The International Travel Regime

Rey Koslowski

To appear in Rey Koslowski, ed. Global Mobility Regimes (Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

Introduction

A longstanding but somewhat latent international travel regime exists given that states have been cooperating with each other on passports and visa policy for close to a century. Such cooperation enabled international travel, even in times of war and political tension, but went largely unnoticed by international relations analysts and migration scholars. The growth of international travel over the past few decades to billions of border crossings per year involved even more international cooperation and its institutionalization within international organizations. Cooperation on international travel may be closely related to cooperation on migration but it is not the same. Often, cooperation on international travel takes place in international organizations and international fora that do not deal with immigration and refugee policies but may nevertheless have a significant impact on international migration and asylum-seeking. For the most part, cooperation on international travel has historically focused on facilitating cross-border movements of ever larger volumes of tourists and business people, however, the hijackings of the early 1970s and the suicidal/homicidal hijackings of September 11, 2001 brought security considerations to the fore of international cooperation in this issue area. As transnational organized crime and terrorism have raised security concerns within states, they have increasingly turned to international cooperation to secure international travel while maintaining levels of travel flows.

The politics of cooperation on international travel also differ fundamentally from the politics of cooperation on international labor migration and refugees. Major migration destination states may not be very interested in making commitments to multilateral cooperation to facilitate labor migration but these very same states may be inclined to join an international regime that facilitates the arrival of international travelers who do not come to work but rather to spend money on lodging, meals and leisure activities. While there may be no inherent reciprocity between states that send and receive labor migration, international tourism has as a different array of political constituencies that produce different political dynamics with respect to international bargaining among states. Just as international travel is a part of the process of international migration, asylum seeking and refugee resettlement, international cooperation on travel and the politics surrounding that cooperation has significant consequences for migration and asylum.

I will elaborate on these arguments in the following steps. First, I examine the extent and nature of international travel. Second, I review the development of international cooperation on international travel within international organizations such as the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), the World Trade Organization (WTO) General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS 4), the World Health Organization (WHO), the World Customs Organization (WCO) as well as outside of international organization in less formal multilateral processes, conferences and consultations. Third, I consider the relationship between international travel and migration as well as the politics of cooperation on international travel in comparison to cooperation on migration. Finally, I examine the relationship of international travel to the processes of asylum seeking and refugee resettlement, explore the potential relationships between the international travel regime and the refugee regime

and consider the implications of increasing international cooperation to secure international travel for the future of asylum.

The Dynamics of International Travel

Global mobility encompasses all international travel for any purpose and length of time and it could be measured by collecting and collating annual statistics from every one of the 192 UN member states on the number of people that have entered each member state through ports of entry and official border crossing points plus an official estimate of those who have crossed each state's borders without authorization. As it stands, we can only really guess the annual number of international border crossings worldwide—perhaps over two billion. It is this number, however, that captures the scope of the activities addressed by international cooperation to facilitate and secure international travel.

UN Statistics Division has collected statistics on the stocks and flows of international migrants upon which UN estimates of the worldwide total number of migrants are based. Beginning with the 1949/50 issue, the *Demographic Yearbook*[i] has presented (periodically) national data on international arrivals and departures classified by specified major categories (i.e long-term immigrants, short-term immigrants, tourists, refugees, excursionists, diplomatic personnel, returning residents). Arrival and departure data come primarily from border control records but also from population register information used by a number of countries (particularly in Europe). Last reported in the 1989 edition of the *Demographic Yearbook*, arrival statistics have many gaps with respect to countries that have not reported any arrival statistics, only reported them for a few years and/or only reported some categories of arrivals. The 1989 *Demographic Yearbook* technical notes enumerate problems encountered with the collection of

international arrival and departure statistics. For example, the statistics are most commonly produced from arrival-departure cards completed at the time an individual crosses a national border but not all groups of international travelers are required to complete such cards. In some countries, entry forms instead of arrival-departure cards are collected but returning citizens and residents are often not required to complete such a form. Also, the categorization of international travelers differs along with statistical treatment of them making international comparability difficult for those countries that have reported their arrival data. Largely due to a meager response from states to UN questionnaires, the UN Statistics Division has cumulatively not collected very many statistics on international travelers and has stopped including the arrival and departure tables in recent editions of the *Demographic Yearbook*.

Much of the work collecting and publishing arrival statistics has largely been assumed by the UN World Tourism Organization (UNWTO). The UNWTO collects statistics from member states and publishes estimates on world-wide international tourist arrivals, which includes travel for leisure, business and to visit friends and relatives. Over the past decade, the numbers of tourists has increased along with the global tourist industry. Not only is international tourism becoming a major share of the economies of certain developing countries but it is becoming an increasing important component of the post-industrial service economies of many developed countries and especially of particular regions and cities of these countries. The governments of many UN member states, their regions and cities spend millions of dollars to actively promote their attractions to international tourists.

