

Resisting World Politics on 'Migration and Development'?

Tracing the Trajectory of Counter Discourses and Movements in Latin America

Mustafa Aksakal

Introduction

This chapter traces the trajectory of Latin American counterdiscourses on the relation between migration and development since the 1950s by juxtaposing them with dominant globalized discourses. It not only provides a different perspective on the discussions on the subject in a particular world region, but also demonstrates how the dominant discourses have been observed, described and countered in this region.

Public discussions on migration and development are nothing new; they emerged in many countries of the global South and North as early as the 1950s. Various migration scholars have outlined these global discussions and identified three major waves of discourse (cf. Nyberg-Sørensen 2012; de Haas 2012; Faist and Fauser 2011; Nyberg-Sørensen et al. 2002). The first, spanning the 1950s and 1960s, took place in a time of labour shortages in many Western countries, and embraced international movements of labour as beneficial for the development of countries of origin by way of their returning migrants. In the 1970s and 1980s a second wave developed that emphasized (under)development in countries of origin as a root cause of migration. The third wave of discourse has been frequently identified as emerging after the 1990s. It was particularly concerned with migrant remittances and the activities of migrant organizations as collective agents that could potentially promote (local) development in their countries of origin.

While this kind of broad overview is useful for illustrating some general trends over time in global policy discourses and public debates, it has its draw-

backs too. It tends to assume a kind of global homogeneity where there is none. As the introduction to the present volume underscores, an important feature of globalization is that it proceeds through increasing economic, political and social ties between economic, political and social actors located in diverse world regions. Furthermore, globalization is also characterized by other dynamics, such as practices related to the different ways in which people observe, describe and interpret the world. With respect to migration and development debates, these practices might be differentiated between dominant globalized understandings and discourses (Castles and Delgado 2008) on the one hand, and counterperspectives that provide alternative, and sometimes fundamentally opposed, positions at the local, national and regional levels on the other. The former are the particular viewpoints of powerful political actors that have been circulated globally. The latter are what the present chapter seeks to address in a particular world region: the history of discussions of migration and development in Latin America in terms of producing counterdiscourses to the dominant globalized ones.

Drawing on a range of policy, civil society and academic documents, then, this chapter addresses the discussions related to migration and development that have emerged in Latin America from the 1950s onward. In doing so, the objective is to highlight the contents and structures of alternative discussions and their role in resisting dominant globalized discourses, raising the question of how discussions in Latin America have positioned themselves in relation to those discourses.

Critical and alternative perspectives on migration and development have been articulated by different actors situated in a variety of world regions. Latin America, however, is particularly salient because it is a region with a long historical tradition in the intellectual production of critical viewpoints on development and migration. Since the 1950s, at least four cycles of debates can be identified that have repeatedly served the purpose of providing counterdiscourses to the dominant global ones. Understanding these perspectives can not only help to obtain a more differentiated picture of migration and development discourse in general, but may also facilitate a better understanding of the composition of current global policies and the power structures embedded within them.

The chapter is organized as follows: the next section engages in a brief literature review of the waves of migration and development discussions and introduces the theoretical viewpoint of this chapter. The third addresses four central public debates that were, implicitly and explicitly, involved in dis-

cussing migration and development in Latin America. The fourth compares the four discursive cycles and highlights their counterdiscursive features, exemplifying the ways in which they previously resisted or still resist dominant discourses. The conclusion returns to the initial guiding question and argues that these viewpoints might be significant for better understanding the composition of current global policies that often comprise political paradoxes.

Dominant globalized discourses on migration and development

Public interest in, and discourses on, the link between migration and development have now continued for seven decades. Various social scientists have provided a historical overview of the changing nature of these discourses and have identified three major waves (Nyberg-Sørensen 2012; de Haas 2012; Faist and Fauser 2011; Nyberg-Sørensen et al. 2002). To some extent, this chapter also provides an overview of migration and development discussions. Here, however, particular attention is paid to Latin American discussions and the ways in which they have opposed dominant discourses. To this end, this section first focuses on the content, structure and the theoretical foundation of two waves of mainstream discourses that emerged during the 1950s and 1960s and then reappeared in updated versions after the 1990s. These insights are later employed as a background for the subsequent analysis of Latin America discussions.

