

# IDS

Institute of Development Studies



## Guyana Population Movement and Societal Development

Dr. Lomارش Roopnarine



University of Guyana

Turkeyen Campus

Guyana

July 2013

# **Guyana Population Movement and Societal Development**

By

**Dr. Lomarsh Roopnarine\***

\*Lomarsh Roopnarine is an Associate Professor of Latin American and Caribbean History at Jackson State University, MS.

Published by the Institute of Development Studies,  
University of Guyana,  
Turkeyen, Georgetown,  
Guyana, South America  
[www.idsguyana.org](http://www.idsguyana.org)

July 2013

ISSN 1019- 1305

This paper should be cited as: Roopnarine, Lommarsh (2013). **Guyana Population Movement and Societal Development**. Institute of Development Studies, University of Guyana Special Series Working Paper # 7/12 to commemorate the 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary (1963-2013) of the University of Guyana

## **ABSTRACT**

The following article analyses Guyanese migration and the society from its historical beginnings to the current contemporary period. In doing so, three broad patterns of Guyanese migration are identified: (1) old world migration; (2) intra-regional migration; (3) extra-regional and return migration. The article argues that these migration patterns are inadequately documented and analysed. The approaches are not as convincing as published works on Guyanese migration reveal discontinuity and fragmentation. It is not certain how the different patterns of migration have shaped Guyanese society. For example, why has Guyana changed from an importer to an exporter of people following the decades of the twentieth century? Or, which of the patterns of migration have had the most profound and pronounced impact on Guyanese society. This article attempts to bring a more nuanced analysis of Guyanese migration, among other themes.

**Keywords:** Guyana, Migration, Society, Importer/Exporter, Remittances

## INTRODUCTION

Guyana has had a long history of complex population movements. With the exception of the natural movement of Amerindians from Euro-Asia, the main population movements and the subsequent development of Guyanese society began with the Europeans in the early sixteenth century. Thousands of Europeans arrived in Guyana looking for economic expansion, financial rewards, and religious zeal. They were guided by the mission of colonialism, imperialism, Social Darwinism and capitalism. To meet these endeavours, thousands of African slaves were forcefully transported to Guyana to work mainly on the European owned expanding sugar plantations. With the slave emancipation in the nineteenth century, a majority of the Africans migrated from the plantations to village settlements, urban areas, and to other destinations within the Caribbean. In response to a labour vacuum, the European sugar planters imported thousands of Portuguese, African, European and Asian indentured contract labourers to substitute the loss of African slave labour. A majority of these contract labourers stayed on in Guyana when their contracts expired, adding to a fledgling multicultural, multi-religious and multi-lingual society.

By the 1900s, Guyana has attracted migrants from other poorer Caribbean islands, such as the overpopulated Barbados. These intra-regional Caribbean immigrants worked on the sugar plantations and interior gold fields. Following the Second World War, Guyana experienced a significant transformation from being an importer to an exporter of people. Guyanese began to migrate to other Caribbean islands as well as to Europe and North America. In recent times, Guyanese migration has been return and circular or transnational, attracting a wide range of Guyanese from all walks of life. Of all the patterns of Guyanese migration, this recent movement has had the most profound impact on Guyana in terms of development and societal change.

Unfortunately, there is lack of a comprehensive understanding of these migratory dynamics. A thorough investigation into Guyanese migration literature reveals that there exists no comprehensive article or book on Guyanese migration. Instead, there are studies on specific patterns and phases of Guyanese migration but without any longitudinal approach or interconnection. While these studies have undoubtedly made a

significant contribution, they have nonetheless, added to the confusion on the published Guyanese migration literature. We are not sure when one phase of migration begins or where it ends, nor of the connection among previous and contemporary movements, much less the relationship among them. We cannot fully understand the elements of Guyanese migration in isolation of each other. A comprehensive analysis and documentation of Guyanese migration is important and justifiable because it will not only produce and provide an accessible volume, but also will demonstrate how Guyanese migration and society have evolved overtime. It will also reveal the characteristics and challenges Guyanese migration has encountered during its formation as well as answering some of the unexplored and unanswered questions about Guyana population movement. How has the forceful migration during the colonial period led to the making of ethnic boundaries in Guyana? How come Guyanese migration has changed from an importer to an exporter of people? Why do we know so little about the neighbouring intra-Caribbean regional migration and more about the extra-regional migration to Europe and North America? How has out-migration during the post-independence period led to growth and under/development in Guyana? What role does return as well as transnational migration play in the shaping of Guyanese society?

This article attempts to divide Guyanese migration into four sections. The first section provides a global theoretical explanation of migration. The second section analyses historical Guyanese migration during the period of slavery and indenture, essentially from the early sixteenth century to 1920. The third section examines Guyanese intra-Caribbean migration from slave emancipation to the contemporary period. Finally, the last section examines Guyanese extra-regional migration to Europe and North America as well as return and circular migration following the post-independence period in 1966.

## **THEORIES OF MIGRATION**

Migration, whether outward, inward or transnational, is driven and determined by a cauldron of complex factors. These factors- age, class, race, gender and status-originate from local, national and international relationships which include individual, family and community livelihood strategies (Thomas-Hope, 2006, p. 168). Migration is also consistent with the specificities of time and space, structural rather than individualistic characteristics, the dynamics of capitalism, globalist trends guided by transnational and international economic and political processes and the consequences of countries of origin and destination as well as the migrants (see Zolberg, 1989, p. 404).

Perhaps the first major migration theorist was Geographer Ernest Ravenstein (1885) who proposed, more than a hundred years ago, that migration is caused by push and pull factors. He argues that migration is caused by external factors and is consistent with distance. If the distance between the sending and receiving destinations is far then migration will decrease, among other things. Since then, the push/pull theory of migration has been modified to include internal factors that caused people to move (see Lee, 1966). The push/pull theory posits that people move in response to economic, social and political factors/hardships that "push" them out of their place of origin while better life opportunities and jobs "pull" them to specific destinations. The push/pull model explains labour migration as a direct result of economic disparity between two nations (see Todaro, 1976). The disadvantaged sectors of society will participate in migration in response to economic imbalance and instability between the underdeveloped and developed regions of the world. The push/pull factors of migration generally benefit the sending as well as the receiving countries, although not on an equal basis. The sending countries experience a depletion of vital skills (brain drain), but benefit from the remitting and returning of capital and skills. The receiving countries benefit from the influx of cheap labour and professional skills (brain gain), although the receiving countries may experience crime and the migrants themselves may be exposed to problems of adjustment, racial discrimination and marginalisation.

The push/pull model of migration cannot be simply restricted or reduced to the brain gain/drain affect. Continuous exchange of remittances and repatriation of human capital (new attitudes and skills) demonstrate more of a brain exchange rather than a brain gain/drain phenomenon (see Addy, 2003). Moreover, the push/pull model of migration does not explain why similar movements do not occur in equally poor nations or why out-migration concentrates in some areas but not in others in the same country or region (Portes & Borocz, 1989, p. 607-608). Another criticism of the push-pull theory is that it examines some of the general macro structural factors such as over-population, underdevelopment and underemployment in the sender country as well as the employment needs of the receiving countries to explain international migration.

Since the 1970s, several theories have emerged to explain international migration but these too are connected to the push/pull model. The neo-classical economic (macro) theory argues that migration occurs when countries have a large labour force relative to a low market wage and inversely when countries have a small labour force relative to a high market wage. The disparity in wages caused individuals from low-wage countries to move to high-wage countries. Consequently, the supply of labour decreases in low-wage countries when wage increases and when wage decreases in the high wage countries, leading to equilibrium (Massey et al 1993:433). The macro-economic theory of migration, however, focuses too much on market forces and less on the migrants. The individual aspiration of migrants to move is not fully addressed. As a result of such a flaw, the micro-analysis of migration or rational choice theory emerged to explain migrant behaviour. The theory focuses on the individual as an active agent in the desire to move. Migrants take into consideration wages, destination and cost-benefit analysis of migration through a series of network linkages such as connections between potential migrants and their destination through information on jobs, life in the receiving countries, and modes of entry that promote migration (Massy et al, 2003).

