

Open Trade, Closed Borders
Immigration Policy in the Era of Globalization
Appendix A: Robustness Checks

Margaret E. Peters*

Yale University

September 24, 2014

*Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Yale University, 77 Prospect St., New Haven, CT 06520; margaret.peters@yale.edu.

Table A1: Factor Analysis

Factor	Eigenvalue	Difference	Proportion	Cumulative
Factor 1	3.65969	1.43823	0.3050	0.3050
Factor 2	2.22146	1.08594	0.1851	0.4901
Factor 3	1.13553	0.08545	0.0946	0.5847
Factor 4	1.05007	0.07847	0.0875	0.6722
Factor 5	0.97160	0.31016	0.0810	0.7532
Factor 6	0.66145	0.10612	0.0551	0.8083
Factor 7	0.55532	0.07995	0.0463	0.8546
Factor 8	0.47537	0.06063	0.0396	0.8942
Factor 9	0.41474	0.02093	0.0346	0.9288
Factor 10	0.39381	0.15813	0.0328	0.9616
Factor 11	0.23567	0.01039	0.0196	0.9812
Factor 12	0.22528		0.0188	1.0000

LR test: $\chi^2(66) = 1.3e + 04$ $Prob > \chi^2 = 0.0000$

Immigrant Flows

As a simple test of whether policy correlates with flows, I regress flows over GDP on policy (Table A2) to control for the demand to migrate due to economic growth in the receiving state (Massey et al. 1993); the results are similar if we use flows standardized by GDP per capita. Flow data is from Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2011), Fitzgerald, Leblang and Teets (2014), Office of Immigration Statistics (2010). The coefficient on immigration policy is positive and statistically significant. Therefore, we have confidence that the policy measure is capturing immigration policy.

Robustness Checks

As a first robustness check, I examine the same regressions using a five-year moving average of policy instead of a linear-time trend (Table A3). Immigration policy tends to be “sticky;” it often remains the same for several years before it is changed. Including a five-year moving average allows us to control for this stickiness.

Table A2: Immigration Flows Standardized by GDP Regressed on Immigration Policy and GDP for each country

<i>DV: Immigrant Flows</i>	All	US	AUS	CAN	NZ	UK	FRA	DEU	NLD	SWI	JPN
Immigration	1.43** (0.42)	0.97*** (0.11)	0.36*** (0.06)	2.17*** (0.20)	0.05 (0.11)	-0.89** (0.25)	-0.31** (0.11)	0.90*** (0.14)	0.04 (0.02)	-0.49*** (0.06)	0.06 (0.04)
Openness	2.21*** (0.32)	1.84*** (0.16)	0.56*** (0.05)	3.43*** (0.26)	0.79*** (0.06)	-0.53** (0.16)	-0.41* (0.17)	2.32*** (0.22)	0.25*** (0.02)	0.01 (0.07)	0.16* (0.06)
Observations	544	144	45	138	54	20	22	40	45	22	14
R^2	0.43	0.65	0.48	0.51	0.00	0.36	0.20	0.54	0.12	0.41	0.14

Robust standard errors in parentheses. The first regression includes country fixed effects.

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table A3: Immigration policy regressed on trade policy and a 5-year moving average immigration policy by era

	(1) All Years	(2) Pre-Globalization	(3) 19th Cen. Globalization	(4) Interwar	(5) Bretton Woods	(6) Post Bretton Woods	(7) Post Bretton Woods, No Argentina
Trade Openness	-0.32** (0.10)	-1.17 (0.94)	-0.74 (0.43)	-0.84* (0.30)	-1.03** (0.33)	-0.42 (0.62)	-1.56* (0.58)
5-year moving average	0.91***	0.20	0.69***	0.98***	0.67***	0.62***	0.57***
Immigration Policy	(0.02)	(0.22)	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.14)	(0.08)	(0.08)
Polity	0.00	0.01**	0.05	0.02+	0.02+	-0.00	-0.01
GDP Growth	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.04)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.01)
	0.08	0.01	0.27*	0.03	-0.05	0.12	0.05
War	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.09)	(0.27)	(0.26)	(0.10)	(0.11)
	0.07*	0.02	0.02	-0.03	0.03	0.01	0.01
Constant	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.03)
	0.32*	1.71+	0.58+	0.51+	0.48+	0.04	1.09+
	(0.11)	(0.85)	(0.29)	(0.25)	(0.26)	(0.60)	(0.58)
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	1549	70	293	287	319	580	548
R ²	0.95	0.60	0.82	0.89	0.63	0.64	0.68

Standard errors in parentheses

+ $p < 0.10$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Second, I use a structural equations model that treats immigration policy as a latent variable (Table A4). This specification ensures that the compilation of the immigration policy variable was not driving the results. Structural equations modeling estimates the effects of our independent variables on a latent variable, in this case immigration policy, which is measured by the observed 12 dimensions discussed above. There are 13 linear equations to be estimated: the independent variables on immigration policy and immigration policy on each of the 12 dimensions. The 13 equations are estimated simultaneously. The first equation, the structural equation, shows how our independent variables affect the latent variable, immigration policy and the next 13 show how immigration policy affects each dimension.. The same variables are included as above, but country and year fixed effects are not included.

The results are largely robust to structural equations modeling. The effect of trade policy are no longer significant over the entire time period; in fact, there is little that can immigration over the entire period. Nonetheless, if we examine the 19th century and interwar period together and Post-Betton Woods era we find significant effects of trade policy. In the pre-World War II and Bretton Woods era, we find that increases in trade openness is correlated with more restrictive immigration policy. Additionally, we find there is a positive and significant effect of increasing democratization as measured by Polity. This is the opposite of what scholars like Polanyi (1944) would have predicted.

The results are also robust to estimation through techniques that down-weight outliers (Table A5). The model on the pre-globalization era cannot be estimated due to the small number of observations.

The results are also robust to including different measures of immigrant flows (Table A6).

Next, I examined whether it is only immigrants with citizenship that can affect policy. As we do not have good data on naturalization rates, I recoded the immigration policy variable to exclude citizenship and regressed it on the measure of citizenship (Table A7).

Table A4: Structural Equations Model: Immigration policy regressed on trade policy by era

	All Years	Pre-1946	Bretton Woods	Post Bretton Woods
Structural Model				
<i>DV: Immigration Polity</i>				
Trade Openness	0.00 (0.00)	-1.14*** (0.20)	0.40 (0.38)	-1.83*** (0.44)
Polity	-0.00 (0.00)	0.02*** (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	0.01*** (0.00)
GDP Growth	0.00 (0.00)	-0.43 (0.26)	0.27 (0.22)	0.56** (0.18)
War	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.11* (0.05)	-0.20* (0.10)	0.01 (0.04)
Years since inclusion	0.00 (0.00)	-0.00*** (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	0.00*** (0.00)
Measurement Model				
National Origins				
IM	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Constant	4.11*** (0.02)	5.38*** (0.20)	3.84*** (0.26)	5.60*** (0.38)
Skill Requirements				
IM	-4557.11 (4394.34)	1.28*** (0.15)	-0.87+ (0.45)	-0.51** (0.17)
Constant	4.83*** (0.17)	5.49*** (0.25)	3.40*** (0.21)	2.18*** (0.24)
Recruitment				
IM	-926.47 (996.65)	0.86*** (0.13)	-0.12 (0.45)	-0.03 (0.12)
Constant	3.88*** (0.15)	4.85*** (0.22)	3.89*** (0.13)	3.24*** (0.16)
Work Prohibitions				
IM	2208.20 (2148.88)	0.20* (0.10)	-1.60 (1.00)	0.83*** (0.20)
Family Reunification				
IM	12285.04 (11783.56)	-1.91*** (0.20)	-3.37* (1.55)	2.53*** (0.46)
Constant	-1.98*** (0.20)	-1.09*** (0.30)	3.40*** (0.69)	5.97*** (0.71)
Quots				
IM	-6877.34 (6611.06)	1.55*** (0.17)	3.34* (1.60)	-1.29*** (0.28)
Constant	6.90*** (0.18)	6.90*** (0.25)	3.58*** (0.68)	2.81*** (0.42)
Refugees				
IM	10158.90 (9746.28)	-0.13*** (0.03)	-4.05* (1.83)	3.08*** (0.56)
Constant	-1.77*** (0.18)	0.87*** (0.04)	2.73** (0.83)	6.40*** (0.87)
Asylum				
IM	8618.61 (8272.03)	-0.08 (0.05)	1.46* (0.61)	2.08*** (0.39)
Constant	-0.97*** (0.17)	1.18*** (0.07)	1.84*** (0.40)	5.31*** (0.61)
Constant	3.47*** (0.12)	4.48*** (0.14)	4.67*** (0.30)	5.28*** (0.30)
Citizenship				
IM	5431.22 (5228.01)	0.81*** (0.15)	-2.57* (1.15)	3.08*** (0.55)
Constant	1.86*** (0.16)	4.70*** (0.24)	4.37*** (0.54)	7.93*** (0.84)
Rights				
IM	1796.89 (1760.89)	0.88*** (0.11)	-3.10+ (1.85)	2.07*** (0.38)
Constant	3.25*** (0.12)	4.99*** (0.19)	4.51*** (0.59)	6.78*** (0.59)
Deportation				
IM	-4173.60 (4036.55)	0.76*** (0.13)	-2.69+ (1.40)	2.97*** (0.52)
Constant	4.59*** (0.20)	4.72*** (0.21)	3.57*** (0.54)	6.86*** (0.83)
Enforcement				
IM	-9891.84 (9491.63)	0.58*** (0.08)	-1.37 (0.92)	0.07 (0.15)
Constant	6.94*** (0.19)	4.97*** (0.14)	3.92*** (0.28)	3.16*** (0.21)
var(e.nat)				
Constant	0.90*** (0.03)	0.67*** (0.04)	0.70*** (0.06)	0.99*** (0.06)
var(e.skill)				
Constant	0.96*** (0.03)	0.90*** (0.05)	0.68*** (0.05)	0.64*** (0.04)
var(e.recruit)				
Constant	0.84*** (0.03)	0.99*** (0.06)	0.75*** (0.06)	0.45*** (0.03)
var(e.work)				
Constant	0.61*** (0.02)	0.73*** (0.04)	0.26*** (0.03)	0.60*** (0.04)
var(e.family)				
Constant	0.76*** (0.03)	0.18*** (0.03)	1.20*** (0.11)	0.61*** (0.04)
var(e.quota)				
Constant	1.07*** (0.04)	0.44*** (0.03)	1.85*** (0.16)	1.00*** (0.06)
var(e.refugee)				
Constant	0.70*** (0.03)	0.05*** (0.01)	0.56*** (0.03)	0.01*** (0.01)

Table A5: Immigration policy regressed on trade policy by era, Robust OLS with Outliers Down-weighted

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	All Years	19th Cen. Globalization	Interwar	Bretton Woods	Post Bretton Woods
Trade Openness	-2.45*** (0.16)	-0.40* (0.19)	-1.45*** (0.35)	-0.46*** (0.12)	-1.34*** (0.36)
Years since inclusion	-0.00*** (0.00)	-0.01*** (0.00)	-0.00** (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.01*** (0.00)
Polity	0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.00 (0.00)	0.01* (0.00)
GDP Growth	0.15 (0.17)	0.11 (0.15)	-0.19 (0.28)	0.14 (0.09)	0.11 (0.13)
War	0.05 (0.04)	0.01 (0.04)	0.14* (0.06)	0.04* (0.02)	-0.01 (0.04)
Constant	2.00*** (0.24)	1.35*** (0.18)	1.01** (0.38)	0.47*** (0.11)	1.65*** (0.40)
Observations	1577	297	298	325	580
R^2	0.86	0.96	0.84	0.98	0.90

Standard errors in parentheses

+ $p < 0.10$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table A6: Immigration policy regressed on trade policy, immigrant flows and alternative explanations for OECD States 1951-1995

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
	BW	BW	Post BW	Post BW	BW	BW	Post BW	Post BW	BW	BW	Post BW	Post BW
Lagged Total Immigrant Flow (100,000s)	-0.02 (0.01)	-0.01 (0.01)	-0.03*** (0.00)	-0.03*** (0.01)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00** (0.00)	-0.00* (0.00)	0.00 (0.01)	0.01 (0.02)	-0.02* (0.01)	-0.02** (0.01)
Lagged Change in Immigrant Flow												
Lagged % Foreign Born												
Trade Openness	3.63 (4.44)	3.50 (2.09)	-7.62* (2.93)	-4.44* (1.59)	3.27 (4.61)	2.90* (0.71)	-7.82* (3.17)	-4.58+ (2.24)	3.79 (4.60)	4.09 (2.64)	-6.83+ (3.24)	-3.57 (1.94)
Years since inclusion	0.00	0.04**	-0.01	-0.03***	0.01**	0.03*	-0.01	-0.02**	0.00	0.04*	-0.01	-0.03***
GDP Growth	-1.56 (0.88)	-0.73 (0.74)	1.79* (0.75)	1.22 (0.72)	-1.63 (1.24)	-0.80 (0.65)	1.56 (0.90)	1.33 (0.72)	-1.58 (0.94)	-0.85 (1.00)	1.79* (0.77)	1.35 (0.75)
War	-0.08 (0.17)	-0.03 (0.14)	0.02 (0.07)	0.01 (0.09)	-0.04 (0.14)	-0.00 (0.07)	-0.00 (0.06)	-0.01 (0.07)	-0.08 (0.17)	-0.01 (0.14)	0.01 (0.07)	-0.01 (0.10)
Welfare Taxes		-0.14* (0.04)		-0.02 (0.02)		-0.18* (0.04)		-0.03 (0.02)		-0.15* (0.05)		-0.02 (0.02)
Union Density		-0.38 (1.00)		-2.14+ (1.02)		-0.91 (0.56)		-2.03 (1.16)		-0.33 (1.25)		-2.21+ (1.00)
Center Parties		0.06+ (0.03)		0.06* (0.03)		0.07+ (0.03)		0.05+ (0.03)		0.05 (0.06)		0.05+ (0.03)
Right Parties		0.10* (0.03)		0.07* (0.03)		0.09** (0.01)		0.07* (0.02)		0.08 (0.07)		0.06* (0.02)
Gini				-0.00 (0.00)				-0.01 (0.00)				-0.00 (0.00)
Constant	-4.91 (4.89)	-10.54* (3.48)	7.10* (2.17)	8.54** (2.43)	-5.05 (4.38)	-8.08* (1.92)	7.54** (2.22)	7.70* (2.31)	-4.98 (5.12)	-11.25* (3.94)	6.76* (2.28)	8.32* (2.53)
Observations	61	62	149	122	57	57	145	119	61	62	149	122
R ²	0.65	0.86	0.70	0.80	0.65	0.91	0.65	0.76	0.64	0.86	0.69	0.79

Robust standard errors in parentheses. Polity omitted due to colinearity.

+ $p < 0.10$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

First, the results on trade are relatively stable given this recoding of the immigration policy variable, which should give us more confidence in the results. Second, there is a positive effect of citizenship policy on immigration policy in all the data or when we examine the Pre-Globalization era. This relationship could be a product of the strength of immigrants; however, it is likely that policymakers, who are more supportive of immigration, are also more supportive of liberal citizenship policies. Historically, states used liberal citizenship policies in combination with open immigration policies to attract immigrants. The insignificance of the citizenship variable after World War II suggests that open citizenship policies are chosen by politicians who want to encourage immigration.

Finally, I examine a five lag and a two lag ECM model for the pre-1945 and post-1946 eras respectively, as they were both found significant at the $p < 0.1$ level. The error correction term is still oppositely signed and statistically significant in at least one of the two policies. Pre-1946 immigration policy was changed relatively little — as noted above about 75% of the country years there was no change — thus it is not surprising that lagged change in immigration had a large effect on the current change in immigration since both were more likely than not to equal 0. Post-1946, the standard deviation for the change in immigration policy and the change in tariffs is about the same (2.15 and 2.12 on a scale from 0 to 100 for immigration and tariffs respectively). A one standard deviation change in immigration will, therefore, have an effect on tariffs about twice the size of a one standard deviation change in immigration policy will have on tariffs. Additionally, the sign of the coefficients support the argument: an increase (decrease) in tariffs leads to more (less) open immigration policy. Further, a more (less) open immigration policy will lead to lower (higher) tariffs, suggesting that immigration policy can be used to prop up import-competing firms, gaining their support for trade openness. Nonetheless, shocks in tariffs will have a much larger effect on immigration, leading trade policy to dominate immigration policy.