("[Insert Table 3.1 about here]")

Arrivals of international tourists have increased from 535 million to 846 million, or 58 percent, from 1995 to 2006 (see Table 3.1). Of those 846 million international tourist arrivals,

51 percent travelled for the purpose of leisure, recreation and holidays; 27 percent for purposes such as visiting friends and relatives, religious reasons/pilgrimages, health treatment; 16 percent for business and the purpose of remaining 6 percent was not specified.[ii]   It is important to point out that many individuals travel internationally several times per year. Therefore, a million international tourist arrivals does not equate to a million individuals who have travelled internationally in one year.

The number of international tourist arrivals, however, does not necessarily include millions of students and temporary contract workers who stay for less than one year and a large number of cross-border commuters who may or may not be counted in arrival statistics. The number of international tourist arrivals also does not include the entries of returning citizens. For example, if we consider the US case, the UNWTO reported that in 2002 the US had 43 million international tourist arrivals. According to US Department of Homeland Security (DHS) statistics,[iii] in 2002, the US had 440 million entries (161 million citizens and 279 million non-citizens). In addition to the 43 million foreign nationals entering with a visa or under the visa waiver program, there were 52 million entries from Canada that were visa exempt and 104 million entries by Mexicans with Border Crossing Cards (which are for stays of up to 30 days to visit relatives, tourism, shopping). The ratio of total non-citizen entries to international tourist arrivals reported by UNWTO to is roughly 6.5 to one. Given that such a ratio may very well be similar to that of other countries with land borders, the UNWTO international arrival statistics may be a good place to start but they only offer a relatively small slice of total annual border crossings.

The UNWTO estimated that in 2010 there were 935 million international tourist arrivals.[iv] If all of these individuals returned directly home, their return trips and entries as

citizens in their home countries add another 935 million border crossings. Some of these individuals will have entered more than one foreign country on one trip abroad and will therefore only be one entry back home for several international tourist arrivals abroad. Although one can only speculate on what the ratio of international tourist arrivals abroad to entry of returning citizen, if one assumes that half the trips taken involve roundtrip travel to only one country while the other half involves travel to two or more countries, a ratio of one citizen return entry per three international tourist arrivals would be reasonably conservative estimate. This ratio would yield a total of 1,246.7 million international tourist arrivals and returns. If the ratio of total non-citizen entries to international tourist arrivals reported by UNWTO of all 192 member states is only a small fraction of the 6.5-to-1 ratio of the U.S., a ratio of one-to-one for example, that would yield an additional 935 million entries (of which over one sixth would be to the U.S.). Using these relatively conservative ratios, one could estimate a worldwide total of over 2 billion entries in 2010 (not including estimates of unauthorized border crossings).

The contrasting demography of international travel is complemented by contrasting economics as well. Discussions of the economics of migration and asylum focus on the costs of social welfare and benefits of cheap labor in destination states as well as the benefits of remittances and costs of "brain drain" in origin countries. The economics of migration, however, is largely limited to a relatively small slice of overall international travel flows. In 2006, those 846 million international tourists generated $733 billion of revenue distributed across the world with 75 states receiving at least one billion dollars.[v] Nevertheless, $369 billion, more than half of the total, went to the top ten recipient countries (see Table 3.2), most of which are states with highly developed economies and, with the exception of China, all members of the OECD.

("[Insert Table 3.2 about here]")

Six of the top ten migration destination countries (the US, Russia, Germany, France, the UK and Spain) are also in the top ten destination countries of international tourists (compare table 2 in Chapter one with table 2 above). Although these major migration destination countries need not consider multilateral cooperation in order to get migrant workers because they are in abundant supply, the supply of international tourists cannot be similarly be taken for granted. Many tourists can opt to travel to other countries or simply travel within their own countries. Moreover, the money that international tourists spend can shift away from states that erect barriers to international travel toward those states that do not.

For example, international tourism to the US peaked in 2000 at 51.2 million international arrivals ($82.4 billion in receipts) then dropped to 41.2 million ($64.3 billion) in 2003. This was the year that the Department of Homeland Security was formed, that the Iraq War began; that many provisions of the Enhanced Border Security and Visa Entry Reform Act of 2002, such as mandatory interviews for visa applications with submission of biometrics, went into effect; and that The United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology (US-VISIT) program was deployed at all airports and seaports to collect facial and fingerprint biometrics from individuals traveling to the US on a non-immigrant visa. It has taken six years until 2006 for the US to regain the level of international tourist arrivals and exceed receipts of 2000 (51.1 million and $85.7 billion respectively). In the same six years, the world total of international arrivals increased 24 percent; Spain overtook the US second place ranking as international tourist arrivals to Spain increased from 47.9 million to 58.5 million and arrivals to China increased from 31.2 million to 49.6 million, bringing China within striking distance of surpassing the US third place ranking.

