Should borders be abolished? ?

If yes, we have to promote a global federation and change international into internal migrations. If not, we have to introduce a taxonomy of possible borders in view to explain future interborders migrations.

3 ? The third and last question (for the moment): if we are not interested in the previous questions probably we are incline to consider only national borders. In that case we need national legislations, national procedures, national economies, national social systems, national security, national everything. But migrations are, by definition, transnational : so we need new concepts and definitions.

It follows.

Raimondo Cagianò de Azevedo

From: Anna Babette Wils <awils@tellus.org>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERNSeminar_Migration] brief extension of seminar to October 14
Date: Thu, 10 Oct 2002 12:58:32 -0400

Dear Participants,

We are getting close to the scheduled end of our cyberseminar "Should Borders be Open? The Population and Environment Dimension". As we know that many of you have very busy schedules, in particular during the week, we have decided to extend the seminar through the coming weekend, until Monday, October 14, 5 PM. We hope that this helps the many of you who would like to contribute but have not found the time to do so. To send a contribution simply send an email to pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu. We look forward to some lively debate during the weekend!

Sincerely,

Annababette Wils, for PERN.

Date: Thu, 10 Oct 2002 16:12:26 -0400
From: Steve Kurtz <kurtzs@freenet.carleton.ca>
To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
Subject: Re: [PERNSeminar_Migration] Should borders be closed?

Greetings participants,

As I've received no logical rebuttals to my first post, I take it that only normative judgements as to what ought to be good are the objections to it. Constraints and sequentially higher self-destruction are the facts. Migration out of a region/country has been analyzed a bit in piecemeal segments. Few bother to consider that the migrants go SOMEWHERE ELSE! What are the environmental impacts in the receiving countries? What are the impacts of the continually growing % of humans

living in huge cities? Attempts to isolate studies involve the necessary blinkering of holistic views of the planetary system.

A response to

Raimondo Cagiano de Azevedo (IUSSP member)
University of Rome

1 ? Let me put a first question in this way :

? Should borders be closed? ?

Is there somebody in our global demographic seminar who answers yes? I hope not.

I humbly suggest that each country admit as many new residents as its citizenry desires. Does anyone in this seminar open their home to strangers without intentional forethought? Another consideration might be a net zero policy, where countries admit as many in per year as the number which emigrate.

2 ? Now a second question:

? Should borders be abolished? ?

National sovereignty is up to each nation. Europe is undergoing a confederation which is admirable, yet each nation still controls residency and citizenship. How can a society maintain social cohesion if widely disparate values are permitted to force themselves freely into communities with largely common values?

If yes, we have to promote a global federation and change international into internal migrations. If not, we have to introduce a taxonomy of possible borders in view to explain future interborder migrations.

This sounds like rationalizing an occurrence AFTER it has been facilitated! Whatever happened to self-governance in democratic societies?

3 ? The third and last question (for the moment): if we are not interested in the previous questions probably we are inclined to consider only national borders. In that case we need national legislations, national procedures, national economies, national social systems, national security, national everything. But migrations are, by definition, transnational : so we need new concepts and definitions.

It follows.

Who is the "we" that "need new concepts and definitions"? It appears to me that it is those seeking to foster unrestricted migration as a social good (the normative judgement mentioned in my intro) Who has the right to tell other people in other places what is "right" or "good"? People choose their values and creeds in free countries; they are not force fed them. If ones habitat is in jeopardy due to carrying capacity constraints, why should self-destructive practices be engaged in? That would be mal-adaptive behavior, and such action would risk species extinction (after much misery, of course).

Thought experiment: If humanoid aliens arrived in spaceships (billions of them), should earth accept them?

Best wishes,
Steven Kurtz
Ottawa

<http://populationinstitute.ca>
<http://www.scientists4pr.org/>

Anyone who believes exponential growth can go on forever in a finite world is either a madman or an economist.--Kenneth Boulding

Subject: [PERNSeminar_Migration] ICPD Program of Action as migration resource
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
From: re@popact.org
Date: Thu, 10 Oct 2002 16:54:58 -0400

I would like to recommend Chapter X of the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development Programme of Action as a resource on questions of international migration, including those presented in this cyberseminar.