What is missing in the micro/structural perspectives of migration, however, are the sociological factors that prompt individuals to move. The emergence of the new economics of migration theory took into consideration the social units such as the family, the household and even the community in the decision to move (see Taylor,



1991; Stark & Bloom, 1985). This theory sees migration as a collective strategy to ensure the economic viability of the domestic unit through the strategic allocation of labour and investment (Faist, 2000, p. 40; Goss & Lindquist, 1995). Thomas Faist argues that we are still faced with difficulties of conflicts and negotiations that are connected within households and the obligated rights of members that go beyond the household (2000, p. 41-42).

While the micro neoclassic and the new economic theories of migration are associated with choices, either on an individual or household level, the dual labour market theory argues that migration has more to do with the permanent demand of labour in developed countries. The argument is that the economies of developed countries are dualistic: they have a primary market of secure, well-remunerated work and a secondary market of low-wage work. Under these circumstances, immigration of labour is necessary because the domestic labour force does not want to associate or accept low-wage jobs in the secondary market. According to this theory, migration emerges from four main characteristics in developed economies: structural inflation; motivational problems; economic dualism and the demography of labour supply. International migration is also driven by the network (making connections before migrating), institutional (private and voluntary organisation help), cumulative causation (each act of migration alters the social context within which subsequent decisions are made), and migration systems theories (some countries receive migrants from specific countries (see Massey et al, 1999; Piore, 1979).

Migration is also caused by the structure of the world economic system. This theory argues that migration is driven by uneven socio-economic world development (Wallerstein, 1974; Piore, 1979; Sassen, 1988). The forces of capitalism penetrate into underdeveloped regions of the world and distort socio and economic relations which in turn cause people to move. Migration is a natural outgrowth of disruptions and dislocations as well as the structure of the world market system in the process of capitalist development. As the capitalist economy grows outward from its core into peripheral regions, migration flows are inevitable because the forces of the capitalist

economy interfere with material bases of survival (land, labour, wages, jobs, culture, etc) in peripheral regions (Massey, 1989; Sassen, 1988).

In recent times, some theories have been developed to explain the return and transnational migration. Return migration emanates from disappointment of migrants in their host society; from short-term circular movement with no intentions of permanent residence; from the desire to move and accumulate savings in the host countries and return home to invest; from social and economic networking from the host society to the homeland for the probabilities to return (see Plaza & Henry, 2006, p. 5-6; Potter & Conway, 2005). Transnationalism departs from the traditional view that migration revolves around leaving and returning and sees migration as a multi-dimensional phenomenon that incorporates multiple links, interactions, motivations, ideologies, and perceptions (see Faist, 2000; Vertovec, 1999). In general, there are two dominant explanations of international migration: macro and micro socio-economic theories of migration. The problem with these groups of theories is that there is little consensus and little integration between them, although some attempts have been made to bridge them (see Faist, 2000).

## **OLD WORLD MIGRATION OR MIGRATION DURING THE PERIOD OF IMPERIALISM AND COLONIALISM**

This section addresses the issue of migration of people from Europe, Africa and Asia during the period of colonisation and settlement to the independent colonies of Essequibo, Berbice and Demerara. These colonies were consolidated into British Guiana in 1831 by the British Government. This section pays attention to the virtually unknown Amerindian migration and then examines and analyses the movement of Europeans, enslaved Africans and indentured Asians, Africans, Europeans and Portuguese labourers to colonial British Guiana. The assessment of this migration starts in the early seventeenth century and stops when the last phase of East Indian

indentured immigration to Guyana ceased in 1920. The section will also show the formation, development and social transformation of British Guianese society with the influx of these immigrants.

The Europeans were not the first people to “discover”<sup>i</sup> and settle Guiana, the land of many waters. Amerindians were in Guiana thousands of years before the arrival of Europeans in the early seventeenth century. We are not sure where the Amerindians came from and are equally uncertain of their population size before contact with Europeans. The existing literature on these two Amerindian themes has produced more confusion rather than confirmation (see Brothwell, 1967). At best, the literature on the Amerindians is based on speculation since these individuals did not leave any written records of themselves. Moreover, seventeenth century European analyses of Amerindians have to be carefully scrutinised since they might not reflect the reality of Amerindian people. Most researchers seem to agree that the Amerindians were one group of people who had migrated out of Africa and eventually crossed the Bering Strait and entered North America about 20,000 years ago. From this location, one or two groups migrated to Central America and eventually to the north eastern shoulder of South America about 11,000 years ago. Three groups entered Guiana from different regions during different time frames. The Warraus came first but their original destination is unknown, followed by Arawaks from the Orinico/Rio Negro areas of South America, and the Caribs probably migrated from Xingu/Tapayoz of Brazil (Edwards & Gibson, 1979, p. 61).

Unfortunately, there is limited information on the size of the Amerindian population before initial contact with Europeans. British geographer and traveller Robert H. Schomburgh (1840, p. 51) placed the Amerindian population to be around 7000 in 1839, although this figure was disputed by other researchers as being too small or large by a few thousand (see Walker, 1878; Swan, 1957). The size of the Amerindian population today is around 68,675 about 9.2 per cent of the 751,223 Guyana population (Guyana Population Census, 2002). Interestingly, Amerindians are certainly a minority within the overall Guyanese population but a majority in the vast interior region. Over 90 per cent of the Guyana population (mainly Africans and East Indians) resides on the narrow

coastal strip of land from Point Playa on the northwest to the Corentyne River on the Southeast, varying in width from ten to forty miles (Adamson, 1972, p 17). In some ways, the interior region is a separate country.

Social scientists often describe pastoral or nomadic migration as primitive. Individuals with such a lifestyle move in response to environmental or ecological pressure induced by natural or man-made barriers (see Dixon, 1943; Petersen; 1959; Rouse, 1986). The migration of Amerindians was no different. They were essentially hunters and gatherers who were unable to subsist from whatever resources were available to them in one particular area. They were forced to move back and forth over their traditional territory, ranging from a few to hundreds of miles. The Amerindians also engaged in long distance trade, sometimes from their interior domicile to the Caribbean Islands. On other occasions, their movement was dictated by warfare, which caused unpredictable haphazard movements either to capture enemies or to avoid being captured by rival groups. Equally significant is that the Amerindian movement was not determined or restrained by boundaries since landownership was communal without well-defined demarcated borders. Their migration was, however, similar to contemporary forms of migration. The Amerindian migration will continue to happen during the contemporary period, mainly from and within the interior regions to Georgetown. Amerindian migration is also dictated by the need and desire for a better life as well as adaptation to new ways of thinking and acting, particularly with the arrival of Europeans.

Although a few adventurous Europeans like Englishman, Sir Walter Raleigh, attempted to make contact with Guiana, the Dutch were the first to enter and settle in Guiana, followed by the French and British in the seventeenth century. European migration to Guiana was largely directed and controlled by their respective home government. Europeans left their homeland for economic opportunities, essentially to tap into the New World's resources as well as for religious tolerance. Their population was small in numbers, ranging from forty to a few hundreds. They, nonetheless, made a significant and indelible impression and impact on historical Guiana. The initial intent of the Dutch was to establish trading relations with the Amerindians for tropical products like dyes, and in so doing, built a number of trading posts on the mouths of the interior river

region. They soon saw an opportunity to establish colonies and exploit Amerindian slave labour on a larger scale. The colonisation scheme, however, failed dismally. Resistance from the Amerindians, the inhospitable terrain, tropical diseases and the intra-regional European warfare forced the Dutch to abandon their interior operations and move to the Atlantic coastlands where they developed large-scale plantation agriculture.<sup>ii</sup> The British immigrants who arrived in Guiana about the same time as the Dutch also engaged in plantation agriculture in the interior regions but faced similar challenges. They eventually followed the Dutch and moved to the Atlantic agricultural coastlands. When the British took control over the three separate colonies and consolidated them into British Guiana in 1831, they continued the policies and agricultural practices put in place by the Dutch. The British realised that the economy of the interior regions posed great risks and produced little profits. All subsequent colonisation attempts were therefore concentrated on the coastlands, although limited attention was paid to interior mining and forestry (Daly, 1975; Thompson, 1987).