Increasing global human mobility has been referenced by scholars as a major factor of globalization. This factor of globalization is often quantified in terms of UN figures on increasing total migrant stock; however, this human factor of globalization would be better measured by time series data on the total number of all entries into all UN member states. Not only are movements for stays of less than one year not captured in world migrant stock statistics, increasing employment of short-term workers from abroad for less than one year that replaces longer-term labor migration, may even translate into declining permanent migration. Therefore, declining international migrant stocks may occur with and reflect increased global mobility measured in increasing numbers of entries. Total world migrant stock data not only fails to adequately measure the scope of global mobility, management of the cross-border movements of the world's 214 million migrants understates the task of international organizations that comprise the international travel regime and a focus on the demographics and economics of migration fails to give an adequate context for understanding the politics of international cooperation with respect to international travel as opposed to international migration as well as the politics of global mobility as whole .

International Cooperation on Travel within International Organizations and Without

The growth of international travel is a largely function of increasing international cooperation within international organizations as well as in the context of less formal bilateral and multilateral interactions. Just as there is no World Migration Organization that regulates labor migration at the global level, there is no International Travel Organization that regulates international travel. Although the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) might a first glance look like a plausible candidate, the UNWTO developed out of early private sector organizations

that had promoted the development of tourism and the primary mission of this international organization has become the development of responsible, sustainable and universally accessible tourism rather than facilitating the crossing of borders by travelers or increasing the security of such crossings. Rather, cooperation among states on international travel has taken place in a wide range of international organizations, "processes," conferences and "consultations." The latent but reemerging international travel regime is comprised of continuing cooperation to facilitate travel as well as increasing cooperation to secure travel that crosses international borders.

International cooperation within international organizations to facilitate international travel reaches back to the League of Nations and the 1920 Paris Conference on Passports and Customs Formalities and Through Tickets, where League of Nations signatory states standardized passport and visa formats and adopted the now familiar multi-page book format passport with uniform rules for layout, content validity and issuing fees.[vi] Despite passport standardization, travel was not sufficiently facilitated for over a million Russians who fled the Revolution and found themselves in a Europe whose post WWI borders now required passports to cross and a home state whose revolutionary government was not about to issue them the travel documents they needed. In response, Fridtof Nansen was appointed the League's High Commissioner for Refugees and in 1921 he persuaded 52 states to accept the "Nansen Passport" to give Russian refugees limited legal status enabling them to work and apply for permanent residency. The Second International Passport Conference, which took place in May 1926 in Geneva, added specifications to the standard international passport format but the collapse of the League of Nations brought a halt to standardization efforts. It was only after WWII that efforts to improve and standardize passports were reignited with the formation of International Civil

Aviation Organization (ICAO) as a United Nations specialized agency in 1946. Given that the passport can only effectively function if the person issued the passport is the person using it and hundreds of thousands of passports are lost or stolen each year, INTERPOL established a database through which member states share information on lost and stolen passports. A growing number of INTERPOL's 187 member states are contributing data to the INTERPOL database, which contains more than 16 million records of lost and stolen passports.[vii]

UN World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) is another part of the international travel regime but one that emerged out of an international non-governmental organization devoted to the promotion of tourism, essentially by continuing that mission but placing tourism promotion within the larger context of economic development. The UNWTO traces back its origin to the International Union of Official Tourist Propaganda Organizations, which was established in 1934. After WWII, this unfortunately named organization was succeeded by International Union of Official Travel Organizations (IUOTO). The IUOTO initiated efforts for the 1963 United Nations Conference on Tourism and International Travel that adopted recommendations on the simplification of international travel formalities as well as a general resolution on tourism development, including technical co-operation, freedom of movement and absence of discrimination. Six years later, the United Nations General Assembly called for the creation of an intergovernmental organization on tourism and, in 1970, the IUOTO Special General Assembly adopted the statutes of the World Tourism Organization (WTO). In 1975, the first WTO General Assembly met in Madrid, established its headquarters there and signed an agreement to become an executing agency of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). In 2003, the UN General Assembly approved the transformation of World Tourism Organization into a United Nations specialized body that itself adopted the initials UNWTO to avoid confusion with "the

new WTO." The UNWTO has played an important role in collecting tourism statistics, many of which have been used to demonstrate the economic importance of tourism generally, and to convince the governments of developing countries that opening their borders to international travelers from developed countries could become a significant driver of economic growth. The UNWTO, however, does not serve as the secretariat overseeing the implementation of any major international treaties that entail major commitments on the part of states with respect to accepting the entry of international travelers.

International organizations have long contributed to international travel facilitation even if this cooperation has often been unacknowledged by students of international cooperation on migration and, as in the case of the International Maritime Organization (IMO), that contribution to travel facilitation has declined in importance relative to overall travel flows. Over the course of the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century. Centuries, states developed customs and immigration inspection requirements with respect to sea travel but they largely did so independently of one another. Increasing transoceanic passenger travel spurred international cooperation on regulations and inspection of passengers arriving by ship. Freighters, transoceanic passenger ships or cruise ships typically visit several states in a single voyage and each state might require the shipping company, captain and passengers to submit information on many official forms. Oftentimes, the information requested by each state was the same but would have to be submitted in a slightly different way. In order to reduce onerous multiple paperwork requirements on commercial shipping states engaged in international cooperation through the IMO to standardize state inspection information requirements and agreed to the 1965 Convention on Facilitation of International Maritime Traffic. Most importantly for the international travel of crewmembers and passenger at ports of call, the convention limited the

documents that public authorities could demand of ships and adopted IMO standardized forms: two of the seven standardized forms are crew lists and passenger lists.