<http://www.iisd.ca/linkages/Cairo/program/p10000.html>

To my knowledge, no international intergovernmental conference has been organized on the issue of international migration. Until one is organized, this chapter represents as close as we can come to an agreement by almost all the world's nations on the issue. A reading of this chapter supports the points made earlier by Raimondo Cagiano de Azevedo. No one I'm aware of is arguing that borders be closed. Even a representative of FAIR, the Federation for American Immigration Reform, argued in this seminar that refugees will always need and deserve countries of refuge. FAIR not only stands by that point but also calls for (numerically limited) immigration into the United States for non-refugees. On the other side, Haydea Izazola argued for what appears to be open borders, writing: "As capital has increasingly free access around the world so should human beings be free to move everywhere." I take her words as a general principle, and not a serious statement. Humans are not free, and should not be free, to move into someone else's dwelling, for example, or onto military bases, or into protected wildlife areas, or onto toxically contaminated land. And given the responsibilities governments take, or at least ought to take, for residents within their borders (respecting their human rights, for example, or defending their lives and property, or educating their children, etc.), it's highly unlikely that governments will accept open borders to human beings the way they accept open borders to capital. Indeed, it is dehumanizing to compare human beings to capital, although I'm confident Dr. Izazola (whom I have met and whose person and writing I respect) did not intend this. Chapter X of the ICPD Programme of Action clarifies that it is a responsibility of national governments to promulgate policies that govern

migration into their national territories, and that this should be done with fairness to human rights, with clear information widely disseminated, and with equitable and just treatment for all. The chapter also stresses the importance of the distinction between legal migration and illegal migration, and urges that the latter be discouraged to the extent consistent with fairness and observance of human rights.

The chapter is unfortunately all but silent on the environmental aspects of migration. My own interest in this question is through the lens of the general relationship of population and environment. I'm afraid I have done little research work personally on specific cases of international migration per se and the environment. A question that interests me is the effect of international migration on global population growth. By some arguments, it is a "zero sum" process, because people are simply changing places, not joining the human species or leaving it. By other arguments, international migration may reduce global fertility, beyond what it would otherwise be, because receiving countries tend to have lower total fertility rates than sending countries, and assimilation eventually occurs in fertility behavior as in others. By yet other arguments, migration actually increases global fertility, again beyond what it would otherwise be, by encouraging people in sending countries to have more children than they would be likely to have if they knew that international migration were not an option for their offspring. A variation of this same argument is that governments are discouraged from instituting population policies (supporting family planning service provision, for example) by the demographic and employment "safety valve" of emigration to other countries, and that more restrictive international migration might encourage governments in sending countries to institute population policies, presumably thus contributing to fertility reduction in sending countries. Looking beyond fertility, it is not inconceivable that international migration could have impacts on the timing of childbearing (which itself influences population growth) or even on mortality rates. I would be very interested in any research that has been conducted to test any or all of these arguments, which seem germane to the topic of this cyberseminar. And I thank the Population-Environment Research Network for this opportunity and discussion.

Best,
Robert Engelman
Vice President for Research
Population Action International
1300 19th Street, N.W., Second Floor
Washington, D.C. 20036
202-557-3403
Fax: 202-728-4177
<http://www.populationaction.org>

Date: Fri, 11 Oct 2002 10:20:56 -0700

From: "AMINE, ALMAZ" <A.AMINE@afdb.org>
To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu

I would like to thank the organizers of this cyber seminar on "Should Borders Be Open". My views on this important topic is the following. In the present time where we are advocating for globalization as the new economic order in the presence of unequal distribution of wealth between the developed and the developing countries, opening up boarders for free mobility of people is calling for widening up the gap between the rich and the poor as those rich countries with advanced technology will be able to exploit more the resources of the poor. Even in the absence of open boarder policies many of the developed western countries are currently doing that(e.g the exploitation of diamond, gold and other resources in Africa) and contributing indirectly to the destabilization, conflict and environmental degradation in the region.

