

Migration—The View from Africa

In Africa, there are an estimated 16.3 million migrants and close to 13.5 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) in 19 countries (UN, 2002; Norwegian Refugee Council, 2002). There are estimated to be some 3.25 million African refugees and asylum seekers. The International Labour Organization estimates that the number of labor migrants in Africa today constitutes one-fifth of the global total and that by 2025, one in ten Africans will live and work outside their countries of origin (ILO, 2002). Many protracted conflicts have ended in recent years as new ones such as the Darfur conflict and northern Congo have also got worse in terms of humanitarian crisis. Currently, in Sudan alone, there are more than seven million IDPs, more than in any other country in the world. Sudan is also the country with the largest amount of people newly displaced in the recent years. In the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) there are 3.6 million IDPs and refugees whereas in Uganda there are more than two million IDPs. Sudan, DRC, Angola, Burundi, and Somalia were the largest sources of uprooted people in Africa, as five years ago, they accounted for more than 75 percent of all uprooted Africans. Tanzania, Sudan, Chad, Congo-Kinshasa, Zambia, and Uganda were the leading refugee and asylum hosts.

This shows Africa has remained both the source and host of most of refugees and IDPs. Repatriation has also been carried out in vast numbers in several African countries: Democratic Republic of the Congo, Angola, Sudan and Uganda. Again African countries remain by far the most affected by internal displacements and refugees. Africa is the source and host of half of the world's IDPs in Africa (United Nations, 2002).

Migration Defined

Migration is a purposeful act of change of location of a group of persons or an individual, as outcome of a deliberate decision of some form by the group or the individual. Strictly speaking, there is no absolutely voluntary migration for migration of any kind involves some sort of outer/super agency; each individual decision bears some sort of socio-geographic influence. Neither does absolute involuntary migration exist, for no migration is a sort of involuntary reflexive reaction.

Mehari Taddele Maru is Executive Director of African Rally for Peace and Development) and Program Coordinator at African Union Commission. He is a fellow at the Max Planck Institute, and was a George Mason Fellow at John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard. He holds a Master of Public Administration from Harvard University, a Master of Science from the University of Oxford and a Bachelor of Law from Addis Ababa University. Mehari served as Legal Expert of the African Union Commission and as Director of the Addis Ababa University Office for University Reform.

The statement Mehari Taddele Maru delivered at the conference was based on this paper.



Migration of all kind has, no matter how narrow, a margin of discretionary power of decision as to *migrate or not*, including the decision and choice to *not migrate* even at heavy cost including death.

The margin of discretionary power of decision and choice making in forced migration is far narrower than in the case of voluntary migration. Thus, voluntary migration has a larger list of choice and a relative predictability of the situation of migration and destination of migration as well as a better chance to plan prior to the migration. This difference in margin of maneuver in decision and choice making is one way of delimiting the "the fuzzy boundaries between forced and unforced migration" (Turton, 2003, p. 7).

The propensity—desire and capacity—to the change of the 'socio spatial' *status quo* in forced migration is also far less in magnitude and motivation than in the case of a voluntary one. Propensity to move is higher in the case of voluntary migration than in forced migration. This is what Kunz qualifies as "reluctance to uproot oneself, and the absence of ...motivation ..." (see Hansen and Anthony, 1982, p. 3). Therefore, the desire and inclination to maintain the *status quo* socio-spatial relationship and inertia against 'socio-spatial change' is one amongst the few defining distinctions between voluntary and involuntary migration.

New Trends and the Nature of Migration in Countries of Origin and Transit

In Africa, migration could take varied causes, forms and trends. As summarized in the African Union's Migration Policy Framework for Africa, low level development, poor governance, conflicts, human right violations, drought-driven spontaneous internal and international migration of pastoralist communities are some of the push factors for migration. These are factors of human insecurity.

Significant internal migratory movements—such as rural-urban migration—are another yet important push factor. The United Nations estimates that the rate of urbanization in Africa stands at 3.5 percent per year, the highest rate in the world, resulting in the rapid growth of urban agglomerations throughout the continent. By 2030, the proportion of Africa's urbanized population is expected to reach 54 percent, as compared to today's figure of 38 percent (UNCHS, 2001). This will increase mixed migration to the European Union and other destinations.

