

Linkages between Internal and International Migrations: Policy Implications for Development¹

Claudia Natali, International Organisation for Migration (IOM), Thailand-Office

Introduction

Migration is increasingly seen as a catalyst for development. Yet, while there is growing recognition of the positive impact that human mobility can have on fostering development, the role of policy in maximizing migration's benefits and minimizing its costs still remains to be properly understood. This challenge is further exacerbated by the fact that the word 'migration' has nearly always been associated with 'international migration', while internal migration has been linked, as Skeldon (2008) points out, with terms such as "population distribution" or "urbanization". The 2007-2011 Plan of the Thai National Economic and Social Development Board (NESDB) provides a good example of how internal migration is only indirectly treated under the umbrella of decentralization and urbanization policies. As a consequence, the 'migration and development' policy debate has been heavily monopolized by studies focusing on international migration. Those working on international migration seldom consider internal migration, or urbanization, as relevant to their interests and vice versa (Skeldon, 2008).

However, both internal and international migration are often triggered by similar economic, social, and political factors, and they offer similar potentialities for development. As Abha Joshi Ghani, World Bank Urban Development Director has pointed out, "Urbanization is one of the pillars of economic success of a country" (*Le Monde*, 23 July 2009). The increased recognition of the contribution that migrants can make to economic and other dimensions of development provides good reason to reconsider the separation between internal and international migration research and policymaking (De Wind and Holdaway, 2008). A better understanding of the interrelationships, and of the similarities and the differences, between these two categories of migration can help to design policies that facilitate the contribution migrants can make to the development of their countries of origin.

¹ Paper prepared for the conference on "Urban-Rural Linkages and Migration: A Potential for Poverty Alleviation in Developing Countries?" held in Dortmund on 16-17 September 2009.

*The author is the Labour Migration Programme Manager with the International Organization for Migration (IOM) Mission in Thailand. For their helpful comments and encouragement, the author is grateful to Gervais Appave, Richard Black, Apichat Chamrattithirong, Ryszard Cholewinski, Rodolfo Córdova, Bruno Maltoni, Phil Martin, Sureeporn Punpuing and Ron Skeldon. All errors and views expressed in this paper are those of the author and they do not represent an official position of IOM or its members.

The conference on *“Urban-Rural Linkages and Migration: A Potential for Poverty Alleviation in Developing Countries?”*, Dortmund, Germany, 16-17 September 2009, provides a good opportunity to increase the recognition of internal migration (and urbanization) as a potentially significant driving force for development, and to explore the most effective policy orientations for the release of that potential, particularly for the benefit of rural areas of origin. The conference also provides an opportunity for the bridging of the gap between international and internal migration and to argue that a comprehensive approach – one that views migration on a continuum running from internal to international – is what is needed if internal migration is to maximize its impacts on development. Both types of migration should therefore be analyzed together and common responses found.

This paper is organized in three main sections. The first section provides some definitions of the key terms and describes how both internal and international migration impact on development. An underlying theme is that internal migration poses the same questions for development as international migration and it brings with it equal, if not greater, opportunities.

Using examples from China, Mexico and Thailand, the second section illustrates how the recommendations and best practices that apply to international migration are also valid to foster the development potential of internal migration.

Finally the paper highlights the linkages between internal and international migration and stresses that policies that aim to maximize the development potential of international migration should look at the impact on internal migration and vice-versa. Similarly, development policies should take into account the impact that they have on international and internal migration (and urbanization) alike. The paper concludes by highlighting the importance of the international community integrating internal migration issues into the discussion on migration and development.

1. The contribution of internal and international migration to development

Human mobility plays a central role in global and local processes of social, economic and political change. For a long time, South-North migration and rural-urban movements were looked at as evidence of development failure (on the assumption that the process of development would ultimately eradicate migration). However, in more recent times the international community has begun to understand that migration can be a force for development rather than a symptom of underdevelopment.