Table A7: Immigration policy without citizenship regressed on trade and citizenship policy by era

	All Years	Pre-Globalization	19th Cen. Globalization	Interwar	Bretton Woods	Post Bretton Woods	Post Bretton Woods, No Argentina
Trade Openness	-2.08** (0.67)	-1.01 (0.64)	-1.57* (0.56)	-2.26+ (1.16)	-1.11+ (0.60)	-1.48 (1.17)	-3.65** (1.20)
Citizenship	0.21* (0.08)	1.76** (0.46)	-0.00 (0.06)	0.29 (0.17)	0.17 (0.10)	-0.18+ (0.10)	-0.15 (0.10)
Years since inclusion	-0.02*** (0.00)	-0.00 (0.01)	-0.02*** (0.00)	-0.02* (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	-0.01** (0.00)	-0.01* (0.00)
Polity	0.01 (0.01)	0.06* (0.02)	0.15 (0.09)	0.00 (0.01)	0.02+ (0.01)	0.01 (0.00)	0.01 (0.01)
GDP Growth	0.05 (0.19)	0.23 (0.15)	0.20 (0.13)	-0.32 (0.31)	-0.04 (0.31)	0.15 (0.18)	0.02 (0.17)
War	0.12 (0.10)	0.96 (0.56)	0.01 (0.05)	0.06 (0.17)	-0.03 (0.09)	-0.03 (0.04)	-0.03 (0.04)
Constant	2.82*** (0.70)	-4.92* (1.64)	2.73*** (0.55)	3.43+ (1.64)	-1.94 (1.35)	2.52* (1.11)	4.30*** (0.95)
Observations	1577	77	297	298	325	580	548
R ²	0.81	0.66	0.53	0.63	0.31	0.42	0.52

Robust standard errors in parentheses

+ $p < 0.10$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table A8: Error Correction Model of Immigration and Trade Policy by Era

<i>DV: Δ Immigration Policy</i>	(1) All	(2) Pre-1945	(3) Pre-1945	(4) Post-1946	(5) Post-1946
EC	-0.01** (0.00)	-0.00 (0.01)	-0.01 (0.01)	-0.03*** (0.01)	-0.03*** (0.01)
Lag Δ Immigration			0.06+ (0.04)		-0.03 (0.03)
Lag 2 Δ Immigration			0.02 (0.04)		0.00 (0.03)
Lag 3 Δ Immigration			-0.08* (0.04)		
Lag 4 Δ Immigration			0.06+ (0.04)		
Lag 5 Δ Immigration			0.06+ (0.03)		
Lag Δ Tariffs			-0.01 (0.03)		0.08* (0.04)
Lag 2 Δ Tariffs			0.04 (0.03)		0.01 (0.04)
Lag 3 Δ Tariffs			0.01 (0.03)		
Lag 4 Δ Tariffs			-0.00 (0.03)		
Lag 5 Δ Tariffs			0.01 (0.03)		
Constant	-0.30*** (0.05)	-0.44*** (0.09)	-0.36*** (0.09)	-0.17* (0.07)	-0.16* (0.07)
Observations	1783	839	769	944	906
R^2	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.03
<i>DV: Δ Tariffs</i>					
EC	0.02*** (0.00)	0.02** (0.01)	0.02* (0.01)	0.01* (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)
Lag Δ Immigration			-0.13** (0.05)		-0.04+ (0.02)
Lag 2 Δ Immigration			0.06 (0.05)		-0.02 (0.02)
Lag 3 Δ Immigration			0.03 (0.05)		
Lag 4 Δ Immigration			0.02 (0.05)		
Lag 5 Δ Immigration			0.05 (0.04)		
Lag Δ Tariffs			-0.11** (0.04)		-0.23*** (0.03)
Lag 2 Δ Tariffs			0.07+ (0.04)		-0.08** (0.03)
Lag 3 Δ Tariffs			0.00 (0.04)		
Lag 4 Δ Tariffs			-0.06 (0.04)		
Lag 5 Δ Tariffs			-0.04 (0.04)		
Constant	-0.06 (0.06)	0.00 (0.11)	0.02 (0.12)	-0.13* (0.05)	-0.18*** (0.05)
Observations	1756	840	770	916	878
R^2	0.02	0.01	0.04	0.01	0.07

Residuals calculated from regressions on all years, pre-1946 and post-1946 respectively.
Standard errors in parentheses

+ $p < 0.10$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

References

- Citizenship and Immigration Canada. 2011. Permanent residents. In *Facts and Figures 2010*. Ottawa: Citizenship and Immigration Canada.
URL: <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/statistics/facts2010/permanent/index.aspxpermanent>
- Fitzgerald, Jennifer, David A. Leblang and Jessica Teets. 2014. “Defying the law of gravity: The political economy of international migration.” *World Politics* .
- Massey, Douglas S., Joaquin Arango, Graeme Hugo, Ali Kouaouci, Adela Pellegrino and J. Edward Taylor. 1993. “Theories of International Migration: A Review and Appraisal.” *Population and Development Review* 19(3):431–466.
- Office of Immigration Statistics. 2010. *2009 Yearbook of Immigration Statistics*. Washington DC: Department of Homeland Security.
- Polanyi, Karl. 1944. *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. New York: Rinehart.

Open Trade, Closed Borders
Immigration Policy in the Era of Globalization
Appendix B: Coding the Immigration Policy Dataset

Margaret E. Peters*

Yale University

September 24, 2014

*Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Yale University, 77 Prospect St., New Haven, CT 06520; margaret.peters@yale.edu.

Case Selection

There are two appropriate and over-lapping universe of cases to which the theory could apply. First, the theory applies to relatively (low-skill) labor scarce states. These are states that have relatively high wages in comparison to the rest of the world or in comparison to their major trading partners. Second, we want to ensure that the countries studied are countries that migrants want to move to. If migrants were not interested in moving to that state, the state could choose any immigration policy since migrants would not move to that state regardless of the policy. Previous research on migration suggests that potential migrants choose locations where wages are high relative to the transaction costs of moving (Massey et al. 1993). States that are very wealthy, such as the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany and Japan, are likely to attract migrants from all over the world; while states that are relatively wealthy in comparison to their neighbors but are not very wealthy, such as Argentina, Brazil or South Africa today, are likely to attract migrants from their neighbors but not from countries far away. The states chosen, therefore, are all wealthy states, in comparison to the rest of the world or to their neighbors, that are likely to attract immigrants and are also relatively (low-skill) labor scarce.

This criteria was operationalized as states with GDP per capita above 200% of the world average GDP per capita in a given year or above 200% of the average GDP per capita for the geographic region in which the state is located. GDP data were taken from both Maddison (2011) and The World Bank (2012). The regional criteria captures states that are attractive to immigrants due to high wages combined with proximity. These two criteria lead to the inclusion of 77 states (or state-like entities) over at least some part of the time period of 1800-2008.

Countries included under the world criteria are: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Belgium, Brunei, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, French Polynesia, Germany, (West Germany between 1945-1990), Greece, Hong Kong, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Israel, Japan, Luxembourg, Macao, Netherlands, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Norway, Puerto

Rico, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, UAE, UK and US.

Countries included under the regional criteria are Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, Cape Verde (only after 1997), Republic of Congo, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Equatorial Guinea (after 1997), Estonia, Fiji, Gabon, Georgia, Hungary, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Lithuania, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Micronesia, Namibia, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Samoa, Seychelles, Slovakia, South Africa, South Korea, Suriname, Swaziland, Taiwan, Thailand, Tonga, Turkey, Vanuatu and Venezuela.

From the universe of wealthy countries, the 19 states and state-like entities were selected: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, France, Germany, Hong Kong, Kuwait, Japan, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, South Korea, Switzerland, Taiwan, the UK and the US.¹ Some states were not studied because they have reached the wealth criteria or became independent states only recently; these states include Cape Verde and Equatorial Guinea and former republics of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia. Other states were not studied because it is nearly impossible to find information on their immigration policies; these states include some of the members of the Gulf Cooperative Council, Brunei, and other autocracies.

From the set of countries left, I chose countries to have a range of values on the important explanatory variables for this study and for the alternative explanations in the literature. For the argument of this study, it was important to find states that have had both open and closed trade and capital policies. Further, we wanted to examine states that have industries that are relatively immobile, such as natural resources and agriculture, and that are relatively mobile, like manufacturing. There are several major alternative explanations in the literature; explanations based on the power of labor, the power of nativists, the power of immigrants, the fiscal costs of immigrants, whether or not a state was a colonial power, regime type and participation in wars. The states chosen to be included, then, vary in these

¹Finding data on immigration policies is highly time and labor intensive and, thus, not all states could be studied.

dimensions. Finally, we included states that have been much studied in the literature to ensure we are testing the alternative explanations on the states which these theories should apply. The breadth of the dataset ensures that previous arguments in the literature can be tested while providing external validity by examining a wider range of immigrant attracting states.

The criteria to have a range of values over these explanatory values means that Europe is relatively under-sampled in this study. The Nordic countries, Portugal, Spain, Italy, and Greece have recently gained much attention in the immigration literature, but were not included in this study. This under-sampling would be problematic if there are ranges of the explanatory variables that are not represented in the study already. The Nordic countries are similar to the Netherlands on many of the key variables, including regime type, trade and capital policies, size of welfare state, coordinated market economies, etc. Therefore, we expect that their industrial policies and their welfare policies as well as regime type are similar to that of the Netherlands and should lead to similar immigration policy outcomes. Portugal, Spain, Italy and Greece are often studied due to their relatively new status as countries of immigration rather than countries of emigration. In this way, their experience should be represented by Japan, South Korea and Taiwan, which all switched from being countries of emigration to being countries of immigration. South Korea saw this change occur shortly after it transitioned to democracy, as was the case in Portugal, Spain and Greece. Thus, we do not think that the exclusion of these cases greatly affects the external validity of tests of the argument of this paper and the alternative explanations.

There are two other coding decisions to make with regards to case selection: how to handle federal states and when to begin the analysis. All federal states are coded according to the policy of the most open member of the state until the time when the federal government takes sole responsibility for immigration policy, at which point the federal policy is coded. This coding scheme is used because most federal states allow the free movement of persons among the members of the federation. Therefore, an immigrant who can come to one of

the members can then have access to all of the members of the federation. Due to this coding, only US federal, and not state, immigration policy is coded. Prior to the 1848 *Passenger Cases* decision of the Supreme Court, many states enacted their own immigration policies. However, not all states enacted these policies and, thus, immigration was relatively unrestricted through at least some ports of entry into the United States. The policies that states did enact — provisions against criminals and those likely to become public charges — were similar to the 1875 Federal Immigration Act (Neuman 1993). If we coded the US using these state policies, the US immigration policy would be restricted at the level it was in 1875 from 1789. The results of this study, however, do not change with this coding. Switzerland is also not included in the dataset prior to 1848 because citizens of the different cantons did not have the right to live in another canton. Therefore, for natives and immigrants, each canton was like a separate country. Among EU members, the immigration policies of the most liberal country is not coded as the policy for these countries because freedom of movement does not extend to third country nationals. When EU policy does affect some or all of the nations — either because they implement the regulations with national legislation, such as the Blue Card program for high-skill workers, or have delegated control to the EU as in Schengen — the EU policy is coded as the policy for each nation it affects.

Table B1 lists the states included in the dataset along with the years of coverage for each state. Every state was coded through 2010, but they vary by when they enter the dataset. States enter the dataset when they gain control over their immigration policy, either when they obtain responsible government, independence, or come into existence in their current form. For example, in the case of Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Hong Kong immigration policy was coded from the date in which colony began and obtained responsible government through a governor general. Canada obtained a level of control over its immigration policy after the 13 American colonies revolted. Singapore and Kuwait were not granted the same level of control over their immigration policy until the first legislature was elected in the case of Singapore and independence in the case of Kuwait.

Similarly, Argentina, Brazil, South Korea, Taiwan and the United States did not gain control of immigration until they gained independence.² Germany, the Netherlands and Switzerland are coded from when the modern state came into existence; for the years 1945-1990, the policy coded for Germany is that of West Germany. The United Kingdom, France and Japan are coded from the year in which they pass their first modern immigration policy. Finally, Saudi Arabia is coded from 1950 for two reasons: GDP data does not exist prior to 1950 and major oil production did not begin until after World War II. It is likely that Saudi Arabia was not wealthy enough until around 1950 to attract immigrants.

Table B1: Countries included in the dataset and the dates of inclusion

Region	Country
Settler States	US (1790-2010)
	Australia (1787-2010)
	Canada (1783-2010)
	New Zealand (1840-2010)
	South Africa (1806-2010)
	Argentina (1810-2010)
European liberal democracies	Brazil (1808-2010)
	UK (1792-2010)
	France (1793-2010)
	Germany (1871-2010)
	Netherlands (1815-2010)
	Switzerland (1848-2010)
Export-oriented industrializers	Japan (1868-2010)
	Hong Kong (1843-2010)
	Singapore (1955-2010)
	South Korea (1948-2010)
	Taiwan (1949-2010)
Autocracies	Saudi Arabia (1950-2010)
	Kuwait (1961-2010)

Coding scheme

Immigration policy is an amalgam of several sets of policies, including policies that regulate who gains entry to the state (border regulations), how the border is enforced (enforcement)

²In the case of the United States, immigration policy is not coded until 1790 when the federal government was granted sole responsibility for immigration policy.

and what rights immigrants receive once they have entered the state (immigrant rights). Within each of these three categories, states have used numerous policies to control their borders; these policies often serve as substitutes for each other. To get to a tractable level of aggregation of policies without comparing too many dissimilar policies, twelve major policy dimensions were coded that cover the major areas of immigration policy. Table B2 lists the different dimensions of each category of immigration policy and the basis of each dimension.

Table B2: Dimensions of immigration policy

Category	Dimension	Coding criteria
Border regulations	Nationality	Number of nationalities restricted
	Skill	Restrictions based on skill or wealth
	Quotas	Numerical limits on entry
	Recruitment	Policies aimed at recruiting immigrants
	Work prohibitions	Restrictions on industries or positions held
	Family reunification	Distance of relatives allowed special entry
	Refugee policy	Entrance policies for refugees outside the state
	Asylum policy	Entrance policies for those claiming refugee status at the border
Immigrant rights	Citizenship	Who can be a member of the state
	Other rights	Other rights immigrants possess
Enforcement	Deportation	Who can be deported and how
	Other enforcement	Other enforcement measures in place

The twelve categories were chosen after an exhaustive reading of the literature on the immigration policies of countries in Europe, the Middle East, East Asia, and the New World. All data on immigration policy and the rights given to immigrants was collected. The data was coded as to whether the law restricted some class or type of immigrant; created a test for immigration such as a literacy test or a point system; whether the law affecting recruiting immigrants by the state or by private companies; whether the law was a quota; whether the law affected a right that immigrants had; whether the law affected citizenship rights; whether the law was about refugees or asylum seekers and whether the law affected enforcement or deportation. From the data collection, it was clear that there were three major areas of focus for policy: who was allowed in, what rights they received and how to get rid of immigrants that are not wanted.

Within policies that regulate who gets into the state, countries have used seven different policies. The major distinction in border regulations throughout the last two centuries has been regulating immigration by nationality or by skill or other characteristic, such as wealth, of the migrant. Nationality restrictions were used in much of the world in the 19th and early 20th century as they were relatively easy to implement. They fell out of favor in the West after World War II and were often replaced by skill restrictions.

There are several other policies that are used less frequently by states to control who gets into the country. First, a few states use numerical quota. Other states have used recruitment policies to control entry. Most states have used recruitment policies to make their countries more attractive destinations for workers by lowering the costs of moving. Other states have sought to make their countries less attractive by decreasing the number of jobs that immigrants can take using work restrictions. While these restrictions do not directly affect entry, they affect the desire for entry. Most states also have a family reunification policy but these policies vary greatly from relatively restrictive, such as Saudi policy restricting family reunification to high-skill migrants and male natives and Hong Kong's quota on Mainland Chinese wives and children, to relatively open. Finally, I include refugee and asylum policy for two reasons. First, most refugees and asylum seekers eventually enter the labor market. Second, there is a fear, especially in Europe, that asylum seekers are economic migrants in disguise.

