



Exodus: How Migration Is Changing Our World

Paul Collier

[Download now](#)

[Read Online](#) ➔

Exodus: How Migration Is Changing Our World

Paul Collier

Exodus: How Migration Is Changing Our World Paul Collier

It is one of the most pressing and controversial questions of our time -- vehemently debated, steeped in ideology, profoundly divisive. Who should be allowed to immigrate and who not? What are the arguments for and against limiting the numbers? We are supposedly a nation of immigrants, and yet our policies reflect deep anxieties and the quirks of short-term self-interest, with effective legislation snagging on thousand-mile-long security fences and the question of how long and arduous the path to citizenship should be. In Exodus, Paul Collier, the world-renowned economist and bestselling author of *The Bottom Billion*, clearly and concisely lays out the effects of encouraging or restricting migration. Drawing on original research and case studies, he explores this volatile issue from three perspectives: that of the migrants themselves, that of the people they leave behind, and that of the host societies where they relocate. Immigration is a simple economic equation, but its effects are complex. Exodus confirms how crucial it will be that public policy face and address all of its ramifications. Sharply written and brilliantly clarifying, Exodus offers a provocative analysis of an issue that affects us all.

Exodus: How Migration Is Changing Our World Details

Date : Published October 1st 2013 by Oxford University Press, USA (first published January 1st 2013)

ISBN : 9780195398656

Author : Paul Collier

Format : Hardcover 309 pages

Genre : Nonfiction, Economics, Politics, Sociology, History

 [Download Exodus: How Migration Is Changing Our World ...pdf](#)

 [Read Online Exodus: How Migration Is Changing Our World ...pdf](#)

Download and Read Free Online Exodus: How Migration Is Changing Our World Paul Collier

From Reader Review Exodus: How Migration Is Changing Our World for online ebook

Don Mario says

I suppose it's not just my personal problem. But when I tried to consider the issue of migration I very soon realized I had very little real information to ponder on. And here is a book that offers the best up to date results of socio-economic research on the subject. And very well presented, though a bit too technical at times.

I think everyone should spend a moment on this book, at least for a quick look at the final chapter, where the author summarizes all previous issues and proposes what he considers a sound basis for a just and effective migration control policy.

His main points are: migration is a natural and good thing, from which everyone profits, provided only that it's not left unregulated. In general migration has no self stabilizing mechanisms: if left unregulated it generates great damage, first of all to the countries of origin. And that's one of the many paradoxes one discovers in this book: host countries normally benefit from migration, the countries of origin in some cases do (eg through money remittances) and in others don't (eg because of brain drain). When considering migration one must keep in mind the good and rights of the migrants, of the host country *and of the country of origin* (this last piece is often forgotten, when that's where the weakest people involved are to be found).

Any attempt to control migration by force alone is unjust and useless. A sound policy should include the following: housing and other public services' policies for immigrants; family reunion policies (too close would be unjust, too open would damage the countries of origin); active efforts toward integration (in his opinion multiculturalism is just a nice word to hide the absence of integration policies, and non integrated national communities have problematic side effects); definition of per-country based quotas (with less places for slower integrating communities); a pragmatic and ordinary (not exceptional) legislation for the treatment of illegal immigrants; active action for hosting refugees and (what no country does) for encouraging their return home when the crisis ends.

Living in a "border region" perhaps makes me especially sensitive to the issue of illegal immigration. His proposal seems to me very honest and realistic. No matter the efforts, there will always be some illegal immigrants, so let's decide how to deal with them so that they don't become non-persons in our countries and thus subject to involvement in outlaw activities. He suggests a long period (some years) of a temporary status: with reduced rights, higher taxes and so on, ending in a regularization that implies subtracting their number from their respective national quotas.

Hiba says

What prejudiced, offensive drivel. Collier's thinly veiled xenophobia is insulting to the reader's intelligence. His insinuations about the inferiority of non-Western cultures, his wildly stereotypical observations about other cultures, and his gall in couching his arguments in an alleged concern for the well-being of LDCs, not to mention the nearly non-existent use of research to back his claims about the detrimental social and economic effects of more open immigration policies to Western countries are enough to consign this book to the "severely toxic - do not touch" pile.

This review by Foreign Affairs, although a good start, is much too mild in its criticism of his arguments:

[http://www.foreignaffairs.com/article....](http://www.foreignaffairs.com/article...)