International labour migration and return during the 1950s and 1960s

Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, international economic inequalities, and especially access to employment (Kindleberger 1967), were considered the main causes of South–North migration. This view of labour market scarcities in countries of the global South was also reflected in considerations of migration outcomes. It was expected that labour migration could help industrialized countries solve the 'excess of labour demand' problem and marginalized countries overcome the 'excess of supply' issue (OECD 1978: 19). For the industrialized countries, it meant increasing the elasticity of their labour supply, countering supply bottlenecks particularly in agriculture, mining and domestic service (UNECE 1963). For the marginalized it implied exporting unemployed people, thus limiting the costs resulting from unemployment (Kindleberger 1967: 199f.). Unemployed people would have the possibility of being

employed and potentially earning higher incomes by moving to industrialized countries. In the long run, they would gain human capital, namely new skills, during their stays in destination countries (UNECE 1963). This meant that migrants would accumulate financial *and* human capital that would be imported to their countries of origin through financial remittances and, especially, through the investments and professional expertise they could offer on their return, which would, supposedly, lead to economic development (Faist and Fauser 2011).

This first discursive phase was significantly shaped by two different, yet in some ways complementary, theoretical approaches, namely neoclassical theory and modernization theory. Common to both approaches is that they ‘evaluate the movement of people from labour-abundant to labour-scarce regions and countries – along with a presumed transfer of capital in the opposite direction’ (de Haas 2012: 13), increasing efficiency and productivity in all regions and consequently providing benefits for all. From a neoclassical perspective, it has been argued that economic differences between regions represent the main drivers for cost-benefit calculations (e.g. expected wages) and subsequent outmigration. Human capital, therefore, represents a particularly important resource because mobile people aim to accumulate and make use of their existing skills as profitably as possible during their stays abroad (Massey et al. 1998). From a modernization theory viewpoint, it has been contended that migrants are important forces of innovation and change. On the one hand, they bring money back to their home countries. On the other, returnees are also identified as transmitters of novel ideas, know-how and professional attitudes. Both aspects were associated with the quick diffusion of wealth and modernization in poor and traditional societies (de Haas 2010).

As King and Collyer (2016) observe, the dominant migration and development discourses of the 1950 and 1960s continued until the 1990s to assume that migration can generate economic and human capital benefits for countries of origin. However, some ‘demystification’ of the assumptions underlying these discourses occurred through a range of empirical studies made during the 1970 and 1980s. What became increasingly clear was that the benefits of labour migration for the countries of destination outweighed those for the countries of origin, in effect creating a kind of development aid from countries of the global South to wealthy countries of the global North (see Castles and Kosack 1973).

Temporary migration and remittances from the 1990s to the present

Migration and development scholars have identified the latest period of broader discourses as emerging after the 1990s. This ongoing wave of discussion has, on the one hand, adapted to the *Age of Migration* (Castles et al. 2014), highlighting the diversification of source and origin countries and patterns of migration. On the other hand, as Castles (2008) noted, the new phase of discussions has also partly revisited older theoretical and political ideas of the first wave. This becomes evident in the World Development Report 2008 in which international migration is discussed as a realistic pathway for poverty reduction in marginalized regions (World Bank 2007). Formulated differently, international migration was still considered an engine of progress that might trickle down to the poorer segments of society. Despite some similarities, the latest wave of discussions, however, covers additional topics related to the circulation of migrants, money and ideas that were received earlier with little or no attention, as well as dealing with the increasing relevance of countries of origin as partners (Faist and Fauser 2011; King and Collyer 2016). So, while in the initial period returning migrants' investments were emphasized, now financial remittances have moved to the foreground. Temporary and circular migration are therefore considered the most efficient ways to ensure the flow of remittances as it is expected that temporary or circular movers not only have the strongest ties to families back home, but also the highest commitment to supporting them and thereby contributing to economic development (EC 2005). In addition, social remittances – understood as the transfer of ideas, knowledge and attitudes – are emphasized as important for propelling development in countries of the global South (OECD 2006). This is considered to have been achieved through temporary returns, brain gain and brain circulation. Migrant organizations are celebrated as important players involved in philanthropic activities and collective entrepreneurship, which is regarded as stimulating both economic and social development (UN 2006). Finally, world political arenas have developed (e.g. the High-Level UN Dialogues on Migration or the Global Forum on Migration and Development), where dialogues between political actors from countries of both origin and destination for migrants have been institutionalized, indicating the acceptance of countries of origin as partners (Ban 2007).

Some core ideas from the previously noted neoclassical and modernization approaches still receive some attention, such as the emphasis on economic development or modernization through the transmission of ideas, at-

titudes and knowledge from advanced to peripheral societies. However, political discourses have also become more diversified through the emergence of different political logics (Nyberg-Sørensen et al. 2002). In the 1950s and 1960s migration was meeting the complementary needs of countries of the global North and South (i.e. the excess of labour demand and supply), but after the 1990s migration discussions were concerned with different issues. For instance, as Guarnizo (2017: 457) observed, past South–North labour migration has significantly shaped public conversations, institutions and societies in many destination countries. This has been expressed, for instance, in tendencies to xenophobic reactions to migrants; the proliferation of right-wing ideologies and political parties has also influenced the latest discourses on migration and development. As Castles and Ozkul (2014) alleged, temporary migration is discursively promoted in some discourses because temporary permits convey the message to the local population that the settlement of immigrants and their access to social entitlement are restricted.