As international air passenger travel began to overtake international travel by sea, states stepped up cooperation within ICAO to further the facilitation of air travel and, after a rash of passenger airplane high jacking in the early 1970s, instituted standards to increase aviation security. Although the standardization of passports helped facilitate international travel by making it easier for inspectors at border controls to quickly find the information they needed on the passport to make their decisions on admissibility, the 1970 launch of the Boeing 747 and then other wide-bodied jets presented a dilemma to airlines, airports and border control agencies. The prospect of several planes with more than 500 passengers each landing at an airport at the same time threatened to quickly overwhelm inspection capabilities and facilities and lead to passenger throughput bottlenecks at passport controls that would, in turn, lead to passengers missing connecting flights or the delay of those flights waiting for arriving overseas passengers. Airports could build larger inspection areas and border control agencies could staff expanded passport controls at a level that would accommodate peak arrival flows but this would involve costly infrastructure investments and increased costs to governments and taxpayers. Alternatively, airports could force airlines to stagger arrivals of large international flights but this would come at the expense of flexibility in scheduling connecting flights as well as passenger demand for particular arrival times.

One solution to this dilemma was to increase throughput at passport controls by automating aspects of the inspection process. By digitizing the traveler's biographic data and storing that data on a machine readable zone of the passport, automated passport readers could capture the travelers' data rather than having the inspector take the time to manually type the

data into the entry systems used by border control authorities to run watch list checks and assist them in determining admissibility.

In 1980 ICAO member states took a major step by agreeing to standards for the issuance of machine readable travel documents (MRTDs), which most states began to issue in the 1980s and 1990s. Moreover, since the machine readable zone contained the same data printed on the passport, the new machine readable passports were more difficult to alter and use for fraudulent entry. Since then, ICAO's Technical Advisory Group on machine readable travel documents TAG/MRTD has continued the work of standardizing passports, increasing the security of the documents and improving the documents in ways that facilitate international travel. By the mid-1990s, TAG/MRTD division had established a New Technologies Working Group, which was to plan and implement the long term development of MRTD's. In 1995, ICAO member states recognized the usefulness of digitized biometrics to establish the link travel documents to those individuals to whom those traveler documents were issued and, in 1998, the TAG/MRTD New Technologies Working Group began work to establish the most effective biometric identification system and the best way to store and access biometric data on travel documents. They gravitated toward a contactless integrated circuit (IC) chip, a storage medium that could be read faster than the machine readable zone and had sufficient capacity to store a digital version of the photo and/or other biometric data. The contactless IC chip is part of a Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) system in which data on a chip or tag is transmitted via radio waves to a reader. As opposed to machine-readable travel documents that use optical character readers requiring the passport to be swiped or scanned, a passport with an RFID chip can be read by the reader at a short distance (10 cm), therefore allowing faster transfer of data from the passport and faster processing of travelers through passport controls. In 2001 the working group issued its technical

report, *Selection of a Globally Interoperable Biometric for Machine-assisted Identity Confirmation with MRTDs* with recommendations for digitized facial biometrics and data storage on a contactless IC chip that were then endorsed by the ICAO Technical Advisory Group in June 2002 and March 2003 respectively.[viii] Most of ICAO's e-passport standards work had been completed by the Technical Working Group before September 11, 2001 but the attacks on that day led states to accelerate the process of approving the new technology standards. Passport features added by international cooperation through ICAO that were intended to facilitate international travel were then leveraged for increased aviation and border security after the September 11, 2001 attacks.

Another way that states cooperated to enable the volume of international travel to increase dramatically in 1980s and 1990s was to drop, on a reciprocal basis, visa requirements for short term visits. The US Visa Waiver Program (begun as a pilot program with the UK and Japan in 1988 and made permanent in 2000) permits travel to the US for purposes of business or pleasure for up to 90 days without a visa by nationals of 35 states that similarly permit visa-free travel by US nationals. Nationals of EU member states do not need visas to travel to other EU states; they only need identification cards (or passports). All EU member states adhere to common visa policy that includes a list of 36 countries whose nationals may travel to any EU member state without a visa for short stays and 126 countries who nationals must apply for and receive visas in order to travel. Seven of the top ten international tourist destination states (France, Spain, US, Italy, UK, Germany and Austria) have reciprocal visa free travel arrangements.