There are two main categories of rights. Citizenship allows the migrant to have all the rights of the native. Even without citizenship, migrants are often granted a variety of rights. While rights do not directly affect who gains entry, they likely affect the attractiveness of the country to potential migrants. Rights affect the security of the position of the migrant and the money that he makes. For example, migrants have few rights to sue their employers for labor violations like withholding pay or overtime in the Gulf Cooperative Council countries. Thus, they are more exposed to abuse and expropriation of their earnings. In contrast, migrants may sue their employers in Western countries, reducing fears of expropriation.

These rights, then, make Western states more attractive to migrants as they reduce the risk that the migrants' investment will be expropriated.

Finally, we have to control for enforcement. Ideally, in this category, we would like a de facto measure of enforcement. Unfortunately, given the nature of undocumented migration, it is nearly impossible to measure how effectively a state is enforcing its laws. Instead, we must rely on the de jure measures that states enact. There are two main categories of enforcement: deportation and other measures. More rigorous deportation measures should correlate with greater deportation of migrants who are in the country illegally. Other measures focus on three areas: border control measures to keep unwanted immigrants out, employer sanctions to reduce the demand for illegal workers and "self-deportation" laws that make living in a state illegally more difficult. Most states have passed laws on border regulations and employer sanctions.

Additionally, policies can belong to more than one category. For example, family reunification policies are considered a right that immigrants may possess in Europe, East Asia and the Persian Gulf and form a less important instrument in their immigration policies; in contrast, family reunification is one of the main policy instruments in United States immigration policy. Similarly, regulations on what positions immigrants can take and what sectors they can work in has been a major policy tool to control entry in East Asia and the Persian Gulf; however, the ability to work in any position is also seen as a right in liberal democracies. Refugee and Asylum policy are also hard to categorize; although these policies control entry into the state, they also are seen as a human right similar to the other rights that immigrants may be granted. A more detailed explanation of the dimensions and their coding is listed below. Each dimension was coded from 1 to 5, with greater restrictions taking lower values and more openness taking greater values.³

³Theoretically, immigration policy has no bounds; states could always pay people more and more money to come to their country; for example in the 1960s, South Africa not only paid for the cost of passage for European workers, but also established them with bonuses and other monetary goods. At the other end of the spectrum, states could also denaturalize part of their population and force them to leave, as the Germans did to the Jews under the Nazi regime or the South Africans did to Africans under Apartheid. These examples, however, are very rare. Most states fall in between these two extremes the vast majority of

Universality by Nationality: How selective is the state about letting immigrants in based on their national origin? Does nationality matter at all? Are there few national groups or many allowed in? A score of 1 represents that few or no nationalities are allowed in. A score of 5 represents that all nationalities are treated equally. One issue that this brings up is that in the late 20th and early 21st centuries, states often gave some groups preferential access to their labor market while having an overall policy of equality. For example, New Zealand uses a point system with no national origin criteria but also has a special program with the island nations of the South Pacific for seasonal workers. In this case, these preferential access programs - because they are almost always for low-skill workers - are coded in the universality by skill category. This coding rule is used because the policy is to increase, and not deny, access to the state.

- 1 Only decedents of natives allowed in.
- 2 A few nationalities allowed entrance but not many. Example: if a European country only allowed immigrants from other EU countries.
- 3 Many nationalities allowed in but not all or migrants from some regions excluded. Example: Between 1924-1965, the US quota system allowed in many Northern Europeans, some Southern and Eastern Europeans, anyone from the Western Hemisphere and no one from Asia.
- 4 Almost all nationalities allowed in. Example: In the late 19th century, only Chinese were excluded from the US. Additionally, numerical limits by country but not differentiated by country. Example: Current US law restricts migration from each country to 20,000.
- 5 No exclusions based on nationality

Universality by Skill or Income: Does the state restrict by the skills or income an immigrant possesses? Does it use a point system with points given for education or special skills?

the time.

Are people excluded based on profession (i.e. no prostitutes), illness (e.g. no epileptics), or likelihood of becoming a public charge? A score of 5 on this scale indicates that the country has no restrictions by skill and a score of 1 means only the very highest skilled workers (executives, high-level intracompany transfers) are allowed in. Again, when states exempt one group from these restrictions - either by nationality in the case of the New Zealand seasonal workers program for Polynesians or by a general category like the seasonal agricultural workers program in Britain - the score increases.

- 1 Only highly educated, high income earners allowed in; many excludable classes.
- 2 Mostly high educated, high earners, but some allowances for low-skilled workers; some excludable classes.
- 3 Preference for high-skill workers but many opportunities for low-skilled workers; some excludable classes.
- 4 Few slots reserved for high-skill workers (i.e like the H1B visa in the US); most visas open for anyone; few excludable classes (e.g. only criminals, those likely to become a public charge).
- 5 No skill restrictions for any visas; no excludable classes.

Quota: Is there a quota and how restrictive is it? Quotas are only coded when the quota is a numerical limit on a large portion of immigrants, not when it is a target for the number of immigrants. Targets, like policy statements or development plans, are not coded because they are not changes in legislation but usually administrative policies. The quota does not need to be binding on all immigrants. This is because it is rare to have a quota that binds on all immigrants. Usually at least wives and minor children of citizens are allowed in above the quota; this policy is denoted in the family immigration policy coding. Sometimes, the quota is only on one class of immigrants, such as the Hong Kong quota on Chinese immigrants, but this class makes up the majority of immigrants entering the country. Again, high-skill

workers from other countries could enter above the quota; although, interestingly, wives and minor children of Hong Kong belongers (equivalent to citizens) cannot. This is denoted in the other categories.

1 Less than 0.25% of population can enter annually

2 0.25-0.5% of population can enter annually

3 0.5-1% of the population can enter annually

4 Over 1% of population can enter annually

5 No quota

Recruitment: Are there special visas or procedures to recruit labor or settlers? To recruit workers, do employers have to advertise first or otherwise seek approval from a government ministry? How many industries can recruit? Do firms have to pay levies or other taxes for foreign workers? Does the government pay for passage or give settlers or workers other benefits to induce them to come? A score of 1 denotes that all workers have to follow the same requirements as all other immigrants and that firms cannot recruit from overseas. An example of this is the US Contract Labor Law. A 5 denotes that the government will pay for passage of any immigrant and will give the immigrant money, land, or other goods to help him to settled.

1 No special procedure or visa, come in under the same system of regulation as everyone else; labor recruitment prohibited.

2 Small set of visas for special groups of workers (i.e. agricultural workers); trigger to reduce numbers based on employment data; employers are not allowed to pay for moving expenses; many restrictions including no unemployed natives in the industry.

3 Moderate number of visas for all groups or many groups obtain visas; employers allowed to pay for moving expenses; some procedures for recruiting workers.

4 Few or no restrictions on visas for any type of worker, employers are allowed to pay moving expenses; few restrictions or procedures for obtaining work visas.

5 Government program to recruit workers or settlers, government pays for the workers' transportation cost and helps pay for firms or government officials to recruit workers.

Work prohibitions: How many occupations can the immigrant work in? Are there requirements to have a certain number of native workers in an occupation/ firm or that foreign workers can only make up a certain percentage of workers? How many occupations do the rules cover? All? Just certain industries? Are there racially based policies? A score of 1 means that immigrants are not allowed to work in any industry. This is not the case for any of the states in this sample. A score of 5 means that there are no restrictions or in modern times, that the only restrictions are in highly sensitive national security positions.

1 Immigrants completely blocked from the labor market.

2 Immigrants restricted from many occupations; less than 30% of the workers in a given occupation/ firm can be immigrants (covering most or all of occupations).

3 Immigrants restricted from some occupations; 30-50% of workers in given occupation/ firm can be immigrants (covers some occupations).

4 Immigrants cannot hold public sector positions; 50% or more of the workers in a given occupation/ firm can be immigrants (covers some occupations).

5 Immigrants can hold any position (except for highly sensitive national security positions); no restrictions on the number of immigrant workers in a given occupation/ firm.

Family: Do family members get special treatment? Can they immigrate more easily than others? Are there racial or skill distinctions? A score of 1 indicates that no family members are given special treatment and a score of 5 indicates that many family members are given special treatment. Most states fall somewhere between a 2 - special treatment for wives and

minor children only and a 4 - wives and minor children and sometimes parents can enter without difficulty and all other relatives can be sponsored with some occupational or skill requirements. One issue with family migration is that states did not seem to consider it a necessary policy to have when there were few restrictions by nationality or skill. Family reunification policies only came into being once other restrictions were put in place. Given that the states have no policy on family migration during these times, these years are scored as a 1.

- 1 No special provisions for family reunification; family members must enter under the same procedures as others.
- 2 Only wives and minor children of citizens or legal permanent residents can be sponsored, but are free from other controls.
- 3 Increased number of relatives can be sponsored (e.g. adult children or dependent parents) but only by citizens and/ or relatives (except minor children and wives) need to possess same characteristics as non-family immigration (i.e. if there is a literacy test, relatives must pass the test); relative in the country has to pay bond or otherwise be responsible.
- 4 Many categories of relatives can be sponsored by citizens or residents (e.g. siblings, parents not dependent on migrant) but still must possess same characteristics as non-family immigrants (except minor children and wives); relative in the country has to be responsible for immigrant.
- 5 Many categories of relatives can be sponsored by citizens or residents and they do not need to possess the characteristics of non-family immigrants (exemption from literacy exams, etc.); no bond required or responsibility for relative in the country.

Family Provisions: Coded 0 before first mention of special provisions for families; 1 after.

Refugee: Does the state have a resettlement policy or does it just resettle refugees on an ad hoc basis? How selective is their refugee policy? Do they let in many refugees?

Are refugees only defined as those who meet the 1951 Convention or 1967 Protocol or is there are more expansive definition? Refugee policy is coded as a 1 if the country has no special policy and a 5 if the country is willing to resettle large numbers of refugees without taking into consideration the refugees' qualifications. This last criteria is to distinguish the more generous refugee policies of the current day with those after World War II when most receiving countries placed occupational restrictions on refugees, selecting for higher skilled migrants. Ad hoc refugee programs for one group during the crises are coded as relaxing refugee restrictions and the magnitude of the change is based on the number of refugees the state was willing to allow in. The change in coding only lasts as long as the refugee program was in place; for example, when New Zealand took in Ugandan refugees in 1973, but no other years, the increase in the refugee score is only calculated for 1973.

- 1 Almost no refugees allowed in; those that are allowed in must follow normal immigration procedures.
- 2 Some refugees allowed in; special refugee visas but refugees chosen by some sort of preference or must be able to pass tests that non-refugee immigrants take; few reasons for being a refugee or ad hoc policy.
- 3 Special refugee visa, preference system but not overly burdensome; moderate number of refugees allowed in; must follow some of the requirements that a non-refugee immigrant would have to pass; the UN definition of a refugee is followed.
- 4 Large number of refugees allowed in; no preference system or very weak system; easy to obtain refugee visa; exemption from requirements of non-refugee immigrant; at least the UN definition of a refugee is followed.
- 5 Large number of refugees; no preference system or requirements; very easy to obtain refugee visa; many categories of refugees included not just the UN definition.

Refugee Provisions: Coded 0 before first mention of refugee; 1 after.

Asylum: How easy is it to gain asylum? What rights do asylum seekers and asylees have? Are they kept in detention centers? Are they repatriated? Is there only one asylum status or is there temporary protected status as well? What are the procedures and are there legal safeguards?

- 1 No asylum.
- 2 Extremely difficult process; asylum granted only in a few cases; little ability to work or access to welfare state while awaiting determination; little recourse if not granted asylum; no temporary protected status; limited access for political refugees.
- 3 Difficult process; asylum granted for more cases; some access to the welfare state or labor market, more recourse including ability to access courts if denied; some temporary protected status allowed.
- 4 Fairly easy process; asylum granted to many groups; access to labor market and welfare system; access to courts and other procedures if denied; temporary protected status given to many groups.
- 5 Easy process; asylum granted for most cases; access to labor markets and welfare state; constitutionally protected procedure; no need for temporary protected status because almost everyone gets asylum.

Asylum Provisions: Coded 0 before first mention of asylum; 1 after.

Citizenship: How easy is it to obtain citizenship? What determines citizenship for children born in the country (jus sanguinis, jus soli, double jus soli)? Are there racial discriminations in citizenship? How easy is it for the government to denaturalize citizens? A score of 1 denotes states where citizenship is only given through birth through one parent (usually the father). A score of 5 denotes jus soli citizenship (citizenship given to all children born in the state) and an easy naturalization process. Racial discrimination in citizenship policies leads to a lower score as well.

- 1 Only by birth from a native father or mother.
- 2 Only by birth through either native parent and/or grandparent.
- 3 Very difficult process to obtain citizenship (language requirements, difficult test) and/or many years to citizenship (more than 10 years) and/or children receive citizenship through either parent or grandparent.
- 4 Moderately difficult process (relatively easy language requirements and/or an easy test) and/or moderate time to citizenship (more than 5 but less than ten years) and/or children born in state automatically get citizenship.
- 5 Fairly easy process (e.g. no language requirements) and short time to citizenship (5 or less years) and children born in state automatically get citizenship.

Immigrant Rights: What rights do immigrants have once in the state? Are there racial/national origin discriminations? Does the government try to integrate immigrants or does it just expect them to assimilate? How easy is it to get permanent residency? A score of 1 indicates few legal rights: immigrants had to be registered; they had to go through invasive health checks; they do not have the right to marry nationals; they could only live in specific locations; they could only work for specific employers; they have no access to the welfare state; they cannot own land; they are discriminated against and they cannot gain permanent residency. In states coded as 1, immigrants can basically only work the job in which they were hired for and cannot leave the housing provided for them by their employer. A score of 5 indicates parity to citizens: complete access to the welfare state; voting rights; no restrictions in where they can live or work; no restrictions in property rights and a robust anti-discrimination program.

- 1 Almost no legal rights; immigrants must leave state if they leave their job; cannot own property; cannot access the welfare state; they have to register, no freedom of religion, no permanent residency, etc.

- 2 Some rights but land ownership and ownership of companies restricted; limited access to the welfare state.
- 3 Ability to change jobs freely, some ownership of real property or companies; some access to the welfare state, some racial discrimination in laws.
- 4 Access to most welfare policies; few restrictions on ownership of property or firms.
- 5 Total access to welfare state, voting rights without citizenship, no restrictions in property ownership, integration policies, no racial discrimination, few years to permanent residency.

Deportation: How easy is it to deport an immigrant? What safeguards exist? Does the state engage in mass expulsions or pay people to leave the country? A score of 1 denotes that there are many deportable offenses, including losing one's job and there are few administrative or judicial safeguards. A score of 5 is given if there are few deportable offenses (usually deportation is limited to criminals) and/ or clear judicial checks.

- 1 No appeals process; many deportable offenses, including losing one's job.
- 2 Administrative process with few checks; fewer deportable offenses.
- 3 More checks on the process and even fewer deportable offenses.
- 4 Judicial checks on process including going to the highest court in the land and/or very few deportable offenses.
- 5 Almost no deportable offenses (conviction for an criminal offense, but not for an immigration offense) and clear judicial checks.

Enforcement: How strongly does the state enforce its borders? Are there employer sanctions, fines or prison time for illegal immigrants? Are there amnesties? During an amnesty are immigrants allowed to stay or just leave without paying a fine? A score of 1 denotes a

high spending country, with severe employer sanctions, sanctions on those who are in the country legally including fines and prison time, bonds to ensure that immigrants leave and identification papers that are hard to forge. A score of 5 denotes no enforcement beyond basic police enforcement.

- 1 High spending, employer raids or hard to forge national work id's, strong employer sanctions, bonds placed by employers to ensure that migrants go home, large number of enforcement officials.
- 2 Slightly less spending, fewer raids or easier to forge national work id, border enforcement is strong but not impossible to over come.
- 3 Even less money, no raids, easy to forge id's, some border enforcement.
- 4 Very little enforcement, screening at points of entry, little enforcement on employers.
- 5 Basically no enforcement.