Differing political logics are often mirrored in discursive contradictions: while in certain discussions some migrants (e.g. irregular migrants) are addressed as a threat to the security, identity or cohesion of immigration states (Nyberg-Sørensen 2012), in others they are celebrated as development heroes (Delgado 2018). This fact has been acknowledged through the denomination of this link as a ‘nexus’ (Nyberg-Sørensen et al. 2002), conveying the notion that ‘a set of complex interdependencies and two-way causality that may have contradictory effects’ co-exist (Carling cited in Bastia and Skeldon 2020: 4).

More importantly for the purposes of this chapter, the previously noted discourse highlights that political actors have indeed observed, described and interpreted migration and development dynamics in immigration *and* emigration countries. However, this has been done from a very particular viewpoint, meaning that, rather than representing entirely global discourses, they often express *globalized* viewpoints because they focus on processes from a particular perspective, that of *the global North*. In addition, the latest globalized discussions have been criticized by some scholars because prevailing power asymmetries between immigration and emigration regions are reproduced in discourses. It has been alleged that representatives of powerful countries discursively promote an unequal division of roles, so that countries and institutions of the global North are suspected of setting the political principles and priorities, and actors of the global South of merely enforcing these agendas (Castles and Delgado 2008). This indicates that discourses are more than verbal communications. From a Foucauldian perspective, not only is knowl-

edge production in discourses related to power, so are the ways in which discourses are linked to diverse practices (e.g. the practices of international organizations) (Foucault 1991). Against this backdrop, migration and development discourses are not only globalized, but also often represent dominating viewpoints, in which inequalities are reproduced.

Discussions in Latin America have historically been opposed to these dominant globalized discourses in many ways that will be addressed in detail in the remainder of this chapter. In many academic contexts these opposing discussions have been frequently reduced to certain neo-Marxist and dependency perspectives. A closer look at these discourses reveals, however, that debates on migration and development have had a long-standing trajectory in the region and have even, in some cases, been linked to social movements, which I address as counterdiscourses. The terminology draws on Karl Polanyi's (1973 [1944]) seminal study *The Great Transformation*. He observed that the political and economic transformations in 19th-century England involved a double movement, referring to dialectical dynamics between liberal public policies and opposing responses from society. Inspired by Polanyi's ideas, this chapter follows the perspective of this book: on the one hand, it traces the ways dominant globalized discourses on migration and development are historically observed, described and opposed in a variety of Latin America debates and, on the other hand, it shows that discourses in this region represent a significant component of global discourse in light of broader globalization processes.

Counterdiscourses on migration and development in Latin America

Discourses on the migration and development relationship had already begun in Latin America in the 1950s. This section is concerned with answering questions related to the content and structure of the discussions as well as the ways in which migration and development were associated. In particular, it aims to uncover the ways in which these discourses instilled difference and opposition to dominant globalized viewpoints. In general terms, it can be argued that, from the very beginning of these discussions, the unequal development of world regions within the global economy was a major concern. As the following review of the most important cycles of discourse in the region shows, the specific link between migration and development has been addressed more implicitly in some periods, and more explicitly in others.¹

Regional asymmetries, industrial development and migration concerns (1950–1960)

The first wave of Latin American discussions was initiated in the 1950s by various intellectuals directly and indirectly linked to the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), with the institution's director, Raul Prebisch, playing a major role in developing what came to be known as the 'Latin American structuralist approach' (in short: 'LA Structuralism'). LA Structuralism represents a theoretical framework which explains, through considering 'structural differences' between countries, a range of macro-economic dynamics, such as the problems associated with the long-term deterioration of the terms of trade in peripheral countries (Jenkins, 2013). Prebisch and his colleagues observed that core countries are historically more industrialized and hegemonic, which is manifested in the production and export of manufactured goods. By contrast, peripheral Latin American economies have an agro-mineral character that is expressed through the export of natural and agricultural resources to core countries. In other words: '[W]hile the centres kept the whole benefit of the technical development of their industries, the peripheral countries transferred to them a share of the fruits of their own technical progress.' (Prebisch 1950: 10). From this point of view, the result is an asymmetric economic relationship between the centre and the periphery to which Latin American countries with structural and institutional differences, unequal exchange and a deterioration of terms of trade were exposed (cf. Kay 2018). As the head of ECLAC, Prebisch was also interested in developing a strategy for the promotion of economic development in Latin America. From a political standpoint, he conceived of economic progress as a way to increase the standard of living for the population by systematically increasing productivity in the region. This was not possible if Latin American countries remained in their traditional roles as producers of primary goods because it made them increasingly dependent, vulnerable and subordinate players in the global economy. From his viewpoint, promoting development involved industrialization which, in turn, required a strong state dedicated to actively promoting progress in the country. The role of the state, then, was to implement political measures related to protectionism, subsidies and investments in the infrastructure of the domestic industry to support the development process, also known as, the 'import substitution industrialization' (ISI) (Kay 1989). Essentially, the underlying idea was to create developmentalist states that protected and promoted domestic industry in Latin American countries,