While the British European migration was primarily from the interior regions to the Atlantic agricultural coastlands, their population remained relatively small as compared to the rest of the population. In 1764, the white population of Berbice was 116 out of a total of 3,476. In 1833, it increased marginally to 570, with 431 males and 139 females, out of a population of 19,320. By contrast, in 1829 the population in Demerara and Essequibo was 78,734. The white population was 3006, with 2100 males and 906 females (Schomburgh, 1840, p. 45-47). These statistics reveal some interesting characteristics. Europeans in British Guiana were the numerical minority and while we cannot determine precisely their economic status from these statistics, they were not a disadvantaged minority. They controlled the higher economic and political resources of British Guiana. What is certain is that European migration to British Guiana was plagued by a gender disparity. For instance, in Berbice in 1883, there were 431 males and 139 females (Schomburgh, 1840, p. 47). This gender imbalance undoubtedly led to unstable lifestyles among the European immigrants in their new environment. Chief among them, were the forceful unions with women from non-European ethnic groups.

European migration was certainly associated with superordinate and subordinate actions.<sup>iii</sup> However, these imposing actions did not lead to the European decimation of the Guyanese Amerindians as had occurred elsewhere in the Caribbean. Instead, the arrival of Europeans did disturb and displace the Amerindian way of survival through physical and psychological warfare. But the Amerindians avoided large-scale enslavement by escaping into the vast interior regions. The unavailability of Amerindian slave labour, however, led to one of the most profound migratory impacts on Guyana. The Europeans transported millions of slaves and indentured servants from Africa, Asia, and Europe to work on their expanding plantations in Guyana. We are not sure how many Africans were brought to Guyana through the African Slave Trade mainly because of unreliable statistics and the constant changing of European control of Essequibo, Berbice and Demerara. Historian, Phillip Curtin's study, *The Atlantic Slave Trade: A Census*, is one of the most reliable sources on the number of Africans brought to the Americas. Curtin writes that "it is extremely unlikely that the ultimate total will turn out to be less than 8,000,000 or more than 10,500,000 (1969, p. 87). He suggested that 480,000 slaves were brought to Suriname and Guyana (1969, p. 89). Out of this total, about two thirds probably were brought to Guyana. In the decade prior to the abolition of slavery, in 1838, there were probably 80,000 to 100,000 slaves living in Guyana (Schomburgh, 1840, p. 42-47). These African slaves were brought mainly from West Africa and they comprised of multiple ethnicities. Some more well-known ethnic groups were the Ashanti from Ghana, the Yoruba from Southwest Nigeria, the Ibo from South Western Nigeria and the Mandingo from Senegal. They were recruited from the ranks of war captives, debtors, and persons found guilty of various criminal and social offences. Others were kidnapped through raids and deceitful ways. More male Africans were brought to Guyana as women were considered a burden to the plantation system because of their time spent on child-bearing and caring activities. European slave traders were initially involved in the recruitment of African slaves but overtime when recruitment became difficult, African chiefs or middlemen were targeted to supply slaves and rewarded with material objects. The arrival of Africans changed the demographics of Guyana as their numbers made them the largest ethnic group, surpassing the Amerindians. They held this status until the first quarter of the twentieth century when

East Indians became the majority population in Guyana. Before the arrival of East Indians in the 1820s and 1830s, for example, in Berbice, there were 523 whites, 1,161 free coloured and 20,118 slaves concentrated on the coastlands while the interior Amerindian population was around 7,000 (Schomburg, 1840, p. 46). However, Africans remained at the bottom of the hierarchy of Guyanese society during period of the old world migration. They were restricted and restrained by inadequate education, nutrition and health care, along with the violation of personal and family dignity through sexual molestation, separation of family members, refusal of marriage, and prohibitions of various cultural, economic and political activities. Guyanese slave society was one of a vertical polarisation. Europeans occupied the highest social strata while the mixed and enslaved remained at middle and lower strata respectively.

The final abolition of slavery in 1838 led to another wave of migrants from the Old World, primarily from Asia and Africa. In a desperate attempt to fill a so-called labour vacuum in response to a gradual withdrawal of freed Africans from plantation agriculture, the planters imported indentured contract labourers from the aforementioned regions. A majority of these contract labourers came from the Indian sub-continent. Under this labour contract scheme, 238,909 labourers were imported from India between 1838 and 1918; 32,216 from Madeira between 1835 and 1881; 13,533 from China between 1853-1884; 14,060 from Africa between 1834 and 1867; 381 from Europe between 1834 and 1845 while some 1,868 were imported from other destinations between 1835 and 1867, comprising a total of 300,967 migrants (Roberts & Byrne, 1966, p. 127).<sup>iv</sup> The arrival of some African immigrant labourers to Guyana was somewhat different. Many arrived on slave ships bound to the last remaining slave colonies of Cuba, Brazil and the United States. However, they were intercepted by British warships policing the seas to stop the trading of slaves after the abolition of the Atlantic Slave Trade in 1807. These rescued Africans were eventually indentured to Guyana and other Caribbean islands to avoid being enslaved. These indentured immigrants left their homeland because of economic and social deprivation, although some were duped and kidnapped. They were drawn from the rural and urban areas in their homeland and were bound to a series of stipulated rules in their contracts which were largely designed to benefit their employers. Consequently, their indentured

experienced was mixed as a majority of them was abused while a minority benefitted. Except for the East Indians who had the option to accept land or return home, which an estimated 75,000 return, a major part of indentured immigration to Guyana led to permanent settlement. After fulfilling their contracts, the labourers did not return to their original homeland but drifted to village settlements, urban areas within Guyana or to other nearby Caribbean Islands.

In the final analysis, migration from the Old World to Guyana produced manifest and latent consequences. The manifest consequence is that old migration transformed Guyana from an essentially bifurcated to a multicultural society with each ethnic group holding on to its own social institution (religion, culture and identity) but mixed and mingled at the work and market places (Smith, 1965). The latent consequence is that because old world migration was largely labour induced, there were varying degrees of tension and competition for limited resources among the immigrant ethnic groups. The end result was open confrontations between Africans and Portuguese, Africans and East Indians. Africans believed that they were the original inhabitants of Guyana and they should have equal or more access to resources than other ethnic groups. They argued that the arrival of indentured Asians and Portuguese were given more privileges over them, such as the access to land. The recently arrived immigrants undermined their bargaining power for better working conditions and wages since they accepted lower working standards. The reality was that these groups were placed in an environment with limited resources or what Guyanese radical historian Walter Rodney (1981) described as 'a struggle for the domination of capital'. On the other hand, the planters were more than eager to use the ethnic tensions to ensure their security, safety and ultimate survival. The influx of these different ethnic groups allowed the planters to practice the common colonial policy of 'divide and rule' by pitting one group against other to deny and deprive the likelihood of a unified movement against them. In general, there continued to be racial and class divisions in early twentieth century Guyana with Europeans (including the ex-indentured Portuguese), Africans, and Asians occupying high, middle and lower strata respectively. European political, but not economic supremacy, started to decline while an increasing number of Africans as well Asians became part of the upper and middle classes through improved education, the civil



service, the trades, professions, work ethics, business and political affiliation. Greater physical and cultural contacts were developed between Europeans, Asians and other racial groups, although racism and discrimination were prevalent.

## **INTERNAL AND INTRA-REGIONAL GUYANESE MIGRATION**

This section deals with two aspects of Guyanese migration. The first is the internal movement, from the time slavery was abolished (1838) to the first half of the twentieth century when the movement was at its peak following emancipation but slowed down after the Second World War. The movement took place from the plantations to village settlements and from these enclaves to urban areas, principally to Georgetown and New Amsterdam. The second section is subdivided into two parts but concentrates on the movements to and from Guyana in the Caribbean and Latin American region (Venezuela and Brazil). The first part examines the movement of Caribbean nationals to Guyana from the slave emancipation period to around the 1970s when this migration practically ceased, transforming Guyana from an importer to an exporter of people. The second part analyses the movement of Guyanese nationals to other Caribbean destinations, which became more noticeable in the early decades of the twentieth century. This Guyanese intra- regional migration continues into the contemporary period surpassing all other phases of Guyanese migration, except for the one from Guyana to North America and Europe.