Some studies have clearly identified the direct and indirect routes whereby migration affects both economic and human development (Chappel *et al.*, 2009). On one hand, *emigration* can entail some negative consequences, such as *brain drain* (i.e. the departure of highly qualified human resources from those countries where they are most needed) which can have a direct effect on human development, while on the other hand, the arrival of migrants at destination (*immigration*) can bring new skills which, to a certain extent, may offset the human resource drain. In addition, *return migration* makes migrants agents of development in the country of origin as they bring back the so-called “social remittances”. They also transfer knowledge and experience that maybe reproduced and/or adapted and sometimes even ameliorated, to meet the local needs and to advance the economies of origin.

Among the indirect routes, arguably the most important one is represented by *remittances* sent back to families and friends. Remittances increase the financial assets of the household and local communities which in turn may have many impacts upon development – for example, at the micro level they might allow for investment in a family business, whereas at the macro level they might provide a valuable source of foreign exchange. In addition, migration creates *diaspora* that can affect communities of origin in several ways, including creating new possibilities for trade (Chappel *et al.*, 2009). Martin (2006) refers to the 3 Rs of development - Recruitment, Return and Remittances - to underline the channels through which migration can accelerate development.

The impacts of migration analyzed above are not confined to international migration. All of the routes whereby migration affects development are at work for internal and international migration alike.

Defining internal and international migration

Human mobility entails different types of movements. It is therefore of central importance to clearly define them if a thorough analysis of their impacts on development has to be undertaken. The International Organization for Migration (IOM) distinguishes, *inter alia*, between internal and international migration and it defines them as follows: *internal migration* consists in “a movement of people from one area of a country to another for the purpose or with the effect of establishing a new residence. This migration might be temporary or permanent. Internal migrants move but remain within their country of origin (e.g. urban-rural migration)”. On the other hand, *international migration* is the “movement of persons who leave their country of origin, or the country of habitual residence, to establish themselves either permanently or temporarily in another country” (IOM, 2004).

Interestingly, internal migration has the potential of bringing with it even more opportunities for development than international migration. There are several reasons for this.

First, **internal migrants cannot (or should not) be 'irregular'** (i.e. that there should not be legal barriers to internal migration as there are for international movements) **and therefore the impact that internal migration has on the development of the communities of origin does not (or should not) depend on the legal status of the migrant**². However, legal and practical barriers to internal migration still exist. The *hukou*³ system in China for example, does not allow persons who are registered in the rural area to receive some public services away from the place of registration. While the system has been relaxed in recent times, especially in smaller urban centers (also contributing to substantial economic growth (Fang and Dewen, 2008)), migrants who move to larger centers without having the relevant *hukou* still cannot access public services such as health care. Internal movements of population were also tightly controlled in Viet Nam under the *ho khau* system until it was reformed in 1986⁴.

Second, **internal migration far exceeds international migration in terms of numbers**. Internal migration is the most common type of migration and this should not be surprising, as underlined by Skeldon (2008) in quoting Ravenstein's first law of migration (1885): "the majority of migrants go only a short distance". There are four internal migrants for each international migrant according to some estimates. The most recent figures for China and India report 136 million and 42 million internal migrants respectively while total figures of international migration in 2009 amounts to 214 million (UN DESA, 2009). Thus the scope of potential development benefits is much larger from internal migration than international migration.

Internal migration also tends to be the most accessible to poorer people as international South-North migration generally involves high costs and may entail significant risk. This explains why South-North migration from many countries with low levels of development tends to be low and more selective for the relatively wealthy and skilled segments of the population (De Haas, 2009). De Haas (2009) also points out that while South-North migration generally yields greater increases in

² Several studies have highlighted the role of the status of the migrant (regular/irregular) on the development outcomes of migration (cfr. Sabates-Wheeler, 2009; Sabates-Wheeler, Natali and Black, 2007).

³ The *hukou* refers to the household registration record that officially identifies a person as a resident of an area. In 1958, the Chinese Government began to use the *hukou* system to control the movement of people between urban and rural areas. Individuals were broadly categorised as a "rural" or "urban" workers.