Better opportunities and greater security in the destination countries such as the European Union serve as pull factors in the decision to migrate. Moreover, social capital in terms of family networks and broader ethnic ties play a role as another pull factor by inducing decisions to why, when, how and where to migrate. The push and pull factors are intensified by lower cost of transportation, lower and better access to information such as television, internet and communication such as telephone, e-mail and postal services and increase the volume and speed of migration.

Human Insecurity, Migration and Security

Clearly if poverty, political instability, conflict, non-respect of human rights, climatic and environmental degradation are the causes of migration, then human insecurity is the cause of migration. Addressing these root causes will need different tools and efforts. Poverty reduction, human rights protection, and the UN Millennium Development Goals are efforts towards human security.

The 9/11 terrorist attacks on the United States has transformed migration as source of a security threat (Tirman, 2004). Clearly the security-migration nexus is not limited to physical and traditional security threats. Rather it has dimensions of socio-economic insecurity and fears of cultural and value domination. The association made between terrorist attacks and migrants, between religious ideological differences with the 'clash of civilization' type theory makes migration a non-traditional security threat, while the old threats attached with migration such as economic, social security and cultural threats are remaining.

National and International Security and Stability

Large spontaneous and unregulated flows of migrants can have a significant impact on national and international stability and security, hindering states' ability to exercise effective control over their borders, and creating tensions between origin and destination countries and within local host communities. Recent

international terrorist activity has also turned the focus on individual migrants and the potential for public order to be compromised by individuals whose intent it is to undermine the security and stability of states and societies. Combating irregular migration and establishing comprehensive migration management systems can contribute to enhancing national and international security and stability. Effective border management would prevent persons with guns from moving across boundaries for illegal purposes.

A key challenge is therefore on the one hand to establish a balance allowing states to meet their economic need for migrants and humanitarian obligations to refugees while concurrently addressing security problems and the need for effective border management.

Migration after the End of the Cold War

Due to security concerns, the strengthening of the border management systems in terms of technology, infrastructure, business process for inspection of travelers and training of staff has become a primary area of cooperation of states with respect to the securitization of migration. Of course, the effect of the 9/11 attacks on the United States is very important. Migration already emerged as a core issues in rethinking national security strategies. Especially against the backdrop of the 9/11 attacks, migrants are taken as potential terrorists. This has increased the securitization of migration.

The nature of migration i.e. the causes, types and volume of migration has changed with the end of the Cold War. A new conception of security that considers *en masse* migration and asylum seekers as threat to national security has also emerged after the end of the Cold War (Chimni, 1998, pp. 284–287; Weiner, 1995, p. 148). The asylum policy became one of the agenda of international and regional political forums (Gibney, 2003, pp. 22–23; Weiner, 1995, pp. 190–192). In some Western countries like the United Kingdom and Germany, political parties called for restrictionist asylum policies ostensibly with legal and economic reasons but inherently racist (Layton-Henry, 1994, pp. 275–280; Martin, 1994, pp. 198–201). The refugee issue became both a topic of the global and domestic political agenda. Furthermore, rampant poverty and internal civil wars—as result of political and economic transformation—have become the main driving causes for the large volume of forced migration.

These changes in causes, types and volume of migration, mainly ascribed to the end of the Cold War, have brought about changes in the policies of both, countries of immigration and emigration (Goodwin-Gill, 1998, pp. 191–192). This is the shift from a policy of openness towards refugees to a policy of closed gates and containment by the Western countries based on

racism and geographic origin of migrants (Layton-Henry, 1994, pp. 275–285). On the other hand, almost all states of the South, mainly the former communist countries, replaced their 'iron curtain' policy, which brought about massive mobility of people (Cohen and Kennedy, 2000, p. 145).

Asylum Policy Shift: From Encouragement to Containment

The end of the Cold War proved that the solidarity by Western governments to the UN refugee regime, ostensibly motivated by humanitarian consideration, was rather a self-serving politically motivated policy (Carens, 1998). This policy shift is best summarized by Cohen and Kennedy who state that "the political refugees of yesteryear are the economic migrants of today" (2000, p. 145). This policy shift from encouragement (of refugees) to containment on the part of the countries of immigration is probably the major effect of the end of the Cold War and signaled the end of 'the hero refugee' regime (Chimni, 1998a, pp. 284–287).