While open boarder policy may have its advantages, there are certain pre-requisites that need to be satisfied for such policy to be of benefit. Among the most important things in this respect is equitable distribution of wealth which can be addressed through the flow of recourses both of financial and technological from the developed to the developing countries (e.g let us make the G8 respect their commitment of giving 0.7% of their GDP towards official development assistance, let these countries increase resources to the Global Fund so that the propagation of the epidemic can be stopped, etc..) . Addressing these critical issues, most of which are already part of the UN declarations on Population, Women, Social Development, HIV/AIDS etc, will bring the poor countries at a level where they would be capable of reaping the benefits of open border policy while protecting themselves from its adverse effects. Open boarder policy in a world where 10% of the population owns 80% of the world's wealth is just like giving a blank check to the developed world (especially the transnational corporations) to exploit the resources of the poor countries endangering the environment and impoverishing the population. In my view Borders should not be abolished, neither should they be completely closed. International migrations should be allowed and be governed by receiving countries rules and procedures that takes into account issues of carrying capacity, socio-demographic characteristics, etc.. Sending countries of international migrants could also make their internal laws and procedures conducive for their nationals abroad to participate in the economic activities of their countries of origin.

I enjoyed the discussion and would suggest for its extension by a week or two.

Alma Amine
African Development Bank

This e-mail and any attachment sent with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. If you have received this e-mail by error please delete it immediately. No reference

should be made of the information contained in this e-mail. The views or opinions expressed in this message, unless otherwise clearly indicated, are solely those of its author and do not necessarily represent those of the ADB. Unauthorized publication, use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail and its associated attachments is strictly prohibited. ADB believes but does not warrant that this e-mail and any attachments are virus-free. You must therefore take full responsibility for checking for viruses therein. ADB disclaims any responsibility and liability arising from your unauthorized use of the contents of this e-mail or your failing to ensure that it is virus-free.

From: "Kathleen Dowd-Gailey" <kdowdgailey@yahoo.com>
**To: "'Steve Kurtz'" <kurtzs@freenet.carleton.ca>,
<pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>**
Subject: RE: [PERNSeminar_Migration] what are the environmental dimensions of cross-border flows?
Date: Sat, 12 Oct 2002 11:58:01 -0700

Dear Participants,

I apologize for the delay in my response; i am currently participating in another ciber conference as well as a live conference in Mexico City, thus time has been short.
in response to several comments....

Frist, I'm not so sure that the pastures are always necessarily greener where migrants go. The belief that they will be greener is pretty strong, but anyone who has worked with immigrants knows that it is not always the case. Indeed, something must be better to keep them there, (usually economics), however in the same region I mentioned before, there are also a substantial number of return migrants.

Second, I fully agree that local production is preferrable, however, I suggest that with US and other developed country agricultural subsidies as they are, maybe this is less of an option in some places, and maybe some people don't want to continue their "peasant agriculture", so who are we to tell them that they need to continue??? Isn't it ironic that Mexico is importing corn.....>...> (Sorry, this is another discussion.....)

and not to harp too much on the issue of remittances, however,

"Even in an economy as large as Mexico's, remittances are more than twice the value of agricultural exports, and over 50 percent of oil exports. Mexico is by

far the largest recipient of remittances in Latin America and the Caribbean, with over \$9.2 billion in 2001. This represents over 40 percent of total flows to the region."

http://www.usaid.gov/press/releases/2002/pr020927_1.html

Third, as my question seemed to prompt some response, I would be interested

if anyone does have any data regarding the environmental consequences of a (potential) migrant in these different situations. Does an "American" lifestyle of an immigrant with all its consumption, and non-renewable fuel usage, etc. have a larger negative impact on the earth as a whole compared to deforestation and expansion of "peasant agriculture" (with its own carbon implications) in a mega-diverse country?? How do we measure the impacts of auto emissions vs. biodiversity loss?? I don't know. I ask the questions in the spirit of the search for knowledge.

Luckily, there are trends in both countries with regards to increasing use of alternative renewable energies (albiet slowly) (US), and project-based initiatives in Mexico that are leading to agricultural sedentarization (also slowly) (Mexico).

Finally, this is not about political correctness, it is about political reality.

"it's highly unlikely that governments will accept open borders to human beings they way they accept open borders to capital" ----Robert Engelman
That is the political reality.

Thanks for your attention and continued spirited discussion.