Combining the data into a single index

The goal of a state's immigration policy is to attract a certain number of immigrants. While there is no consensus on how these different dimensions affect the flow of migrants, it is clear that not all dimensions affect migration equally.⁴ To combine these different policies into a single measure, I use principal components analysis. The analysis reveals that these dimensions combine to create two different factors: immigration policy and rights of immigrants.⁵ Table B3 shows the eigenvalues over the different factors.

The first factor, immigration policy, places more weight on nationality, skill, recruitment, quotas, enforcement and deportation policies than the second, rights of immigrants, which

⁴Leblang, Fitzgerald and Teets (2009) has examined how policies attract immigrants, but only used citizenship policy and a simple coding of immigration policy.

⁵There are four eigenvalues greater than 1; the other two are 1.14 and 1.05 and neither explain much variation.

Table B3: Factor Analysis

Factor	Eigenvalue	Difference	Proportion	Cumulative
Factor 1	3.65969	1.43823	0.3050	0.3050
Factor 2	2.22146	1.08594	0.1851	0.4901
Factor 3	1.13553	0.08545	0.0946	0.5847
Factor 4	1.05007	0.07847	0.0875	0.6722
Factor 5	0.97160	0.31016	0.0810	0.7532
Factor 6	0.66145	0.10612	0.0551	0.8083
Factor 7	0.55532	0.07995	0.0463	0.8546
Factor 8	0.47537	0.06063	0.0396	0.8942
Factor 9	0.41474	0.02093	0.0346	0.9288
Factor 10	0.39381	0.15813	0.0328	0.9616
Factor 11	0.23567	0.01039	0.0196	0.9812
Factor 12	0.22528		0.0188	1.0000

LR test: $\chi^2(66) = 1.3e + 04$ Prob > $\chi^2 = 0.0000$

places more weight on family reunification, refugee, asylee, citizenship, rights and work prohibition policies; hence, the names for the two factors (Table B4).⁶

Table B4: Factor Loadings

Variable	Factor Loading	Factor Loading	Uniqueness
	Immigration Policy	Rights of Immigrants	
Nationality	0.3871	0.1452	0.8291
Skill	0.7439	-0.0363	0.4453
Quota	0.4278	-0.4310	0.6313
Recruitment	0.5485	0.0713	0.6941
Work Prohibitions	0.4266	0.5465	0.5194
Family Reunification	-0.6910	0.4364	0.3320
Refugees	-0.4837	0.6174	0.3848
Asylum	-0.4527	0.4399	0.6015
Citizenship	0.2429	0.6050	0.5750
Other rights	0.4571	0.6359	0.3867
Deportation	0.7411	0.4097	0.2830
Enforcement	0.7465	-0.0789	0.4366

Another coding decision is how to treat refugee, asylum and family reunification policy before these policies were in place. In the 19th century, many states had relatively open

⁶The first factor correlates highly (at 0.95) with a standardized average of nationality, skill, quota, recruitment, work prohibitions, deportation and enforcement.

immigration policies and so had little need for a separate policy for refugees, asylum seekers or family members. In the coding of immigration policy in this paper, refugees, asylees and family policies were coded as a 1 until there was a policy on these issues in place. As a robustness check, I coded these policies as a 5 for years with no policy and as a 1 once there was another policy in place that would exclude a refugee, asylum seeker, or family reunification immigrant (e.g. provision against public charges or other wealth criteria). This coding produced just one factor, which correlates with the coding of immigration policy at 0.9.

Finally, to ensure the validity of the coding, the data for eight countries were recoded by a second coder; the two codings correlate at 0.9.

Sources

Several primary and secondary sources were used to compile the data on the laws and are listed below by country.

Argentina

Adelman (1994), Albarracín (2003), Avni (1991), Baily (1969), Barnhart (1962), Bastos de Ávila (1964), Castro (1971), de la Torre and Mendoza (2007), Engerman and Sokoloff (2008), Fields (1932), Fischel de Andrade (1998), Foerster (1919), Germani (1970), Government of Argentina (1869, 1978, 1981, 1994, 2004), Gravil (1985), Hines (1999, 2010), Iza (1994), Jefferson (1926), La Cava (1999), Maurette (1937*a, b*), Migration (1961*a*, 1962), Migration Dialogue (1994-2011), Misuriello (1993), Morner and Sims (1985), Moya (1998), Newton (1982), Plender (1972), Randall (1977), Sanchez-Albornoz (1974), Sanchez-Alonso (2000), Scobie (1971), Silva (1998), Solberg (1970), Solberg, McNeill and Adams (1978), Tigner (1981), UNHCR (2009), Velez (2010), Villar (1984)

Australia

Blainey (1984), Borrie (1994), Carrothers (1966), Clarke (1990), de Lepervanche, Wheelwright and Buckley (1975), Department of Immigration, Local Government and Ethnic Affairs (1988), Freeman and Jupp (1992), Gibney and Hansen (2005), Government of Australia (2007), Hatton (2004), Hawkins (1991), Hayden (1971), Jupp (2002), Kelley (1965), King (1993), Kubát, Merhländer and Gehmacher (1979), Lack and Templeton (1995), Lynch and Simon (2003), Madgwick (1969), Mauldon and Williams (1990), Migration Dialogue (1994-2011), Mills (1930), Ongley and Pearson (1995), Plender (1972), Smith (1981), Tsuchida (1998), Winkelmann (2000), Zolberg (2006)

Brazil

Amaral and Fusco (2005), Baily (1969), Barnhart (1962), Bastos de Ávila (1954, 1964), Beat-tie Jr (1983), Brody (2002), Browne (1972), Dean (1971), Engerman and Sokoloff (2008), Fausto (1999), Fields (1932), Fischel de Andrade (2011), Foerster (1919), Government of Brazil (1980), Hall (1969), Hastings (1969), Holloway (1978, 1980), Jubilut (2006), Jubilut and de Oliveira Selmi Apolinário (2008), Klein (1991), La Cava (1999), Lesser (1999), Library of Congress Law Library (2006), Luebke (1987), Marshall (2005), Maurette (1937*a, b*), Meade (2009), Migration (1961*c*), Migration Dialogue (1994-2011), Morner and Sims (1985), Nogueira and Marques (2008), OECD (2009), Pescatello (1970), Plender (1972), Randall (1977), Rios-Neto (2005), Sanchez-Alonso (2000), Smith and Marchant (1951), Smith (1972), Tigner (1981), Topik (1987), Tsuchida (1998), Vainer and Brito (2001), Young (1974)

Canada

Bhatti (2007), Borrie (1994), Boyd and Vickers (2000), Carrothers (1966), Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2006), Corbett (1957), Gibney and Hansen (2005), Government of Canada (1976), Green, Hatton and Williamson (1994), Hastings (1969), Hatton (2004),

Hawkins (1972, 1991), Kelley and Trebilcock (1998), King (1993), Kubát, Merhländer and Gehmacher (1979), Madgwick (1969), Migration Dialogue (1994-2011), Mills (1930), Ongley and Pearson (1995), Plender (1972), Smith (1981), Timlin (1960), Troper (1972), Tsuchida (1998), Zolberg (2006)

France

Baldwin-Edwards and Schain (1994), Cross (1983), Einaudi (2007), Foerster (1919), Freeman (1989), Geddes (2003), Hammar (1985), Horowitz and Noiriél (1992), King (1993), Libet (1995), Lynch and Simon (2003), Migration Dialogue (1994-2011), Papademetriou and Hamilton (1996), Plender (1972), Sicsic, Hatton and Williamson (1994), Tsuchida (1998), Weil (2001), Zolberg (2006)

Germany

Bade (1987), Baldwin-Edwards and Schain (1994), Booth (1992), Foerster (1919), Geddes (2003), Government of Germany (2011), Hammar (1985), Herbert (1990), Hoffmann-Nowotny, McNeill and Adams (1978), Iguchi (1998), Joppke and Rosenhek (2003), King (1993), Lynch and Simon (2003), Marshall (2000), Migration Dialogue (1994-2011), Plender (1972), Rogers (1985), Tranaes and Zimmermann (2004), Weil (2001), Zolberg (2006)

Hong Kong

Alabaster, de Mello and Koenig (1915), Appleyard (1988), Athukorala (1993, 2006), Chen (1987), Chui (2002), Government of Hong Kong (1853, 1895, 1902, 1914, 1915, 2008*a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h*), , Ku (2004), Migration Dialogue (1994-2011), Ng and Lee (1998), Peterson (2008), PriceWaterhouseCoopers (2003), Settlage (1997), Skeldon (1994), Ullah (2010), Wu and Inglis (1992)

Japan

Athukorala (1993), Brody (2002), Chu and Lin (2001), Chung (2010), Foote (1993), Friman (2002), Gurowitz (2004), Hanami, Weiner and Hanami (1998), Iguchi (1998), Junichi (2006), Kajita, Weiner and Hanami (1998), Komai (2000), Kondo (2002), Koshiro (1998), Kuwahara (1998), Library of Congress Law Library (2006), Mackey and Anderson (2009), Mendel Jr (1964), Migration Dialogue (1994-2011), Morita and Sassen (1994), Morris-Suzuki (2010), Nagayama (1992, 1996), Nasu (2008), Plender (1972), Suzuki (2007), Takeda (1998), Tsuchida (1998), Watanabe (1998), Weiner and Hanami (1998), Weiner (2000), Yamashita (2008), Yamawaki (2000), Zha (2002)

Kuwait

Addleton (1992), Al-ramadhan (1995), Al-Salem, Farah and Al-Salem (1980), Alessa (1981), Bitar (2008), BureÅi (2008), Chalcraft (2010), Choucri (1977, 1986), Choucri and Brecke (1983), Dib (1988), Feiler (1991), Human Rights Watch (2010), Kapiszewski (2001, 2006), Koli and Al-Omair (1988), Longva (1997), Migration Dialogue (1994-2011), Russell and Al-Ramadhan (1994), Russell (1989), Seccombe and Lawless (1987), Visit Kuwait (2011), Weiner (1982), Winckler (1997)

Netherlands

Baldwin-Edwards and Schain (1994), Caestecker and Moore (2010, 2011), Colijn and Smit (1994), Entzinger (1994*a, b*), Ersanilli (2007), Fields (1932), Fullerton (1988), Geddes (2003), Gieler (2003), de Groot (2001), Hammar (1985), King (1993), Kubát, Merhländer and Gehmacher (1979), Lucassen (2002*a, b*, 2003), Lucassen and Penninx (1997), Migration Dialogue (1994-2011), Miller (1989), Moore (1986), Plender (1972), Prak (1997), Rath (2009), Reisner (1964), Roodenburg, Euwals and Rele (2003), Scholten and Minderhoud (2008), Schrover (2009), Tom (2006), van Amersfoort and Penninx (1994), van Eijl (2000, 2008),

van Ours and Veenman (2005), van Selm (2000), Vogel (2003), Vos (1994), Weil (2001), Zorlu and Hartog (2002)

New Zealand

Beaglehole (1990, 2009), Bedford (2004, 2005), Bedford, Ho and Lidgard (2000), Binzegger (1980), Borrie (1991, 1994), Brawley (1993), Carrothers (1966), Farmer (1996, 1997), Francis (2006), Gallienne (1991), Gibney and Hansen (2005). Government of New Zealand (182, 2002, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010*a, b, c, d, e, f, g*), Hatton (2004), Hawke (1985), Henry (2008), Kubát, Merhländer and Gehmacher (1979), Lovelock and Leopold (2008), Madgwick (1969), McKinnon (1996), Migration Dialogue (1994-2011), Mills (1930), O'Connor (1968), Ongley and Pearson (1995), Plender (1972), Price (1974), Roche (2005), Shroff (1989), Smith and Edmonston (1997), Smith (1981), Tagupa (1994), Templeton (2008), Wearing (1990, 1993), Winkelmann (1999, 2000), Zolberg (2006)

Saudi Arabia

Addleton (1992), Birks and Sinclair (1979), BureÅi (2008), Choucri (1986), Choucri and Brecke (1983), Dib (1988), Feiler (1991), Halliday (1977), Kanovsky (1984), Kapiszewski (2001, 2006), Looney (1985, 1988), Migration Dialogue (1994-2011), Ministerial Agency of Civil Affairs (1954), Richards and Martin (1983), Seccombe and Lawless (1986, 1987), Silvey (2008), Weiner (1982), Winckler (1997), Woodward (1988)

Singapore

Athukorala (1993, 2006), Fong and Lim (1982), Gallienne (1991), Government of Singapore (2011), Hui (1997, 1998), Kaur (2006), Migration Dialogue (1994-2011), Pang (1992), Plender (1972), Stahl (1986), Tat (1992), Wong (1996, 1997), Yamashita (2008), Yeoh (2004)

South Africa

Adepoju (1988), Anderson (1993), Borrie (1994), Bouillon (1998), Bradlow (1978), Breytenbach (1979), Brown (1987), Carrothers (1966), Christopher (1971), Crush (1997, 2000, 2011), Crush, Jeeves and Yudelman (1991), Crush and Mather (2000), Crush and McDonald (2002), Crush and Tshitereke (2001), Duly (1968), Feinstein (2005), Fields (1932), Foster (2003), Gibney and Hansen (2005), Government of South Africa (1949, 1991, 1995, 2005), Hatterley (1950), James (1992), Jeeves (1985), Jeeves and Crush (1997), Klausen (2002), Klotz (1997, 2000), Lincoln and Mararike (2000), Madgwick (1969), Martens (2006), Mather and Mathebula (2000), McDonald (1998), Migration (1961*b*), Migration Dialogue (1994-2011), Mills (1930), Morris and Bouillon (2001), Neumark (1957), O'Malley (2011), Osborn (1964), Peberdy (2001, 2009), Plender (1972), Prothero (1974), Ross (1975), Smith (1981), South African History Online.org (2011), Ulicki and Crush (2000), Vahed (2002), Wentzel (2003), Wentzel and Tlabela (2006), Whitman (2000), Wilson (1972*a, b*, 1976), Zolberg (2006)

South Korea

Adams (2007), Athukorala (2006), Choi (2001), GAO (2010), Hulse (2010), Kang (1996), Kim (2005), Mackey and Anderson (2009), Migration Dialogue (1994-2011), Park (1994, 1998, 2010*a, b*), Refugee Reveiw Tribunal of Australia (2008), Skeldon (2006), UNHCR (2010, 2011), Yamashita (2008)

Switzerland

Afonso (2005), Argast (2009), Baldwin-Edwards and Schain (1994), Bergier et al. (2002), B'öhning (1984), B'öhning and Maillat (1974), Fields (1932), Fischer, Nicolet and Sciarini (2002), Fl'uckiger (1998), Frey (1987), Hammar (1985), Hoffmann-Nowotny (1995), Holmes (1988), Holzer, Schneider and Widmer (2000), King (1993), Kubát, Merhländer and Gehmacher (1979), Library of Congress Law Library (2006), Mayer (1965), Migration Dia-

logue (1994-2011), Miller (1989), Plender (1972), Riaño and Wastl-Walter (2006), Sprenger (1999), Straubhaar and Fischer (1994), Studer (2001), Vagts (1997), Vuilleumier (1992), Wanner, Efonayi and Fibbi (2009), Whelpley (1905)

Taiwan

Athukorala (1993, 2006), Chang (2002), Earth Times (2009), Government of the Republic of China (1990, 1992, 2002, 2003, 2006, 2007, 2009*a, b*, 2010*a, b, c*), Hsia (2004), Hsieh and Kuo (2009), Kanjanapan (1992), Lee and Wang (1996), Lee (1995), Migration Dialogue (1994-2011), Selya (1992), Settlege (1997), Skeldon (2006), Tsay and Lin (2001)

United Kingdom

Baldwin-Edwards and Schain (1994), Booth (1992), Castro (1999), Clarke (1990), Department of Immigration, Local Government and Ethnic Affairs (1988), Geddes (2003), Hammar (1985), Kay and Miles (1988), Kaye and Charlton (1990), Kelley and Trebilcock (1998), King (1993), Kubát, Merhländer and Gehmacher (1979), Lynch and Simon (2003), Migration Dialogue (1994-2011), Mills (1930), Papademetriou and Hamilton (1996), Plender (1972), Schain (2008), Smith (1981), Spencer (1997), Walvin (1984), Weil (2001), Zolberg, McNeill and Adams (1978), Zolberg (2006)

