

# **The Emergence of Long Distance International Displacements and Restrictive Migratory Laws: A Review of Legal Expressions Based on Racist and National Discrimination**

Luciana L. Contarino Sparta\*

Defined as a large group of people with strong bonds based on a common culture, language and history, the concept of nation emerged during 19<sup>th</sup> century as the agglutinating background of western states. As governments were interested in ensuring the loyalty of population and in legitimating the monopoly of state power, they encouraged the idea of unity related to constructions of ethnic and cultural homogeneity and to traditions and a shared history<sup>1</sup> in order to create a profile that could distinguish themselves from other nationalities and peoples. By the end of 19<sup>th</sup> century, long distance migratory movements reached an unusual extension, with thousands and millions of people crossing oceans and political borders. These movements caused an unsettling effect on the discourse about blood and cultural purity inside state boundaries. It did not matter if the idea of national uniformity had been fictitious or invented (Gellner, 1983; Anderson, 1993); foreigners began to be perceived as a threat to national essence.

Governments exposed their concern about the entry of people that were considered culturally, and also, phenotypically different. And this concern was shared not only by European countries, but also by recently independent states of other continents. As Harald Kleinschmidt (2013) affirmed, migrations became a political issue and defining migrants as

---

1. “Especially useful in that sense was public education [...], as soon as historians, who could construct evocative “national histories”. This topic is developed by Robert Marks (2007) in *The Origins of Modern World* (Rowman and Littlefield Publishers).

\* Luciana L. Contarino Sparta, Professor, Department of History Section of Asian and African Studies, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina.  
E-mail: llcontarinosparta@hotmail.com .

opposed to national citizens appeared as a central matter inside modern nation-states. The world migrations emerged as “a term of social sciences functional to practical needs of administrators and derived from social theory and political philosophy of 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries” (Kleinschmidt, 2013:12). Since then, the conditions that an individual or group of people must accomplish to be accepted as an immigrant or, on the contrary, be considered an undesirable person, turned into a main political task.

## **I. Swinging policies**

Migratory movements were, on one side, a main source of labour force when internal offer was not enough to meet the demand –a recurrent situation in capitalism history, and, on the other, a process that jeopardised national values and reduced employment opportunities for citizens. That is why stop-and-go migratory policies were put into practice: they were not simply prohibitive, but regulatory of the entry of foreigners who wanted to settle down in the country. They, alternately, could become a convenient or a negative presence depending on circumstances and changing contexts and it was therefore imperative to count on legal instruments to justify expulsions and define preferred profiles of people.

Example of this was the United Kingdom that as a consequence of its early process of industrialization and labour opportunities that it offered, became a particularly attractive territory of destination. During the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the country received German, Italian and Irish immigrants, as well as thousands of Jewish that tried to flee from persecutions, who came from Romania, Russia, Lithuania and Poland. But there has been also a gradual arrival of immigrants from different parts of British Empire, including Africa, Asia and Caribbean territories; many of them began to work at London harbour. However, the uncertain future after Long Depression<sup>2</sup>, when xenophobic

---

2. The Long Depression or Long Recession of 1873-1896 combined financial problems with the fall of agriculture prices and the lack of basic food for survival and reproduction of population. As a consequence of demand inside industrial process, the profusion of subsistence crops have been diminishing in favour of raw material, but these circumstances got worse because successive poor harvests caused by climate issues. In the same time, debtors that could not fulfil credit commitments resulted in markets collapse and banks failure.

reactions spread, implied the end of an “open doors” period to give birth to an age of social control and regulations.

The most representative legal expression was the British Alien Act, enacted in Great Britain in 1905. Although it was a merely regulatory law, it also offered to local authorities a wide margin of discretion in migratory issues. The law qualified as “undesirable” the immigrant who could not prove that was in a position of finding the means to maintain himself and the persons who relied on him; who was “a lunatic or an idiot” or suffered any disease that could turn him in a burden on the public finances or a public danger; who had been sentenced in a foreign country or against whom an expulsion order had been issued.