and to improve the life chances of the members of these societies. This means that the fruits of these endeavours were envisaged as trickling down from the companies to the industrial labourers through increasing wages and, consequently, decreasing causes of labour migration. Regarding human mobility, Prebisch was also aware that a constantly growing rural population entailed not only rural–urban migration, but also industrial development as underlined in the following quotation:

agriculture absorbs a decreasing proportion of the increase in the population of working age, with the result that industry and other activities have been able to increase their employment more [...]. There have, however, been instances in which the rapid growth of industry during recent years has brought about an actual transference of workers, with unfavourable consequences for agriculture. (Prebisch 1950: 43)

While this reflects the outcomes of industrialization on agriculture, it is worth noting that discourses within ECLAC in subsequent years were also directed toward the demographic and social effects that rural–urban migration had on peripheral countries and on urban societies (Ducoff et al. 1965). Moreover, discussions on the role of the developmentalist state sought to find strategies to attract highly skilled migrants. It has been emphasized that to attract skilled foreign workers, more than sporadic economic progress is required. To achieve long-term socio-economic development in Latin American countries, Bertola (2016: 246) noted, the implementation of effective developmentalist policies was needed. This in turn required the building of 'economic, social and political structures'. From this point of view, development was perceived as a useful means to attract more qualified immigrants. Furthermore, it was argued that an additional role of the state is to create and implement coherent recruitment strategies, namely, attractive migration policies for 'encouraging immigration of specialized labour' (Perez 2016: 69).

This approach was developed at around the same time that the first migration and development discourses emerged in the Global North. It is striking that both discussions were similar in that the emphasis was on economic development through industrialization but focused on this idea from different angles, namely, from origin and destination region perspectives. As previously noted, an asymmetric relationship between core and periphery countries that led to unequal outcomes was the main focus. From this vantage point, (internal) migration was not addressed as a natural consequence of emerging regional disparities and rational choices, but rather as an issue sit-

uated in the broader economic development processes of the global economy. Industrial development was thought to have side effects related to urbanization and the depopulation of rural areas that might have required state intervention (ECLAC 1957). At the same time, highly qualified immigration was perceived as relevant for accelerating industrial development.

The almost simultaneous emergence of this Latin American discussion and the first wave of dominant globalized migration and development discourses indicates that counterdiscourses do not always represent a concrete response to dominant discourses. In fact, discourses may result from different types of observations and interpretations of development, which may afterwards be instrumentalized as tools to counter dominant viewpoints.

Debates on dependency, underdevelopment and migration (1970–1980)

In the mid-1960s, dependency theories gradually gained traction in public discourses in Latin America and evolved from regional discourses to internationally known and accepted critical migration and development debates during the 1970s and 1980s. While the core ideas of the centre–periphery paradigm of LA Structuralism were kept alive in nascent dependency theories, the approach roughly developed in two theoretical directions: the structuralist and the Marxist strands. Indeed, both strands provided analytical tools for explaining the relevance of dependency in the development processes of countries of the global South, but they focused on the underlying mechanisms differently. For instance, from a structuralist viewpoint, Furtado (1973) observed that both the technologies and the determination of consumption patterns in peripheral countries were controlled by core countries. He considered these ‘dependent patterns of consumption’ as keys for explaining the preservation of underdevelopment and dependence in peripheral countries. From a more Marxist position, Marini (1973) observed that dependency in peripheral countries was accompanied by the ‘super-exploitation’ of the domestic labourer. According to this viewpoint, the core–periphery division in the global economy and the resulting unequal exchange would lead to decreasing profit rates among domestic capitalists. To compensate for this economic loss linked to unequal exchange, the capitalists would overexploit the local labour force. In turn, this overuse of labourers would hinder the switch from absolute to relative surplus values as the dominant productive relationship in society, which would reinforce the dependency of these economies. Independent from the particular strand of dependency theory in play, these ap-

proaches often considered that earlier noted capitalist macro-dynamics had fundamentally transformed the ways in which society was organized, such as the forms of (re)production and relationships. Resulting structural imbalances thus produced an industrial reserve army inclined to migrate either internally or internationally (Portes 1978).

