

Ivan Szelenyi

William Graham Sumner Emeritus Professor, Yale University

Exclusion and Inclusion in Immigration Policies: the
Exclusionary Immigration policies of the Gulf Monarchies

Paper presented at the conference „Globális Migrációs Folyamatok és
Magyarország – Kihívások és Válaszok”

Budapest, November 16, 2015

Various immigration regimes

- 1/ Exclusion of natives by colonizing immigrants (white colonies)
- 2/ Multi-ethnic and multi-lingual monarchies/empires
- 3/ Nation states with or without inclusionary immigration policies
- 4/ Transnationalist immigration regimes
- 5/ Minority natives exclude from citizenship rights migrants, they are only temporary guest workers

Exclusion of natives by colonizing immigrants (white colonies): North America

1.1 North America: change in population

- In 1482 the Native American population of the current territory USA is estimated to have been between 2.1-18 million.
- In 1890 it was around 248,000
- On 2015 2.2 million identified themselves as Native American from the population of 315 million
- 1.2. Legal status: obtained citizenship in 1924

Exclusion of natives by colonizing immigrants (white colonies): Australia

1.2 Australia: change in population

- In 1788 the aboriginal population is estimated to have been between 350,000 and 1.25 million.
- In 1920 it was around 50,000
- On 2015 606,000 identified themselves as aboriginals from the population of 22 million

1.2. Legal status: obtained citizenship in 1967

Multi-ethnic and multi-lingual monarchies/empires

- Typically in patrimonial states people were subjects of the ruler/emperor, not citizens of a nation state. Collective identities (tribal, ethno-religious, rank) was based on jus sanguinis. Case studies: Hungaria and Ottoman Empire
- 2.1 Hungaria: the Holy Crown principle regarded all under the rule of the Crown as Hungarus, irrespective whether they were „Magyars” or Croats, Slovaks, or Romanians. Began to be questioned by rise of nationalism late 18th, early 19th centuries
- 2.2 Ottoman Empire: its 32 provinces offered great deal of autonomy to various ethno-religious groups. Applied different laws to moslims (sharia) and non-moslims (Kanun)

Nation states with or without inclusionary immigration policies

- 3.1 Jus soli in non-migration regimes as an instrument of building one nation from multi-ethnic, multi-lingual monarchies/empires
- 3.2 Jus sanguinis : as an instrument to keep „non-nationals” out of the nation. Non-nationals as guest workers. The German case
- 3.3 Combination of jus soli and jus sanguinis as selective exclusion for ethnically „undesirable” immigrants and inclusion of „desirable” immigrants
- 3.4 The eventual breakdown of jus sanguinis in liberal democracies

Jus soli in non-migration regimes as an instrument of building one nation from multi-ethnic, multi-lingual monarchies/empires

- Jus soli: as non-legitimate authority in patrimonial states: Weber's essay on *The City in Economy and Society*
- Code Napoleon: jus soli as the principle of citizenship.
- The purpose was to create ONE nation from a multi-ethnic, multi-lingual society by creating French as the sole language and one French identity - Great Britain, instead of England...
- The same was attempted in some countries without success (19th century Hungary, 20th century Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia)

Jus sanguinis : as an instrument to keep „non-nationals” out of the nation. Non-nationals as guest workers. The German case

- Fichte: Kultur-nation. Those who speak the same language, share the same culture and assume common ancestry constitute the „nation”.
- Ideology of German diaspora
- After WWII Germany needs labor. The initial solution (dominant in 1950's) is admission of „guest workers”. Only those with work-permit and without family can enter as long as work permit lasts. No or limited benefits.

Combination of ius soli and ius sanguinis as selective exclusion for ethnically „undesirable” immigrants and inclusion of „desirable” immigrants

- Migration regimes – such as US or Australia initially (usually) screen the ethnicity of migrants
- US in 1790: only „free white persons” qualify for naturalization. Blacks received citizenship only in 1860, Asians only by the 1950’s
- During the second half of 19th century, early 20th century some 30 million European migrated to the US, many Italian, Jews, Slaves (and Hungarians). 1924 quota to exclude Italians, Jews, Slavs.
- Australia: 1901 immigration act: only white are admitted.

The eventual breakdown of ius sanguinis in liberal democracies

- USA: 1965 Immigration act: eliminates racial quotas. US with a population of 300 million+ receives about 1 million migrants a year. It has about 40 million citizens who were foreign born. It has now about 195 million whites, 50 million Hispanics, 37 million Blacks and 15 million Asians. By 2045 whites will be a minority.
- Australia 1973 eliminates race as a criterion for immigration and citizenship. Out of 23 million of its inhabitants almost 7 million were born abroad, mainly in UK and New Zealand, but about a half a million in China and another half a million in India
- Germany: after 1990: mainly jus soli. 80% of the population of 80 million has no migrant background. It has 3 million Turks, 1 million Africans, 1 million East Asians – but most of population is white European.