--Kathleen Dowd-Gailey
Kathleen M. Dowd-Gailey
IMichigan nternational Development Associate
Pronatura Peninsula de Yucatan, A.C.
Calle 17 #188-A x 10, Colonia Garcia Gineres
Merida, Yucatan 97070, Mexico
Tel/fax: 52.999.925.3787,
efax: 1.810.821.2907

Date: Mon, 14 Oct 2002 11:33:27 +0200
To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
From: Isolde PROMMER <prommer@iiasa.ac.at>
Subject: [PERNSeminar_Migration] brief extension of seminar to October 14

Sorry for the late contribution on "Should borders be open?" and thanks for the personal invitation to contribute.
the title clearly led to some confusion and put the discussion sometimes away from scientific sound arguments into political ones. I'm not a migration expert at all, but I've a few comments on this very interesting cyber seminar.

First, the migration issue is a very complex one and there is lot of scientific studies done especially during the 70s. I was astonished that almost nobody referred to "what lessons did we learn from past research and political experience".

Second, in this context, the migration theories are of interest and where never discussed. All the comments just deal with the "push-pull" theories but with non of the others, e.g. the "network theory".

Third, the seminar is heavily dominated by scientists from affluent western/northern/industrialized countries. The few contributors from the so-called developing countries discussed much more the dynamics of migration movements of sending and receiving regions, which do not necessarily have to be identical with national borders (sovereignty), and not only the impacts on receiving countries.

I will continue here and add my comments: That we should/have to close borders are comments mainly brought up by contributions from affluent countries. The arguments we know. This does not mean at all, that immigration to those countries will be stopped, in contrary we are talking here from "selective migration flows". The criteria are known, and these controlled migration serves the economies and social securities (pension schemes) of the receiving countries. I welcome the contribution which looked at the ecological footprints to calculate the national's ecological deficits (I'm not very familiar with this theory) and I'm convinced that is this theory is very interesting basis for further research. But I'm not sure if they take the "exported ecological deficits" into consideration. Further I want to point out that for the classical migration theory, simplified here as population pressure on land, I couldn't find any empirical evidence (I just recall here one paper from Bilborrow and DeLargy, or Blackie).

I was astonished that "refugees" are not considered as migrants (check the AOU convention and the declaration of Cartagena, which widen the narrow definition of the 1951 convention). UNCHR is one organization which tries to estimate the global numbers of refugees and displaced people (refugees within nations). The estimated number of refugees was 13.2 millions in 1997. This number does not include the Palestinians. The estimates for displaced people is about 16 million in 1997 - solely in Africa! The first definition of "environmental refugees" I found in an UNEP report of the year 1985 - but still it's hard to find any number because the borders of the definition are vague (e.g. environmental disruption).

And, as far I can remember, I might be wrong, the biggest migration movements occur on the African continent and the absolute majority of these migrants never leave the continent, followed by Asia. And second, the biggest migrations are from rural areas to urban areas - urbanization, megacities - the majority of these fast growing megacities are in developing countries. As we know, those poor people do not contribute to the global warming, but of course, they have an impact on the local environment - in situ bad sanitation problems and air quality (see cyber seminar contribution on increase on deceases such as TBC and cholera). But there was no discussion on it.

Let's continue: What are the impacts on the sending and receiving regions? My contributions deal with impacts on the sending countries. We know from empirical studies that the impacts can be positive but as well negative, both from ecological and socio-economic view (see all cyber seminar contributions, but also dependent on the definition of systems borders). Often discussed and well-known but quite often ignored is the "brain drain" effect of the sending regions, independent if rural or urban. I do not

continue on this.

I want to add here one example for negative environmental impacts of the sending region - Yemen and its manmade terraces, originally coffee production and intercropping of cereals and vegetables (other famous terrace cultures are in Hindu Kush-Himalayan-Region, Andes, Philippines and Indonesia, Western Atlas Mountains, Konso Ethiopia, and smaller areas in Central Europe). About 10% of world population lives in mountainous areas. One important characteristic of all terrace cultures is the demand of available human labor force - the human labor force can hardly be substituted by machines. In Yemen, in the 70s more than 1/3 of the male rural population emigrated. This resulted in a 30% reduction of cultivated area, of which the majority was in the mountainous areas of Yemen with its horizontal bench terraces. This system is a very complex watering and water retention system, and soil conservation system. The reduction of this 30% agr. area resulted more or less in a total erosion of the terraces - which means a total loss of soil and water retention capacity, which caused in some areas severe drinking water problems. The terraces of the 1903-1905 drought emigration waves are already completely destroyed and of the 1950s emigration waves almost not existent any more. As we see the speed of terrace erosion is fast - it destroys systems which were built over centuries (also human made systems can be ecologically worthwhile). Another nasty side effect was the change of the labor intensive coffee production (world market development plus emigration) to the labor extensive *Kat* (a type of drug). Of course, the remittances helped the families to buy kerosene stoves, food for the household, and other "luxury" items. But meanwhile, the men are back (no jobs any more abroad): no remittances, no fertile land area (eroded), less jobs in local markets.