Apart from the movement of Amerindians in the interior region, the movement of Europeans from the interior region to the Atlantic agricultural coastlands and the flight of enslaved Africans to independent communities, the major internal migration in Guyana occurred primarily soon after the abolition of slavery. The movement took place from the plantations to independent villages and was determined and dictated by the restrictive land purchase policy of the Crown and planters as well as by the initiative of freed Africans (see Farley, 1964). Soon after emancipation, the freed Africans envisioned

moving to vacant Crown lands and began a new life independent from the plantations, mainly to engage in small-scale farming. The planters, however, wanted to retain a steady supply of labour to their plantations and therefore discouraged opportunities for out-migration by raising the price of land. This land restrictive policy plus the reduction of wages and fringe benefits, such as medical care and rations, did not only exacerbate a long held feeling that the paternal plantation system was degrading and demoralizing but also stimulated a mass exodus from the planter controlled environment. Some Africans simply drifted into urban areas while others went to the interior regions and engaged in gold mining, woodcutting and *balata* bleeding.<sup>v</sup> The main flow, however, was to urban areas like Georgetown because the amenities and luxuries of urban life were more appealing than the interior regions or “bush life” (Daly, 1975, p. 204). In comparison to the forceful out-migration of some Africans from the plantations, other freed Africans used their savings, accumulated during slavery, to buy abandoned plantations from their former masters either through the proprietary or cooperative system. The proprietary system was a process whereby a planter sold a part of his land to freed Africans, with the expectation that they would stay and work on the plantations while the cooperative system was when Africans pooled their savings and resources to buy abandoned plantations and land. By 1839, 267 cottages were established by the proprietary system (Adamson, 1972, p. 35). The cooperative movement to villages was more impressive. In 1839, 84 labourers purchased Plantation North Brook in Demerara for \$10,000. Geographer Alan Adamson declares that from 1838 to 1844 the following plantations were bought by freed Africans: “500 acres of Plantation Friendship, purchased by 168 labourers for \$80,000; 500 acres of Plantation New Orange Nassau (now Buxton) by 128 labourers in common for \$50,000; 400 acres of Plantation Beterverwating by 145 labourers for \$22,000; and 300 acres of Plantation Plaisance by 88 labourers for \$39,000” (1972, p. 36). Guyanese historian Vere Daly writes that by 1842, four years after emancipation, 16,000 Africans had moved out of the plantations and were living in free villages. This population figure scaled up to 29,000 in 1847 and by the end of 1848 the village population was a staggering 44,038. Out of a total of 82,000 African labouring population in 1850, 42,000 departed from the plantations to villages (Daly, 1975, p. 201-07).

This movement from the plantations to villages revealed some interesting characteristics of Guyanese society and labour relations. The planters wanted to retain a total control over the labourers during the post-emancipation period while the Africans wanted to be free of the planters' domination in order to improve their low social and economic status. This polarised industrial uneasiness ultimately led to the planters importing foreign labour while the Africans slowly drifted away from the plantations. Both reactions demonstrate the inflexible and intolerable aspects of plantation labour. The planters applied the same attitude towards foreign contract labourers, and like the Africans, the former also migrated from the plantations to village settlements and urban areas soon as their contracts expired. The movement of foreign contract labour was somewhat different, however. Except for the indentured Africans who joined the free Africans in the movement towards village settlements, the movement of former foreign contract labourers was more individually administered. The Chinese and Portuguese left the plantations and engaged in urban retail businesses soon after their contracts expired.<sup>vi</sup> In the main towns of Georgetown and New Amsterdam, owners of grocery stores, restaurants and laundry businesses became synonymous with Chinese and Portuguese names. The Chinese and Portuguese dominated the micro economic sector until a decade after Guyana's independence in 1966, when President Forbes Burnham introduced the policy of cooperative socialism that stymied and stifled private businesses. Cooperative socialism placed more than eighty per cent of the economy in the hands of the nation-state, stifling practically all private micro economic activities.<sup>vii</sup>

The most significant internal movement following the African village migration and settlement was that of time-expired indentured East Indians (Roopnarine, 2001). This movement began after the early 1870s when the planters gave time-expired East Indians an option to accept a parcel of land to settle in lieu of their entitled return passages to India. This policy was not based on humanitarian sentiments but rather on the planters' need to retain a cheap and steady labour supply to the plantations. Moreover, it was cheaper for the planters to settle ex-indentured Indian labourers than to repatriate them to India. While the policy of land in lieu of passage was unfair to Africans, in that they were denied this option, it was fraught with problems. Like the African experience in the villages, the land was not only infertile but also difficult to

manage as drainage was poor. The owners had little or no experience with landownership. Moreover, the entire land settlement scheme was inconsistent and checkered. It started in 1880, ceased in 1882 and then revived between 1897 and 1902. During this period, only an estimated 3000 Indians in Guyana received land (Roopnarine, 2011a, p. 180). Nevertheless, landownership, despite being limited, was catalyst for Indian migration from the plantations to villages and to urban areas. Geographer Lesley Potter reveals that in 1871 out a total population of 55,101, only 3,215 Indians were living in village settlements. However, from 1881 to 1921, the village population increased substantially. According to statistics for 1881, 1891, 1911 and 1921, out of a total population of 85,163, 105,528, 126,517 and 124,939, respectively, there were 17,441, 28,477, 58,500 and 63,139 Indians living in villages and settlements in each of the years mentioned above. In 1921, over fifty per cent of the Indian population was residing away from the plantations or estates (Potter, 1975, p. 82).<sup>viii</sup>

While a significant number of Guyanese were moving out of the insular plantation system to villages and urban areas, other Caribbean immigrants, mainly from the Windward island chain, were entering the country and taking up job opportunities on the plantations, urban areas and interior mining regions. In the latter destination, they were looking for “B.G. gold” or British Guiana gold. These immigrants were pushed out of their homeland because of population pressure, in relation to land space and job opportunities, and were pulled in by prospects of labour and land ownership opportunities in Guyana. These working class immigrants, estimated to be more than 50,000, arrived soon after emancipation in 1838 and continued to stay until the third decade of the twentieth century. A majority of these islanders were from Barbados (Rodney, 1977).<sup>ix</sup> Their move to Guyana, however, was not always welcomed as they were exposed to bouts of discrimination from Guyanese and their immediate overlords. The movement of Caribbean islanders to Guyana reached its peak during the late nineteenth century and dwindled into a trickle in much of the twentieth century. Two factors were responsible for this migration pattern: slow economic development in Guyana that discouraged migration and the gradual overall improvement of living standards in other Caribbean islands after World War II. Nonetheless, these immigrants have made a significant contribution in terms of sustaining the agricultural industry in

Guyana and have more or less assimilated into the Guyanese way of life. Their roots are merely symbolic to their departed homeland, especially those who had arrived during the peak period in the late nineteenth century.

Guyana also attracted Brazilian *Garimpeiros* or miners, particularly to the mining interior regions and to a lesser extent to the capital city, Georgetown. Their arrival to the interior mining regions began in the 1990s. This was in response to strict mining policies (in small-scale gold mining) from their home government to safeguard the environment and the way of life of indigenous Brazilians. These immigrants are attracted to mining activities because of their experience and the long porous border between Brazil and Guyana. Statistics on how many Brazilians are in Guyana are sketchy. Some sources estimated the Brazilian population in Guyana is around 10,000, a majority of them illegally (Prabhala, 2002; Romero, 2000; Corbin, 2007).<sup>x</sup> The Brazilians have currently dominated small-scale gold mining activities and have certainly contributed to the growth of revenues to the Guyana government, although large quantities of gold are not declared to the government or are smuggled out of the country. The Guyanese government is currently caught in quandary with the steady influx of Brazilians. The government wants to integrate itself economically with Brazil but it is concerned with the continuous arrival of Brazilians. The government believes that Brazilians will transform Guyana culturally and pose a serious risk to the small-scale gold mining industry and the interior region eco-system since a majority of them are engaged in reckless and rapacious mining practices (see Roopnarine, 2002; 2006; Romero, 2010). The international community, including environmentalists, is also concerned that if the 300 miles road from Georgetown to Lethem (a town on the border with Brazil) is paved then this would lead to a further influx of Brazilians as well as posing a serious threat to wild life in the region. The prognosis is that Brazilians will continue to come to Guyana mainly because of the porous border between Guyana and Brazil, strict mining policies in Brazil, high prices for gold in the international market and weak regulatory immigration policies in Guyana. It is also felt that Brazilians will face challenges of integration into Guyanese society mainly because of language difference. They might also form a noticeable diasporic Brazilian community in Guyana from which they will practice segmented and selective assimilation.<sup>xi</sup>