United States

Congressional Quarterly (2006*a, b*), Cornelius, Weiner and Hanami (1998), Freeman and Jupp (1992), Garcia, Lee and Tatelman (2005), Gemery, Hatton and Williamson (1994), Gibney and Hansen (2005), Hatton (2004), Hutchinson (1981), Jenks (1993), King (1993), Migration Dialogue (1994-2011), Neuman (1993), Schuck (1998), Takenaka (2004), Teitelbaum (1998), Timmer and Williamson (1998), Tsuchida (1998), U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (2009), Weiner and Hanami (1998), Zolberg (2006)

References

- Adams, B. 2007. "Korea needs to open its doors."
URL: <http://www.hrw.org/en/news/2007/08/20/korea-needs-open-its-doors>
- Addleton, J. S. 1992. *Undermining the centre: The Gulf migration and Pakistan*. Oxford University Press, Karachi.
- Adelman, J. 1994. *Frontier development: Land, labour, and capital on the wheatlands of Argentina and Canada, 1890-1914*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Adepoju, A. 1988. International migration in Africa south of the Sahara. In *International migration today*. Vol. 1 Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization and the University of Western Australia pp. 17–88.
- Afonso, A. 2005. "When the Export of Social Problems Is No Longer Possible: Immigration Policies and Unemployment in Switzerland." *Social Policy & Administration* 39(6):653–668.
- Al-ramadhan, M. A. 1995. "New population policy in Kuwait: the quest for a balance in the population composition." *Population bulletin of ESCWA* (43):29.
- Al-Salem, F., T. Farah and M. Al-Salem. 1980. "Alienation and Expatriate Labor in Kuwait." *Journal of South Asian and Middle Eastern Studies* 4(1):3–37.
- Alabaster, C. G., A. de Mello and E. Koenig. 1915. "Eastern Colonies." *Journal of the Society of Comparative Legislation* 15:14–26.
- Albarracín, J. 2003. Explaining Immigration Policies in Argentina during the 1990s: European Immigration, 'a Marriage in Sickness and in Health'. In *XXIV Congreso Internacional de LASA*. LASA.
- Alessa, S. Y. 1981. *The manpower problem in Kuwait*. London: Kegan Paul International.

- Amaral, E. F. and W. Fusco. 2005. "Shaping Brazil: The Role of International Migration." Migration Policy Institute.
- Anderson, B. J. 1993. "The Restoration of the South African Citizenship Act: An Exercise in Statutory Obfuscation." *Conn. J. Int'l L.* 9:295.
- Appleyard, R. T. 1988. "International migration in Asia and the Pacific." *International Migration Today* 1:89–167.
- Argast, R. 2009. "An unholy alliance: Swiss citizenship between local legal tradition, federal laissez-faire, and ethno-national rejection of foreigners 1848-1933." *European Review of History: Revue europeenne d histoire* 16(4):503–521.
- Athukorala, P. 1993. "International Labour Migration in the Asian Pacific Region: patterns, policies and economic implications." *Asian Pacific Economic Literature* 7(2):28–57.
- Athukorala, P. 2006. "International Labour Migration in East Asia: trends, patterns and policy issues." *Asian Pacific Economic Literature* 20(1):18–39.
- Avni, H. 1991. *Argentina & The Jews*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press.
- Bade, K. J. 1987. Labour, Migration, and the State: Germany from the Late 19th Century to the Onset of the Great Depression. In *Population, Labour, and Migration in 19th- and 20th- Century Germany*. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc. pp. 59–86.
- Baily, S. L. 1969. "The Italians and the Development of Organized Labor in Argentina, Brazil, and the United States 1880-1914." *Journal of Social History* 3(2):123–134.
- Baldwin-Edwards, M. and M. Schain. 1994. *The politics of immigration in Western Europe*. Portland, OR: Frank Cass.
- Barnhart, E. N. 1962. "Citizenship and Political Tests in Latin American Republics in World War II." *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 42(3):297–332.

- Bastos de Ávila, F. 1954. *Economic impacts of immigration; The Brazilian immigration problem*. The Hague: M. Nijhoff.
- Bastos de Ávila, F. 1964. *Immigration in Latin America*. Washington, DC: OAS.
- Beaglehole, A. 1990. *A Small Price to Pay: Refugees from Hitler in New Zealand, 1936-46*. Wellington: Allen & Unwin.
- Beaglehole, A. 2009. Looking back and glancing sideways: refugee policy and multicultural nation-building in New Zealand. In *Does History Matter?: Making and Debating Citizenship, Immigration and Refugee Policy in Australia and New Zealand*. Canberra: Australia National University EPress p. 105.
- Beattie Jr, C. S. 1983. "The 1980 Lei do Estrangeiro: The Return of Traditional Defenses against Expulsion in Brazilian Immigration Law." *Tex. Int'l LJ* 18:151.
- Bedford, R. 2004. "The quiet revolution: Transformations in migration policies, flows and outcomes, 1999-2004." *New Zealand Geographer* 60(2):58-62.
- Bedford, R. 2005. International Migration and Globalization: the transformation of New Zealand's migration system since the mid-1980s. In *Sovereignty under siege? Globalisation and New Zealand*. 2005 ed. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Bedford, R., E. Ho and J. Lidgard. 2000. "International migration in New Zealand: Context, components and policy issues." *Population Studies Centre Discussion Paper* (37).
- Bergier, J. F., W. Bartoszewski, S. Friedlander, H. James, H. B. Junz, G. Kreis, S. Milton, J. Picard, J. Tanner, D. Thuarer and J. Voyame. 2002. "Switzerland, National Socialism, and the Second World War: Final Report." Pendo Verlag GmbH.
- Bhatti, F.M. 2007. *East Indian Immigration Into Canada: 1905-1973*. Lahore, Pakistan: Pakistan Study Centre, University of Punjab.

- Binzegger, A. 1980. *New Zealand's Policy on Refugees*. New Zealand Institute of International Affairs.
- Birks, J. S. and C. A. Sinclair. 1979. *International migration project, country case study: Saudi Arabia*. Durham: University of Durham.
- Bitar, M. 2008. "Unprotected Among Brothers: Palestinians in the Arab World." RSC Working Paper No. 44.
- Blainey, G. 1984. *All for Australia*. North Ryde: Methuen Haynes.
- B'ohning, W. R. 1984. *Studies in international labor migration*. London: Macmillan.
- B'ohning, W. R. and D. Maillat. 1974. *The effects of the employment of foreign workers*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Booth, H. 1992. *The migration process in Britain and West Germany: Two demographic studies of migrant populations*. Research in ethnic relations series Aldershot, Hants, England: Avebury.
- Borrie, W. D. 1991. *Immigration to New Zealand, 1854-1938*. Canberra: Demography Program, Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University.
- Borrie, W. D. 1994. *The European peopling of Australasia: A demographic history, 1788-1988*. Canberra: Australian National University,.
- Bouillon, A. 1998. "'New' African Immigration to South Africa." The Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society, Cape Town.
- Boyd, M. and M. Vickers. 2000. "100 Years of Immigration in Canada." *Canadian Social Trends* pp. 2-12.
- Bradlow, E. 1978. *Immigration into the Union, 1910-1948: policies and attitudes* PhD thesis University of Cape Town, History. PhD.

- Brawley, S. 1993. "No 'White Policy' in NZ: Fact and Fiction in New Zealand's Asian Immigration Record, 1946-1978." *New Zealand Journal of History* 27(1):85-100.
- Breytenbach, W. J. 1979. *Migratory Labour Arrangements in Southern Africa*. Revised ed. Pretoria, South Africa: Africa Institute of South Africa.
- Brody, B. 2002. *Opening the door: Immigration, ethnicity, and globalization in Japan*. New York: Routledge.
- Brown, B. B. 1987. "Facing the 'Black Peril': The politics of population control in South Africa." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 13(2):256-273.
- Browne, G. P. 1972. "Government immigration policy in imperial Brazil, 1822-1870."
- BureÅi, J. 2008. *Main characteristic and development trends of migration in the Arab world*. Prague: Institute of International Relations.
- Caestecker, F. and B. Moore. 2010. "The legal construction of policy towards aliens prior to 1933." *Refugees from Nazi Germany and the Liberal European States* p. 193.
- Caestecker, F. and B. Moore. 2011. "Female domestic servants as desirable refugees: Gender, labour needs and immigration policy in Belgium, The Netherlands and Great Britain." *European History Quarterly* 41(2):213.
- Carrothers, W. A. 1966. *Emigration from the British Isles, with special reference to the development of the overseas dominions*. New York: A.M. Kelley.
- Castro, D. S. 1971. *The development of Argentine immigration policy, 1852-1914*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Castro, M. J. 1999. Toward a new nativism? The immigration debate in the United States and its implications for Latin America and the Caribbean. In *Free Markets, Open Societies, Closed Borders? Trends in International Migration and Immigration Policy in the Americas*. Miami: North-South Center Press.

- Chalcraft, J. 2010. "Monarchy, migration and hegemony in the Arabian Peninsula." Kuwait Programme on Development, Governance and Globalisation in the Gulf States.
- Chang, H. F. 2002. "Liberal Ideals and Political Feasibility: Guest-Worker Programs as Second-Best Policies." *Immigr. & Nat'lity L. Rev.* 23:339.
- Chen, A. H.Y. 1987. "The Development of Immigration Law and Policy: The Hong Kong Experience." *McGill LJ* 33:631.
- Choi, J. H. 2001. "International Migration, Human Resource Development and Migration Policy in Korea." *Asia and Pacific Migration Journal* 10(3-4):463–483.
- Choucri, N. 1977. "The new migration in the Middle East: A problem for whom?" *International Migration Review* 11(4):421–443.
- Choucri, N. 1986. "Asians in the Arab world: labor migration and public policy." *Middle Eastern Studies* 22(2):252–273.
- Choucri, N. and P. Brecke. 1983. *Migration in the Middle East: transformations, policies, and processes*. Cambridge, MA: Technology Adaption Program, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Christopher, A. J. 1971. "Colonial Land Policy in Natal." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 61(3):560–575.
- Chu, Y. and J. Lin. 2001. "Political development in 20th-century Taiwan: State-building, regime transformation and the construction of national identity." *The China Quarterly* 165(-1):102–129.
- Chui, E. 2002. "Housing and Welfare Services in Hong Kong for New Immigrants from China: Inclusion or Exclusion?" *Asia and Pacific Migration Journal* 11(2):221–245.
- Chung, E. A. 2010. *Immigration and citizenship in Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Citizenship and Immigration Canada. 2006. "Forging Our Legacy: Canadian Citizenship and Immigration, 1900-1977."
- URL:** <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/publications/legacy/chap-5.asp>
- Clarke, S. F. 1990. *Immigration of workers into Australia, Canada, Sweden and the United Kingdom*. Washington D.C.: American-British Law Division, Law Library of Congress.
- Colijn, I. and H. Smit. 1994. The Labour Market and Minorities in the Nineties. In *Immigrant ethnic minorities in the Dutch labour market: Analysis and policies*. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers pp. 135–148.
- Congressional Quarterly. 2006a. Immigration, 2001-2002 legislative chronology. In *Congress and the nation 2001-2004 (Vol. 11)*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Congressional Quarterly. 2006b. "War Supplemental Has Strings Attached." *CQ Almanac 2005*.
- Corbett, D. C. 1957. *Canada's immigration policy; A critique*. Toronto: Published under the auspices of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs by University of Toronto Press.
- Cornelius, W. A., M. Weiner and T. Hanami. 1998. Appearances and Realities: Controlling Illegal Immigration in the United States. In *Temporary Workers or Future Citizens? Japanese and U.S. Migration Policies*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd pp. 384–427.
- Cross, G. S. 1983. *Immigrant workers in industrial France: The making of a new laboring class*. Temple University Press.
- Crush, J. S. 1997. "Covert Operations: Clandestine Migration, Temporary Work, and Immigration Policy in South Africa." Southern African Migration Project.
- Crush, J. S. 2000. Introduction: Making Hay with Foreign Farmworkers. In *Borderline*

- farming: Foreign migrants in South African commercial agriculture*. Cape Town: IDASA pp. 1–13.
- Crush, J. S. 2011. “South Africa: Policy in the face of xenophobia.”
URL: <http://www.migrationinformation.org/Profiles/display.cfm?ID=689>
- Crush, J. S., A. Jeeves and D. Yudelman. 1991. *South Africa’s labor empire: a history of Black migrancy to the gold mines*. African modernization and development series Boulder: Westview Press.
- Crush, J. S. and C. Mather. 2000. *Borderline farming: Foreign migrants in South African commercial agriculture*. Cape Town: IDASA.
- Crush, J. S. and C. Tshitereke. 2001. “Contesting Migrancy: The Foreign Labor Debate in Post-1994 South Africa.” *Africa today* pp. 49–70.
- Crush, J. S. and D. A. McDonald. 2002. *Transnationalism and New African Immigration to South Africa*. Cape Town: The Southern African Migration Project (SAMP) and the Canadian Association for African Studies (CAAS).
- de Groot, G. R. 2001. Access to Citizenship for Aliens in the Netherlands. In *Citizenship in a Global World: Comparing Citizenship Rights for Aliens*. New York: Palgrave.
- de la Torre, A. and J. Mendoza. 2007. “A Comparative Analysis of Immigration Law in the US and Argentina.” *Am U. Modern Am.* 3:46–83.
- de Lepervanche, M., E.L. Wheelwright and K. Buckley. 1975. Australian Immigrants, 1788-1940: Desired and Unwanted. In *Essays in the Political Economy of Australian Capitalism*. Sydney: Australia and New Zealand Book Company pp. 72–104.
- Dean, W. 1971. “Latifundia and Land Policy in Nineteenth-Century Brazil.” *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 51(4):606–625.

- Department of Immigration, Local Government and Ethnic Affairs. 1988. *Australia and Immigration*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Dib, G. 1988. Laws governing migration in some Arab countries. In *International Migration Today*. Vol. 1 Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization and the University of Western Australia pp. 168–879.
- Duly, L. C. 1968. *British land policy at the Cape, 1795-1844: a study of administrative procedures in the Empire*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Earth Times. 2009. “Taiwan to give asylum to Chinese dissidents under amended law.” *Earth Times* .
URL: <http://www.earthtimes.org/articles/news/301639,taiwan-to-give-asylum-to-chinese-dissidents-under-amended-law.html>
- Einaudi, L. 2007. *Le politiche dell’immigrazione in Italia dall’Unità a oggi*. Roma-Bari: Laterza.
- Engerman, S. L and K. L Sokoloff. 2008. “Once upon a time in the Americas: land and immigration policies in the New World.” National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Entzinger, H. 1994a. Changing Policy Approaches and Scenarios for the Future. In *Immigrant ethnic minorities in the Dutch labour market: Analysis and policies*. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers pp. 149–166.
- Entzinger, H. 1994b. Shifting Paradigms: An Appraisal of Immigration in the Netherlands. In *European Migration in the Late Twentieth Century, Historical Patterns, Actual Trends and Social Implications*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited pp. 93–112.
- Ersanilli, E. 2007. “Focus-Migration: The Netherlands.”
URL: <http://focus-migration.hwwi.de/The-Netherlands.2644.0.html?L=1>

- Farmer, R. S.J. 1996. "Economic Deregulation and Changes in New Zealand's Immigration Policy: 1986 to 1991." *People and Place* 4(3).
- Farmer, R. S.J. 1997. "New Zealand's 'targeted' immigration policy, 1991 to 1996." *People and Place* 5(1).
- Fausto, B. 1999. *A concise history of Brazil*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Feiler, G. 1991. "Migration and recession: Arab labor mobility in the Middle East, 1982-89." *Population and Development Review* 17(1):134-155.
- Feinstein, C. H. 2005. *An economic history of South Africa: Conquest, discrimination and development*. Cambridge Univ Pr.
- Fields, H. 1932. "Closing Immigration Throughout the World." *Am. J. Int'l L.* 26:671.
- Fischel de Andrade, J. H. 1998. "Regional policy approaches and harmonization: A Latin American perspective." *International Journal of Refugee Law* 10(3):389.
- Fischel de Andrade, J. H. 2011. "Brazil and the International Refugee Organization (1946-1952)." *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 30(1):65.
- Fischer, A., S. Nicolet and P. Sciarini. 2002. "Europeanisation of a non-EU country: The case of Swiss immigration policy." *West European Politics* 25(4):143-170.
- Flückiger, Y. 1998. "The labour market in Switzerland: The end of a special case?" *International Journal of Manpower* 19(6):369-395.
- Foerster, R. F. 1919. *The Italian emigration of our times*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Fong, P. E and L. Lim. 1982. "Foreign labor and economic development in Singapore." *International Migration Review* 16(3):548-576.