Denise says

This book is basically an attempt by a liberal to support, recast in dense academic verbiage, positions that have been historically self-evident to conservatives, by citing research and justifications that appeal to progressive sympathies. Thus it will produce cognitive dissonance in people from both camps.

His thesis is that given open borders, migration from poor countries will continue until the poor countries are largely empty and the rich countries are destabilized. The larger the diaspora group in a host country, the faster it will grow and the less it will be integrated into the surrounding culture, causing unsustainable growth in social welfare spending, lowered wages for poor indigenes, and conflict in proportion to the distance between the two cultures, not to mention stripping the country of origin of its most productive citizens and impoverishing those left behind. He comes down in favor of nationalism, immigration quotas, admitting immigrants by accomplishment rather than family reunification, and other not-so-progressive strategies, because the alternative is unworkable. He sees a moral responsibility to aid refugees, but advises that they be kept outside of borders, or admitted for only a limited time. Here are a few quotes:

"It may prove unsustainable to combine rapid migration with multicultural policies that keep absorption rates low and welfare systems that are generous." (The Impossible Trinity)

"A refusal to countenance racially based differences in behavior is a manifestation of human decency. A refusal to countenance culturally based differences in behavior would be a manifestation of blinkered denial of the obvious."

"It is possible that permanently rising cultural diversity would gradually undermine mutual regard and that unabsorbed diasporas would hang onto dysfunctional aspects of the social models that prevailed in their countries of origin at the time of migration."

t. says

Food for thought. Especially with the current state of affairs.

Highly recommended to those who want to be more informed in times of increasing migration and to those who, like myself, left their country of origin behind. It is important to know what consequences such a decision may have in the bigger picture.

Tristram says

Eine Stimme der Vernunft

Mit seinem 2013 erschienenen Buch *Exodus. Warum wir Einwanderung neu regeln müssen* hat der britische Ökonom Paul Collier etwas getan, wozu in unserer Zeit nur die wenigsten bereit oder fähig zu sein scheinen,

sobald es um die Frage der Einwanderung geht. Er hat seinen Verstand eingeschaltet, diverse Forschungsergebnisse und Theorien herangezogen und auf dieser Grundlage die Vor- und Nachteile der Migration für alle drei von ihr betroffenen Gruppen – Migranten, Einheimische der Zielgesellschaften, in den Herkunftsgesellschaften Zurückgebliebene – abgewägt, um am Ende eine von Verantwortungsethik geprägte ideale Einwanderungspolitik zu skizzieren. Dabei geht es ihm, wie er oft betont, nicht um die Frage, ob Einwanderung zuzulassen oder gänzlich zu unterbinden sei, da sich diese Frage angesichts der globalen politischen und wirtschaftlichen Entwicklungen ohnehin nicht stelle, sondern um die Frage, in welchem Maße und nach welchen Gesichtspunkten Einwanderung stattfinden soll. Damit dürfte er sich gleich von zwei Seiten Kritik eingehandelt haben, wenn man denn das Wiederholen der immer gleichen Vorurteile mit dem edlen Wort „Kritik“ aufwerten will – einerseits von den Xenophoben, die in der Einwanderungspolitik westlicher Regierungen nicht einfach eine Mischung aus Unvermögen und Heuchelei, sondern gar eine Verschwörung sehen; andererseits von den wohlstandsverwahrlosten Gutmenschen, die ganz gern ihre Gesinnungsethik zur Schau tragen und dabei übersehen, daß die Grundlagen, auf denen unser Wohlstand beruht, höchstwahrscheinlich von einem fragilen Gleichgewicht über Jahrhunderte gewachsener Strukturen abhängen.