Further I did once a literature study on the impacts of male rural outmigration on agricultural production. Most studies (not many when we take into consideration that still the majority of population is dependent on agriculture in developing countries) are from the seventies and could be of interest in the context of the HIV/AIDS pandemic. Rural out-migration and HIV/AIDS epidemic in rural areas have - very simply formulated - the same effect: loss of the prime age group. Shortly summarized the "ecological" impacts are: reduction in cropped area (could be positive) and reduction in soil maintenance activities (which is negative in terms of erosion and soil depletion), and change from labor intensive to labor extensive crops (e.g. from maize to cassava/manioc could be positive or negative); hence the overall "socio-economic" impact on the household, could be: reduction in total agricultural production (= product of reduced cropped area and productivity decrease because of soil depletion and erosion) which leads to undernourishment of household member (change from more nutritious to less nutritious crops). In case emigrated family member, which paid remittances to buy food, comes back, this doesn't necessarily mean that production increases back to the former level. Remittances do not necessarily mean change to more modern technologies, etc.

We are still far away from the complex thinking necessary to deal with this problem and to deal with the problem cross-national and globally. Mass

migration movements won't stop as long as big disparities are existent - and mainly these cause problems. What we are discussing about, that we are connected through IT technologies is only valid for an affluent minority. As long as no solutions are found to develop the "liberal market theory" to a more closing the inter-national economies gap, migration will still occur - and mainly in the poor countries and won't never reach the borders of the affluent ones. I do not know any solution, but "live greener" could be part of the solution. Diversity, in my opinion is one important key issue, just because of the simple fact that the ecological and socio-economic impacts differ substantially in sending or receiving regions (of course patterns are existent).

Somebody mentioned the right of development:

In adopting the Declaration on the Right of Development in 1986, the United Nations General Assembly defined that right as "Recognizing that development is a comprehensive economic, social, cultural and political process, which aims at the constant improvement of the well-being of the entire population and of all individuals on the basis of their active, free and meaningful participation in development and in the fair distribution of benefits resulting therefrom." (G.A. Resolution 41/128, annex, 41 U.N. GAOR Supp. (No.53) at 186, U.N. Doc. A/41/53, December 4, 1986, available at <http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/instreet/s3drd.htm>)

Thank you

Isolde Prommer

(Research Assistant, IIASA)

From: "Salonius, Peter" <psaloniu@nrca.gc.ca>

To: "'pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu'"

<pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>,

'''kdowdgailey@yahoo.com'''

<kdowdgailey@yahoo.com>

Subject: [PERNSeminar_Migration] Political reality / Resource reality

Date: Mon, 14 Oct 2002 06:03:03 -0400

Dowd-Gailey (below) states that "maybe some people don't want to continue their "peasant agriculture", so who are we to tell them that they need to continue?".

This is quite similar to the statement of President George W. Bush that "Americans like their lifestyle and their sport utility vehicles and they do not want to change."

We can ADVISE (not tell) the migrant Mexicans that they are attaching themselves to a very precarious economy, and we can ADVISE (not tell) the Americans that their energy intensive "consumption, and non-renewable fuel usage,etc," is precarious and unsustainable.

Dowd-Gailey concludes by suggesting that "this is not about political

correctness, it is about political reality", however there is a looming resource availability reality that must be faced sooner or later, either by planning (see my post about non renewable energy taxation entitled 'Environmental impacts / Slowing consumption / Hope', October 8, 2002, 12:10 PM) or by having devastating scarcity thrust upon us unprepared.