International practices of visa reciprocity have over time developed into international norms that have been codified under the GATS to help govern a major share of international

travel – namely the 131 million international arrivals for the purposes of business in 2006.[ix] (UNWTO 2007). The GATS delineates the four possible forms of service delivery covered by the agreement, which includes the "presence of natural persons," also referred to as "Mode 4." WTO members' commitments under Mode 4 are to provide for temporary admission of foreign nationals who provide services, as outlined in the GATS "Annex on movement of natural persons supplying services under the Agreement."[x] The scheduled horizontal mode 4 commitments made by some 100 member states are irrevocable and primarily deal with business visitor visas that are generally limited to 90 day stays.[xi]

UN member states working through the World Health Organization (WHO) have also agreed to cooperate on regulations of international travel to control the spread of contagious diseases across borders. WHO oversees implementation of the International Health Regulations, an international legal instrument that entered into force on June 15, 2007 and is binding on 194 countries. These regulations help states to collectively prevent and respond to acute public health risks that have the potential to cross borders, such as pandemic human influenza virus. The regulations require countries to report certain disease outbreaks to WHO and then WHO may issue recommendations to states to impose travel restrictions in order to limit the spread of the disease. WHO's role in the international travel regime tends to be episodic, as when it issued travel restriction recommendations during outbreaks of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) and the H1N1 flu virus. The potential use of infectious diseases in the asymmetric biological warfare of terrorists has increased interaction of public health agencies and border security agencies of national governments and may, in turn, lead to increasing cooperation between WHO and the international organizations and fora through which border control officials cooperate.

International cooperation among border control authorities to facilitate and secure international travel takes place to a certain extent within the World Customs Organization (WCO) as well as less formally during the meetings of border control authorities concerned with the cross-border movements of people, such as the International Border Police Conference and the Intergovernmental Consultations on Migration, Asylum and Refugees.

For the most part, the WCO is concerned international cooperation to facilitate and secure the international movement of goods across borders. Nevertheless, the WCO plays a role in international cooperation on travel in that the data standardization and best practices in border controls vis-à-vis cargo and conveyances may be applied to the movement of people as well. It is important to remember that in many states, such as Canada, customs officers handle primary inspection and passport controls of all travelers; more specialized immigration officers are used in secondary inspection. Moreover, customs agencies, as in the case of New Zealand, or legacy customs agencies within new departments, as in the case of the US, often provide the information technology platforms upon which the entry systems used for passport controls are built. Given that customs agencies collect taxes (and in some cases their budgets benefit from forfeiture laws) they are often in a better position to take the lead on purchasing border control technologies that may also be used to facilitate and secure international travel of persons. Hence, the WCO may become a useful forum for information technology professionals within border control agencies even if the technology (i.e., biometrics) is used for securing the movement of people, as opposed to goods.

The International Border Police Conference grew out of the "Budapest Process," a consultative forum of more than 50 governments (primarily European) and 10 international organizations established in 1991 who meet to exchange information and experiences in dealing

with topics such as: regular and irregular migration, asylum, visa, border management, trafficking in human beings and smuggling of migrants, readmission, return, etc. The Hungarian Border Guard has been hosting and organizing the International Border Police Conference since 1993. Meeting in Siofok, Hungary every year since 1995, the International Department of the Hungarian Border Guard served as the Conference Secretariat. The conference is an annual meeting during which senior representatives of border police agencies have multilateral discussions and exchange experience as well as engage in bilateral discussions. A major focus of the fourteenth century annual meeting in 2006 was the role of multilateral and regional international organizations and institutions in promoting cooperation and activities of border services.[xii] Participants included representatives of border control authorities of 43 states: Algeria, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany (Federal Police and the Bavarian Police), Hungary, Iran, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Mongolia, Morocco, the Netherlands, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, South-Africa, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan. Representatives from international organizations such as INTERPOL, the International Organization for Migration (IOM), the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD) and BORDERPOL also attended.

Over time, the annual conference spurred the formation of working groups that hold additional meetings through the preceding year and report during plenary session of the annual conference. Working groups have formed on a variety of substantive issues and are organized and hosted by states that have been participating in the International Border Police Conference

over the years. Working groups include: 1) Suppression of Illegal Circulation of Weapons, Ammunition and Radioactive Materials; 2) Visa Regime and Conditions of Entry; 3) Border Traffic Control; 4) Training, Further Vocational Training and the use of Human Resources; 5) Cooperation Among the Border Services and Other Relevant Bodies in the Fight against Drug Smuggling; 6) Combating Illegal Migration; 7) Collecting Analytical Data. The scope of the conference and its working groups has grown beyond the concerns of the initial membership of border guards from European states who, during the 1990s, were attempting to increase East-West cooperation within the context of the enlargement of the European Union. While the formation of FRONTEX provides an institution for border guard authorities that could take over the primary missions of the conference as it existed in the 1990s, participation of the Central Asian states, Morocco, Algeria, Iran, Canada, Australia and South Africa established the conference as a global forum for international cooperation among border police.