From the 1960s, especially after independence in 1966, the Guyanese intra-regional migration took a dramatic turn, from being an importer to an exporter of people, to a point where this outward movement was almost as equal as the country's national export of sugar, rice and gold. Political turmoil, economic hardships, inadequate education and healthcare services as well as declining and deteriorating quality of life and unstable security, forced Guyanese to migrate to better destinations and discouraged individuals from other countries from coming to Guyana.<sup>xii</sup> The United Nations Human Development Index (2009) ranked Guyana 114 out of 182 countries. By contrast, Barbados, which receives a high level of in-migration from Guyana, was ranked 38 out of 183 countries<sup>xiii</sup>. For instance, from 1980 to 1991, the Guyanese population declined from 759,567 to 723,673 in 1991, a total of 35,894. During the same period, there were about 10,000 immigrants in Guyana, a mere 1.3 percent of the population<sup>xiv</sup>. The natural outlet was to the neighbouring countries and islands which were primarily encouraged by proximity and liberal immigrant laws. The Guyanese population in these regions ranged from 100,000 to 150,000. There are about 60,000 Guyanese in Suriname; 30,000 in Venezuela; 30,000 in Brazil; 34,000 in Barbados; 15,000 in Antigua; 5,000 British Virgin Islands; 5,000 in the Dutch islands of St. Maarten, Saba and St. Eustatia; 4,000 in St. Kitts, Nevis and Anguilla; and 1000 in Montserrat.<sup>xv</sup>

These outward movements have not always been dictated by deteriorating push factors in Guyana. Rather, some have occurred because of the free movement of skills policy developed under Caribbean Single Market Economy (CSME). In 1989, CSME revised the Treaty of Chaguaramas to include the free movement of skilled Caribbean nationals within member CARICOM states. The key characteristics of CSME are: the free movement of skills, service, capital and a right to establishment. This was enacted into the domestic law of all member states in the CSME with some restrictions in terms of residence and work permits.<sup>xvi</sup> However, whether or not these outward intra-regional movements from Guyana are determined and driven by failed internal policies or proactive regional labour immigration procedures, they are associated and connected with a host of interrelated characteristics and issues that are not always in favour of Guyanese migrants in the new destinations (see Roopnarine, 2011b). First is that the

movement is generally within the periphery of the world development model which means Guyanese have faced some of the same challenges at home, as in their new environment. Their new societies generally do not have the resources to accommodate them and therefore overseas Guyanese continue to face bouts of marginalisation, stigmatisation and discrimination. This is noticeable, particularly in Suriname, Barbados and Trinidad. During the 1980s, Suriname leader, Desi Bouterse blamed Guyanese immigrants for their economic problems and began forced repatriation of them back to Guyana. In recent times, it is not uncommon to read newspapers' headlines stating "Guyanese defend their right to live in Trinidad" (*Trinidad Newsday*, November 1, 2010); "Guyanese workers being abused" (*Trinidad Express*, May 24, 2009); "Fifty-three Guyanese Deported from Barbados" (*Stabroek News*, June 30, 2009); or "Guyanese in Barbados plead for President Jagdeo's intervention" (*Kaïeteur News*, May 18, 2009). Second is that given their unwanted presence in these societies, overseas Guyanese overtime will have to clamour and compete for jobs and make demands for access to healthcare, educational opportunities and other social service benefits. They have already started to negate and affirm, dismantle and construct, reject and reshape their purpose and place and push for the same opportunities like other native born nationals. Third is that many Guyanese have become residents in their new environment and are therefore eligible to sponsor their family. Their steady influx in particular areas of the Caribbean has subsequently transformed them into a visible minority. Guyanese are already the largest minority in Antigua<sup>xvii</sup>. Fourth is that this movement has certainly deplete and deprive Guyana from the opportunity to engage in sound economic development since some migrants have chosen to abandon ties with their homeland. There are already populations of native born and hybrid Guyanese within the Caribbean who have little or no meaningful ties with home other than symbolic.

## **GUYANESE EXTRA-REGIONAL MIGRATION AND RETURN MIGRATION**

This section deals with the major movement of Guyanese to developed countries in Europe and North America. The main focus will be to examine and analyse Guyanese migration since independence (1966) to the current period, although some references will be made before this period. This section also examines the return and transnational movement of Guyanese between their old and new destinations.

Migration scholars are unsure how many Guyanese have migrated to developed countries since independence because of unreliable statistics and the unpredictability of the very nature of Guyanese extra-regional migration. One study proffers that “In South America, the country with, by far, the largest brain drain is Guyana, from which more than 70 per cent of individuals with a tertiary education have moved to the United States” (see Carrington & Detragiache, 1999). Researchers Martin J. Boodhoo and Ahamad Baksh show that from 1969 to 1976, 43,639 Guyanese migrated. Of this total, 83 per cent went to North America and Europe and 9.5 per cent went to other Caribbean Islands (1969, p. 50; Sackey, 1978, p. 45-58). A similar pattern occurred with student migration. From 1976 to 1992, Guyanese migration to overseas destination increased substantially, averaging 20,000 to 30,000 a year. This movement caught the attention of Canada’s independent newspaper the *Toronto Star* which reported that “Desperate Guyanese Flocking to Canada as Depressed Homeland Nears Collapse.”<sup>xviii</sup> The independent Guyanese newspaper the *Catholic Standard* asked “Where are all the Managers Gone?”<sup>xix</sup>. From 1992 to the current period, Guyanese out-migration slowed down, averaging about 10,000 a year. Nonetheless, this out-migration is still startling.

Given these events, we can make some careful speculations about Guyanese extra-regional migration by using the rough aforementioned statistics. It appears that Guyanese post-independence extra-regional migration has occurred in three statistical stages: it rose after the first decade after independence, peaked during the mid-1970s to 1992, and slowed down marginally thereafter to the current period. On an average about 25,000 to 30,000 Guyanese had departed the country since 1966 bringing the total number of Guyanese overseas population to 150,000. This is a conservative



estimate since thousands have left illegally and those born in their new destinations do often consider themselves Guyanese. The Human Development Report states that Guyana has an emigration rate of 33.5 per cent with 78.6 per cent of emigrants going to North America.<sup>xx</sup> There are over an estimated 200,000 Guyanese in the United States but this is an undercount since undocumented Guyanese were not factored in. The Guyanese Embassy in Canada estimated that there are about 200,000 Guyanese residing in Canada while another 75,000 Guyanese living in Europe, with a majority in Britain. It is most probable that no less than 400,000 to 500,000 Guyanese live in western developed countries.

There are a myriad of reasons for Guyanese extra-regional migration. The most obvious emanated from push/pull factors so commonly operative between developing and developed countries. Political and economic instability, crime and overall deteriorating living conditions have pushed Guyanese to move while favourable changing immigration laws, job opportunities and better living conditions have pulled them to better destinations in developed countries. From 2002 to 2007, the *Economists* reported Guyana as a dangerous Caribbean country marred with death squads, crime and racial violence.<sup>xxi</sup> In 2008, The *New York Times* reported that a gang of gunmen killed eleven East Indian Guyanese, out of which five victims were children sleeping in their beds.<sup>xxii</sup> By contrast, labour shortages in the receiving destinations following the Second World War caused the British Government to actively recruit workers from its overseas colonies, including British Guiana. The London Transport and British Hotels and Restaurants Association had agents in British Guiana and elsewhere enlisting workers (Gmelch, 1987, p. 320). The British Guianese colony was eager to send its citizens to work in the mother country to avoid unemployment burdens at home. An estimated 10,000 to 15,000 Guyanese went to Great Britain under this work programme. By the early 1960s, however, the white public outcry against non-white immigration resulted in the British Government passing the Commonwealth Act of 1962. The Act states that Guyanese and other British West Indians could sponsor their wives, husbands, or children under 16, but all others were barred from entering Great Britain. While the British Government closed its doors to Guyanese and Caribbean immigrants, Canada

and the United States opened their immigration doors in 1962 and 1965 respectively. Canada removed its non-white immigration policy based on social, ethnic and racial backgrounds and began to admit immigrants based on educational and occupational qualifications (Challinor 2011). The US removed the differential national quotas and adapted a more liberal immigration system regardless of place of birth. By 1970, these reform immigration laws shifted Guyanese migration flow from Europe to North America: US, Canada and Great Britain received 37 per cent, 29 per cent and 15 per cent of Guyanese migration respectively (Sukdeo, 1981).