⁴ The *ho khau* system has been relaxed since 1986 but government policies in Viet Nam are still discouraging migration. Migrants are not recognized as permanent registered inhabitants at the location where they are living, but are seen as non-permanent citizens which creates a barrier for them to access social services such as health care or education for their children (Cu Chi Loi, 2005).

income and livelihood security than internal or South-South migration⁵, **internal migration (or South-South migration) is more likely to be inequality-decreasing since it is often less selective than the more costly and risky South-North migration.**

Black et al. (2006) point out that the relationship between migration and inequality varies between and within countries but migration has the potential to reduce inequality when the poorest have access to it. Evidence from Mexico show that a ten percent increase in international remittances increased rural inequality by 2.8 percent, while a similar increase in internal remittances reduced rural inequality by 0.1 percent (de Haas, 2009).

In summary, like international migration, internal migration can potentially be a good development and livelihood improvement strategy, the difference being that the development opportunities from internal migration are more likely to reach a significantly higher number of people.

1.1 Migration and Development and the International Community

The positive impact that migration can have on countries of origin has received considerable attention by the international community recently, particularly in light of the recommendations on Migration and Development in the Global Commission on International Migration report (GCIM, 2005) or the United Nations General Assembly High Level Dialogue on Migration and Development in September 2006. 'Migration and Development' has since been placed among the top priorities of action for the international community. This trend is also shown by the increased interest and effort devoted to the Global Forum on Migration and Development⁶ (GFMD) which will have its 3rd Forum in Athens on 4-5 November 2009 on "Integrating Migration Policies in Development Strategies for the Benefit of All, and especially Countries of Origin". It is also worth pointing out that the European Commission is currently putting a lot of effort and funding on Migration and Development programming and studies.

However, international dialogue evolving around 'migration and development' has generally been limited to the analysis of international migration. This unfortunately ignores the fact that internal

⁵ De Haas refers to several studies in Morocco and Burkina Faso that suggest that internal (and South-South) migration within the African continent is primarily a means to enhance livelihood security through income diversification and that welfare gains are relatively small while mainly migration to Europe allowed household to accumulate substantially more wealth besides stabilizing incomes.

⁶ The Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) is a voluntary, informal and government led process to advance understanding and cooperation on the mutually reinforcing relationship between migration and development and to foster practical and action-oriented outcomes (GFMD, 2008).

migration can have the same (if not greater) beneficial effect on the communities of origin, especially for poverty alleviation and that international migration is very closely linked to internal migration (and therefore the two can not be treated separately).

The International Organization for Migration (IOM) has been closely involved in the migration and development discourse, contributing not only through programmes such as the Migration for Development Initiative in Africa (MIDA), but also through policy oriented research (e.g. mainstreaming migration into national development plans). Moreover, since the beginning, IOM has recognized the important role that internal migration plays in the migration and development equation and has been working towards its integration in the wider dialogue. For example, IOM organized the “Migration, Development and Poverty Reduction in Asia” conference hosted by the government of China in Lanzhou, Gansu in March 2005. The Lanzhou conference emphasized the importance of internal migrants for local and national development and how their contributions can be enhanced by strategies to reduce the risks of migration for poor people. In addition, IOM and the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) organized a workshop titled “Migration and Development Within and Across Borders: Concepts, Methods, and Policy Considerations in Internal and International Migration”, from which this paper draws substantially, which took place during November 2005 in New York.

In recent times, the international community has given increasing attention to the likely implications of climate change and environment degradation on population movements. Estimates of the number of people likely to be displaced by environmental factors by 2050 vary enormously, with estimates ranging from 212 million (Myers, 2001) to one billion people (Christian Aid, 2007). There is agreement that most of these movements will happen within countries, but there is a challenge in establishing what impact they are likely to have on development.

2. Policies that can favour the development potential of internal migration in areas of origin

Since internal and international migration have similar motivations and impacts on development, policy recommendations and best practices to manage international migration for development could and should also be applied to improve the potential of internal migration. This section highlights some of the best practices recognized by the international community⁷ (in bold below) and

⁷ This list aims by no means to be comprehensive. Some best practices put forward by the GFMD II have been reported to exemplify that the same can be applied to internal migration.

using examples from China, Mexico and Thailand shows how policy recommendations for migration and development affecting international migration can also be applied to internal migration.