- Foote, D. H. 1993. "Japan's Foreign Workers Policy: A View from the United States." *Geo. Immigr. LJ* 7:707.
- Foster, J. 2003. "'Land of Contrasts' or 'Home We Have Always Known'?: The SAR&H and the Imaginary Geography of White South African Nationhood, 1910-1930." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 29(3):657-680.
- Francis, A. 2006. "Anti-Alienism in New Zealand during the Great War: The von Zedlitz Affair, 1915." *Immigrants & Minorities* 24(3):251-276.
- Freeman, G. P. 1989. Immigrant labour and racial conflict: The role of the state. In *Migrants in modern France: Population mobility in the later nineteenth and twentieth centuries*. London: Unwin Hyman pp. 160-176.
- Freeman, G. P. and J. Jupp. 1992. *Nations of Immigrants: Australia, the United States, and International Migrants*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Frey, M. 1987. "Swiss asylum law: Recent changes." *Geo. Immigr. LJ* 2:439.
- Friman, H. R. 2002. Evading the Divine Wind Through the Side Door: The Transformation of Chinese Migration to Japan. In *Globalizing Chinese Migration: Trends in Europe and Asia*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company pp. 9-33.
- Fullerton, M. 1988. "Restricting the flow of asylum-seekers in Belgium, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, and the Netherlands: New challenges to the Geneva Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and the European Convention on Human Rights." *Va. J. Int'l L.* 29:33.
- Gallienne, R. 1991. *The whole thing was orchestrated: New Zealand's response to the Indo-Chinese refugees exodus, 1975 to 1985*. Vol. 2 University of Auckland, Centre for Asian Studies (Auckland).

- GAO. 2010. Humanitarian Assistance: Status of North Korean Refugee Resettlement and Asylum in the United States. Report to Congressional Requesters GAO-10-691 Government Accountability Office.
- Garcia, M. J., M. M. Lee and T. Tatelman. 2005. *Immigration: Analysis of the Major Provisions of H.R. 418, the REAL ID Act of 2005*. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service.
- Geddes, A. 2003. *The politics of migration and immigration in Europe*. Sage politics texts London: SAGE Publications.
- Gemery, H. A., T. J. Hatton and J. G. Williamson. 1994. Immigrants and Emigrants: International Migration and the US Labor Market in the Great Depression. In *Migration and the International Labor Market, 1850-1939*. London: Routledge pp. 175–199.
- Germani, G. 1970. Mass immigration and modernization in Argentina. In *Masses in Latin America*. New York: Oxford University Press pp. 289–330.
- Gibney, M. J. and R. Hansen. 2005. *Immigration and asylum from 1900 to the present*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- Gieler, W. 2003. *Handbuch der Ausländer-und Zuwanderungspolitik*. Münster: Lit-Verl.
- Government of Argentina. 1869. “Citizenship and Nationality [Argentina].”
- Government of Argentina. 1978. “Citizenship and Nationality [Argentina].”
- Government of Argentina. 1981. “Migration and Immigration Promotion [Argentina].”
- Government of Argentina. 1994. “Migration Regulations [Argentina].”
- Government of Argentina. 2004. “Citizenship [Argentina].”
- Government of Australia. 2007. “Citizenship Act 2007 (as amended up to Act No. 51 of 2010) [Australia].”

Government of Brazil. 1980. “Foreigners Law of 1980 (Brazil).”.

URL: <http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil/leis/L6815.htm>

Government of Canada. 1976. “Immigration Act, 1976-77 [Canada].”.

Government of Germany. 2011. “German Interior Ministry.”.

URL: www.zuwanderung.de

Government of Hong Kong. 1853. “The Aliens (Rights of Property) Ordinance, 1853 (Hong Kong).”.

Government of Hong Kong. 1895. “The Chinese Immigration Ordinance, 1895, of Hong Kong.”.

Government of Hong Kong. 1902. “Relating to the Naturalization fo Aliens of Hong Kong.”.

Government of Hong Kong. 1914. “Hong Kong Legislative Council Minutes, 20 August 1914.”.

Government of Hong Kong. 1915. “Hong Kong Legislative Council Minutes, 30 December 1915.”.

Government of Hong Kong. 2008*a*. “Frequently Asked Questions: New Amendments to the Rules for Capital Investment Entrant Scheme.”.

URL: http://www.immd.gov.hk/ehhtml/faq_cies.htm

Government of Hong Kong. 2008*b*. “Immigration Guidelines for Entry to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People’s Republic of China.”.

URL: http://www.immd.gov.hk/ehhtml/hkvisas_1.htmintro

Government of Hong Kong. 2008*c*. “Quality Migrant Admission Scheme: Entry of Dependents.”.

URL: http://www.immd.gov.hk/ehhtml/QMAS_12.htm

Government of Hong Kong. 2008*d*. “Quality Migrant Admission Scheme: General Points Test.”.

URL: http://www.immd.gov.hk/ehhtml/QMAS_8.htm

Government of Hong Kong. 2008*e*. “Quality Migrant Admission Scheme: Prerequisites.”.

URL: http://www.immd.gov.hk/ehhtml/QMAS_6.htm

Government of Hong Kong. 2008*f*. “Quality Migrant Admission Scheme: Scheme Objective.”.

URL: http://www.immd.gov.hk/ehhtml/QMAS_2.htm

Government of Hong Kong. 2008*g*. “Quality Migrant Admission Scheme: Scope of the Scheme.”.

URL: http://www.immd.gov.hk/ehhtml/QMAS_3.htm

Government of Hong Kong. 2008*h*. Visa Information for Non-Local Graduates. Technical report Hong Kong Visa Handbook Hong Kong: .

Government of New Zealand. 1982. “Citizenship (Western Samoa) Act 1982 [New Zealand].”.

Government of New Zealand. 2002. “Immigration Act 2002 [New Zealand].”.

Government of New Zealand. 2004. *Migration Trends 2003/2004*. Wellington: Department of Labour, Government of New Zealand.

Government of New Zealand. 2005. *Migration Trends 2004/2005*. Wellington: Department of Labour, Government of New Zealand.

Government of New Zealand. 2006. *Migration Trends 2005/2006*. Wellington: Department of Labour, Government of New Zealand.

Government of New Zealand. 2007. *Migration Trends 2006/2007*. Wellington: Department of Labour, Government of New Zealand.

- Government of New Zealand. 2008. *Migration Trends 2007/2008*. Wellington: Department of Labour, Government of New Zealand.
- Government of New Zealand. 2009. *Migration Trends 2008/2009*. Wellington: Department of Labour, Government of New Zealand.
- Government of New Zealand. 2010a. *Immigration Act 2009: Appeals*. Wellington: Department of Labour, Government of New Zealand.
- Government of New Zealand. 2010b. *Immigration Act 2009: Deportation*. Wellington: Department of Labour, Government of New Zealand.
- Government of New Zealand. 2010c. *Immigration Act 2009: Employer Obligations*. Wellington: Department of Labour, Government of New Zealand.
- Government of New Zealand. 2010d. *Immigration Act 2009: Refugee and Protection Status Determinations*. Wellington: Department of Labour, Government of New Zealand.
- Government of New Zealand. 2010e. *Immigration Act 2009: Sponsorship*. Wellington: Department of Labour, Government of New Zealand.
- Government of New Zealand. 2010f. *Immigration Act 2009: Summary of Key Changes*. Wellington: Department of Labour, Government of New Zealand.
- Government of New Zealand. 2010g. *Migration Trends 2009/2010*. Wellington: Department of Labour, Government of New Zealand.
- Government of Singapore. 2011. "ICA - Apply for Singapore Citizenship."
URL: <http://www.ica.gov.sg/page.aspx?pageid=132secid=130>
- Government of South Africa. 1949. "South African Citizenship Act, 1949 [South Africa]."
- Government of South Africa. 1991. "Aliens Control Act, 1991 [South Africa]."
- Government of South Africa. 1995. "South Africa Citizenship Act, 1995 [South Africa]."

Government of South Africa. 2005. “Immigration Regulations [South Africa].”.

Government of the Republic of China. 1990. “AIDS Prevention and Control Act [Republic of China].”.

URL: http://law.moj.gov.tw/eng/news/news_detail.aspx?id=2735k1 = *employment*

Government of the Republic of China. 1992. “Operation Directions for Foreign Professionals Applying for the Employment PASS Card [Republic of China].”.

Government of the Republic of China. 2002. “2002 Immigration Law [Republic of China].”.

Government of the Republic of China. 2003. “2003 Employment Services Law [Republic of China].”.

Government of the Republic of China. 2006. “2006 Nationality Law [Republic of China].”.

URL: http://law.moj.gov.tw/eng/news/news_detail.aspx?id=2390k1 = *nationality*

Government of the Republic of China. 2007. “2007 Immigration Act [Republic of China].”.

Government of the Republic of China. 2009a. “Amended Articles 6, 12 and 17 of the Regulations Governing Visiting, Residency and Permanent Residency of Aliens [Republic of China].”.

Government of the Republic of China. 2009b. “Review Criteria for the Cases Stated in Subparagraphs 13 and 15, Paragraph 1, Article 18 of the Immigration Act [Republic of China].”.

Government of the Republic of China. 2010a. “Alien Entry Prohibition Operation Directions [Republic of China].”.

Government of the Republic of China. 2010b. “Criteria Governing Cases of Subparagraph 13 and 15, Paragraph 1, Article 18 of the Immigration Act [Republic of China].”.

- Government of the Republic of China. 2010c. "Enforcement Rules of the Nationality Act [Republic of China]."
- Gravil, R. 1985. *The Anglo-Argentine connection, 1900-1939*. Dellplain Latin American studies, no. 16 Boulder: Westview Press.
- Green, A. G., T. J. Hatton and J. G. Williamson. 1994. International Migration and the Evolution of Prairie Labor Markets in Canada, 1900-1930. In *Migration and the International Labor Market, 1850-1939*. London: Routledge pp. 156–174.
- Gurowitz, A. 2004. International law, politics, and migrant rights. In *The Politics of International Law*. Vol. 51 Cambridge: Cambridge Univeristy Press p. 131.
- Hall, M. M. 1969. The Origins of Mass Immigration in Brazil, 1871-1914 PhD thesis Columbia University, Department of Political Science. PhD.
- Halliday, F. 1977. "Migration and the Labor Force in the Oil Producing States of the Middle East." *Development and Change* 8(Summer):263–292.
- Hammar, T., ed. 1985. *European immigration policy: A comparative study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hanami, T., M. Weiner and T. Hanami. 1998. Japanese Policies on the Rights and Benefits Grated to Foreign Workers, Residents, Refugees and Illegals. In *Temporary Workers or Future Citizens? Japanese and U.S. Migration Policies*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd pp. 211–237.
- Hastings, D. 1969. "Japanese Emigration and Assimilation in Brazil." *International Migration Review* 3(2):32–53.
- Hattersley, A. F. 1950. *The British settlement of Natal: a study in imperial migration*. Cambridge, England: University Press.

- Hatton, T. J. 2004. "Emigration from the UK, 1870-1913 and 1950-1998." *European Review of Economic History* 8:149–169.
- Hawke, G. R. 1985. *The making of New Zealand: An economic history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hawkins, F. 1991. *Critical years in immigration Canada and Australia compared*. Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Hawkins, Freda. 1972. *Canada and immigration: Public policy and public concern*. Toronto: Institute of Public Administration of Canada ; McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Hayden, A. A. 1971. "New South Wales Immigration Policy, 1856-1900." *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 61(5):1–60.
- Henry, M. 2008. "Border geostrategies: Imagining and administering New Zealand's post World War One borders." *New Zealand Geographer* 64(3):194–204.
- Herbert, U. 1990. *A history of foreign labor in Germany, 1880-1990: Seasonal workers, forced laborers, guest workers*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Hines, B. 1999. "An Overview of Argentine Immigration Law." *Ind. Int'l & Comp. L. Rev.* 9:395–573.
- Hines, B. 2010. "The Right to Migrate as a Human Right: The Current Argentine Immigration Law." *Cornell Int'l LJ* 43:471–611.
- Hoffmann-Nowotny, H. J. 1995. Switzerland: A non-immigration immigration country. In *The Cambridge survey of world migration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press p. 302–307.
- Hoffmann-Nowotny, H. J., William H. McNeill and R. Adams. 1978. European Migration after World War II. In *Human Migration: Patterns and Policies*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press pp. 85–105.

- Holloway, T. H. 1978. "Creating the Reserve Army? The Immigration Program of Sao Paulo, 1886-1930." *International Migration Review* 12(2):187-209.
- Holloway, T. H. 1980. *Immigrants on the land: Coffee and society in Sao Paulo, 1886-1934*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Holmes, M. 1988. *Forgotten migrants: Foreign workers in Switzerland before World War I*. Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson Univ Pr.
- Holzer, T., G. Schneider and T. Widmer. 2000. "Discriminating decentralization: Federalism and the handling of asylum applications in Switzerland, 1988-1996." *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 44(2):250-276.
- Horowitz, D. L. and G. Noiriél. 1992. *Immigrants in two democracies: French and American experience*. New York: New York University Press.
- Hsia, H. C. 2004. Prospects and Impass of Multicultural Citizenship in the Era of Globalization: The Case of Immigrant Movement in Taiwan. In *International Conference on Political Challenges and Democratic Institutions, organized by Department of Political Science, National Taiwan University*.
- Hsieh, C. and D. Kuo. 2009. "Refugee Draft Bill Passed." *Girdline Magazine* .
URL: <http://www.taiwantodaynews.com/index.php/refugee-draft-bill-passed>
- Hui, W. T. 1998. "The regional economic crisis and Singapore: Implications for labor migration." *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal* 7:187-218.
- Hui, W.T. 1997. "Regionalization, Economic Restructuring and Labour Migration in Singapore." *International Migration* 35(1):109-130.
- Hulse, C. 2010. "HIV Positive? South Korea Will Happily Deport You!".
URL: <http://news.change.org/stories/hiv-positive-south-korea-will-happily-deport-you>

- Human Rights Watch. 2010. *Walls at Every Turn: Abuse of Migrant Domestic Workers through Kuwait's Sponsorship System*. New York: Human Rights Watch.
- Hutchinson, E. P. 1981. *Legislative history of American immigration policy, 1798-1965*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Iguchi, Y. 1998. What We Can Learn from the German Experiences Concerning Foreign Labor. In *Temporary Workers or Future Citizens? Japanese and U.S. Migration Policies*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd pp. 293-318.
- Iza, A. O. 1994. "Asylum and Refugee Procedure in the Argentine Legal System, The." *Int'l J. Refugee L.* 6:643.
- James, W. G. 1992. *Our precious metal: African labour in South Africa's gold industry, 1970-1990*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Jeeves, A. 1985. *Migrant labour in South Africa's mining economy: The struggle for the gold mines' labour supply, 1890-1920*. Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Jeeves, A. and J. S. Crush. 1997. *White farms, black labor: The state and agrarian change in Southern Africa, 1910-50*. Pietermaritzburg, South Africa: University of Natal Press.
- Jefferson, M. 1926. *Peopling the Argentine Pampa*. American Geographical Society research series, no. 16 New York: American Geographical Society.
- Jenks, R. E. 1993. "Immigration and nationality policies of leading migration nations." *Population & Environment* 14(6):567-592.
- Joppke, C. and Z. Rosenhek. 2003. "Contesting ethnic immigration: Germany and Israel compared." *European Journal of Sociology* 43(03):301-335.
- Jubilut, L. L. 2006. "Refugee Law and Protection in Brazil: a Model in South America?" *Journal of Refugee Studies* 19(1):22.