The Intergovernmental Consultations on Migration, Asylum and Refugees (known as the "IGC") is an informal, non-decision making forum for intergovernmental information exchange and policy debate on issues of relevance to the management of international migratory flows. As concerns grew among European states over the increasing numbers of asylum seekers, the IGC came into being in 1985 when a group of seven states launched an informal consultative process. The IGC focused on asylum until 1992 (when discussion of asylum processes was increasingly taken up in meetings of interior ministry officials in Justice and Home Affairs institutions of the European Union established by the Maastricht Treaty). At that time, the IGC expanded its scope of issues to discuss to the return of rejected asylum applicants, human smuggling and border control technologies. Although most of its 17 participating states are European (Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden,

18

Switzerland and the United Kingdom), its membership spans three continents as Australia, Canada, New Zealand and United States are members as well. Moreover, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the International Organization for Migration and the European Commission are partner organizations whose representatives participate in IGC meetings. In 1990, the IGC established a small secretariat in Geneva comprised of professional full-time officials, support staff and seconded officers from participating states. The secretariat organizes and facilitates consultations, maintains databases and a secure website, produces reports for participating states as well as publications available to the public. Chairmanship of the IGC rotates annually among the participating states with the previous and future chair advising the current chair in the "troika" format similar to that of other organizations. The chair organizes annual "Full Round of Consultations" and "Mini Full Round of Consultations" and "steering group meetings" attended by senior IGC officials. There are also semi-annual meetings of standing working groups on asylum; return; data; smuggling; technology and country of origin information as well as ad hoc workshops upon specific request of participating states. The IGC is a vehicle for international cooperation among its member states on various aspects of securing international travel. These informal meetings may not produce binding agreements but they facilitate information exchanges and enable participating states to develop common positions on negotiations within other larger international fora. The IGC subsequently became a model for Regional Consultative Processes formed by other groups of states that wanted to cooperate on asylum, border controls and migration management.

Politics of Cooperation on International Travel in Relation to International Migration

The phenomena of international travel and migration are closely inter-related. International travel is often a precursor to migration and migrants often become international travelers for business or leisure. The domestic politics of cooperation on international travel, however, differ significantly from the politics of cooperation on migration. These differing domestic politics support the increasingly robust international travel regime while the potential labor migration regime remains elusive.

As opposed to the *Völkerwanderung* of the first millennium or the great migrations out of Europe to the Western Hemisphere, Australia, Southern Africa and Siberia during the 16th through 19th Centuries, contemporary migration is less often a matter of a one-time, long-term move and more often the culmination of several shorter trips. That is, many of the 935 million people who have travelled abroad for business or leisure in 2010 may eventually return for a stay longer than a year and of that group some may never return to their country of origin. International migration also leads to subsequent international travel. Migrants and their descendants often travel to their countries of origin or ancestry. Similarly, migrants may assist their relatives in acquiring visitor visas or visiting a relative who has moved abroad may simply be the reason for another's international journey. Regardless of direction, 228.4 million international tourist arrivals in 2006 were for the purpose of visiting friends and relatives.

The politics of cooperation on travel differ fundamentally from cooperation on migration largely because the distribution and visibility of the economic benefits of international tourism are quite different than that of international labor migration. The economic benefits from international labor migration largely go to the migrants themselves, the businesses in migration destination states that profit from lower labor costs and their customers who enjoy lower costs for the goods and services produced. Receipts from international tourists benefit the lodging,

restaurant and entertainment businesses and can be directly tied to jobs in these industries. While a decline in labor migration may be most visibility reflected in declining remittances to origin countries, a decline in a destination country's international tourist arrivals is often made visible in rising unemployment rates and declining tax revenues in that country's major tourist destinations. While politicians who advocate maintaining or increasing labor migration may face significant opposition from those constituents who face wage competition from migrants, advocacy for increasing international tourism is not only uncontroversial but it is a common mantra of economic development policies of many cities and regions in most countries of the world. While it may be very difficult for a politician in a major migration destination state to support international agreements that would commit a country to accept certain levels of labor migration regardless of economic conditions, advocacy for international cooperation that may facilitate international tourism would not be difficult. Indeed, depending on how much international tourism contributes to the economy of the politician's constituency, taking a leadership role in furthering international cooperation to facilitate tourism would most likely be very popular among many businesses people as well as those who work in the hospitality industry.

A fundamental difference between international cooperation on migration versus travel is that the world's 214 million migrants[xiii] are primarily people from lower socioeconomic classes who went abroad to take difficult, dirty, dangerous and undesirable jobs; international tourists and business travelers are primarily from middle and upper socioeconomic classes. Those international tourists from lower socioeconomic classes are primarily migrants returning home to visit their family or migrants' relatives visiting them. While liberal immigration policies and international cooperation on facilitating labor migration primarily benefits migrant workers and

their extended families back home who receive remittances; liberal visa and border security policies as well as international cooperation to facilitate international travel primarily benefits middle and upper class people who wish to take their holidays abroad as well as attend business meetings and conferences. While there are politicians in migration destination states who advocate in favor of liberal immigration policies for the sake of migrant workers well-being and human rights as well as for the sake of economic development of their home counties through remittances, it is much easier for politicians to advocate liberal visa and border control policies that reduce the inconveniences of international travel for their own well-to-do constituents while at the same time making international travel for migrants easier.