Anyway, beyond appealing to diseases, criminal records or insolvency in order to qualify some immigrants as undesirable, restrictive legislations took into account positivist racial categories. They were the same that had been used in Europe to justify the extermination of American native population, slave trade and colonization, which classified human beings on the basis of somatic differences, putting whites at the top of a racist pyramid. Biological arguments appeared as the explanation of differences among human beings and they were incorporated as “cause and base of a strictly hierarchic organization of society” (Gilroy, 2001:58). By the end of 18<sup>th</sup> century, the English surgeon Charles White assessed that “white European” must be considered as “the most beautiful human race”. “Nobody will doubt their intellectual power and superiority and I think – he asserted- that it will be proved that their ability is also naturally superior than the ability of any other man”. Fifty years later, British anatomist Robert Knox maintained this discourse to oppose the superiority of European over “dark races”, that included African and Asian, but likewise Jewish, Irish and Gypsies (Meyer, 1996).

This thought was reflected in the new migratory British laws of early 20<sup>th</sup> century, when the number of people that arrived from colonies multiplied. As Paul Rich (1990:12) said: “Race thinking in Great Britain in early 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries was strongly shaped by the twin experiences of imperial expansion overseas and industrial growth and class conflict at home”. In this context, immigrants have been compelled to register themselves with the police while the Aliens Order (1920) and the Special Restriction Act (1925), known as Coloured Alien Seamen, restricted labour possibilities for Asian

and African sailors who could not prove their British nationality; they were considered unfair competition by their white colleagues, who accused them of accepting low salaries. This normative was enacted in the middle of race riots that emerged in harbours and targeted sailors that were considered coloured. It resulted in a process of expulsions including people of British citizenship like those that have arrived from the Caribbean Sea, whose identity documents had been confiscated in order they could not prove their nationality (Selvon, 1956). English and Black became incompatible identities in British mother country.

## **II. Early exclusion cases: race and national issues in the United States**

Earlier examples of racial categorization could be found on the other side of the ocean, in the United States of America. The first rules that were established in this country had no straight connection with migration, but laid the foundation of future policies. Between 1790 and 1802, National Congress established basic conditions that must be fulfilled by people who had settled down in the territory and wanted to obtain citizenship: five years of residence, a good moral character and be free white persons (Smith M., 2002). There were not specific laws about migration during this period aside from the 1798 Foreigners and Sedition Act that empowered the president to deport those persons who were considered a threat to peace and security of the country. Specific regulations of immigration were not admitted in those times because, given the urgent need of population growth, it was considered a resource of national strength and wealth (Smith J.F., 1990). The Steerage Act of 1819 was related to this thinking as this law aimed at providing security and health conditions on passenger ships that transported immigrants.

Nevertheless, specific racial issues did not take long to appear. They became the base of exclusive laws initially related to internal migrations that came into force and regulated the settlement of free black people in different states of the country, and not only in the ancient slavery South, because “the new northern states that entered the Union after the end of slavery were as concerned about racial purity as the oldest ones” (Smith M., 2002). As an example, the state of Ohio enacted Black Codes in 1804 and

1807 that obliged blacks that entered the state to post a bond of 500 dollars in order to guarantee good behaviour and prove they were free men. This legislation was effectively applied years after, in 1929, when Afro-American population increased in the state and they were compelled to comply with the normative or leave (Sweet, 2005).

It is true that, as a whole, the United States introduced changes in their legislation in 1870, when the Naturalization Act came into force, allowing African-Americans access to citizenship that was reserved only to free Whites according to the previous law of 1790. However, almost simultaneously, in 1890, the Morrill Act enshrined the principle of “separate but equal”, that institutionalized two segregated systems of health, education and housing for Blacks and Whites, which were not only kept apart but also showed a completely different quality. This legislation enforced a fictitious inclusion or, more precisely, legal discrimination against the descendants of who Edouard Glissant (1995) called naked migrants, that is to say, enslaved Africans<sup>3</sup>.