A further crucial issue related to the migration and development link that dependency scholars emphasized was the phenomenon of brain drain. From this point of view, conditions of underdevelopment were not solely connected to the overexploitation of domestic labourers, but also represented a powerful factor pushing especially well-educated and qualified society members to the more developed and industrialized regions (Frank 1967). In the case of Argentina, Oteíza (1971) revealed that the outflow of qualified persons could be linked to differences in wages, infrastructure, social prestige, and political instabilities and repression between countries of origin and destination. These circumstances have been associated with barriers to development as reflected in a policy document by ECLAC (1975: 10):

The emigration of scientists, professionals and skilled labour in general is a common feature of all the countries of the region which has been accentuated over the last few decades and is favoured by the emigration policies of the developed countries. [...] It is known that this emigration represents a substantial economic loss in terms of training costs and of the productive resources thus taken from the national economy.

The quote illustrates the ways ECLAC addressed intellectual and economic losses related to training, human capital and taxes. In subsequent years, the previous discussions were continued by updating the contents to fit the current circumstances but also became more diversified through the inclusion of alternative viewpoints.

The debate on development from within and unequal exchange (1990–2000)

Discussions on neoliberal globalization have emphasized the politically promoted trend toward an increasing circulation of capital and goods and a decentralization of production (Harvey 2007). This global development has also shaped discussions on migration and development in Latin America. As a consequence, classical structuralist and dependency theories lost their analytical power to explain development processes. Moreover, after the 1980s, migra-

tion processes moved toward the more globalized, accelerated and diversified dynamics identified by Castles and colleagues (2014) as the 'Age of Migration'. These conditions involved the need to adjust the analytical lens to changing economic, political and social circumstances. These challenges were met by the further development of perspectives toward neo-structuralist and neo-dependency approaches, as noted earlier.

Neo-structuralist approaches emerged in Latin America as a response to the proposed macroeconomic policies under the Washington Consensus and its adjustment programmes. Like previously discussed LA Structuralism, the neo-structuralist perspective in the 1980s also focused on 'endogenous structural factors' (Sunkel 1993: 7).² A systematic, theoretical and practical revision was carried out in 1990 in the context of ECLAC and its policy document *Changing Production Patterns with Social Equity*:

[T]he 1980s represented, in historical terms, a turning point between the previous pattern of development of Latin America and the Caribbean and a phase which is not yet fully defined but will undoubtedly be different and which will mark the future development of the region [...]. The challenge is none other than to find the path that leads to development. (ECLAC 1990: 2)

Briefly summarized, the approach foresees a development process that is 'from within', or a change in the productive structure of the economy from the export of raw materials to the export of industrial goods. As in the previous structural approach, several functions appertain to the state. Its role changed from that of a developmentalist actor to one entrusted with the tasks of seeking new opportunities in the global economy, observing and governing the market, promoting private–public partnerships and open regionalism as well as implementing social policies to increase equity in society (Kay 2018). As in LA Structuralism, migration was implicitly considered to be part of the theoretical framework of the neo-structuralist perspective. This signifies that the macroeconomic conditions were perceived as an important factor that decreased the life chances of society members and could simultaneously cause internal or international migration. By contrast, adapting to the contemporary economic rules of the game meant, by definition, reducing migration pressures and avoiding a brain drain. In short, the focus was solely on the causes of outmigration, namely, development conditions, thus creating a rather indirect link to migration. While neo-structural intellectuals have been hesitant to directly address the link between migration and development, this does not hold true for representatives of the neo-dependency school.

In globalized discourses, free trade is often associated with increasing economic development in countries of the global South. In relation to migration, this means there is an expectation that, after high levels of short-term outmigration, there will be reduced migration in the long run due to the general improvement of the socio-economic situation of the origin-country population (Martin 2016). Moreover, and as discussed above, financial remittances are seen in this perspective as also promoting development (World Bank 2018).

These kinds of viewpoints are sharply challenged by several neo-dependency scholars. They observe that transnational corporations represent increasingly important global players forcing developing countries into a new kind of dependency. As Delgado and Marquez (2007) suggest, this situation becomes clear when one considers the maquiladora sector in Mexico, which expanded in times of free trade under the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). Maquiladoras are productive units that are largely disconnected from the Mexican economy and represent industrial extensions of large transnational corporations originating mostly from the USA that carry out labour-intensive assembly work. Because these companies enjoy an attractive production environment via tax breaks and low wages, they indirectly export labour. In addition to this 'indirect export' of labour, there is also a direct exportation of labour expressed in migration flows toward the US, composed of a kind of 'reserve army of the unemployed' (cf. Delgado and Marquez 2007). The underlying labour-export-led model clarifies why (against neoclassical considerations) relatively high levels of inequality (underdevelopment) persist in Mexico and why the country has, in recent history, risen to be the largest migrant-exporting country in Latin America. From this viewpoint, the role of financial transfers can be seen as placing the onus of development performance on the shoulders of migrants, thereby, creating additional economic dependencies.