Transnationalist immigration regimes

- Even „inclusionary” immigration policies often insisted on the „one citizenship policy”. Upon naturalization one had to renounce earlier citizenship(s)
- More and more countries accept multiple citizenships (certainly those attained by birth, or even those by naturalization)
- Alejandro Portes in his studies on Hispanic small business people points out that increasing numbers retain contacts with the home country, may eventually return in retirements: they are transnational
- That is increasingly the case with professionals

Minority natives exclude migrants from citizenship rights:
migrants are only temporary: guest workers

- 5.1 The immigration policies of GCC countries
- 5.2 UAE demographic situation and prospects
- 5.3 The research project on Pakistani workers in the UAE

The immigration policies of GCC countries

- The Gulf Cooperation Council countries (Bahrein, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and UAE) are resource rich and population poor countries
- They need labor (both qualified and unskilled) , but they want to keep their culture and identity so they do not have a naturalization/green card policy.
- They try to build nations with non-nationals (occasionally as many as up to 90% of the population is there on three year visa with no/(little) hope for citizenship
- This is the most extreme case of exclusion by natives of non-native immigrants

The % of non-nationals in GCC countries

Countries	% of non-nationals
Bahrein	52
Kuwait	69
Oman	44
Qatar	86
Saudi Arabia	33
UAE	89

UAE demographic situation

- In 1960 the „Trucial States” was believed to have a population of 90,000 of which 2% were migrants
- Shaik Zayed Al Nahyan of Abu Dhabi creates the federation of seven emirates (each absolute monarchies) and pushes forward to fast economic development. By 2015 only about 25% of GDP is from oil export, rest from industry and service industries and massive construction.
- 2010 census estimated the population to be 8.2 million of which 900,000 are Emirati. There is an additional 1 million illegal migrants.

Prospects and contradictions of UAE immigration policies

- Dual aim: turn UAE into post-oil, information society/from labor intensive to capital intensive economy AND retain Arabic/Islamic identity
- But massive expansion by 2030 Abu Dhabi will grow from 1,5 million to 3 million, Dubai from 3 million to 6 million. Where will these people come from?
- Double challenge: 1/ at least half of the residents are from South Asia, India (over 2 million), Pakistan (over 1 million) and Bangladesh (up to 1 million). UAE is a South Asian society where Arabic is hardly spoken. Is it Islamic at all? Probably 50%. 2/ India is the major source for professionals of information society. But middle class situation improves fast. Will Indian (and Pakistani) professional take jobs in UAE without citizenship?

The research project on Pakistani workers in the UAE: why study return migrants?

- Given tight security in UAE it is next to impossible to carry out any field research, even government offices do not exchange data with each other, interviews, surveys are not permitted, respondents believe they are monitored and would be deported if security does not like what they say
- So I decided to carry out a survey of return migrants from UAE to Pakistan

Research questions

- Two initiating question:
 - 1. Guest workers come from troubled nations they still seem to get along well while in UAE. Why?
 - 2. Are qualified professionals as satisfied as non-qualified workers? Will they return? If not can it mean long term difficulties of labor supply to information society

Theories and hypotheses

- Ad 1.
- Deportation theory: ethno-religious conflict is suppressed given tight police control and immediate deportation if rules are broken
- Contact theory (Robert Allport): ethno-religious prejudice is reduced if different groups are in contact with each other. If return migrants are less prejudiced than intending migrants contact theory is supported
- Ad 2.
- Neo-classical theory (Todaro): migrants are individual utility maximizers
- New economics of labor migration (D. Massey) : migration decision made by family, goal maximization of remittances . If better educated less likely to plan return to UAE, this will support NELM theory

Research design and field work

- Quasi-experimental (before-after) research design: a random sample of 250 intending migrants who were not in the UAE yet (but have already work permit) and 260 return migrants (people who returned in the past 5 years)
- Field work carried out by Institute of Social Research, Lahore, Pakistan
- Fall of 2013 in-depth interviews and focus group interviews across the country
- Spring 2013 survey data collection and coding
- 2014-15 data analysis (still incomplete)

Findings: contact theory

- Contact theory has modest support
 - Return migrants have more universal self-identification 40% identify themselves as Pakistani (only 33% of prospective migrants do so, while prospective migrants more often identify with ethnicity and caste : 14% vs 7% of return migrants)
 - 42% of return migrant said they fear less Indians due to their experiences in UAE

Deportation theory gets also support:

using Bogardus scale we find no significant difference in prejudice against Indians between return and prospective migrants

Over 90% of return migrants agreed, that fear of deportation kept workers from aggressive behavior

Sample selection problem: prospective migrants better educated, more urban. Sample may be too small for more sophisticated analysis

Findings: NELM theory

- NELM theory received fairly strong support
- 63% of return migrants reported their family could not survive without remittances sent from UAE – 49% reported the family made the decision to take a job in the UAE
- Generally their experiences in the UAE were mixed (46% was satisfied with wages, 64% were satisfied with working conditions, but 67% felt they were treated like slaves). Nevertheless 57% would return to UAE (among them the unemployed and less educated are overrepresented).

Policy implications for UAE- and globally

- The Gulf Monarchies exclusionary guest worker system is only sustainable as long as 1/South Asia remains poor, 2/ they need low skilled, less educated people, 3/as long as UAE remains an absolute monarchy. Liberal democracies will not accept such levels of exploitation
- Given the massive construction project under way and the resistance to Arab immigration (and declining birth rates and increasing life expectancy among Emirati) it is an illusion that the UAE can remain an Arab/Islamic country. It is already a myth...
- This is equally true (though not with the same urgency) in the globalizing world for core countries: 1/ they either increase their birthrates – unlikely scenario – or accept lower living standards especially for the old 2/or they will have to open up to the globalizing world and become multiple inclusionary transnationalist societies. The US seems to accept 2/, Europe resists, but in order to retain „white Christian Europe” they have to accomplish 1/.