Also during the last decades of 19<sup>th</sup> century and following similar discriminatory justifications, the first law aimed at restricting the entry of immigrants in the United States was enacted. It had its target among the people from a specific non-western territory, China. Taking into account that Chinese have been the main labour force that allowed the development of gold mining in California, the new position of United States government vis-à-vis these immigrants can be related – as in Great Britain - with the need of shifting the responsibility for deterioration of labour demand during Long Depression of 1873-1996. And this time, in the same way, exclusion was justified by means of qualifying a sector of immigrant population as different and dangerous to national morality and homogeneity. “The Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 was the first national effort to restrict immigration. The Congress responded to depression of those times blaming Chinese (as a scapegoat) as the reason of unemployment and other economic dislocations. Claims and complaints against Chinese included manifestations of xenophobia, as that they were incapable of adopting ‘our habits’ and assimilate to host society and that they ‘had brought’

---

3. In his book “Introduction à une poétique du divers”, Edouard Glissant opposed the category of migrant *nu*, the enslaved Africans that has been transported from their land of origin without any provision, to the migrant *armé*, the colonizer, and the migrant *familiale*, who took part of spontaneous migratory waves.

prostitution. It was also feared that increasing Chinese immigration could reduce white colonization in the West.” (Smith, J.F., 1990:671)

As the jurist James Frank Smith remarked, this law was only the first effort. In 1898, the Immigration Service created a List of Races or People to classify the immigrants who must go through an inspection process at the main door of entry, the Ellis island, where settlement areas and labour activities were to a large extent determined. By the end of 19<sup>th</sup> century, the reference to national origins often appeared in migratory laws. It became a main issue due to the growing nativist public opinion, promoted by intellectuals who demanded restrictive measures to “preserve American values and culture”, and that resulted in recurrent episodes of hostility against foreigners.

Restrictions were extended in 1917 with the new Immigration Act that was enacted in order to prohibit the entry to sixteen years old foreigners that were physically able of reading but could not read English language or any other language or dialect, including Hebrew and Yiddish. Consuls were trained to discourage the immigration of people who could become a “public burden”. Immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe were qualified in 1920 as “racially inferior, inassimilable, radical and dangerous” and the reduction of their number was immediately ordered (Adam, 1990:175-176). Besides this law, an Asian Barred Zone was created in order to delineate a complete region of the world whose citizens were banned from entering the United States. And this restriction was not addressed only to Chinese people but to every person from Southern Asia from Arabia to Indochina and nearby islands, space that included India, Burma, Thailand, the Malaysian states, Eastern Indian islands, Asian Russia, the Polynesia and parts of Arabia and Afghanistan.

A quota system was put into practice in 1921. The future settlement of immigrants was reduced to three per cent of the population of the same origin that already lived in the United States. That proportion was cut down in 1924 to two per cent, as soon as Asian continued to be completely excluded and immigration from Southern and Eastern Europe was again reduced, giving an advantage of six to one in favour of people from Western and Northern Europe. The stated aim was “preserving race purity giving greater quotas to preferred countries and very small quotas to countries whose people were of ‘inferior level’.” (Streich and Kalaitzidis, 2008: 4-5).