Initially, the post-independence extra-regional migration revolved around high skilled individuals and university students. By mid-1980s, the bulk of the movement was from the low social status, although there were increases in the movement of high skilled personnel. The impact of this extra-regional migration on Guyana is manifold. On a negative level, the country has experienced a brain drain, that is, the loss of skilled and educated personnel such as doctors, lawyers, nurses, teachers and technicians. Out-migration from Guyana has reduced human capital, which in turn, stymied growth and development. The social cost has also been incalculable. Guyanese migrants generally leave their families behind, including children, who often lose their main source of support. The responsibility is then shifted onto relatives who generally have limited resources themselves to cope. The years of separation translated into children growing up ignorant of the contours of their parents' faces. On a positive level, the extra-regional movement to developed countries certainly led to a Guyanese Diaspora, the scattering of discrete and distinct sub-cultural communities. These micro communities have contributed significantly to Guyana by the way of remittances. Statistics reveal that remittances have increased substantially from US\$27,000,000 to US\$266,000,000 in 2000 and 2009 respectively (see Orozco 2002; Migration Policy Institute Report 2010). In 2010, Guyanese remitted US\$374 million and this figure is expected to increase over the next few years as the economy recovers from its pre-crisis levels. Inbound and outbound money transactions were valued at an estimated US\$196 million. Remittances account for twenty-percent of Guyana's Gross Domestic Product and continues to play an important role as a source of foreign exchange, reducing poverty

as well as providing for household investments such as paying electric, education and health bills. Remittances have created a culture, to which in the local parlance, Guyanese call waiting for a “lil raise.”

Guyana’s extra-regional migration has not been one way. Actually, a number of Guyanese have returned home or have been living transnational lives. The latter explains this migratory behaviour as neither permanent settlement nor permanent return. Sociologist Dwaine Plaza defines transnationalism as

“having multiple ties and interactions that link people and their institutions across the borders of nation-states ... transnational groups are those that are globally dispersed but still identify in terms of their original ethnicity and relate to both the host states in which they reside as well as the home countries from which they or their ancestors originated. They are tied together transglobally through a variety of social relationships or networks”. (2008).

Prior to independence, the annual rate of return migration was about 420. However, the first decade after independence from 1965 to 1976 saw an estimated 13,700 Guyanese returning home (Strachan 1983: 126). The Guyana Bureau of Statistics showed that from 1979 to 1999 there were more departures than arrivals. For example, in 1979, there were 131,863 arrivals and 144, 632 departures; in 1989, there were 129,892 arrivals and 145,196 departures; in 1999, there were 178,982 arrivals and 191,146 departures (2000, p. 9). It is not certain if these were all Guyanese or whether these individuals were temporarily, transnational or permanent arrivals/returnees. It seems like some of these individuals were just visiting Guyana on short-term bases, anywhere from one week to one month. What is certain is that there has been a smaller number of Guyanese returning compared to those who are leaving.<sup>xxiii</sup> A number of characteristics account for return migration from developed to developing countries like from the U.S. to Guyana. First, some return home because they have accomplished the purpose for which they emigrated. That is, they achieved some level of economic, educational and material success that would give them a satisfactory lifestyle in their native homeland.

They generally have enough finances to buy a parcel of land to build a house as these returnees had planned to return home before they left their homeland. Others returned because they were disappointed with their overseas experience and failed to integrate with the host society and saw no real reason to remain. Still, some returned home because of visa controls that disallowed them to stay beyond the authorised period of time. These were mainly students and business personnel. Some individuals returned simply because of the ageing process as they would like to retire in their homeland, particularly if they have property, investment or family there. Older siblings were obligated to return home and take care of ageing parents. The love of home, strong nationalistic feelings, as well as the long and harsh winters, may also stimulate return migration. Even conflicts within families abroad may lead to return migration.

Return migration also depended on the conditions of the homeland. If the political, social, economic and medical conditions improve, then there is likelihood for individuals to return home. Likewise, if the conditions are favourable in terms of well paid job opportunities, currency exchange rates, returnees will not re-migrate permanently (Strachan, 1983; Thomas-Hope, 1999; Tilokie, 2011). Networking, which may be inspired by governments or private groups, does encourage return migration. For example, in the 1990s, the Guyanese government launched a re-migration scheme to attract overseas Guyanese to return. The scheme is really a preferential treatment policy, which provides tax breaks and incentive to overseas Guyanese who have lived at least three years abroad. So far, the scheme has attracted only a minority of return overseas Guyanese. Finally, the global recession, which started in 2008, forced many overseas Guyanese to return home.

Return and transnational migration have had a profound impact on Guyanese society. This impact can be categorised into positive and negative aspects. The positive aspect is that return Guyanese tend to introduce new skills, ideas, techniques as well as capital which are much needed for growth and development. Return Guyanese generally have a positive demonstration effect to which the local population tries to emulate such as in terms of office mannerisms and computer skills. Guyanese returnees are important source of investment as remittances have led to unprecedented levels of infrastructural

development. In every region in Guyana, private and public buildings are being repaired or built. The town of Corriverton, for example, has undergone much transformation and it is difficult to recognise it from twenty years ago, precisely at a time when Guyanese began to send substantial sums of money back home. Generally speaking, the positive aspects of returnees are referred to as inadvertent innovators or carriers of change (see Cerase, 1974).

The negative aspect of return and transnational migration is that the home government does not meet the expectations of returnees. They are not well paid and are placed in jobs that do not make use of their overseas training. They are also not placed in important leadership positions to make significant changes. The returnees are also maladjusted to the traditional ways of thinking because of the long time spent away from their homeland. This is particularly true of deportees. Since 1996, a new reformed immigration law in the U.S. gave the judicial system the right to deport green card status offenders for even minor infractions. In the first half of 2011, the U.S. deported more than 2,000 criminals back to the Caribbean of which sixty-four of these involuntary returnees were from Guyana.<sup>xxiv</sup> Many of them left Guyana at a very young age and spent most of their lives in North America. On return, they are not only mal-adjusted but Guyana does not have the available resources to invest and make their integration process a successful one. The deportees also are not viewed kindly by the wider society since some of them re-enter into a life of crime which destabilises their new environment. One U.S newspaper reported that “some deportees have become criminal kingpins, corrupting government officials and organising native Guyanese into gangs that are smuggling drugs into the United States and firearms into Guyana” (Richard, 2003).<sup>xxv</sup> Some of the crimes are directed at non-deported return Guyanese since they are believed to possess “Yankee dollars.” There is also a growing tension between local and return Guyanese as the former believe that return Guyanese tend to flaunt their successes and instigate change. In the final analysis, we are not sure to what extent return migration and transnationalism have impacted Guyana since the movement has been recent and few studies have addressed this phenomenon. Moreover, the

Guyanese government has just begun to form meaningful relationships with its North American and European Diaspora.

## **CONCLUSION**

This article analyses Guyanese migration and society from the historical to the contemporary period. The article categorises Guyanese migration into three phases: old world, intra-regional, extra-regional and return. Each phase was complex, contributing to the shaping of Guyanese society. The first phase was a movement from Europe, Africa and Asia from the late fifteenth to the early twentieth century. The movement coincided and clashed with the Amerindian migration that resulted in the displacement of the Amerindians in the interior regions but the peopling of Guyana's plantation coastlands. Apart from the internal movement of Amerindians and the in-migration of Europeans, the dominant movement during this phase was the influx of African slaves and Asian indentured labourers. The movement transformed Guyana from a remote outpost to a multicultural society. The movement also created ethnic tensions emanating from various groups competing for limited resources. It was a period when the seeds of inter-ethnic rivalry were planted and when European colonialism was at its peak.