With respect to reciprocity, nationals of migration destination states might not be particularly interested in gaining access to the labor markets of migrant origin countries, however, those who have the financial resources, personal and business interests that would enable and motivate them to travel abroad are generally interested in access to the widest range of countries for leisure and business travel.

One of the major challenges to states that liberalize their visa policies is the abuse of those visas by tourists and business travelers who do not abide by the terms of their visas (or visa free travel), whether these individuals work after entering on tourist visas or they stay without authorization beyond the terms of their visa. If those who overstay their visas stay long enough, this is how a significant share of international travel becomes international migration of the illegal sort. As the percentage of international travel that becomes illegal migration grows, political support for liberal visa and border controls wanes. As such political support wanes, the domestic political dynamics favorable to international cooperation on international travel shift

and obstacles can quickly develop that are similar to those in the way of international

cooperation on labor migration.

Politics of Cooperation on International Travel in Relation to Asylum

In a sense, the international refugee regime began to emerge together with the

international travel regime. That is, the cooperation among League of Nations states to restart

travel flows after WWI with the 1920 conference on passports and visas was complemented by

states' acceptance of the need for and recognition of the Nansen passport in 1921. It was the

inter-war Russian refugee crisis that precipitated the international cooperation on passports for

refugees that would be subsequently institutionalized after WWII with the UN Refugee

Convention. The international refugee regime articulates a set of rules, norms and principles for

signatory states with respect to those individuals who seek asylum either by traveling to another

state and applying for asylum there in that "first country of asylum" or those individuals in first

countries of asylum, who after being recognized as refugees, are resettled in another state that is

then often referred to as a "second country of asylum." In any event, international travel is the

vehicle of asylum, whether in the form of asylum applications by those who arrive spontaneously

in a state or in the form of refugee resettlement.

To the extent international cooperation within the international travel regime has

facilitated international travel, the international travel regime has enabled increased asylum-

seeking and refugee protection. That is, every bit of international cooperation that has facilitated

international travel by rail, ship and then commercial aircraft has not only expanded the scale of

international travel flows to and from a widening range of points on the earth but has enabled

refugees and asylum seekers to more easily travel to and from those places. This cooperation has

facilitated the travel of refugees moving from their country of first asylum to the country to which they have been resettled. The broadening range of international travel routes to a broadening number of ports of entry has also increased the opportunities for asylum seekers to travel to states where they might lodge applications. Cooperation within ICAO that enabled the expansion of international jet aircraft travel not only broadened international travel opportunities for business, education, international sports competitions and cultural events, it gave some of those international travelers opportunities to "defect" from their country of nationality through an application for asylum in the country to which they traveled. Moreover, the broader scale and range of international travel gave more opportunities for those individuals who may have been persecuted by their government but had the financial resources to purchase airplane tickets and acquire visas to leave their countries of nationality but apply for asylum upon arrival at their destination. The dramatic expansion of passenger air travel in the 1970s meant that asylum seeking was not necessarily limited to neighboring countries from which refugees might then be resettled to states much further away but rather asylum seekers with sufficient resources could fly directly to countries such as the U.S., Canada, Australia and New Zealand, which have a long tradition of large-scale refugee resettlement as well as to European countries, such as Germany, which had exceptionally liberal asylum policies.

With the growth of international air travel, those with a well-founded fear of persecution by a repressive government who did not have a passport and exit visa (and were unlikely to get them from the government that they opposed) could acquire fraudulent passports and visas that were sufficient to convince airline personnel at check-in counters that they were authorized to travel to the flight's destination. Such asylum seekers routinely turned themselves in to border control authorities upon arrival and lodged asylum applications. As asylum application and

24

adjudication processes lengthened into years, even an ultimately unsuccessful asylum application could enable an individual to escape the violence of civil war or the destitution resulting from famine or an economy's collapse. Hence, the expansion of international travel enabled asylum applications of those who had been tortured by their governments for their political activity or religious beliefs as well as asylum applications of those who were not persecuted by their governments but sought to emigrate to improve their lives economically. As increasing numbers of such spontaneous arrival asylum applications were lodged by those individuals that many states deemed "economic migrants" and not genuine political refugees, these states toughened border controls, trained airline personnel to recognize fraudulent documents, developed more secure travel documents, cooperated in groups, like the European Union, to require asylum seekers apply in the first country reached and declared other countries to be "safe third countries" where it was posited asylum seekers should lodge their applications instead of transiting to another destination country with the aim of applying there.