Although racial approach was replaced by nationality in migratory

legislation, in fact, nationality and race became –not by chance- related terms that implied the same idea of superiority and inferiority. Legislation enacted in the United States was suspicious about foreigners and, more specifically, about those who did not share neither Western features nor the Western culture or, to be precise, Saxon features and culture. Restrictions about Chinese immigrants have been explained taking into account that their large presence as low-cost labour force in western coastal mines was perceived as labour competition and caused social unrest among native workers during the times of crisis. However, the arguments used to justify exclusion exceeded particular circumstances and practical issues and were based on a xenophobic thinking that was shared even by sectors considered as the most progressive in the country, whose members stressed superiority of natives of Saxon descent facing foreigners and nationals of other origins.<sup>4</sup>

In this sense, illustrative are the opinions expressed in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century by feminist militant Margaret Sanger in her book *Women and the New Race*, where she developed a clearly eugenic position. She considered that it was doubtful to think about the construction of a “better race” with the contribution of immigrants that arrived before 1910, who were for the most part illiterate. “That these foreigners who have come in hordes have brought with them their ignorance of hygiene and modern ways of living and that they are handicapped by religious superstitions is only too true – Sanger (1920) stated- [...]Under such circumstances we can hope that the ‘melting pot’ will refine. We shall see that it will save the precious metals of racial culture, fused into an amalgam of physical perfection, mental strength and spiritual progress. Such an American race, containing the best of all racial elements, could give to the world a vision and a leadership beyond our present imagination”. In short: immigration brought a danger of “pollution” that jeopardised, in this case, the conservation of superior values that have been introduced in the country by Saxon people.

### **III. From north to south: shared restrictive principles**

Similar ideological foundations had exclusive policies and laws of other

---

4. This comparison is developed by Robert M. Yerkes (1921) in his book *Psychological Examining in the United States Army*.

states organized in America. That was the case of Canada, a confederation with a dominion status inside the imperial United Kingdom since 1867. With a rising economy, but a short number of inhabitants especially in the western side of the country, during 19<sup>th</sup> century its government promoted a migratory policy seemingly unrestricted. In 1869 the Immigration Act was put into force to ensure immigrants security, although it also established some restrictions that penalized the entry of “lunatics, idiots, deaf or full, blind or ill”. References to geographical origins were not included.

Although immigrants came massively to Canada from Anglo-Saxon world during that century, after this law was enacted communities as diverse as those of Mennonites, Russian Jewish and Islanders were formed. Given that the construction of Canadian Pacific Railway was urgent, Chinese immigration was promoted and hundreds of workers of this origin arrived in the beginning of 1880s. Problems arose when the project came to an end and they were no longer welcomed and many citizens demanded the government to limit Chinese immigration and settlements as they were considered a danger to people security. Complaints became so extended that government created in 1884 a commission to verify what Canadians thought about this community. Workers, police agents, judges, lawyers, clerics and businessmen testified before the commission and all of them were unanimous in qualifying Chinese as dirty, prone to diseases, immoral, dishonest and unable to assimilate and their women were all called prostitutes. Besides, they were accused of stealing labour opportunities from the White people (Kelley, N. and M. Trebilcock, 2010). The government response was immediate: it was established that any Chinese who wanted to settle down in Canada had to pay a 10 dollars tax. The Chinese Immigration Act of 1885 raised the amount first to 50 dollars and to 500 dollars after the amendment of 1903. Finally, as a consequence of new restrictions that were added during the first decades of 20<sup>th</sup> century, it was estimated that only fifteen Chinese were able to enter the country between 1923 and 1946.<sup>5</sup>

Besides this legislation based on stereotypical and prejudiced ideas similar to those that have been constructed in the United States in order to exclude Chinese migrants in 1882, 1906 and 1910, Canada government enacted new general and restrictive laws on migratory issues. The main characteristic

---

5. These were the conclusions reached by the Canadian Museum of Immigration at Pier 21, Halifax, that can be accessed at [www.pier21.ca](http://www.pier21.ca).

of this legislation was that it gave the government discretionary powers to decide who could stay in the country, in other words, it allowed the authorities to execute deportation orders without any possibility of judicial review. In addition to this normative, a subsequent amendment authorized the administration to prohibit the entry of immigrants of any nationality, race, profession or social class on the basis of their particular habits, ways of life and methods of access to property. Simultaneously, the government organised campaigns to promote the entry of immigrants from the United States and Central Europe, considering the latter as expert farmers.