Following slave emancipation in 1838, Guyanese migration became freer as ex-slaves used their freedom to migrate from the dreaded plantations to villages and urban areas. Time-expired indentured labourers also participated in this internal rural-urban movement to compete with the Africans for urban amenities. The ensuing result was renewed tensions among the immigrant groups. By the 1850s, the out-migration from the plantation environment created a labour vacuum which was filled by the in-migration of thousands of southern Caribbean islanders. This migration continued until the first decade of the post-independence period but ceased soon after because of declining

living conditions in Guyana perpetuated by bad economic policies and racial animosity. By the 1990s, Guyana attracted another wave of intra-Caribbean migration mainly from Brazil to the interior region. The Brazilians have a de facto rein in the interior region, especially in small-scale gold mining.

Paralleling these pre and post-independence movements were the out-migration of Guyanese to other Caribbean islands. Guyanese were driven from their homeland by political turbulence, economic stagnation and social tensions. This movement was essentially within the developing Caribbean and so Guyanese migrants faced similar challenges in their new environment as they did in their homeland. They were exposed to bouts of discrimination, marginalisation as well as deportation. Nonetheless, Guyanese continued to migrate within the Caribbean because these destinations proved to offer better opportunities than their homeland. This intra-regional migration has created a Guyanese Caribbean Diaspora where in places like Antigua, Suriname, Trinidad, Barbados and St. Martin they have become noticeable minorities. While these communities have maintained links with Guyana because of nearness to their home and cheaper air flights, they have been practically ignored by the Guyanese government and the larger Guyanese Diaspora in North America and Europe.

By the 1980s, Guyanese migration seems to have reached a full circle. Guyanese were seen in Europe, North America and practically in every corner of the globe. While a significant portion of this migration remained, some of it returned or engaged in transnational movements. Like the intra-regional migration, this movement has created a Guyanese Diaspora which continues to have an enormous impact in the new destinations and on Guyana. Migration has resulted in the return of remittances, skills, technology, capital, investment and crime. Apart from the sponsored return migration programme from Guyanese, there appears to be no sound action or procedure to capitalise on the benefits to be had from the Guyanese overseas Diaspora. At best, the relationship between Guyana and the Diaspora on a procedural level remains fragmented and disunited. The final prognosis is that migration from and to Guyana will continue as long as there are unsound political and economic development in Guyana

as well as wage differentials between Guyana and other Caribbean countries and North America and Europe.

## REFERENCES

- Adam, Adamson (1972) *Sugar without Slaves: The Political Economy of British Guiana 1838-1904*, (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press).
- Addy, A. David (2003) "Trends in Labour Migration and its Implications for the Caribbean." In Cynthia Barrow-Giles & Don Marshall (eds). *Living in the Borderlines: Issues in Caribbean Sovereignty and Development* (Kingston: Ian Randle Publishers), 376-394.
- Boodhoo, M & Baksh, Ahamad (1969) *The Impact of Brain Drain on Development: A Case- study of Guyana*, (Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: Percetakan Intisari).
- Brothwell, D. R (1967) "The Amerindians of Guyana: Biological Review," *The Eugenics Review*, 59 (1), 22-45.
- Challinor, A. E (2011) Canada's Immigration Policy: a Focus on Human Capital. Migration Policy Institute. Accessed from <http://www.migrationinformation.org/feature/display.cfm?ID=853>
- Cerase, F. P (1974) "Expectations and Reality: A Case Study of Return Migration from the United States to Southern Italy", *International Migration Review*, 8 (2), 245-262.
- Corbin, H. P. (2005) Brazilian Migration to Guyana as a Livelihood Strategy: A Case Study Approach". Accessed from [http://www.ufpa.br/naea/gerencia/ler\\_tcc.php?id=13](http://www.ufpa.br/naea/gerencia/ler_tcc.php?id=13)



- Carrington, W. J & Detragiache, E. (1999, June) "How Extensive is the Brain Drain?" *Finance & Development*, 46-49. Accessed from <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/fandd/1999/06/carringt.htm>
- Curtain, Philip, D. (1969). *The Atlantic Slave Trade: a Census* (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press).
- Daly, Vere (1975). *A Short History of the Guyanese People* (London: Macmillan).
- Depoo, Tilokie (2011). Repatriation of New York Guyanese by Age and Gender, Paper presented at the ASBBS Annual Conference, Las Vegas, February.
- Dixon, Roland. B (1934). "Migrations, Primitive" In *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, (New York: Macmillan) 10, 420-25.
- Edwards, W. & Gibson, K. (1979), "An Ethnohistory of Amerindians in Guyana" *Ethnohistory*, 26 (2), 161-175.
- Faist, Thomas (2000) "Transnationalization in International Migration: Implications for the Study of Citizenship and Culture" *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 23 (2), 189-222.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2000b). *The Volume and Dynamics of International Migration and Transnational Social Spaces* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Farley, Rawl (1964) "The Rise of the Village Settlements of British Guiana," *Caribbean Quarterly*, 2 (1), 52-61.
- Gmelch, George (1987) "Work, Innovation, and Investment: The Impact on Return Migration on Barbados" *Human Organization*, 46 (2), 131-140.
- Goss, Jon & Bruce Lindquist (1995). "Conceptualizing International Labour Migration: A Structuration Perspective" *International Migration Review*, 24 (2), 317-351
- Guyana Statistical Bulletin, Bureau of Statistics 5 (4) 1996
- Guyana Population Census (2002) Accessed from, <http://www.statisticsguyana.gov.gy/census.html>
- Lee, E. S. (1966). "A Theory of Migration" *Demography*, 3, 47-57.
- Massey, D. at el (1993). "Theories of International Migration: A Review and Appraisal." *Population and Development Review*, 19 (3), 180-210.
- Massey, D (1989) "International Migration and Economic Development in Comparative Perspective" *Population and Development Review*, 14, 383-414.

- Orozco, Manuel (2002) "Remitting Back Home and Supporting the Homeland: The Guyanese Community in the US" Inter-American Dialogue, Working Paper commissioned by the US Agency for International Development. GEO Project, October 25.
- Petersen, William (1959), "A General Typology of Migration" *American Sociological Review*, 23, 3: 256-66
- Plaza, Dwaine (2008) Transnational Return Migration to the English-speaking Caribbean *La Revue européenne des migrations internationales (REMI)*, 24 (1), 115-137.
- Plaza, E. Dwaine & Frances Henry (2006) *Returning to the Source: The Final Stage of the Caribbean Migration Circuit* (Kingston: University of the West Indies Press).
- Piore, Michael J. (1979) *Birds of Passage: Migrant Labour in Industrial Countries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Portes, Alejandro & Jozsef Borocz (1989) "Contemporary Immigration: Theoretical Perspectives on its Determinants and Modes of Incorporation" *International Migration Review*, 23 (3), 606-630.
- Potter, Robert & Dennis Conway (2005) "Experiencing Caribbean Return: Societal Contributions, Adaptations and Frustrations," In Robert Potter, Dennis Conway and Joan Phillips (eds). *The Experience of Return Migration: Caribbean Perspectives* (Aldershot, England: Ashgate) 283-287.
- Prabhala, Achal (2002, June 9), "The Brazilian Presence in Guyana," *Stabreak News*
- Ravenstein, E. (1885). "The Laws of Migration" *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 48 (2), 167-235.
- Richard, Randall (2003, November 17) "The Deportation of Crime: U.S. Policy Causing Problems Elsewhere" *Seattle Times*.
- Roberts, George and Joycelyn Byrne (1966) "Summary Statistics on Indenture and Associated Migration Affecting the West Indies, 1834-1918" *Population Studies*, 20 (1), 125-134.

Rodney, Walter (1977) *Barbadian Immigration Into British Guiana, 1863-1924*, Barbados, U.W.I. Cave Hill, Ninth Annual Conference of Caribbean Historians, April, 1977.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1981) *A History of the Guyanese Working People, 1881-1905* (Baltimore, Md.: John Hopkins University Press).

