

Germán Martínez

Immigration and Population Specialist and Researcher (ECOSUR)

*Translated by Cecilia Chapa*

Chiapas is a laboratory for the study of [human] migration in the sense that in Chiapas there are international labor migrations in which Guatemalans come to the State to work in coffee cultivation. There is migration, also international, of trans-migrants who use Chiapas and Mexico to go to the US. There is migration, also international [that happened] some decades ago, of refugees from Guatemala to Chiapas. There is internal migration within the limits of the State. Colonization is still taking place in natural reserves for example, in the case of the Lacandona Jungle, the case of the Ocote Jungle, the Biosfera del Triunfo Reserve, and some other federal forests that are still undergoing colonization. This [colonization process] is another characteristic of Chiapas in terms of its indigenous character, its agricultural character, and it still has much to do with tilling the land. Likewise, there is also a growing urban development by the indigenous population in the State for those who come to the State's main cities looking for new ways of life. And that also imprints a very special characteristic to human mobility to the State's interior. The governments of Mexico and Central America [should assign] resources to creating alternatives for [economic] development in these countries. We are talking about Mexico and Central America. To the extent that economies have not been able to create alternatives for a decent life in our countries, to that extent, migration has become the means to arrive to less difficult living conditions that [wouldn't be possible] if this migration didn't take place. What do I mean by this? I mean that in order to stop migration to the United States, it will be required to invest in socioeconomic development

projects in Mexico and Central America to eliminate the huge inequalities between these countries and the US. To the extent that the wage difference in the US is huge, to the extent that in the US there still are economic activities involving immigrants, to the extent that the US population structure is allowing generations of Mexicans and Central Americans to fill some of the gaps in the population pyramid, - because North Americans' fertility is very low, and thus, there is a demographic labor need - then, to that extent it is expected that this migration will continue. Therefore, we are talking about two main issues: The issue of productive investment in our countries and, on the other hand, the issue of the existing demand in the United States. So, we are talking about this complexity because if there were a complete [economic] development in Mexico and Central America in which there were sustainable jobs, in which people could live free of hunger, in which people could lead a comfortable life, to that extent there would be no need to leave in search of a job risking one's life. But, if to the extent that a person in Chiapas, for example, with a high school degree - "high school" no? - has the possibility of survival here in the State that represents, for example, earning two thousand pesos a month, approximately two hundred dollars, in any service sector job, from the young people's perspective this doesn't constitute an expectation to maybe be able of fulfilling their dreams, because their logic is: "And, what I'm I supposed to do with two thousand pesos a month? My option is to take the risk, to have a job that will allow for more savings." For example, in the US case, despite all the disadvantages in the quality of life they have over there, in the sense that they have to share the rent of an apartment with twenty others to have the possibility of saving money depending on how much they can limit their entertainment and food, however, these savings allow them, when they

come back, to buy a piece of land. These savings allow them to build a relatively modest house. And after reaching these goals, after these achievements, their expectation is to return to the US once more and continue to stash, continue saving to buy a car, to buy a pick up truck, etc. Therefore, on one hand it is fair to criticize the building of walls by, in this case, the US Government, but it is also fair to criticize local governments for doing nothing to improve life conditions for their people. Therefore, there is much contradiction there as well. Although it is true that the United States has the sovereign power to build those obstacles for immigrant crossing, it is also perceived as a double discourse. From the Mexican point of view, US migratory policy is conceived, is interpreted as an action holding two contradictory discourses. Why? Because on the one hand migration is restricted, but on the other there is a need of immigrants. In the US there are some activities the Anglo population does not want to do. A large portion of all farming activities relies on the work done by Mexicans and Central Americans. As everybody knows, there are many jobs in the US where nationalities are inserted. Right? And in that sense such a contradiction is noticed. Furthermore, throughout the history of the US migratory policy we've seen that when labor is needed they open the doors, and whenever there are political pressures or national security issues call for other measures, then doors are closed and walls are built. Right? Therefore, I believe that, indeed, most likely the walls are holding migration a little bit. But, from my point of view, I don't think it represents a permanent barrier or an obstruction that will stop migratory flow. The only thing it has produced is more deaths because migrants will always look for a way in even at the expense of their own lives.