While immigration from Europe and the United States was encouraged, new legislation was applied as an instrument to restrict the entry of members of other communities that were considered undesirable. During the first decade of 20<sup>th</sup> century, the targets were people from Japan and India, no matter if the latter was part of British Empire. Ministry of Labour recommended the prohibition of entry to workers who had been contracted in Japan “in the interest of racial harmony and homogeneity”<sup>6</sup>. About people from India, the justification of the exclusion was that “immigrants of this kind, used to tropical weather, are completely inappropriate for this country and their inability to adapt themselves to a so different environment will led them inevitably to suffering and deprivation” (Kelley, N. y M. Trebilcock, 2010: 149).

In many areas of the British Empire outside America that were also territories with a high immigration demand, we can find more examples of regulatory laws. One of these was the Immigration Restriction Act enacted in the beginnings of 20<sup>th</sup> century in Australia, another white dominion of the United Kingdom. Principles that seemed to be a copy of first British laws were included in this legislation, that prohibited the immigration of any “insane or idiot” or person who suffered contagious diseases, was a prostitute or exploited other people for this kind of activities, was a convict or a person sentenced to more than one year of prison. Western preferences were also included: the normative empowered the authorities to expulse anyone unable to write in the presence of the designated officer a paragraph of fifty words in European language (Wilson, McMahan and Thompson, 1996). Similar normative had been earlier enacted in Natal, South Africa (1897), and in New Zealand (1899).

---

6. Words pronounced by Mackenzie King, in charge of the Ministry, who later would be Primer Minister of Canada.

This kind of policies and laws has not been exclusive to Anglo-Saxon world. They were also applied in the main migratory destinations of Latin America between the second half of 19<sup>th</sup> and the first of half the 20<sup>th</sup> century, as it happened in Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay where the aim of local government was to expand agriculture and livestock economy. From the south, but looking to the north, the principles held by the creole elite that participated in the organization of Argentine Republic were clear: “If the

population of more than six million of Anglo-American that started the United States Republic instead of growing with immigrants from the free and civilized Europe would have been populated with Chinese or Asian Indians, or with Africans, or with Ottomans, would it be the same country of free men that is today? [...] Why have I said that governing is populating and that this is an unquestionable truth? Because populating, I repeat, is to instruct, to educate, to moralize, to improve race. That is why [...] government must promote European immigration. Populate is not civilize, but brutalize, when it is done with Chinese and Indian from Asia and black from Africa.”<sup>7</sup>

Although National Constitution of 1853 was subtler, it was also clear enough about migratory preferences and about the origins of migrants that were going to be favoured. As soon as its preamble opened arms “to every man of good will who wants to inhabit the Argentine soil”, the same Constitution stated that it would be encouraged, specifically, the “European immigration”. This preference was put into practice when Immigration and Colonization Act was enacted in 1876, although this law did not include precisions on preferred migrants’ nationalities or characteristics. The law generally defined migrants as any foreigner under the age of 60, “labourers, craftsmen, industrialists, agricultures or teachers”, who could prove “morality and abilities” and wanted to settle down in the country. Those who were identified as preferred immigrants by National Constitution were attracted through the action of agents who were sent to Europe in order to promote the advantages that Argentine government offered to people from that continent (Novick, 2008). The purpose of encouraging the entry of immigrants of European origins implied a complete opposition

---

7. These expressions are part of the document “Bases y puntos de partida para la organización de la República Argentina” (1852), that was written by the local politician and intellectual Juan Bautista Alberdi and was used as the fundamental base of National Constitution, that would be enacted the following year.

to any kind of cultural diversification. On the contrary, the objective was cultural homogeneity, but conceived as European homogeneity, assuming that “racial diversity” could cause “serious social problems” (Garabedian, 2011:8).