- Jubilut, L. L. and S. M de Oliveira Selmi Apolinário. 2008. "Refugee Status Determination in Brazil: A Tripartite Enterprise." *Refuge: Canada's periodical on refugees* 25(2).
- Junichi, A. 2006. "Challenging Japan's Refugee Policies." *Asia and Pacific Migration Journal* 15(2):219–238.
- Jupp, J. 2002. *From white Australia to Woomera: The story of Australian immigration*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kajita, T., M. Weiner and T. Hanami. 1998. The Challenge of Incorporating Foreigners in Japan: 'Ethnic Japanese' and 'Sociological Japanese'. In *Temporary Workers or Future Citizens? Japanese and U.S. Migration Policies*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd pp. 120–147.
- Kang, S. D. 1996. "Typology and conditions of migrant workers in South Korea." *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal* 5(2-3):265.
- Kanjanapan, W. 1992. "White-collar foreign workers in Republic of China." *Asian and Pacific migration journal: APMJ* 1(3-4):569.
- Kanovsky, E. 1984. *Migration from the poor to the rich Arab countries*. Tel Aviv: Dayan Center for Middle Eastern and African Studies, Shiloah Institute, Tel Aviv University.
- Kapiszewski, A. 2001. *Nationals and expatriates: population and labour dilemmas of the Gulf Cooperation Council States*. Reading: Ithaca Press.
- Kapiszewski, A. 2006. "Arab versus Asian migrant workers in the GCC countries." United Nations Expert Group Meeting on International Migration and Development in the Arab Region.
- Kaur, A. 2006. *International migration in Malaysia and Singapore since the 1880s: State policies, migration trends and governance of migration*. New England, NSW: The Uni-

- versity of New England Asia Centre (UNEAC) for the Malaysia and Singapore Society of Australia.
- Kay, D. and R. Miles. 1988. "Refugees or Migrant Workers? The Case of the European Volunteer Workers in Britain (1946-1951)." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 1(3-4):214.
- Kaye, R. and R. Charlton. 1990. *United Kingdom Refugee Admission Policy and the Politically Active Refugee*. Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations, University of Warwick.
- Kelley, A. C. 1965. "International Migration and Economic Growth: Australia, 1865-1935." *The Journal of Economic History* 25(3):333-354.
- Kelley, N. and M. J. Trebilcock. 1998. *The making of the mosaic: A history of Canadian immigration policy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Kim, J. K. 2005. "State, Civil Society, and International Norms: Expanding the Political and Labor Rights of Foreigners in South Korea." *Asia and Pacific Migration Journal* 14(4):383-418.
- King, R. 1993. *Mass migrations in Europe: The legacy and the future*. London: Belhaven Press.
- Klausen, S. 2002. *The Uncertain Future of White Supremacy and the Politics of Fertility in South Africa: 1930-1939*. Durban: Univ. of Natal, History Dep.
- Klein, H. S. 1991. "The Social and Economic Integration of Portuguese Immigrants in Brazil in the Late Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 23(2):309-337.
- Klotz, A. 1997. "International relations and migration in Southern Africa." *African Security Review* 6:38-45.
- Klotz, A. 2000. "Migration after Apartheid: Deracialising South African Foreign Policy." *Third World Quarterly* 21(5):831-847.

- Koli, K.L. and M. Al-Omain. 1988. "Changing Patterns of Migration in Kuwait." *Population bulletin of ESCWA* (22).
- Komai, H. 2000. "Immigrants in Japan." *Asia and Pacific Migration Journal* 9(3):311–326.
- Kondo, A. 2002. "The Development of Immigration Policy in Japan." *Asia and Pacific Migration Journal* 11(4):415–436.
- Koshiro, K. 1998. Does Japan Need Immigrants? In *Temporary Workers or Future Citizens? Japanese and U.S. Migration Policies*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd pp. 151–176.
- Ku, A. S. 2004. "Immigration Policies, Discourses, and the Politics of Local Belonging in Hong Kong (1950-1980)." *Modern China* 30(3):326.
- Kubát, D., U. Merhländer and E. Gehmacher, eds. 1979. *The Politics of migration policies: The first world in the 1970s*. 1st ed. New York: Center for Migration Studies.
- Kuwahara, Y. 1998. Japan's Dilemma: Can International Migration be Controlled? In *Temporary Workers or Future Citizens? Japanese and U.S. Migration Policies*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd pp. 355–383.
- La Cava, G. 1999. *Italians in Brazil*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Lack, J. and J. Templeton. 1995. *Bold Experiment: A Documentary History of Australian Immigration since 1945*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Leblang, D. A., J. Fitzgerald and J. Teets. 2009. "Defying the law of gravity: The political economy of international migration." University of Virginia.
- Lee, J. S. and S. W. Wang. 1996. "Recruiting and managing of foreign workers in Taiwan." *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal* 5(2-3):281.
- Lee, T. L. 1995. "Stateless Persons and the 1989 Comprehensive Plan of Action Part: Chinese Nationality and the Republic of China (Taiwan)." *Int'l J. Refugee L.* 7:201.

- Lesser, J. 1999. *Negotiating national identity: Immigrants, minorities, and the struggle for ethnicity in Brazil*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press Books.
- Libet, L. V. 1995. Building the border: The treatment of immigrants in France 1884-1914
PhD thesis.
- Library of Congress Law Library. 2006. "Immigration law sanctions and enforcement in selected foreign countries Brazil, Egypt, Japan, Mexico, Sweden, and Switzerland."
- Lincoln, D. and C. Mararike. 2000. Southward Migrants in the Far North: Zimbabwean Farmworkers in Northern Province. In *Borderline farming: Foreign migrants in South African commercial agriculture*. Cape Town: IDASA pp. 40–62.
- Longva, A. N. 1997. *Walls built on sand: Migration, exclusion, and society in Kuwait*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Looney, R. 1985. "Demographic Perspectives in Saudi Arabia's Development."
- Looney, R. E. 1988. "Manpower problems in a capital-rich country: The case of Saudi Arabia." *Population bulletin of ESCWA* (32):31.
- Lovelock, K. and T. Leopold. 2008. "Labour Force Shortages in Rural New Zealand: Temporary Migration and the Recognised Seasonal Employer (RSE) Work Policy." *New Zealand Population Review* 33(34):213–234.
- Lucassen, J. and R. Penninx. 1997. *Newcomers: Immigrants and their descendants in the Netherlands; 1550 - 1995*. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
- Lucassen, L. 2002a. "Administrative into social control: The aliens police and foreign female servants in the Netherlands, 1918-40." *Social History* 27(3):327–342.
- Lucassen, L. 2002b. "Bringing Structure Back In: Economic and Political Determinants of Immigration in Dutch Cities, 1920-1940." *Social Science History* 26(3):503.

- Lucassen, L. 2003. Revolutionaries into Beggars: Alien Policies in the Netherlands, 1814-1914. In *Migration Control in the North Atlantic World: The Evolution of State Practices in Europe and the United States from the French Revolution to the Inter-War Period*. New York: Berghahn Books p. 178â94.
- Luebke, F. C. 1987. *Germans in Brazil: A comparative history of cultural conflict during World War I*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press.
- Lynch, J. P. and R. J. Simon. 2003. *Immigration the world over: Statutes, policies, and practices*. Lanham: Rowan & Littlefield Publishers.
- Mackey, A. and A. Anderson. 2009. Asylum law: Surrogate protection: Asian perspectives, challenges and contributions. In *Asian Society of International Law Second Biennial Conference, Tokyo*.
- Maddison, A. 2011. "Statistics on World Population, GDP, and Per Capita GDP, 1-2008 AD.".
URL: <http://www.ggdc.net/maddison/>
- Madgwick, R. B. 1969. *Immigration into eastern Australia, 1788-1851*. Sydney: Sydney University Press.
- Marshall, B. 2000. *The new Germany and migration in Europe*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Marshall, O. 2005. *English, Irish and Irish-American Pioneer Settlers in Nineteenth-Century Brazil*. Oxford: Centre for Brazilian Studies at University of Oxford.
- Martens, J. 2006. "A transnational history of immigration restriction: Natal and New South Wales, 1896-97." *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 34(3):323-344.

- Massey, D. S., J. Arango, G. Hugo, A. Kouaouci, A. Pellegrino and J. E. Taylor. 1993. "Theories of International Migration: A Review and Appraisal." *Population and Development Review* 19(3):431–466.
- Mather, C. and F. Mathebula. 2000. 'The Farmer Prefers Us': Mozambican Farmworkers in the Mpumalanga Lowveld. In *Borderline farming: Foreign migrants in South African commercial agriculture*. Cape Town: IDASA pp. 14–39.
- Mauldon, R. G. and D. B. Williams. 1990. Price Policy. In *Agriculture in the Australian Economy*. Sydney: Sydney University Press in association with Oxford University Press.
- Maurette. 1937a. "Immigration and settlement in Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay: I." *Int'l Lab. Rev.* 35:215–247.
- Maurette. 1937b. "Immigration and settlement in Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay: II." *Int'l Lab. Rev.* 35:215–247.
- Mayer, K. B. 1965. "Postwar Migration from Italy to Switzerland." *International Migration Digest* 2(1):5–13.
- McDonald, D. A. 1998. "Hear no housing, see no housing immigration and homelessness in the new South Africa." *Cities* 15(6):449–462.
- McKinnon, M. 1996. *Immigrants and citizens: New Zealanders and Asian immigration in historical context*. Wellington: Institute of Policy Studies, Victoria University of Wellington.
- Meade, T. A. 2009. *A brief history of Brazil*. New York: Facts On File.
- Mendel Jr, D. H. 1964. "Japan's Taiwan Tangle." *Asian Survey* pp. 1073–1084.
- Migration. 1961a. "Immigration in Argentina." *Migration* 1(4):63–64.

- Migration. 1961*b*. "New Plan Outlined to Encourage Immigration in South Africa." *Migration* 1(3):53–54.
- Migration. 1961*c*. "New Social Security Law in Brazil." *Migration* 1(2):75–76.
- Migration. 1962. "Argentina: Population Census." *Migration* 2(1):59–64.
- Migration Dialogue. 1994-2011. *Migration News*. Davis, CA: University of California, Davis; German Marshall Fund of the United States, and the University of California - Berkeley Center for German and European Studies.
- Miller, M. J. 1989. Political Participation and Representation of Noncitizens. In *Immigration and the Politics of Citizenship in Europe and North America*. Lanham: University Press of America.
- Mills, A. P. 1930. The immigration policies of the British dominions, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa PhD thesis Stanford University, Department of Economics. PhD.
- Ministerial Agency of Civil Affairs. 1954. *Saudi Arabian Citizenship System*. Riyadh, Saudi Arabia: Ministry of Interior, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.
- Misuriello, V. 1993. *Politica de la Inmigracion en la Argentina, 1853-1970*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Ediciones del Gabinete, la Universidad Nacional de Tucuman.
- Moore, B. 1986. *Refugees from Nazi Germany in the Netherlands, 1933-1940*. Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Morita, K. and S. Sassen. 1994. "The new illegal immigration in Japan, 1980-1992." *International Migration Review* 28(1):153–163.
- Morner, M. and H. Sims. 1985. *Adventurers and proletarians: The story of migrants in Latin America*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

- Morris, A. and A. Bouillon. 2001. *African Immigration to South Africa: Franophone Migration of the 1990s*. Pretoria, South Africa: PROTEA & IFAS.
- Morris-Suzuki, T. 2010. *Borderline Japan: Foreigners and frontier controls in the postwar era*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moya, J. C. 1998. *Cousins and strangers: Spanish immigrants in Buenos Aires, 1850-1930*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Nagayama, T. 1992. "Clandestine migrant workers in Japan." *Asian and Pacific migration journal: APMJ* 1(3-4):623.
- Nagayama, T. 1996. "Foreign workers recruiting policies in Japan." *Asian and Pacific migration journal: APMJ* 5(2-3):241.
- Nasu, H. 2008. "Constitutionality of the Japanese Nationality Act: A Commentary on the Supreme Court's Decision on 4 June 2008." *Journal of Japanese Law* 13(26):101–116.
- Neuman, G. L. 1993. "The Lost Century of American Immigration Law (1776-1875)." *Columbia Law Review* 93(8):1833–1901.
- Neumark, S. D. 1957. *Economic influences on the South African frontier, 1652-1836*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Newton, R. C. 1982. "Indifferent Sanctuary: German-Speaking Refugees and Exiles in Argentina, 1933-1945." *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 24(4):395–420.
- Ng, S. H and G. O.M Lee. 1998. "Hong Kong labor market in the aftermath of the crisis: Implications for foreign workers." *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal* 7:171–186.
- Nogueira, M. B. and C. C. Marques. 2008. "Brazil: Ten years of refugee protection." *Forced Migration Review* pp. 57–58.

- O'Connor, P. S. 1968. "Keeping New Zealand White, 1908-1920." *New Zealand Journal of History* 2(1):41-64.
- OECD. 2009. Brazil. In *Latin American Economic Outlook 2010*. Paris: OECD.
- O'Malley, P. 2011. "The O'Malley Archives."
URL: <http://www.nelsonmandela.org/omalley/index.php/site/q/03w00000.htm>
- Ongley, P. and D. Pearson. 1995. "Post-1945 International Migration: New Zealand, Australia and Canada Compared." *International Migration Review* 29(3):765-793.
- Osborn, R. F. 1964. *Valiant harvest: The founding of the South African sugar industry, 1848-1926*. Durban: South African Sugar Association.
- Pang, E. F. 1992. "Absorbing temporary foreign workers: The experience of Singapore." *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal* 1(3-4):495.
- Papademetriou, D. G. and K. A. Hamilton. 1996. *Converging paths to restriction: French, Italian, and British responses to immigration*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace: Brookings Institution [distributor].
- Park, K.H. 2010a. "Korea: Forced Migration Online."
URL: <http://www.forcedmigration.org/browse/regional/korea/>
- Park, S. 2010b. "Naturalized Koreans Jailed for over 7 years to lose citizenship." *The Korea Times* .
URL: <http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2010/09/11373646.html>
- Park, Y. 1994. "The turning point in international migration and economic development in Korea." *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal* 3(1):149.
- Park, Y. 1998. "The financial crisis and foreign workers in Korea." *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal* 7:219-234.

- Peberdy, S. 2001. "Imagining immigration: Inclusive identities and exclusive policies in post-1994 South Africa." *Africa Today* 48(3):15–32.
- Peberdy, S. 2009. *Selecting immigrants: National identity and South Africa's immigration policies, 1910-2008*. Johannesburg, South Africa: Wits University Press.
- Pescatello, A. M. 1970. *Both Ends of the Journey: A Historical Study of Migration and Change in Brazil and Portugal, 1889-1914*. Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles.
- Peterson, G. 2008. "To Be or Not to Be a Refugee: The International Politics of the Hong Kong Refugee Crisis, 1949-55." *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 36(2):171–195.
- Plender, R. 1972. *International migration law*. Law and population series, no. 2 Leiden: Sijthoff.
- Prak, M. 1997. "Burghers into citizens: Urban and national citizenship in the Netherlands during the revolutionary era (c. 1800)." *Theory and Society* 26(4):403–420.
- Price, C. A. 1974. *The Great White Walls are Built: Restrictive Immigration to North America and Australasia 1836-1888*. Australian Institute of International Affairs in association with Australian National University Press.
- PriceWaterhouseCoopers. 2003. "The Hong Kong Capital Investment Entrant Scheme."
URL: http://www.pwchk.com/home/eng/cap_invest_entrant.html
- Prothero, R. M. 1974. "Foreign migrant labour for South Africa." *International Migration Review* 8(3):383–394.
- Randall, L. 1977. *A comparative economic history of Latin America: 1500-1914; Volume 3: Brazil*. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International.