Collier widmet sich in seiner dreischrittigen Analyse (Zielländer, Migranten, Herkunftsländer) nicht bloß ökonomischen Auswirkungen, sondern betrachtet auch kulturelle und soziale Folgen einer ungesteuerten Auswanderung. Unter anderem legt er die Bedeutung sozialer Narrative für den Wohlstand und die Leistungsfähigkeit von Gesellschaften dar, wobei er allerdings betont, daß es hier nicht darum geht, diese Gesellschaften *per se* als höher- oder minderwertig einzustufen, sondern sie allenfalls im Hinblick auf die Frage, welche Entfaltungsmöglichkeiten und Wohlstandsoptionen sie ihren Mitgliedern bieten, zu betrachten – etwas, das die Migranten ja auch tun. Es wird im Verlaufe dieser Ausführungen deutlich, daß wirtschaftlicher Erfolg nicht einzig von geographischen Bedingungen, Ressourcen und demographischen Faktoren abhängt, sondern eben auch von den Narrativen, die in einer Gesellschaft verbreitet sind und die sich über Jahrhunderte herangebildet haben. In Anlehnung an Robert Putnam kommt er zu dem Schluß, daß für westliche Gesellschaften besonders das Vertrauen in die Institutionen des Staates sowie in die Vertreter von Institutionen und Gruppen, aber auch in das *fair play* der Mitbürger ausschlaggebend ist. So kann ein modernes Staatswesen nur dann sozial funktionieren, wenn die Bürger bereit sind, einen Teil ihres Einkommens der Allgemeinheit zur Verfügung zu stellen, wohlwissend, daß staatliche Institutionen diesen für die Verbesserung der öffentlichen Güter und den moderaten Ausgleich sozialer Ungleichheit verwenden und daß dies auf eine überwiegend gerechte und nutzbringende Art geschieht. Migranten aus in dieser Hinsicht dysfunktionalen Gesellschaften indes bringen dieses Vertrauen in der Regel nicht auf und sind infolgedessen meist in geringerem Maße zur gesamtgesellschaftlichen Kooperation willens. Die Folgen einer übermäßigen Einwanderung von Menschen aus solchen Gesellschaften für die zukünftige Bereitstellung und Verwaltung öffentlicher Güter dürften jedem ersichtlich sein.

Collier legt aber auch dar, daß Migranten selbst, obwohl sie zunächst einmal zu den Hauptgewinnern der Migration zählen dürften, auf lange Sicht ein ökonomisches Interesse an Einwanderungsbeschränkungen haben dürften. Besonders interessant wird es allerdings, wenn er sich den Folgen einer ungesteuerten Einwanderung für die Menschen widmet, die in den Herkunftsländern bleiben, beispielsweise weil sie sich aufgrund ihrer Armut eine Auswanderung gar nicht leisten können. Hier relativiert er die Bedeutung des sogenannten Braindrains, weist aber gleichzeitig nach, daß ab einem bestimmten Ausmaß an Auswanderung dieser Braindrain dann tatsächlich stattfindet. Auch die Höhe der Rücküberweisungen, die Familienangehörige von Auswanderern erhalten und die nach Collier eine wichtige Ergänzung der westlichen Entwicklungshilfe sind, hängt den ihm vorliegenden Daten nach von dem Ausmaß der Migration und der Möglichkeit des Familiennachzuges ab.

Dies sind freilich nur einige der Punkte, auf die Collier in einer sehr umsichtigen und vernunftgeleiteten Analyse eingeht und die im Rahmen einer Rezension nicht in Gänze behandelt werden können. Abschließend kommt er dann zu Eckpunkten eines Modells für eine ideale Migrationspolitik, die von den Zielländern ausgehen muß, sind es doch, wie er wiederholt betont, diese und nicht etwa die

Auswanderungsländer, in deren Macht es liegt, Migration – sowohl in ihrem eigenen Sinne als auch in dem der Herkunftsländer wie auch der Migranten – zu steuern. Diese Punkte lauten wie folgt:

- a) Obergrenzen: Collier hält von den Zielländern festgesetzte Obergrenzen für die Migration für unumgänglich, wobei er diese in erster Linie davon abhängig machen möchte, wie hoch die Absorptionsrate, d.h. die Rate der Migranten eines bestimmten Herkunftslandes ist, die sich in die Zielgesellschaft integriert haben. Der Hintergrund dieser Überlegung ist, dass eine hohe Auslandsgemeinde, d.h. die Gruppe derer, die die Integration noch nicht vollzogen haben, eine hohe Attraktionskraft auf weitere potentielle Einwanderer ausübt.
- b) Auswahl: Zielländer sollten das Recht auf Familiennachzug als nur eines unter mehreren Kriterien gelten lassen und sich vielmehr auf Faktoren wie Schutzbedürftigkeit (beispielsweise vor politischer Verfolgung), Qualifikation, Arbeitsmarktfähigkeit oder kulturelle Herkunft konzentrieren, weil all diese Aspekte zum einen die Absorptionsrate beeinflussen, zum anderen aber auch Rückwirkungen auf die Situation in den Herkunftsländern haben.
- c) Integration: Angesichts der Bedeutung der auf Vertrauen gründenden Kooperation für den wirtschaftlichen Erfolg westlicher Gesellschaften überrascht es nicht, daß Collier dem *salad bowl model* skeptisch gegenübersteht. Er verfißt nicht auf biologische, sondern kulturelle Gemeinsamkeiten, Teilhabe ermöglichenden und inklusiven Nationsbegriff und sieht die Nation als eine wichtige Quelle für die Bereitschaft zur Kooperation. Dies setzt auf seiten der Einheimischen sowie der Migranten – hier allerdings noch stärker – die Bereitschaft zu Offenheit und Anpassung voraus.
- d) Legalisierung illegaler Einwanderung: Bislang werden illegale Einwanderer stillschweigend ignoriert und damit toleriert. Daß man sie nicht einfach massenhaft ausweisen kann, ist Collier klar, und deshalb verfolgt er mit diesem Punkt das Ziel, ihren Status zu legalisieren, verknüpft damit jedoch temporäre Restriktionen, denen sie sich zu unterwerfen haben, um auf diese Weise den Anreiz zur illegalen Einwanderung zu vermindern.