Peter Saloni
Scientists for Population Reduction
<http://www.scientists4pr.org>

Date: Mon, 14 Oct 2002 10:49:17 -0400
From: Steve Kurtz <kurtzs@freenet.carleton.ca>
To: pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu
Subject: Re: [PERNSeminar_Migration] brief extension of seminar to October 14

Thanks are in order to the organizers and contributing participants to this seminar on what can be a 'hot button' and somewhat irrational topic. Humanism demands that the needy be considered, but also that the wasteful and shortsighted be admonished. Attempts at addressing these have been made, and continued communication is far preferable to belligerence.

A comment on Isolde Prommers post:

- > We are still far away from the complex thinking necessary to deal with
- > this problem and to deal with the problem cross-national and globally.
- > Mass migration movements won't stop as long as big disparities are
- > existent - and mainly these cause problems.

Certainly problematic. Violent conflict might be as likely a result of the wide disparities.

- > As long as no solutions are found to develop the "liberal market
- > theory" to a more closing the inter-national economies gap, migration
- > will still occur - and mainly in the poor countries and won't never
- > reach the borders of the affluent ones.

Well, there already are backlash elements against high immigration in W. Eur., Australia, and N.America. So the flows are still reaching the affluent countries. It is perhaps possible that tightening of borders (affluent) will continue, making the above statement largely correct.

- > I do not know any solution, but "live greener" could be part of the
- > solution.

Agree that this is rational, long term thinking.

- > Diversity, in my opinion is one important key issue, just because of
- > the simple fact that the ecological and socio-economic impacts differ
- > substantially in sending or receiving regions (of course patterns are
- > existent).

Don't know whether you mean biodiversity or cultural diversity or both?? The former is necessary (requisite variety) for biosphere stability and healthy human habitats. The latter has proven to be 'double edged' depending on scale and on system constraints: sometimes enriching, but potentially destabilizing.

- > Somebody mentioned the right of development:
- > In adopting the Declaration on the Right of Development in 1986, the
- > United Nations General Assembly defined that right as "Recognizing
- > that development is a comprehensive economic, social, cultural and
- > political process, which aims at the constant improvement of the
- > well-being of the entire population and of all individuals on the
- > basis of their active, free and meaningful participation in
- > development and in the fair distribution of benefits resulting
- > therefrom." (G.A. Resolution 41/128, annex, 41 U.N. GAOR Supp. (No.53)
- > at 186, U.N. Doc. A/41/53, December 4, 1986, available at
- > <http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/instatee/s3drd.htm>)

The late Julius Nyerere from The Challenge to the South: Report of the South Commission:

" In the long run the problem of overpopulation of the countries of the South can be fully resolved only through their development. But action to contain the rise of population cannot be postponed." (Nyerere, 1990)

from a paper written in 2000:

"In 1989, as verified by The UN Population Fund, the following countries signed a statement urging early stabilization of human population. Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Botswana, Cape Verde, China, Columbia, Cyprus, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Fiji, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Rep. of Korea, Liberia, Malta, Mauritius, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Panama, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Seychelles, Singapore, Sri Lanka, St. Kitts-Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent & the Grenadines, Sudan, Thailand, Tunisia, Vanuatu, and Zimbabwe.

Note the absence of most wealthy nations. It is ridiculous to claim that the rich are trying to coerce the poor nations to reduce population. In fact, they are not responding to the affirmed needs of the poor.

The following countries are part of either the South Commission or

Partners in
Population and Development: Zimbabwe, Kenya, Mexico, Colombia, Thailand,
Indonesia, Bangladesh, Morocco, Egypt, Tunisia, China, India, Pakistan,
Uganda, Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, Guyana, Ivory Coast, Jamaica,
Kuwait, Malaysia, Mozambique, Nigeria, Philippines, Senegal, Sri Lanka,
Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia (former), and Western Samoa. The "Partners"
share expertise with each other in reproductive health, appropriate
technologies, and population policy."

http://populationinstitute.ca/Essays/Feedback_and%20Disequil.htm

Part of any solution seems to demand addressing the key driver of high
fertility.