- **Freer movements of people are good for development and poverty reduction**

The international community is currently exploring ways to foster regular migration programmes between countries as freer and regular movement of people between countries would enhance development. Similarly, internal redistribution of population, and principally rural-to-urban movements, are linked to poverty reduction. Thailand provides a good example of this. The achievement of the Millennium Development Goal No.1 (to halve the poverty level by 2015) in Thailand has been correlated with a sustained increase in rural to urban population movements through migration (Skeldon, 2006).

While national borders place obvious restrictions on the movement of international migrants, it would appear, at first glance, that internal migrants are not confronted by similar limitations. However, as observed above, movements within borders are still restricted in certain countries and there is a need for governments to realize that freer internal migration can be good for development and economic growth, including bringing benefits to the marginal communities of origin.

China has moved some steps in this direction. While the *hukou* system is still in place, the Chinese Government has shifted its migration management policies from migration control to the encouragement of internal migration. Similarly, Viet Nam has liberalized the *ho khau* system since the reform in 1986. Both countries have experienced a drop in poverty over the few decades following the liberalization of movement (though the observed decline in poverty in both countries was also linked to shifts in other national policies such as trade and investments for example). The number of poor people in China declined from around 260 million in 1978 to 23.6 million in 2005 (Wang, 2008). The poverty rate for Viet Nam declined from 58 percent in 1993 to 29 percent in 2002 (Skeldon, 2006).

- **Migrants whose basic rights are protected are best placed to contribute to development both at destination and origin**

China

Due to the *hukou* system, local urban workers are often employed in the formal sector with better social and labour protection while rural migrants are mainly employed in the informal sector with less protection. Although the urban labour market is now more open to rural migrants the unfinished reform of the *hukou* system still causes problems, including inequities in employment opportunities, less protection in workplaces and lower access to social security and public services for rural migrant workers and their households.

However, the Chinese Government has understood that more protection for migrants can translate in more development and it has taken a more active public policy approach to providing public services and to protect the rights of rural migrants. The central government has started to unify the labour market (e.g. extending training and services) and provide social security to rural migrants. More specifically, the content of the policy document prepared by the Chinese central government includes: (1) a guarantee of the minimum wage and a system to monitor the delivery of wages to migrant workers; (2) the enforcement of the labour contract system and regulation of labour administration of rural workers; (3) the provision of employment services and job training to migrant workers and the removal of discriminatory restrictions; (4) the enlargement of rural workers security system coverage to include employment injury, medical care and pension schemes; (5) the provision of access to urban public services and improvement of migrant's housing conditions; (6) the improvement of the mechanisms to protect migrants democratic political rights and land contract ownership; and (7) the promotion of local economic development and township and village enterprises to encourage the local transfer of the surplus rural labour force (Wang, 2008).

The above-mentioned provisions have contributed to a narrowing of the differences in employment opportunities, payments and social welfare between rural and urban migrants, and between local and migrant workers.

The Chinese Government has also strengthened the legislation to protect the rights and interests of rural migrant workers. The Employment Promotion Law stipulates that rural migrant workers enjoy equal labour rights as urban workers and the same access to training and public services (Wang, 2008).

Mexico

Mexico is another country with large flows of internal migrants. Mexico City together with the industrial area of Mexico State has a population of over 27 million inhabitants – the most populated city globally. While the majority of the movements are rural-urban, incentivized by job opportunities

in industrial areas (and an associated lack of interest by the central Mexican Government in promoting the development of rural areas), rural-rural inter-state flows of workers are also very common in Mexico. These migrants are called *jornaleros agrícolas*. The *jornaleros agrícolas* generally move with their families to big agro-industrial fields in the north of the country where they can find better jobs and salaries. The State of Guerrero has approximately 20,000 *jornaleros agrícolas* per year (Saboie, 2007) and it is the principal state for inter-state migration in Mexico. Guerrero is also home to one of the most marginalized regions of Mexico, Región Montaña, which has the lowest level of both economic and human development. Not surprisingly, a large number of *jornaleros agrícolas* in Mexico originate from the State of Guerrero (Saboie, 2007).