Brazilian authorities fostered European immigration with the objective of “improving population quality” (Schramm Correa, 2005). Anyway, what they wanted was to replace the labour force that slavery had offered, because it was abolished in 1888. A decree enacted in 1980 was explicit from its first article that referred to exclusions in migratory aspects: “The entry to harbours of the Republic is completely free to valid and fit for work individuals not subject to any criminal action in their countries, with the exception of indigenes from Asia or Africa, who will be only admitted previous authorization of National Congress”. As Ricardo Nóbrega said (2008: 118), the preference for European immigrants instead of people of Asian or African origins had to do with the adoption of the same stereotypical principles that “associated progress of developed nations to the characteristics of their people, which would be the result of racial belonging”. In coincidence, Darcy Ribeiro (1992) stated that governments adopted “as a national project, the replacement of local people by European because they were considered to have an urgent desire for progress”.

The Oriental Republic of Uruguay received large population waves from France, Spain and Italy that increased the population from 70,000 inhabitants in 1830 to one million in 1900. But this huge population contribution did not take place by chance. On the contrary, it was intentionally encouraged by local government that restricted explicitly the entry of migrants from other parts of the world and privileged Western Europeans, who became the owners of more than 50 per cent of rural lands and urban areas of the capital city.

With content that was similar to the preamble of Argentine Constitution, the Uruguayan Act 2096 that was put into force in 1890 established in its preface that “to the effects of this law, migrant is any honest and fit for work foreigner that would move to the Oriental Republic of Uruguay in a steam or sailing ship with a second or third class ticket and with the intention of fixing his residence in the country”. But this preface offers a mistaken idea about the level of openness of migratory policy in this country. In fact, although this Uruguayan normative was inspired in Argentine 1876

Immigration and Colonization Act, it also differed from this because it gave precisions about which were the migratory patterns clearly rejected. In its 26<sup>o</sup> article, the law established restrictions on beggars, persons that suffered a contagious illness, individual not fit for work as a result of a physical problem and sixty years old people except that “they were accompanied with four people fit for work”. Anyway, limitations exposed in 27<sup>o</sup> article were openly racist because it prohibited “Asian and African immigration, as well as the immigration of people known as Hungarians and Bohemians.” (LópezSala, 2005)

#### **IV. Conclusion**

According to Aristide Zolberg (1989), the role played by government policies related to the development of international migrations is central. An archetypical example is the already analysed case of the United States, country that emerged as a “nation of immigrants, no doubt, but not of any immigrant” because “since de moment they began to manage their own affairs, just before political independence, the Americans have made the decision of determining who could join them” (Zolberg, 2008). Other host countries, to a greater or lesser extent, put into practice selective policies that led migrants to face obstacles, sometimes insurmountable, as soon as they transformed into undesirable elements.

Although it is true that regulations varied depending on economic conditions, for the most part these restrictions had its foundations in colonial ideology, centralized in the idea of racial hierarchy. As Paul Gilroy (2008: 29) said: “Race has been essential to the elaboration of a political anatomy of 19<sup>th</sup> century. As this concept came to be really scientific, it became an important aspect of European geopolitics inside a process of transition to its world leadership that was reinforced and legitimized thanks to an adapted application of Darwin ideas”. In the end, the discourse of racial superiority emerged as the ideological base of imperial domination and defined the essence of White nations as a reservoir of societies that were phenotypically and culturally opposed to a non-Western world characterized as uncivilized.

During the historical age of overseas migratory expansion, these ideological principles were reproduced in host territories that had different political

conditions, economic needs and international positions. United Kingdom government, with its colonial leadership, founded immigration restrictions in the same position of superiority that have led the country to conquer a great part of the world. The United States and Canada targeted the non-European others as a dangerous presence. It was not difficult to justify restrictions to the entry of persons that belonged to non-Western category as soon as they were characterized as polluting stereotypes of a constructed cultural homogeneity. And, for the same reason, they became the recurrent scapegoat in times of unemployment and economic problems.