The Buen Vivir discussion (2000–present)

Good Living or *Buen Vivir*³ represents another important wave in which migration and development have been intensively discussed. As an indigenous philosophical perspective, *Buen Vivir* has a long trajectory in the Andean region. However, the viewpoint has resurged as a migration and development discourse in recent years and became increasingly popular around the 2000s in Latin America. This social philosophy represents a holistic perspective on

human wellbeing which has important implications in the understanding of the migration and development link. In general terms, *Buen Vivir* expresses an indigenous worldview on the ways society is organized around the environment, the community and a certain way of living that is based on socially determined needs (Chuji et al. 2019). This perspective was taken up in academic, political and civil society discourses in the Andean region and led to some social movements during the 1990s as well as later political changes in Bolivia and Ecuador after the 2000s.

The philosophical starting point of *Buen Vivir* is similar to the previously noted discourses, and is related to a fundamental critique of past and present Western development thinking and globalized debates:

[The perspective represents] a substantial questioning of contemporary ideas of development, and especially their attachment to economic growth and their inability to solve the problems of poverty, without forgetting that their practices lead to severe social and environmental impacts. (Gudynas 2011: 2; author's translation)

While many of the previously discussed counterperspectives identify development issues in relation to asymmetric dynamics, dependency and underdevelopment, *Buen Vivir* critically addresses the ways in which prosperity is discussed and expressed in Western discourses, politics and economic practices. But what exactly are the main characteristics of this perspective and how is development perceived by it? Before addressing this question, it might be worth noting that *Buen Vivir* represents a framework in which multiple academic approaches, civil society and policy discourses and practices co-exist (Vanhulst and Beling 2014). This becomes especially evident in political debates that have evolved in Bolivia and Ecuador where *Buen Vivir* has been, although with slight differences, recognized as a set of guiding principles for state action. Gudynas (2011) identifies these characteristics as follows: firstly, the approach considers development as a non-linear process, recognizing the plurality of development ideas and paths in human history. Secondly, the emphasis is on a new relationship between nature and human beings. Nature has an intrinsic value and the excessive exploitation of it through certain means of production and consumption is, therefore, condemned. Thirdly, the perspective rejects the reducing of social relations to marketable goods or services and emphasizes rather the relevance of social relations and interactions in communities that are based on reciprocity and solidarity. Finally, because this perspective rejects the primacy of economic development and its mea-

surement by property or income levels, it stresses non-material wellbeing, such as happiness and good spiritual living. In short, inspired by non-capitalist indigenous visions of wellbeing, *Buen Vivir* underscores the importance of ecologically, socially and socioeconomically sustainable community developments. Two concepts in *Buen Vivir*, namely (in)equalities and inclusion seem to be particularly interesting with regard to discussions on migration and development.

As Villalba (2013: 1430) notes, '*Sumak Kawsay* [Buen Vivir] corresponds to the Andean indigenous ontology', leading to very different understandings of advancement in society. This perspective foresees a decisive transformation in the way human beings define, produce and consume their basic needs away from ideas and practices related to development and thinking that are linked to European modernity. This includes a shift in how relationships to others and to the environment are formed and maintained through economic, political and social practices (Chuji et al. 2019), and embracing wellbeing (i.e. happiness and a good spiritual life) (Villalba 2013). A rigorous implementation of the above-mentioned principles may resolve many of the currently existing inequality-related dynamics because it includes a systematic shift in the perception of outcomes as well as the means to achieve such outcomes. Against this backdrop, it would also be unlikely that particular development conditions, such as regional economic differences, would reproduce certain drivers of migration. An example in favour of *Buen Vivir* is the idea of food sovereignty reflected in the following statement by a Bolivian intellectual:

How do you achieve a good life? By satisfying the basic nutritional needs, and this by controlling production. The *Ayllu* [author's comment: *a type of extended family, working collectively in a commonly held terrain*] community strictly regulates the system of agricultural production and other resources, the decisions made by the authorities after consultation with the people are carried out with speed, opposition is punished. With the achievement of good production at the same time, one of the fundamental objectives, *suma manq'aña*, namely the principle of eating well, is achieved. (Choque cited in Gudynas 2011: 6; author's translation)