The *jornaleros agrícolas* are vulnerable to many risks and subject to many abuses. A low level of protection against exploitative recruiters is coupled with the lack of health care during the migration journey, while at the destination, *jornaleros agrícolas* suffer from a lack of labour rights protection amongst other things. Aware of the negative consequences that can arise, as well as the many development opportunities that are likely to be missed if the challenges faced by *jornaleros agrícolas* are not addressed, the Government of the State of Guerrero has recently developed a Institutional Action Plan for the benefit of both the migrants and their communities of origin. While the Plan has not yet been implemented, there are signs that it may be implemented soon⁸. If implemented, the Action Plan will be coordinated between 18 State government institutions under the framework of the Special Sub-Committee for the Integration and Development of Agricultural Workers. Its main objectives are: to ensure that the workers migrate under the respect of their human rights; to make sure that their labour rights are respected at destination; and provide the migrants with the health care and education support that they require (Gobierno de Guerrero, 2009).

Thailand

In Thailand, studies and policies on internal migration attracted a lot of attention in the last two decades of the 20th Century but they have stagnated since the end of the 1990s following the Thaksin government's successful rural development programmes. For example, while the 6th Plan of the National Economic and Social Development Board (NESDB) directly referred to rural-urban migration and aimed to incentivize it in conjunction with economic and social development policies focusing on rural development (Chamrathirong, 2007), the 10th Plan of NESDB (2007-2011) makes no reference to internal migration or to the need to empower internal migrants (if their development potential is to be maximized). However, a careful reading of the 10th Plan shows that emphasis has been placed on the "extension of social insurance to those in the informal economy" (NESDB, 2007:

⁸ Author's direct communication with Rodolfo Córdova of the *Alternative Center for Social Development*, Mexico DF.

17). Since many migrants are employed in the informal economy, it could be argued that Thailand indirectly recognizes that the increase in protection of migrant workers ultimately contributes to development. However, these links remain to be clearly accounted for.

- **Diaspora and migrants can contribute to development and governments need to devote more attention to the creation of a more enabling environment to empower migrants to become agents of development**

China

The remittances sent by rural migrant workers play a significant role in rural development in China (Ping and Shaohua, 2008). However, often the remittance receiving household must use this income to pay for education or medical care. It follows that the money sent back home by migrants cannot be used to invest in productive assets such as in the agriculture or non-agriculture sectors. The Government has therefore decided that students in compulsory education from poor areas do not have to pay textbooks or fees. This allows rural households to increase their saving ability and potentially frees up more income for investment. As with education, it would be important that the government enlarge and improve their contribution to the provision of health care in rural areas so that remittances can be liberalized and play a bigger role in rural development. A similar reasoning can be applied to taxation and rural fiscal system. Governments may, for instance, consider waiving the agricultural tax to free up more remittances for productive investments.

In addition, to ensure that internal migration contributes to rural development and to reduce poverty at origin, it is important to find effective ways to lower the social and economic costs of labour migration and to improve the living and working conditions of migrants themselves so that they are able to remit more.

Mexico

The Plan of Action for *jornaleros agrícolas* prepared by the State government of Guerrero in Mexico ultimately aims to contribute to the development of the communities of origin and to guarantee a decent level of life to the households left behind. Among the actions proposed are: (1) the development of projects that contribute to create economic opportunities in the communities of origin; and (2) contributing to the well-being and to the improved health of these communities. It is hoped that this will ultimately create the environment to encourage migrants to invest in their communities of origin, therefore enhancing development (Gobierno de Guerrero, 2009). One additional measure that might deserve consideration is the application of the Three-for-One

Program⁹ to internal remittances.

Thailand

In Thailand, as in other Southeast Asian countries, rural-urban migration streams are female dominated with many unmarried women moving in search of employment. In general there are also more expectations on women, and Thai parents expect their daughters to be able to support them with the remittances they send back (Guest, 2003). Indeed, Osaki (1999) found that in Thailand women are more likely than men to remit money or goods to their household of origin, and they also remit a larger proportion of their incomes. Women are therefore strong agents of development in Thailand. Their potential could be enhanced if the government developed specific programmes and policies to facilitate transfers of remittances and reduce the risks and delays in sending remittances back to their communities of origin or if it created a viable environment to use the remittances for productive purposes and not only for sustaining relatives. Providing basic social security and pension schemes for members of rural communities would help to maximize the impact of urban migrant remittances on development.