In response to these barriers to reaching the states in which asylum seekers desired to lodge their applications, they increasing turned to human smugglers. An overwhelming majority of asylum seekers now arriving in the EU and North America have probably been smuggled or committed travel document fraud. This is nothing new. After the international community turned its back on Europe's Jews at the 1937 Evian Conference, many Jews only escaped the Holocaust by paying smugglers who helped them cross the border into Switzerland. During the Cold War, those who helped East Europeans cross the border into Austria were often considered heroes, even if they accepted payment. For doing the same thing today, one may be prosecuted as a criminal.

Asylum applications on a state's territory are largely a function of weak or careless border controls. International cooperation to secure international travel by increasing travel document security and sharing data on lost and stolen passports reduces the opportunities for successful spontaneous arrival asylum seeking by those with a well-founded fear of individual persecution and increases the potential for human rights abuses around the world. Looking toward a future of increasing applications of technology to border controls, more secure travel documents and more effective inspection processes, we can see a decline in asylum applications. Many of these asylum-seekers may have bogus applications but some will be people whose lives are truly in peril.

The improving border security of the re-emerging international travel regime ultimately conflicts with the international refugee regime's mission to protect those with a well-founded fear of persecution unless additional measures are taken. In order protect those facing genocide and individual persecution by their own governments, it may be necessary that states step up international cooperation in other areas such as: accepting asylum applications in consulates and embassies, increasing refugee resettlement from countries of first asylum and increasing funding to UNHCR for humanitarian assistance and protection in place.

Conclusion

International cooperation on international travel is long-standing even if cooperation and levels of international travel have ebbed and flowed due to major disruptions such as the First and Second World Wars. In this sense, the international travel regime is the oldest global mobility regime.   However, the outputs of the cooperation it has fostered, such as standardized passports and visas, are largely taken for granted aspects of international life that have mostly

gone unnoticed by international relations scholars. With increasing security threats to and as well as by way of air travel, the international travel regime has re-emerged from obscurity as a framework for international cooperation to secure the ever growing flows of international travel that previous cooperation had facilitated. While engendering international cooperation on labor migration has been difficult due to domestic political concerns, international travel for business and tourism (and the money that comes with it) is mostly welcomed by citizens, businesses and the politicians who respond to their constituents' interests. Hence, international cooperation on travel is likely to proceed apace while cooperation on labor migration continues to face more political obstacles and the potential international labor migration regime remains elusive. Finally, the international travel regime not only preceded the international refugee regime but international cooperation on passports that led to the expectation that all travelers should have them necessitated the Nansen passport and the subsequent development of the refugee regime. While the development of the international travel regime after WWII facilitated asylum along with increased international travel, increasing international cooperation to secure travel over the past decade is constricting spontaneous arrival asylum seeking by those with a well-founded fear of individual persecution. Such international cooperation on securing travel necessitates additional international cooperation to protect refugees lest the international refugee regime be weakened so much that asylum is practically impossible for the vast majority of those who need it most, leaving the world poised for repeating the 1937 Evian Conference and its aftermath.

[i] All issues of the United Nations *Demographic Yearbook* and related technical notes can be found at:

http://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic/products/dyb/dyb2.htm

[ii] United Nations World Tourism Organization, *Tourism Highlights,* (Spain: UN World Tourism Organization, 2007).

[iii] Department of Homeland Security, "Request for Proposals for US-VISIT Program Prime Contractor Acquisition,"

RFP no. HSSCHQ-04-R-0096 (Washington: US-VISIT Office, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Nov. 28,

2008).

[iv] United Nations World Travel Organizations, *UNWTO World Tourism Barometer*, 9, no.1 (Spain: UN World

Tourism Organization, February 2011).

[v] United Nations World Tourism Organization, *Tourism Highlights*

[vi] Martin Lloyd, Martin**,** *The Passport: The History of Man's Most Travelled Document* **(**Stroud, U.K.: Sutton

Publishing 2003); Mark B. Salter, *Rights of Passage: The Passport in International Relations* (Boulder, CO: Lynne

Rienner Publishers, 2003)

[vii] International Criminal Police Organization, "Secure borders, document security and anti-counterfeiting initiatives

high on agenda in meeting between Ukraine Prime Minister and INTERPOL Secretary General," INTERPOL media

release, January 20, 2009.

[viii] International Civil Aviation Organization, *Machine Readable Travel Documents MRTDs: History,*

Interoperability and Implementation (Montreal, Canada: International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) March

23, 2007).

[ix] United Nations World Tourism Organization, *Tourism Highlights.*

[x] World Trade Orgnization, "Movement of natural persons supplying services under the Agreement," Annex, World

Trade Organization, at: http://www.wto.org/English/tratop_e/serv_e/8-anmvnt_e.htm

[xi] World Trade Organization, "Presence of Natural Workers (Mode 4)" (Background note, S/C/W/75, Geneva:

Secretariat World Trade Organization, Council for Trade in Services, December 8, 1998).

[xii] The author attended this meeting.

[xiii] Uinted Nations, *International Migration Wallchart*, UN publication no. E.09.XIII.8

(New York: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, 2009).