The creole elites of Latin-American countries that became independent states during 19<sup>th</sup> century tried to construct a European national essence, with Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay as paradigmatic examples. Supporting this idea implied specific actions, like the extermination of indigenous people<sup>8</sup> and campaigns organised to promote European immigration. It was also an ideology that not only sought to marginalise indigenous communities and other non-Western peoples, like those of African descent; more radically, as in the Argentine case, the purpose was to invisibilise them, denying these communities as part of the social fabric and, consequently, trying to hide racism. This kind of concealment has been also put into practice in Brazil, a country that was defined as *mestizo*, adjective that was widespread by local sociologist Gilberto Freyre (1942). This word intended to define a society where origins were mixed-up and, consequently, discrimination was not a possibility. In comparison with Anglo-Saxon world, this local sociologist assessed that in his country there were no hostility between “the White and the Black, master and slave” because “we are two halves living in fraternity that enrich one another”. For its part, the United States set up a fiction of equality of rights since 1868, when the doctrine *separate but equal* was put into practice.

During modern times, European countries that had sold enslaved Africans during centuries to America and colonised remote territories, homogeneity of Western civilization seemed to be protected by geographical distance. Nevertheless, migratory movements put an end to distance. While empires still existed, many individuals from colonies swelled labour force in European metropolis and others took up studies in that continent. After Second World War, this influx became more significant.

---

8. During the 19<sup>th</sup> century, in Argentina took place the Desert Campaign and the Conquest of the Desert that led to the displacement and assassination of indigenous people followed by the occupation of their lands that were going to be distributed among the members of an elite close to state power.

Extended international migrations resulted in what Paul Gilroy called a new world of “conviviality”, term that he defines as the process of cohabitation and interaction that have turned multiculturalism in a common and daily feature of social life in urban areas of the world that transformed itself after colonial experience (Gilroy, 2008). However, far from being considered an enriching experience, this multiculturalism began to be observed as a threat to European and the White civilization. Others’ communities have been characterized as potentially dangerous and rejected inside a xenophobic context, as soon as they were held liable to unemployment, crime and lack of security. With the rise of migrations waves, racist and discriminatory perceptions strengthened and resulted in the denial of rights such as labour, education and decent housing.

Segregation or invisibilization became preferred policies inside modern nation-states that configured themselves in the ideology of European superiority and social homogeneity, qualifying people from non-Western countries as polluting to national identity. The entrenchment of this ideology implied that it has not been enough to abolish slavery or put an end to colonization; a highly racialized thought persisted over time (Calvès, 2008) and after the declaration of independence elites of former colonized countries applied to immigrants the same kind of discrimination that they have suffered before and continued to experience inside a neo-colonialist background.

Although the cases that have been approached are neither unique nor exhaustive, they show the common principles shared by countries that became main host territories during 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. At the opposite ends of the world, in an imperialist metropolis or in recently independent territories that began to share the common characteristic of migrant receiving countries, the category of undesirable was consolidated on the same racialized stereotypes and, consequently, led to the definitive internalisation of human classifications that developed inside the colonial world.

## References

- Adam, Willi Paul Comp (1990) *Los Estados Unidos de América, México: Siglo XXI.*
- Anderson, Benedict (1993) *Imagined Communities: Reflections of the Origin and Spread of Nationalism, New York: Verso.*
- Calvès, Gwénaële (2008) *La discrimination positive, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.*
- Corrêa, Lucelina Schramm (2005) “As políticas públicas de imigração europeia não portuguesa para o Brasil – de Pombal à República”. *Simposio Nacional de História, 23, 2005, Londrina, Anais do XXIII Simpósio Nacional de História – História: guerra e paz. Londrina: Anpuh, Cd-Rom.*
- Freyre, Gilberto (1942) *Casa grande e Senzala, Mercantori.*
- Garabedian, Marcelo (2011) *Inmigración en la Argentina Moderna, Buenos Aires: Historia Visual, Museo Roca.*
- Gellner, Ernest (1983) *Nations and Nationalism, New York: Cornell University Press.*
- Gilroy, Paul (2001) *Against Race: Imagining Political Culture Beyond the Color Line, Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.*
- (2008) *Después del imperio. Emigración, xenofobia y diversidad cultural, Barcelona, Ensayo Tusquets Editores.*
- Glissant, Eduard (1995) *Introduction à une poétique du divers, Paris: Gallimard.*
- Kelly, Ninette and Michael Trebilcock (2010). *The Making of the Mosaic. A History of Canadian Immigration Policy, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.*
- Kleinschmidt, Harald (2003) *People on the move. Attitudes Toward and Perceptions of Migration in Medieval and Modern Europe, Greenwood Publishing Group.*