- Rath, J. 2009. "The Netherlands: A0 reluctant country of immigration." *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie* 100(5):674–681.
- Refugee Review Tribunal of Australia. 2008. "South Korea - Applying for Protection - Asylum Policy." KOR35513.
- Reisner, R. 1964. "National Regulation of the Movement of Workers in the European Community." *The American Journal of Comparative Law* 13(3):360–384.
- Riaño, Y. and D. Wastl-Walter. 2006. "Immigration policies, state discourses on foreigners, and the politics of identity in Switzerland." *Environment and Planning* 38(9):1693.
- Richards, A. and P. L. Martin. 1983. "The laissez-faire approach to international labor migration: The case of the Arab Middle East." *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 31(3):455–474.
- Rios-Neto, E. L.G. 2005. "Managing Migration: The Brazilian Case." Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais.
- Roche, M. 2005. *Empire, Duty and Land: Soldier Settlement in New Zealand 1915-1924*. In *(Dis)placing Empire: Renegotiating British Colonial Geographies*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Rogers, R. 1985. *Guests Come to Stay: The effects of European labor migration on sending and receiving countries*. Westview Press.
- Roodenburg, H., R. Euwals and H. T. Rele. 2003. *Immigration and the Dutch Economy*. The Hague: CPB Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis.
- Ross, R. 1975. "The 'White' Population of South Africa in the Eighteenth Century." *Population Studies* 29(2):217–230.
- Russell, S. S. 1989. "Politics and Ideology in Migration Policy Formulation: The Case of Kuwait." *International Migration Review* 23(1):24–47.

- Russell, S. S and M. A Al-Ramadhan. 1994. "Kuwait's migration policy since the Gulf crisis." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 26(04):569–587.
- Sanchez-Albornoz, N. 1974. *The population of Latin America; A history*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Sanchez-Alonso, B. 2000. "Those Who Left and Those Who Stayed behind: Explaining Emigration from the Regions of Spain, 1880-1914." *The Journal of Economic History* 60(3):730–755.
- Schain, M. 2008. *The politics of immigration in France, Britain, and the United States: A comparative study*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Scholten, S. and P. Minderhoud. 2008. "Regulating Immigration Control: Carrier Sanctions in the Netherlands." *European journal of migration and law* 10(2):123–147.
- Schrover, M. 2009. "Family in Dutch migration policy 1945-2005." *The History of the Family* 14(2):191–202.
- Schuck, P. H. 1998. The Legal Rights of Citizens and Aliens in the United States. In *Temporary Workers or Future Citizens? Japanese and U.S. Migration Policies*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd pp. 238–290.
- Scobie, J. R. 1971. *Argentina: A city and a nation*. Latin American histories New York: Oxford University Press.
- Secombe, I. J and R. I. Lawless. 1986. "Foreign worker dependence in the Gulf, and the international oil companies: 1910-50." *International Migration Review* 20(3):548–574.
- Secombe, I. and R. Lawless. 1987. "Work camps and company towns: Settlement patterns and the Gulf oil industry." University of Durham, Centre for Middle Eastern and Islamic Studies Working Paper.

- Selya, R. M. 1992. "Illegal migration in Taiwan: A preliminary overview." *International Migration Review* 26(3):787–805.
- Settlage, R. 1997. "No Place to Call Home-Stateless Vietnamese Asylum-Seekers in Hong Kong." *Geo. Immigr. LJ* 12:187.
- Shroff, G. 1989. New Zealand's Immigration policy. In *New Zealand Official Yearbook 1988-1989*. Wellington: Department of Statistics, Government of New Zealand pp. 193–207.
- Sicsic, P., T. J. Hatton and J. G. Williamson. 1994. Foreign Immigration and the French Labor Force, 1896-1926. In *Migration and the International Labor Market, 1850-1939*. London: Routledge pp. 119–138.
- Silva, H. A. 1998. *Significado de la Presencia Espanola*. Bahia Blanca, Argentina: Universidad Nacional del Sur.
- Silvey, R. 2008. In the Margins of Riyadh: Indonesian Domestic Workers in Saudi Arabia. In *Migrants to the metropolis: the rise of immigrant gateway cities*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Skeldon, R. 1994. "Turning points in labor migration: The case of Hong Kong." *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal* 3(1):93.
- Skeldon, R. 2006. "Recent Trends in Migration in East and Southeast Asia." *Asia and Pacific Migration Journal* 15(2):277–293.
- Smith, J. P. and B. Edmonston. 1997. *The new Americans: Economic, demographic, and fiscal effects of immigration*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Smith, T. E. 1981. *Commonwealth migration: Flows and policies*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Smith, T. L. 1972. *Brazil; People and institutions*. 4th ed. ed. Baton Rouge,: Louisiana State University Press,.

- Smith, T. L. and A. Marchant. 1951. *Brazil, Portrait of half a continent*. Dryden Press.
- Solberg, C. E. 1970. *Immigration and nationalism, Argentina and Chile, 1890-1914*. Austin, TX: Published for the Institute of Latin American Studies by the University of Texas Press.
- Solberg, C. E., W. H. McNeill and R. Adams. 1978. Mass Migrations in Argentina. In *Human Migration: Patterns and Policies*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press pp. 146–170.
- South African History Online.org. 2011. “Grade 12: 1924-1948 Legislation and Segregation.”
URL: <http://www.sahistory.org.za/pages/hands-on-classroom/classroom/pages/projects/grade12/less-feature-link.htm>
- Spencer, I. R. G. 1997. *British immigration policy since 1939: The making of multi-racial Britain*. New York: Routledge.
- Sprenger, K. 1999. Swiss Law relating to Foreigners 1860-1978. In *Da und fort. Leben in zwei Welten. Interviews, Berichte und Dokumente zur Immigration und Binnenwanderung in der Schweiz*. Zurich: Limmat Verlag.
- Stahl, C. W. 1986. *International labor migration: A study of the ASEAN countries*. New York: Center for Migration Studies.
- Straubhaar, T. and P. A. Fischer. 1994. Economic and Social Aspects of Immigration into Switzerland. In *European Migration in the Late Twentieth Century, Historical Patterns, Actual Trends and Social Implications*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited pp. 127–148.
- Studer, B. 2001. “Citizenship as Contingent National Belonging: Married Women and Foreigners in Twentieth Century Switzerland.” *Gender & History* 13(3):622–654.
- Suzuki, N. 2007. “Carework and Migration: Japanese Perspectives on the Japan-Philippines Economic Partnership Agreement.” *Asia and Pacific Migration Journal* 16(3):357–382.

- Tagupa, W. 1994. "Law, Status and Citizenship: Conflict and Continuity in New Zealand and Western Samoa (1922-1982)." *The Journal of Pacific History* 29(1):19–35.
- Takeda, I. 1998. Japan's Responses to Refugees and Political Asylum Seekers. In *Temporary Workers or Future Citizens? Japanese and U.S. Migration Policies*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd pp. 431–451.
- Takenaka, A. 2004. "The Japanese in Peru: History of Immigration, Settlement, and Racialization." *Latin American Perspectives* 31(3):77–98.
- Tat, H. W. 1992. Foreign Workers in Singapore: Role of Government, Management, and Unions in Cooperation. In *Present Issues of International Migration: How can the Sending Country and Receiving Country Cooperate*. Tokyo, Japan: The Japan Institute of Labour.
- Teitelbaum, M. S. 1998. US Responses to Refugees and Asylum Seekers. In *Temporary Workers or Future Citizens? Japanese and U.S. Migration Policies*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd pp. 452–477.
- Templeton, F. 2008. *Te Ara-the Encyclopedia of New Zealand*. Wellington: Ministry for Culture and Heritage.
URL: <http://www.teara.govt.nz/>
- The World Bank. 2012. "World Development Indicators."
- Tigner, J. L. 1981. "Japanese Immigration into Latin America: A Survey." *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 23(4):457–482.
- Timlin, M. F. 1960. "Canada's Immigration Policy, 1896-1910." *The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science / Revue canadienne d'Economique et de Science politique* 26(4):517–532.
- Timmer, A. S. and J. G. Williamson. 1998. "Immigration Policy Prior to the 1930s: Labor

- Markets, Policy Interactions, and Globalization Backlash.” *Population and Development Review* 24(4):739–771.
- Tom, A. 2006. “How Stricter Dutch Immigration Policies are Contributing to Rising Islamic Fundamentalism in the Netherlands and Europe.” *Wash. U. Global Stud. L. Rev.* 5:451.
- Topik, S. 1987. *The political economy of the Brazilian State, 1889-1930*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Tranaes, T. and K. F. Zimmermann, eds. 2004. *Migrants, work, and the welfare state*. Denmark: University Press of Southern Denmark and the Rockwool Foundatin Research Unit,.
- Troper, H. M. 1972. *Only farmers need apply: Official Canadian government encouragement of immigration from the United States, 1896-1911*. Toronto: Griffin House.
- Tsay, C. and J. Lin. 2001. “Labor Importation and Unemployment of Local Workers in Taiwan.” *Asia and Pacific Migration Journal* 10(3-4):505–534.
- Tsuchida, M. 1998. A Histroy of Japanese Emigration from the 1860s to the 1990s. In *Temporary Workers or Future Citizens? Japanese and U.S. Migration Policies*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd pp. 77–119.
- Ulicki, T. and J. S. Crush. 2000. Poverty and Women’s Migrancy: Lesotho Farmworkers in the Eastern Free State. In *Borderline farming: Foreign migrants in South African commercial agriculture*. Cape Town: IDASA pp. 63–101.
- Ullah, A. K.M.A. 2010. *Rationalizing migration decisions: Labour migrants in East and South-East Asia*. Ashgate Pub Co.
- UNHCR. 2009. *UNHCR Resettlement Handbook*. Geneva: UNHCR.
- UNHCR. 2010. “South Korea - Refugee granted citizenship for first time.”.
URL: <http://www.unhcr.org/4ba89d939.html>

- UNHCR. 2011. "2011 Regional Operations Profile - East Asia and the Pacific."
- URL:** <http://www.unhcr.org/pages/49e488f56.html>
- U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. 2009. "Historical Immigration and Naturalization Legislation."
- Vagts, D. F. 1997. "Switzerland, International Law and World War II." *The American Journal of International Law* 91(3):466–475.
- Vahed, G. 2002. "Constructions of Community and Identity among Indians in Colonial Natal, 1860-1910: The Role of the Muharram Festival." *The Journal of African History* 43(1):77–93.
- Vainer, C. B. and F. Brito. 2001. Migration and migrants shaping contemporary Brazil. In *Anais do XXIV Iussp General Population Conference*.
- van Amersfoort, H. and R. Penninx. 1994. "Regulating Migration in Europe: The Dutch Experience, 1960-92." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 534:133–146.
- van Eijl, C. 2000. "Immigration policy in the Netherlands, 1849-1914." Leiden University.
- van Eijl, C. 2008. Tracing back âillegal aliensâ in the Netherlands, 1850-1940. In *IMISCOE (International Migration, Integration and Social Cohesion)*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press pp. 39–56.
- van Ours, J. C. and J. Veenman. 2005. The Netherlands: Old emigrants-young immigrant country. In *European Migration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- van Selm, J. 2000. "Asylum in the Netherlands: A hazy shade of purple." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 13(1):74.
- Velez, W. A. 2010. "South American Immigration: Argentina."
- URL:** <http://www.yale.edu/ynhti/curriculum/units/1990/1/90.01.06.x.html>

- Villar, J. M. 1984. "Argentine Experience in the Field of Illegal Immigration." *International Migration Review* 18(3):453–473.
- Visit Kuwait. 2011. "Passport/ Visa Requirements."
URL: <http://www.visit-kuwait.com/info/kuwait-visa.aspx>
- Vogel, D. 2003. *Einwanderungsland Niederlande: Politik und Kultur*. Frankfurt am Main: IKO.
- Vos, J. 1994. Illegal Migrants in the Dutch Labour Market. In *Immigrant ethnic minorities in the Dutch labour market: analysis and policies*. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers pp. 93–114.
- Vuilleumier, M. 1992. *Immigrants and refugees in Switzerland: An outline history*. Zurich: Pro Helvetia.
- Walvin, J. 1984. *Passage to Britain: Immigration in British history and politics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin in association with Belitha Press.
- Wanner, P., D. Efonayi and R. Fibbi. 2009. Switzerland. In *Statistics and reality: Concepts and measurements of migration in Europe*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press pp. 151–166.
- Watanabe, S. 1998. "The economic crisis and migrant workers in Japan." *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal* 7:235–254.
- Wearing, B. 1990. "Immigration Law in New Zealand and the USA: A Comparison of Recent Changes in New Zealand's Immigration Law with Those Made in the USA." Institute for Social Science Research.
- Wearing, B. 1993. New Zealand's Immigration Policies and Immigration Act (1987): Comparisons with the United States of America. In *Immigration and Entrepreneurship: Culture, Capital, and Ethnic Networks*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

- Weil, P. 2001. "Access to citizenship: A comparison of twenty-five nationality laws." *Citizenship today: Global perspectives and practices* pp. 17–35.
- Weiner, M. 1982. "International migration and development: Indians in the Persian Gulf." *Population and Development Review* 8(1):1–36.
- Weiner, M. 2000. Japan in the age of migration. In *Japan and Global Migration*. London: Routledge pp. 52–69.
- Weiner, M. and T. Hanami. 1998. Opposing Visions: Migration and Citizenship Policies in Japan and the United States. In *Temporary Workers or Future Citizens? Japanese and U.S. Migration Policies*. London: MacMillan Press Ltd.
- Wentzel, M. 2003. Historical and Contemporary Dimensions of Migration between South Africa and its Neighboring Countries. In *HSRC Migration Workshop*. Pretoria, South Africa: .
- Wentzel, M. and K. Tlabela. 2006. Historical background to South African migration. In *Migration in South and Southern Africa: Dynamics and determinants*. Cape Town: Human Sciences Research Council pp. 71–96.
- Whelpley, J. D. 1905. *The problem of the immigrant*. London: Chapman & Hall.
- Whitman, J. 2000. *Migrants, Citizens, and the State in Southern Africa*. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.
- Wilson, F. 1972a. *Labour in the South African gold mines 1911-1969*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, F. 1972b. *Migrant labour: Report to the South African Council of Churches*. Johannesburg: South African Council of Churches and SPRO-CAS.
- Wilson, F. 1976. "International Migration in Southern Africa." *International Migration Review* 10(4):451–488.

- Winckler, O. 1997. "The immigration policy of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) states." *Middle Eastern Studies* 33(3):480–493.
- Winkelmann, R. 1999. "Immigration: The New Zealand Experience." The Institute for the Study of Labor.
- Winkelmann, R. 2000. "Immigration Policies and their Impact: The Case of New Zealand and Australia." The Institute for the Study of Labor.
- Wong, D. 1996. "Foreign Domestic Workers in Singapore." *Asia and Pacific Migration Journal* 5(1):117–138.
- Wong, D. 1997. "Transience and Settlement: Singapore's Foreign Labor Policy." *Asia and Pacific Migration Journal* 6(2):135–167.
- Woodward, P. N. 1988. *Oil and labor in the Middle East: Saudi Arabia and the oil boom*. New York: Praeger.
- Wu, C. and C. Inglis. 1992. "Illegal immigration to Hong Kong." *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal* 1(3-4):601.
- Yamashita, S. 2008. *Transnational migration in East Asia: Japan in a comparative focus*. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- Yamawaki, K. 2000. Foreign Workers in Japan: A historical perspective. In *Japan and Global Migration*. London: Routledge pp. 38–52.
- Yeoh, B. 2004. "Migration, international labour and multicultural policies in Singapore." Asia Research Institute Working Paper Series.
- Young, G. F.W. 1974. *The Germans in Chile: Immigration and colonization, 1849-1914*. New York: Center for Migration Studies.

- Zha, D. 2002. Chinese Migrant Workers in Japan: Policies, Institutions and Civil Society. In *Globalizing Chinese migration: trends in Europe and Asia*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company pp. 129–157.
- Zolberg, A. R. 2006. *A Nation by Design: Immigration Policy in the Fashioning of America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Zolberg, A. R., W. H. McNeill and R. Adams. 1978. International Migration Policies in a Changing World System. In *Human Migration: Patterns and Policies*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press pp. 241–286.
- Zorlu, A. and J. Hartog. 2002. “Migration and immigrants: The case of The Netherlands.” *Studies and Comments* p. 119.