Steven Kurtz
Ottawa

--

<http://populationinstitute.ca>
<http://www.scientists4pr.org/>

Anyone who believes exponential growth can go on forever in a
finite world is either a madman or an economist.--Kenneth Boulding

From: "Alex de Sherbinin" <adesherbinin@ciesin.columbia.edu>
To: <pernseminars@ciesin.columbia.edu>
Subject: [PERNSeminar_Migration] international migration and the environment
Date: Mon, 14 Oct 2002 12:42:31 -0400

I've enjoyed the contributions thus far, though I note that several
participants have referred to the lack of research addressing these
connections, and there seems to be a general lack of reference to migration
theory and the large body of research on migration & development. A number
of references were made to the Mexico-US relationship. I did some research
in the 1980s on the impacts of migration and remittances on the communities
of the Senegal River valley (bordered by Senegal, Mauritania & Mali). This
region has experienced long-standing migration flows, mostly to France, but
also to Libya, Gabon, and a number of other African countries, and since
1990, to the United States. I think there are some relevant lessons to be
learned from the Senegal River case:

1. Migration is facilitated by connections between communities in source and
destination countries. Chain migration will no doubt continue to be a major
factor in influencing future migration patterns. Culturally imbedded factors
are also important; in some cultures, migration is a rite of passage for
young men and women.
2. Remittances were/are extremely important to the household economies of
the Senegal River Valley, providing means for extended families to purchase
foodstuffs, basic necessities, construction materials and some "luxury"
items. Does this permit source communities to live beyond their local

carrying capacity? It may, but how does this differ from any community in the developed world that inevitably lives well beyond its local carrying capacity owing to importation of goods (at highly favorable terms of trade) from abroad? (cf. previous Ecological Footprint discussion) It should also be noted that remittances are pooled by village associations for local development activities, and that these have largely positive impacts on the environment.

3. I believe that demographic factors and a "constrained environment" did/do play a role in pushing many migrants to leave the Senegal River Valley. But perhaps more important in recent history has been the impact of large-scale development activities. Since the 1980s, OMVS (a development authority run by the three countries) has dammed the river and promoted irrigated agriculture in place of traditional production systems. These have had a significant impact on the resource base (both fisheries and the traditional flood-recession agriculture), and inadvertently increased the prevalence of schistosomiasis.

4. I do not know if there has been any recent research on the impact of OMVS activities on migration. I wrote a paper in 1992 looking at the (indirect) impact of the OMVS activities in Mauritania, where the perception by the Moor-controlled government that river lands were suddenly more valuable led to the mass expulsion of Halpulaar across the border on the pretext that historically they had no claim to the lands. Some Halpulaar have returned, but many remain in refugee settlements in Senegal. Black and Sessay (1997) utilized remote sensing to examine the impacts of this refugee flow on the Senegal side of the river, and found a decrease in vegetative cover and an increase in cultivated area, but concluded that it was hard to separate out the impact of the refugees from other social, political and climatic changes in the basin.

5. My point in bringing in the OMVS is that many regions are encountering *major* ecological changes due to large-scale development activities well beyond the control of local subsistence agriculturalists. China is a case in point. Major water diversion plans from the humid south to the semi-arid north (Beijing) are threatening to displace millions of people, and I would bet that some number of these displaced people will be candidates for international migration. They will have few options, since the reports I have read (in the NY Times) indicate that the Chinese authorities have generally not followed through on promises of new land to displaced peoples.

6. As a geographer, I see current trends in migration as an inevitable result of the differential development potential of world regions, which are related to environmental constraints. Jeffrey Sachs, the new Director of the Columbia Earth Institute, has emphasized recently the huge impact that malaria has had on the economies of sub-Saharan Africa. He makes a compelling argument that economic development is not just a matter of putting in place "good governance" or correct macro-economic policy; there are some regions that are fundamentally constrained for reasons of climate and disease, and developed nations will need to do more (in terms of development aid) for these regions if they are going to have a fighting

chance of obtaining decent living standards (see Sachs et al. The geography of poverty and wealth, Sci Am. 2001 Mar;284(3):70-5). If the developed world chooses to turn its back and consistently put its own interests first, the inevitable result (so far as I can see) will be the continued migration from less to more developed regions. (I should add that I do not necessarily see the latter as a bad thing; it is a fact; an outcome of current global inequalities as mentioned by Prommer, among others. Perhaps a more appropriate title for this seminar might have been, "Can Borders Conceivably be Closed?")

Thanks for a stimulating discussion.