- López Sala, Ana María (2005) *Inmigrantes y estados: la respuesta política ante la cuestión inmigratoria*, Barcelona, Anthropos Editorial.
- Meyer, Susan (1996). *Imperialism at home. Race and Victorian Women's Fiction*, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Nóbrega, Ricardo (2008) "Migraciones y modernidad brasileña: italianos, nordestinos y bolivianos en San Pablo". En: Novick, Susana (comp.) *Las Migraciones en América Latina Políticas, culturas y estrategias*. Buenos Aires, Catálogos- CLACSO.
- Novick, Susana (2008) "Migración y políticas en la Argentina: tres leyes para un país extenso". En: Novick, Susana (comp.) *Las Migraciones en América Latina Políticas, culturas y estrategias*, Buenos Aires, Catálogos- CLACSO.
- Quijano, Aníbal (2010) "¡Qué tal raza!". En: Mosquera Rosero-Labré, Claudia; Agustín Laó-Montes y César Rodríguez Garavito (Ed. y coautores), *Debates sobre ciudadanía y políticas raciales en las Américas negras*. Universidad del Valle/Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Bogotá.
- Ribeiro, Darcy (1992) *Las Américas y la civilización: proceso de formación y causa del desarrollo desigual de los pueblos americanos*, Caracas, Biblioteca Ayacucho, Caracas.
- Rich, Paul B. (1990) *Race and Empire in British Politics*, New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Sanger, Margaret (1920) *Women and the New Race*, Nueva York, Truth Publishing Co.
- Schramm Correa, Lucelinda (2005) *As políticas públicas de imigração europeia não-portuguesa para o Brasil - de Pombal à República*". *Revista Geo-Paisagem*, Year 4, Nº 8, July/December.
- Selvon, Samuel (1956) *The London Londoners*, London, Longman.
- Smith, James Frank (1990) *Derecho constitucional comparado México-Estados Unidos*. México, Universidad Autónoma de México.

Drop Rule. Florida, Backintyme Publishers

Weiner, Myron (1990) "Immigration: perspectives from receiving countries".  
Third World Quaterly, Enero, Vol. 12, N° 1.

Wilson, J.; J. McMahon, y J. Thomson, J. Editores (1996) *The Australian  
Welfare Stat. Key Documents and Themes*, Melbourne, Mac. Millan  
Education Australia Pry, Ltd.

Zolberg, Aristide (1989) "The next waves: migration theory for a changing  
world". *International Migration Review*, Vol. 23, N° 3.

----- (2006) *A Nation by Design. Immigration  
Policy in the Fashioning of America*, Cambridge, Harvard University  
Press.

Smith, Marian L. (2002) "Race, Nationality and Reality: INS Administration  
of Racial Provisions in U.S. Immigration and Nationality Law Since  
1898". *The Immigrants' Journal*, Primera parte.

Streich, Gregory y AkisKalaitzidis (2008) "Immigration and Race in the  
U.S. A Historical Perspective". Chicago, MPSA Annual National  
Conference.

Sweet, Frank W. (2005) *Color Line. The Rise and Triumph of the One-*