Romero, Simon (2000, March 30) "Guyana: Caught in Brazil's Net? Small Nation, New to Free Markets, Fears Loss of Its Identity" *New York Time*, March 30.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2010, May 8) "Muddy Road Molds Debate on the Future of Guyana" *New York Times*

Roopnarine, Lommarsh (2011a) "Indian Migration during Indentured Servitude in British Guiana and Trinidad, 1850-1920" *Labor History* 52 (2), 173-192.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2006) Small-scale Gold Mining and Environmental Policy Challenges in Guyana's

Interior Region" *Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, 31 (61), 115-144

\_\_\_\_\_ (2002) "Wounding Guyana: Gold Mining and Environmental Degradation" *European Review of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, 73, 83-91

\_\_\_\_\_ (2011b) "The Challenges of CARICOM Integration: The Barbadian-Guyanese Impasse" *Transition*, (Institute of Developmental Studies at the University of Guyana), 40, 62-91.

Rouse, Irving (1986) *Migrations in Prehistory: Inferring Population Movement from Cultural Remains* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press).

Sackey, James, A. (1978) "The Migration of High Level Personnel from Guyana: Towards an Alternative Analysis" *Transition* 1 (1), 45-58.

Sassen, Sakia (1988). *The Mobility of Labor and Capital: The Study of International Investment and Labor Flow* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

- Schomburgh, R. (1840) *A Description of British Guiana: Geographical and Statistical* (London: Simpkins, Marshall and Company)
- Smith, M. G (1965) *The Plural Society in the West Indies* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press).
- Strachan, A. J. (1983) "Return Migration to Guyana" *Social & Economic Studies*, 32 (3), 121-142.
- Sudkeo, Fred (81-82) "The Impact of Emigration on Manpower Resources in Guyana," *Revista/Review Interamericana*, 11 (4), 483-91
- Swan, M. (1957) *British Guiana: Land of Six People* (London: HMSO).
- Stark, Oded & David Bloom (1985) "The Economics of Labour Migration" *American Economic Review*, 75, 187-178.
- Taylor, J. E. (1999) "The New Economics of Labour Migration and the Role of Remittance in the Migration Process" *International Migration* 37 (1), 63-88.
- Todaro, Michael P. (1976) *International Migration in Developing Countries: A Review of Theory* (Tech. Rep.: International Labour Office).
- Thomas-Hope & M Elizabeth (2006) "Maximizing Migration: Caribbean Return Movements and the Organization of Transnational Space" In Plaza, E. Dwaine & Frances Henry (eds) *Returning to the Source: The Final Stage of the Caribbean Migration Circuit* (Kingston: University of the West Indies Press), 167-187.
- Thomas-Hope, E. (1999) "Return Migration to Jamaica and its Development Potential" *International Migration Review*, 37 (1), 183-207.
- Thompson, Alvin (1987) *Colonialism and Underdevelopment in Guyana 1580-1803* (Bridgetown: Carib Research and Publications).
- Vertovec, Steven (1999) "Conceiving and Researching Transnationalism" *Racial and Ethnic Studies*, 22 (2): 447-662.

Walker, W. (ed) (1878) *British Guiana at the Paris Exhibition* (London: Stanford).

Wallerstein, Immanuel (1974). *The Modern World System, Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century* (New York: Academic Press).

---

<sup>i</sup>. The word discovery is a highly controversial one in Guyanese and most of Caribbean historical literature. Most Caribbean historians believed Europe made contact or rather than discovered the Caribbean in the late fifteenth century. This controversy reached its peak in 1992 five hundred years after Christopher Columbus made contact with the Caribbean.

<sup>ii</sup> For a study on Dutch overseas migration and colonization see Gert Oostindie (eds.), *Dutch colonialism, migration and cultural heritage*, KITLV Press: Leiden 2008.

<sup>iii</sup> Superordination means when a migrating group imposes its will on indigenous population while subordination means when migrating groups are subjugated by other groups that have already settled.

<sup>iv</sup> . A few hundred African Americans from the United States were brought to British Guiana under the labor contract system.

<sup>v</sup> For a study on African Guyanese involvement in the interior region, see Barbara Josiah *Migration, Mining, and the African Diaspora: Guyana in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2011

<sup>vi</sup> Interestingly, in the nineteenth century, some Chinese immigrants re-migrated from Guyana to the rest of the Caribbean for better opportunities. They engaged in trading but also looked for Chinese brides, whom apparently were in low numbers to their male counterparts. The Chinese indentured service to the Caribbean suffered from gender disparity. More males were brought to the Caribbean.

<sup>vii</sup> For a brief and fair account of the restrictive policies of Forbes Burnham's Cooperative Socialism see "Guyana President accuses U.S. of Trying to Undermine Regime," *New York Times* February 6, 1984. p6.

<sup>viii</sup> There was a significant Chinese internal settlement/migration of Chinese from the plantations to Hopetown.

<sup>ix</sup> Linden Lewis, a Professor of Sociology at Bucknell University, wrote an excellent essay documenting this early relationship between Guyana and Barbados which first appeared in the *Bim* Journal but was reprinted in the *Stabroek News* (August 1, 2011) titled "Mudhead in Barbados: Lived Experience".

<sup>x</sup> *The Stabroek News* (October 21, 2012) editorialized that migration between Lethem (Guyana) and Bonfim, Boa Vista and Manus (Brazil) has created a Guybraz culture, that is, a hybrid culture between Guyanese and Brazilians.

<sup>xi</sup> For a sort of unity between Brazil and Guyana see "Guyana, Look South: Bridging a Divide of Language and History," *Economist* January 11, 2007.

<sup>xii</sup> Meislin, "Guyana's Leader Thrives as his Nation Founders," *New York Times* October 12, 1982, Section A, p, 2.

<sup>xiii</sup> <http://hdr.undp.org/en/>

<sup>xiv</sup> *ibid*

<sup>xv</sup> The author made various phone calls to embassies of these nations to obtain these figures. Many of embassies were not sure how Guyanese live in their country but some offered rough population estimates.

<sup>xvi</sup> One interesting case of this intra-regional migration is that since the 1980s, St. Kitts' sugar industry has been importing overseas cane-cutters, including Guyanese to harvest sugar-cane. In 2005, the sugar industry closed down in light of economic problems. There were about 232 Guyanese cane-cutters out of labor force of 1,500. "Life After Sugar-The St. Kitts Experience," *Jamaica Gleaner*, May 1, 2006.

<sup>xvii</sup> Guyana sends a number of students to study within the Caribbean. Cuba receives the bulk of this student migration. As of 2012, there were about 500 Guyanese students in Cuba. "President meets Guyanese Students in Cuba," *Guyana Chronicle*, October 22, 2012.

<sup>xviii</sup> *Toronto Star*, March 21, 1984: A1.

<sup>xix</sup> February 11, 1990: 7; The *New York Times* reported that U.S. has been a magnet for Caribbean nationals including Guyanese, see French, W. Howard, "Caribbean Exodus: U.S. Is constant Magnet," *New York Times*, May 6, 1992, 1, A12L.

<sup>xx</sup> (<http://hdr.undp.org/en/>).

<sup>xxi</sup> *Economists* "Politics in Guyana: Tinderbox, the fear of racial Violence," September 7, 2002, 37; "Guyana: Policing the Cops: Politics and a Death Squad," May 20, 2004; Racial Politics in Guyana: Good hopes and Bad Intentions," April 27, 2006.

<sup>xxii</sup> Agence France-Presse "11 are Killed in a Guyanese Village," *New York Times*, January 27, 2008, 6, 1P.

<sup>xxiii</sup> The Net migration in Guyana was last reported at -40000 in 2010, according to a World Bank report published in 2012

<sup>xxiv</sup> Kaieteur News "64 Guyanese deported from US in last six months" *Kaieteur News* April 20, 2011.

<sup>xxv</sup> For a brief treatment on how Guyana treats deportees see "Guyana: information on the treatment of criminal deportees" United States Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services, <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/country,,USCIS,,GUY,,414ef10d4,0.html>