- **Good data and research for better identification of the migration-development interplay and for evidence-based policy-making by governments and other actors**

China

In order to improve the management of internal migration, the Chinese Government has taken measures to improve its data and information collection system. A National Urban Labour Force survey is conducted regularly and there are now a thousand 'rural labour flow and employment monitoring stations' to improve information networks around the country (Wang, 2008).

Mexico

Mexico has not yet developed a specific survey to measure and monitor trends and patterns of internal migration. However, the *Conteo de población y vivienda*¹⁰ collects information about the place of residence of each of the members in the surveyed households. The *Conteo de población y vivienda* was undertaken for the first time in 1995 and it is a project of the *Instituto Nacional De Estadística y Geografía* (INEGI) that aims to collect inter-censal socio-demographic information about the national population, its distribution and its characteristics.

⁹ The Three-for-One-Program is a Mexican matching grant scheme that seeks to direct the money sent by migrant organizations abroad to the provision of public and social infrastructure, and to productive projects in migrants' communities of origin. To do so, the municipal state and federal administrations match the amount sent by hometown associations by a ratio of 3 to 1.

¹⁰ http://www.inegi.org.mx/est/contenidos/espanol/proyectos/metadatos/censos/cpv_12.asp?s=est&c=10387

Thailand

In Thailand, a National Migration Survey (NMS) was developed and launched in early 1990 by the Institute for Population and Social Research (IPSR) of Mahidol University as an understanding of the levels of migration was viewed to be crucial to the formulation of effective strategies to address migration mobility. While the NMS was adopted by the National Statistical Office of Thailand with the aim of becoming a routine annual national migration survey, it was repeated for only a few years and was interrupted at the end of 1990s. Since 2000, the Kanchanaburi Demographic Surveillance System (KDSS) initiated by IPSR has been a longitudinal data source for migration studies (Chamrathirong, 2007) although limited to one only province in Thailand.

3. The linkages between internal and international migration and implication for policy making on development

After considering the significance of internal and international migration for development and contending that best practices/recommendations for international migration also apply to internal migration, it is important to answer the question how the two migratory processes are related to one another. Only then will it become clearer why policy responses aiming to enhance the impact of migration on development need to address both internal and international movements concomitantly.

Internal and international migration are linked to each other in many different ways. First, internal migrants can become international migrants when borders of countries are realigned. This has happened in many instances in Africa when country borders were determined without taking into account the ethnicity of groups or population living there (Skeldon, 2008). Also, rural-urban migration can be a first step that migrants take before deciding to move further away. Stage-migration has been observed in Mexico where the development of maquiladoras¹¹ along the Mexico-US border have not only redefined the patterns of internal migration but also increased international migration. In turn, the international movement of people from the cities frees up jobs for other people who might therefore decide to move from the countryside to the urban areas (replacement migration).

On the other hand, return international migrants can also have the effect of increasing rural-urban migration. Martin (2009) notes that the migration of Moroccans to Europe affected rural-urban migration patterns when they returned. Returnees to Morocco invested in towns and cities in their

¹¹ *Maquiladoras* refer to the export-oriented assembly plants along the Mexico-US border.

region of origin rather than in the villages from which they came. This helped to encourage internal migration for those who did not migrate to Europe but were seeking more opportunity to move to towns and cities.

Since internal and international migration are closely interrelated (although the first is not necessarily a precondition for the second (Skeldon, 2008)), it follows that actions undertaken to increase their development potential should be concerted. Migration policies for development will fall short of their full objective, and at a minimum will minimize the positive development and poverty reduction impact that migration can have on development, if they fail to take account of internal migration. A policy to foster out-migration that does not account for the impact outflows of people have in the country of origin - and therefore does not facilitate the movement of people from rural to urban areas or does not provide them with the necessary support services - will certainly limit the impact that migration might have on rural areas. Similarly, if return migration policies do not account for the possible impacts that returns can have on internal movements, their development potential will be hampered.