Ich habe eigentlich noch nie eine so treffende Analyse dieses emotionsbeladenen Themas gelesen, die am Ende zudem noch zu praktikablen, von umsichtiger und vorausschauender Verantwortungsethik getragenen Lösungsvorschlägen kommt, und kann nur hoffen, obwohl leider anderes zu befürchten ist, daß dieses Buch noch rechtzeitig zur Grundlage einer zukünftigen Migrationspolitik gemacht wird.

Michael Kay-cee says

A non-biased sensitive approach to the question of Immigration without avoiding any of the hard issues. I found his discussions on the positive and negative effects on the developing world of immigration particularly enlightening.

Renaud says

Thought-provoking, sometimes controversial, but always relying on actual data. A forceful contribution to a necessary debate

Popup-ch says

A refreshingly objective overview of current research in the subject of migration. This is a subject that's far too often clouded by opinions and feelings, but Collier summarizes the available research. It is of course impossible not to be influenced by one's opinions, but the author does a good job of separating the two.

He looks into the three main stakeholders in the migration process, the source country, the destination country, and the migrants themselves. (Conspicuously there is no discussion of the transit countries, nor of people smuggling.)

The main conclusion is that on the whole migration has had a mainly positive impact on everyone concerned, but that the effect depends a lot on the policies employed by the destination countries. If the migrants are poorly integrated, they will act as a magnet for more migrants, as well as reducing the trust within the destination country. One surprising conclusion is that strict guidelines favourising well-educated migrants is that it will (in many cases) *reduce* the effective brain-drain from the source countries. Collier is also strongly against the admission of family members, as it increases the separateness between the immigrant diaspora and the indigenous population.

Chris says

I won this book on Goodreads. Thank you!

The author seeks to be a voice of reason in a prickly and emotional discussion that affects all people, everywhere. I doubt that anyone believes that emotion has no place at the table, but good decisions demand thorough review of all aspects. Whether or not you agree with Professor Collier's end position, I believe that you will find his arguments compelling.

I have greatly enjoyed this thought provoking book which was especially timely as I am currently taking Economics courses. In fact, I am thinking of passing this on to one of my professors and will be interested to hear his views.

Gary Knapton says

What could be more topical ? I bought this book way before the migrant crisis in the EU exploded onto the news channels. I saw the author interviewed, possibly on Newsnight, in 2014. I eyed the book as a hardback and then paperback at Christmas in a bookstore in Leeds. I finally plumped for the eBook on iBooks - consuming it on a combination of my phone and my desktop computer.

Paul stays clear of any emotion and partisan stance whilst he considers the effects of migration of the three groups that are involved by it: the migrants, the country of origin and the host country.

It's a scientific approach so if you're this way inclined, as am I, you'll find it really informative and an eye-opener as you get to take a new look at concepts such as remittances, world aid programmes and migrant diasporas. Old questions are re-opened and the answers we took for granted may not be as they seem any longer. For example, the concept of the brain drain always, to my mind, meant that the country of origin lost

out. Not so in the bigger scheme of things.

The book urges that instead of asking migration or no ? we should be asking how much and at what rate ? Instead of asking how many people should we accept as a host nation we should be looking at how to integrate migrants upon arrival.

Paul addresses what goes right and what goes wrong and how seemingly stand-alone policy decisions in a host nation massively effect behaviours years later in far away lands.