Alexander de Sherbinin
Science Applications Division
Center for International Earth Science Information Network (CIESIN)
Columbia University
P.O. Box 1000, Palisades, NY 10964 USA
Tel. +1-845-365-8936, Fax +1-845-365-8922
Web: <http://www.ciesin.columbia.edu>

Date: Tue, 15 Oct 2002 16:20:48 -0400
From: Anna Babette Wils <awils@tellus.org>

Cyberseminar Summary

I would like to thank all of those who participated in this seminar, both with active contributions and with attentive reading. The participants, many of them leaders in their field, others future leaders, brought up a diverse set of important topics, which I will attempt to summarize in this closing comment. The discussion, particularly in the second half of the seminar picked up considerably, and this summary necessarily short-changes many contributions. My apologies in advance.

There are five main themes that run through the seminar, raised by Curran in her discussion paper and in part, by Simmons in his opening comment. These are: migration in the context of globalization - including global trade and foreign investment; relief of population pressure in sending regions; the role of remittances; increasing consumption as a result of migration; emigration as a cause of continued high fertility in sending regions. From the start, Curran and Simmons state what many others echo in later contributions (Murphy, Prommer, Dowd-Gailey) namely that we need to be willing to see this topic in a comprehensive, and complex, context, with many different scales, and many different nuances.

In addition to these main threads, which I summarize below, a number of new, little studied phenomena are raised - international forest frontier migration and the environmental vulnerability of new urban arrivals (Hogan); development leading to major environmental changes that necessitate migration, notably damming a waterway (de Sherbinin). Refugees, environmental and otherwise, are mentioned by a number of

participants as an important issue to consider.

A majority of participants view globalization as a lasting phenomenon ("one sure trend is ever-increasing interdependence" Vlassof, joined by Simmons, Reboratti, Murphy, de Azevedo, Izazola) which deeply affects migration. Many argue that as long as the present global economic inequalities remain, so will international migration (de Sherbinin, Izazola and others). Almaz however, argues that the present structure of inequalities allows the wealthy to exploit the poor, including the international migrants.

Two contributors (Dowd-Gaily and Marsh) quote examples where emigration from a marginal agricultural regions results in reforestation (an environmental positive); Prommer quotes contrary examples from mountain regions of terraced agriculture where emigration has resulted in erosion of the centuries old terraces and with them, the soil (and in the case of Yemen, a worsened situation because "the men are back no remittances, no fertile land area, less jobs in local markets"). Wils mentions Cape Verde, where emigration directly led to increased population through lower mortality levels, but without clear local environmental impacts.

Related to the effect of emigration on the sending region is the issue of remittances. Some warn of reliance on remittances as a precarious option (Salonius); others argue that remittances are used for investment or reconstruction, and even where consumption is the main outcome, it is perhaps a relief from deep poverty (Dowd-Gailey, Murphy), and causes a reduction of land used for agriculture.

Migration, the contributors agree, tends to increase consumption either of the migrant in the receiving country or of remittance-receiving family in the country of origin (implicitly this means there is a consensus that migration raises the income of the migrant). A number of contributors (Parker, Salonius) see in this a reason to limit migration to wealthy countries, as consumption leads to higher environmental resource use. Dowd-Gailey challenges this premise by asking "how do we measure auto emissions vs. biodiversity loss (in sending regions)?" and Reboratti, Vlassof, warn us not to fall into the "Hardin-like trap" of blaming the victim for higher consumption. A number of contributors suggest that the discussion move beyond the simplistic "carrying capacity" debate and to a more nuanced understanding.

Finally, a number of contributions asked whether "migration is a zero-population-sum process" (Engelman). A number answer that emigration allows sending countries to maintain high fertility, while Wils argues the contrary for Cape Verde.

There is not clear consensus on many issues, which hopefully will be resolved by future research and policy setting, but it is clear that migration has a significant environmental dimension that needs to be better understood. I would like to again, thank all of you for participating, and look forward to hearing from you in the future at

PERN's coming cyberseminars. I would also be happy to place your research in our resource database with a link to your website, if you will send me information about your ongoing research, working papers, journal papers, syllabi, etcetera.

Sincerely
Dr. Annababette Wils
Coordinator, Population Environment Research Network
Visiting Scholar
Tellus Institute
11 Arlington Street
Boston, Mass. 02116
tel. 617-266-5400
fax. 617-266-8303
<http://www.populationenvironmentresearch.org/>