The same should be applied to development policies. A government that applies an export-led strategy, like that of Thailand a few years back, needs to take into account the incentives it creates for people to leave the countryside and move to cities to work in factories where the labour demand is higher than in the agriculture sector. It can also be argued that the numerous rural-urban inflows brought about by export-led economies can ultimately foster international migration too, and in turn even greater internal migration. These internal movements induced by policies for development cannot be overlooked by policymakers. Should they not be factored into the export-led development strategy, there is a risk that the benefits of these movements will be undermined by, *inter alia*, the social conflicts that might arise in overpopulated and poorly serviced urban areas.

Conclusions

This paper has reviewed the potential contribution that internal migration, like international migration, can have to development. It has argued that the best practices and recommendations to maximize the positive impact of international migration on development identified by the international community should also be applied to manage internal migration. The removal of barriers to internal migration and discrimination against migrants should be accompanied by the appropriate support for those who move internally and pro-development urban planning to avoid their social and economic marginalization. Examples from China, Mexico and Thailand, three

countries characterized by internal migration, albeit to different degrees, demonstrate how the removal, or at least the reduction, of internal barriers to migration and the protection and empowering of migrants can provide developmental benefits to the country.

The paper has also highlighted the interlinkages between internal and international migration and policies that aim to enhance the development potential of migration should analyse both internal and international migration together. The international community should move forward and develop sound migration and development policies which also take account of internal movements if migration is truly to contribute to development. Many dialogues and fora have already been set up to promote discussion on migration and development.

The challenge is now to fully recognize the potential benefits of internal migration and to put this issue high on the political agenda of governments. This can only be achieved if the linkages between international and internal migration and urbanization are clarified and when governments realize that by addressing migration in a comprehensive and coherent manner they will get closer to meeting their development objectives. Developing comprehensive migration policies also means accounting for internal movements. IOM, as well as other international organizations, can play an important role in this equation, primarily by fostering and continuing to promote the international dialogue and by working together with governments.

References

Allix, Gregoire. 2009. *L'Urbanisation comme Moteur du Developpement?*. Le Monde, Jeudi 23 Juillet 2009.

Black, Richard, Claudia Natali and Jessica Skinner. 2005. *Migration and Inequality*. Washington: World Bank.

Cai Fang and Wang Dwen. 2008. Impacts of Internal Migration on Economic Growth and Urban Development in China. In *Migration and Development Within and Across Borders: Research and Policy Perspectives on Internal and International Migration*. Ed. Josh De Wind and Jennifer Holdaway. IOM and SSRC.

Chamrathirong, Apichat. July 2007. Research on Internal Migration in Thailand: The State of Knowledge. *Journal of Population and Social Studies*. 16 (1).

Chappel, Laura and Alex, Glennie. 2009. *Maximizing the Development Outcomes of Migration: A Policy Perspective*. Human Development Research Paper 2009/01, United Nations Development Programme, New York.

Christian Aid. 2007. *Human Tide: the Real Migration Crisis*. A Christian Aid Report. Available online: <http://www.christianaid.org.uk/Images/human-tide.pdf>

Cu Chi Loi. 2005. *Rural to Urban Migration in Viet Nam*. Available online: http://www.ide-jetro.jp/English/Publish/Download/Asedp/pdf/071_7.pdf

De Haas, Hein. April 2009. *Mobility and Human Development*, Human Development Research Paper 2009/01, United Nations Development Programme, New York.

De Wind, Josh and Jennifer Holdaway. 2008. A Framework for Linking and Comparing the Development Impacts of Internal and International Migration in Research and Policy. In *Migration and Development Within and Across Borders: Research and Policy Perspectives on Internal and International Migration*. Ed. Josh De Wind and Jennifer Holdaway. IOM and SSRC.

Deshingkar, Priya and Claudia Natali. 2008. Internal Migration. In *World Migration 2008: Managing Labour Mobility in the Evolving Global Economy*. World Migration Report 2008. IOM. Geneva.

Dewen, Wang. July 2008. *Rural-Urban Migration and Policy Responses in China: Challenges and Options*. Working Paper No.15, ILO Asian Regional Programme on Governance and Labour Migration. ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok.

Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM). 2005. *Migration in an Interconnected World: New Directions for Action*. SRO Kundig. GCIM. Geneva. Available online: <http://www.gcim.org/attachements/gcim-complete-report-2005.pdf>

Global Forum on Migration and Development. October 27-30, 2008. Protecting and Empowering Migrants for Development- Report of the Proceedings. Manila.

Government of Guerrero. 2009. *Plan de Accion Institucional para la Atencion de los Jornaleros Agricolas y sus Familias*. PowerPoint Presentation.

Guest, Philip. 2003. *Bridging the Gap: Internal Migration in Asia*. Paper prepared for the conference on African Migration in Comparative perspective, Johannesburg, South Africa, 4-7 June.

Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía. 2009. *Conteo de Población y Vivienda*. http://www.inegi.org.mx/est/contenidos/espanol/proyectos/metadatos/censos/cpv_12.asp?s=est&c=10387

International Organization for Migration. 2008. *World Migration 2008: Managing Labour Mobility in the Evolving Global Economy*. IOM. Geneva.

IOM. 2004. Glossary on Migration. IOM. Geneva.

Le Thanh Sang. 2004. *Urban Migration in Pre- and Post-Reform Viet Nam: Macro Patterns and Determinants of Urbanward Migration, the 1984-1989 Periods*. Paper derived from a chapter of the dissertation by Le Thanh Sang defended at the University of Washington, 2004.

Martin, Philip. 2006. *The Trade, Migration and Development Nexus*. Available online: <http://www.dallasfed.org/news/research/2006/06migr/martin.pdf>

Martin, Philip. 2009. *Demographic and Economic Trends: Implications for Mobility*. Human Development Research Paper 2009/17, United Nations Development Programme, New York.

Myers, Norman. 2001. Environmental Refugees: a Growing Phenomenon of the 21st Century. *Philosophical Transactions: Biological Sciences*, Vol. 357 No.1420/2001, p.609-613.

National Economic and Social Development Board of Thailand. 2007. *Summary of the Tenth National Economic and Social Development Plan (2007-2011)*. Office of the Prime Minister. Bangkok. Thailand.

Osaki, Keiko. 1999. Economic Interactions of Migrants and their Households of Origin: Are Women More Reliable Supporters. *Asia and Pacific Migration Journal*. Vol.8 No.4.

Ping, Huang and Zhan Shaohua. 2008. Migrant Workers' Remittances and Rural Development in China. In *Migration and Development Within and Across Borders: Research and Policy Perspectives on Internal and International Migration*. Ed. Josh De Wind and Jennifer Holdaway. IOM and SSRIC.

Sabates-Wheeler, Rachel, Claudia Natali and Richard Black. 2007. *Migration, Legal Status and Poverty: Evidence from Return from Ghana*. Migration DRC Working paper WP-T19. Brighton: Migration DRC, University of Sussex. Available online at: http://www.migrationdrc.org/publications/working_papers/WP-T19.pdf

Sabates-Wheeler, Rachel. 2009. *The Impact of Irregular Status on Human Development Outcomes for Migrants*. Human Development Research Paper 2009/26, United Nations Development Programme, New York.

Saboie, Laura. 2007. *Migración Interna de los Jornaleros Agrícolas Indígenas: de la Region Montana de Guerrero a los Campos del Norte de Mexico*. Unpublished paper.

Skeldon, Ronald. March 2006. *Population, Migration and the Millennium Goals*. Written Evidence Prepared for All Party Parliamentary Group Hearings on Population Growth-Impact of the MDGs. Development Research Centre on Migration, Globalisation and Poverty. University of Sussex. Brighton.

Skeldon, Ronald. 2008. Linkages Between Internal and International Migration. In *Migration and Development Within and Across Borders: Research and Policy Perspectives on Internal and International Migration*. Ed. Josh De Wind and Jennifer Holdaway. IOM and SSRC.

Thematic Working Group on International Migration including Human Trafficking. 2008. *Situation Report on International Migration in East and South-East Asia*. IOM, Bangkok.

United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA), Population Division. 2009. *Trends in Total Migrant Stock: The 2005 Revision, population Database*. UN DESA, Population Division, New York.