Early on you get the graphs. The Diaspora Schedule and the Migration Function denoted as lines charted on an X and Y axis plot. And it's right here that you realise this is the one piece of media totally free of emotion and human interest - that the current debate is totally flawed in the press and that this subject is important enough to earn some intellectual consideration in an environ worthy of the cause.

I applaud the author for this. It is considered, thorough and enlightening. Are we each one of us not guilty of coming down a little too firmly on one side of this debate which never was black and white in any case ? Paul Collier has the reader looking right across the spectrum of interests. All three groups are human after all.

Big respect. I enjoyed this and come away feeling an intense mix of humility and further education.

It is the book of our times.

Eric says

Quite an interesting read. Kind of reinforces the idea that you might be better off reading books than reading the news if you want to understand world events.

Much of Exodus builds on a diaspora absorption model: the diaspora are the people from a given that have not yet been fully absorbed into the mainstream. The observation is that a bigger diaspora makes it easier to migrate (you have a network). This model has two opposing forces (some Bret Victor style insta-feedback visualisation would be helpful here). It grows as people come in (thus accelerating migration because as the diaspora grows, migration becomes easier), and shrinks as people assimilate.

[A funny implication of this might be that one way a xenophobe could go about reducing the number of foreigners they see would be to be nicer to them, help them integrate into the mainstream (shrink the diaspora network)]

Collier explores this from several angles basically blowing up the two dimensional space of how is affected (indigenous, migrants, left behind) and how (economically vs political), and then caps it off with some policy recommendations. If I understand correctly, the overall picture is that so far migration has been beneficial to all parties (except maybe recent Haiti), but that bad things could happen if it were to accelerate (see diaspora model). The point according to Collier isn't whether migration is intrinsically good/bad, but how much of it we should want.

If I recall correctly, economically speaking, basically everybody wins-ish. Migrants most of all, but for the indigenous it's neutral to slightly positive? (but negative if low skilled). The left behind get remittances (good), but gain better educations (people are incentivised and motivated by prospect of being able to seek a better life)... but also potentially lose from brain drain. There's apparently a sort of optimal migration you can

hit where the education boost outweighs the brain drain (and the loss of conscientious people with the right attitudes).

Socially and politically, things are a bit trickier. One of the ideas Collier introduces here is that of "mutual regard", something deeper than just mutual respect (ok, fellow human) but a sort of one-of-us-togetherness feeling... which can go down in culturally diverse societies (one measure of cultural distance he uses is a via linguistic family tree). So yes, societies benefit from more variety and viewpoints, but can lose cohesion (trust, cooperation) if migrants are not successfully absorbed into society so that everybody's feeling fraternal.

A lot to absorb. This was a pretty carefully written book. I kind of feel bad for the guy, have to be very very careful not to be misunderstood. Some distinctions he makes here that between the obligation to help poor people, and to have them migrate. Another is between immigrants, students, and refugees. If you come out of the book thinking that migration should be carefully limited, note that Collier thinks that having students come in is very good (they go home full of new ideas from the host country), and that refugees should be welcomed with open arms... but with the requirement that they return when the conflict has subsided.

Collier also makes an argument somewhere that part of the difference between rich and poor countries are *gulp* differences in social models (institutions, rules, norms, and organisations of a country), and then well as far as prosperity is concerned, (ahem, Diamond Age), some social models are more conducive than others. There is talk about downloadable role models, organisational insiders (aligned with the goals of the org) vs outsiders, etc... which sometimes drifts uncomfortably close to the sort of "well, damnit, some cultures ARE better than others, there I've said it, and just so you don't think I'm racist, look at Asians" rhetoric (which I tend to think more often than not has elaborately disguised racism in it). I don't think that's the sort of thing Collier intends though. I'm sort of comfortable if we stick to talking in terms of social models and norms...

???? ?????? says

???? ?????? ????? ?????? ?????? ?? ??? ??????
?????????
?????? ?????????? ???
?????? ??????????
? ?????? ?????? ????? ?? ???????

R. Hyunjung says

Opened up a lot of perspectives for me confronting the seemingly "un-unravelable" problem of immigration.

Kim Frey says

I won this book on Goodreads! I learned significantly more about the social, political, and economic issues related to migration from reading this book than I did during four years of college--and I was a Global Studies and Political Science major! The author does an excellent job of explaining the likely outcomes of