The quote shows how agriculture is approached as an integral part of community development. Rural production is not only considered a means for satisfying basic needs, but is also linked to social relationships and decision-making processes in the community. The academic and civil society discussions on food sovereignty impacted political discourse and were finally implemented in

the Bolivian Constitution in 2009. Article 255 proclaimed food sovereignty for all Bolivian citizens, including the prohibition of privatization of rural areas as well as a ban on biotechnologies and toxic substances suspected of harming human health and the environment in agricultural production. This gives farmers more power to decide what, how and where to produce, and it protects them politically, potentially eliminating a range of inequalities in rural areas (e.g. exclusion or exploitation) and, therefore, some important drivers of rural outmigration. It also invites us to embrace the role of social actors in rural development differently: it does not suggest outmigration as a pathway out of rural underdevelopment, as proposed by some international organizations, but rather aims to empower rural dwellers economically and politically.

In addition, the link between migration and development was approached in a different manner. Migrants were looked at from an equity and rights perspective, rather than as the threats to, or heroes of, development that they are frequently identified as in globalized debates:

[*Buen Vivir*] promotes the creation of Latin American and Caribbean citizenship, the implementation of policies that guarantee the human rights of border populations and refugees, and the protection of human rights of Latin Americans and the Caribbean in countries of transit and destination. (Acosta 2009: 25; author's translation)

The citation shows that the migration and development link is considered an integral process in which the inclusion of all human beings is a major priority. From this viewpoint, citizenship is embraced as universal membership. This includes solidarity with migrants, meaning a respectful and tolerant interaction with foreigners. Some of these ideas were also considered in the Ecuadorian National Plans of Development. The significance of inclusion was underscored as a 'harmonious integration' (cf. SENPLADES 2010: 110) through promoting the formal relations in the region. Moreover, the constitution claims to integrate returning migrants to 'protect migrant workers' (ibid.: 80). From this vantage point, migrants have not been solely viewed in terms of consequences for countries of origin and destination, but rather as subjects that may conceivably need support and safeguarding.

Buen Vivir has been critically addressed, and it has been pointed out that the political implementation of this perspective by the governments of Ecuador and Bolivia was certainly not free of ambiguity and various problems (see, for example, the issues of food security addressed by McKay et al. 2014). Nonetheless, *Buen Vivir* evolved into one of the most important alternative

perspectives in Latin America and, in many ways, challenged dominant globalized discourses on migration and development. Although there have been political turnarounds recently towards more reactionary governments in Bolivia and Ecuador, the *Buen Vivir* discourses in academia, policy-making and civil society have opposed and still oppose the deep-seated mainstream understanding that prioritizes (economic) development and material wellbeing. The consideration of relational and emotional aspects in development processes opened up a different vantage point on the causes of migration. In embracing migrants and their needs in an inclusive and solidarity-based perspective, this vantage point clearly counters (neo)liberal understandings that perceive migrants as national security threats in destination regions or as cash cows for remittance-based developments in origin countries.

Discussion: Countering dominant globalized discourses

The previously presented four periods of discussion not only show that public discourse on migration and development has had a long historical trajectory in Latin America, but also that a multitude of actors have approached the nexus from different angles.

With regard to the former aspect, the first three approaches focus mainly on economic (under)development as an important factor in migration. In the early structuralist approach, migration was addressed as a consequence of industrial development and then later in relation to the brain drain. It was also acknowledged that the human capital represented by skilled migrants was needed for industrial development. Therefore, the emphasis was placed on promoting development both to avoid outmigration and to attract skilled foreign labourers. LA Structuralism served as the central theoretical groundwork for discourses related to dependency theories. In the second wave of discussions, several social scientists explicitly considered internal and international migration as a consequence of dependency and underdevelopment. The third wave of LA discourses largely represented theoretical revisions of the earlier discussions. While neo-structuralist approaches concentrated on development as an endogenous process in which migration was addressed in a way similar to earlier discussions, the neo-dependency perspective concentrated on the relevance of global capital and on the activities of transnational companies, particularly, in the framework of free trade. In contrast to these largely macroeconomic perspectives, the discourse on *Buen Vivir* represents

another vantage point on migration and development which can, therefore, be identified as the fourth and exceptional wave of the debates. As a holistic and humanistic as well as non-material perspective, it underscores the role of overarching goals such as universal (human) rights, solidarity and inclusion as central to society, and represents principles that are associated in many ways with the migration and development nexus.

As for agents, multiple actors have been involved. In the earlier structuralist approach, the discussion was mainly concentrated around ECLAC members and state representatives who observed and, in some cases, followed the recommendations of the UN institution. In the following decades, ECLAC remained an important player in public discussions. In the dependency discourses, academic actors became increasingly involved in public discourses (Kay and Gwynne, 2000). In the 1990s especially, civil society took a central role in counterdiscourses, which was related to at least two dynamics: in the post-Washington Consensus, non-governmental organizations were awarded central roles as agencies in development practices, and were thus financially and rhetorically promoted (Veltmeyer and Petras 2000); the 1990s likewise witnessed the emergence of diverse 'new social movements' (Delgado and Veltmeyer 2017) in Latin America that were initially organized by farmers, rural workers and indigenous groups. Afterwards some of these movements expanded globally because activists all over the world showed their solidarity with them (Petras and Veltmeyer 2011). A case in point is the Zapatista Army of National Liberation, which started its activities in Mexico, symbolically in the same year that the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) was implemented, as a local indigenous social movement resisting global neoliberal discourses and policies. Finally, it is worth noting that after 2005 some leftist governments evolved as new players reproducing counterdiscourses in the context of the socialism of the 21st century (Delgado and Veltmeyer 2017). Ecuador and Bolivia implemented central ideas of *Buen Vivir* in their political constitutions around 2008 and 2009.

In sum, all these actors have observed the global economy, dominant globalized discourses and related manifestations in the form of economic and political practices, and have reacted, in one way or another, with counterdiscourses and sometimes with political and social movements. Needless to say, there have been variations in observing, describing and interpreting globalized discourses and economic and political dynamics in Latin America. The previous analysis provided an overview of the most important cases in which the global economy and migration processes as well as migration and devel-

opment discourses have been interpreted from alternative and often opposing points of view. It underscores that dominant globalized discourses were challenged in most of the critical discussions on migration and development in Latin America. From a Foucauldian viewpoint, it might even be argued that most Latin American discourses have identified globalized discourses as symbols of imposition, reproducing power asymmetries. Consequently, the previously addressed Latin American discussions mostly developed opposite viewpoints, which this chapter terms counterdiscourses.

The Latin American structuralist and *Buen Vivir* approaches represent particular discussions. While the former viewpoint was initially developed to explain dynamics in the global economy and afterwards adapted to migration and development discussions, the latter viewpoint represents an ancient indigenous philosophy, which has gained public acceptance over the past three decades. Nonetheless, when considering the entire trajectory of discussions, it can be argued that these discussions in Latin America represent an impressive history of resistance to dominant globalized discourses, policies and practices. The results also indicate that Latin American discussions represent an important component of global discourses on migration and development.

Conclusion

This chapter has been devoted to public discourses on the link between migration and development in Latin America, investigating the ways that public discourses were positioned in relation to dominant globalized discourses over the past decades. Considering the historical trajectory of Latin American debates, it has become clear that very diverse and rich reflections on development and migration have evolved. It is striking that, with the exception of the *Buen Vivir* approach, the vast majority of the selected perspectives concentrated on the link between asymmetries, dependency and economic underdevelopment and migration. This means that many discourses have reflected on North–South relationships and perceived this link to be unequal, as well as a process that most likely provokes outmigration. Put differently, they produced materialistic perspectives on development and migration. Nonetheless, the previous discussion shows that the debates on migration and development symbolized discursive waves of political counter practices, including discourses and, partly, political and social movements that were theoretically and politically opposed to dominant discussions on migration and develop-

ment. In this way, they represent an important component of global discussions in the past and in the present, and are therefore more than just 'pessimistic' views of the link, as assumed by some social scientists (e.g. de Haas 2010). This is because of the long discursive tradition in which different viewpoints have developed.

There are several benefits from understanding these dominant discourses and their counterdiscourses. On the one hand, they can provide insights into different modes of observation, description and interpretation, especially the ways in which these practices are shaped by political interactions and mutual references. On the other, they can facilitate a better understanding of current dynamics in global migration policies. In addition, the juxtaposition of the two viewpoints can, for instance, provide new insights for analysing the paradoxes in recent global discourses, such as the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration launched in 2017.

Notes

- 1 The aim of this analysis is not to provide a comprehensive overview of alternative migration and development discourses in the region, but rather to selectively focus on the most significant discussions. The underlying selection criteria of these four periods of public discussions are related to the variety of political actors involved, the political resonance on the institutional, civil society and academic levels in the region, and the concrete references to previously noted dominant globalized discourses. Moreover, it is worth noting that the distinction between the four discursive waves follows analytical purposes. In fact, many of the presented waves are related, meaning that rather than representing clearly separated discursive phases, they have built on or even overlapped with each other.
- 2 The Washington Consensus represents a range of economic policy recommendations related to the Structural Adjustment Programme, aiming to promote liberalization, deregulation, privatization and free trade, thereby resolving development issues in Latin American countries.
- 3 '*Sumak Kawsay*' in Kichwa or '*Suma Qamaña*' in the Aymara language.