With the great number of migrants to the Western countries, the issue of multiculturalism and readiness to accommodate other ways of life became a serious security issue and brought the refugee regime into high politics. Racists, far right politicians, assimilationists and the advocates of the pro-homogenous ethnic nation state are at the center of these changes in asylum policies in Europe (Gibney, 2003, p. 24; Kymlicka, 2003). The cases of US intervention in Haiti, Bosnia and the creation of 'free zone policy' as well as NATO's intervention in Kosovo, and to some extent the intervention of Australia in East Timor were aimed at keeping the refugee influx out and render protection and assistance within the country of origin (Carens, 1998, pp. 28–29). However, in some cases such interventions unintentionally increased the volume of migration (Gibney, 1999, p. 25). US intervention in Somalia and the refugee flux to Ethiopia may serve as the best example for this situation.

Immigration as Source of Socio-Economic and Cultural Threat

Apart from the end of Cold War, other explanations for the emergence of restrictionist asylum policies in the Western countries, such as the global economics thesis or the volume of migrants, are reductionist by nature. Neither the labor market in the Western democracies, which demand for more labor, nor the numerical thesis sufficiently justify restrictionist policies. Closer study of historical accounts of global migration compared to the population increase globally shows that the numerical justification for restrictionist policies is not plausible. The recent competition for skilled immigrant labor from the South by the United Kingdom, the United States,

Germany, Canada, and Australia is a good example to prove the high demand for labor in the Western countries.

However, there is a very crucial point relevant to this topic: the assumption that skilled labor immigrants will be culturally comfortable based upon the Anglo/German-Conformity criteria (Kymlicka, 2003, p. 1). Hence, the large volume of migration coupled with the decreasing birth rate and future demographic imbalances has posed a serious threat to values of the Western countries and nation states. Such threats became real with the growth of international protection of human rights universally regardless of the possession of citizenship of the host country (Layton-Henry, 1994, p. 275). Moreover, increasing acceptance of multiculturalism as form of governance—including adoption of policies that legitimize and promote territorial autonomous self-government of ethnic and indigenous communities—engenders a new kind of problem.

Multiculturalism as form of governance is not the most favorable one to the ideal of liberalism. Respect and state support (as multiculturalism demands) for collective rights such as culture and religion in countries like France and the Netherlands with regard to migrants from former colonies in Africa, and the Middle East, Turkey and Africa in Germany were taken as threat to the very foundation of the assimilationist nation state (Layton-Henry, 1994, pp. 275–285; Martin, 1994, p. 196; Kymlicka, 2003, pp. 2–3). This is also holds true for the Puerto Ricans in the United States who have a permanent residence permit but not political rights. Migrants, as failed guest workers, illegal overstayers and entrants were considered as Metics—citizens with lesser rights (Martin, 1994, p. 194; Kymlicka, 2003 pp. 2–3).

Economic Globalization, Global Governance and Forced Migration

The end of the Cold War is marked by turmoil and reordering of the political and economic systems of many countries. In some cases, it brought many violent regime changes particularly in the former communist countries. Of the 62 major conflicts registered worldwide since 1960, more than 40 i.e. 66.6 percent were registered from the end of the 1980s to January 2002 (Barry and Jeffery, 2002, p. 23). One effect of this turmoil and reorder was massive forced migration of people fleeing severe internal civil war and conflicts. With these changes, complexities begin to occur regarding the traditional division between forced and voluntary migrants (Castles, 2000, pp. 80–81). Such complexities are partially attributed to the nature and causes of forced migration. Internal civil wars (as result of political and economic transformation) and rampant poverty became the main driving causes for the large volume of forced migration. During the Cold War, the

main reason for flight was political persecution due to ideological struggle. Therefore, one disruptive effect of economic reordering, via globalization and global governance, is a marginalization of the Global South. Both shattered the hope of survival and narrowed the freedom of choice of many poor people in the South. Migration became one of the few coping mechanism for survival.

The end of the Cold War marked the triumph of capitalism as the only viable economic system. This brought about the post-Cold War's new international political and economic order led by the United States, as sole superpower, and other transnational corporations and multilateral institutions of economic globalization such as the IMF, World Bank and WTO. The establishment of global governance under these three powerful institutions accelerated the economic globalization. Any disobedience with regard to an implementation of the reforms prescribed by these institutions (on global financial, monetary and trade relations respectively) is difficult, if not impossible, because it is met with severe penalties. These prescriptions, such as the imposition of free market policy, structural adjustment programs and privatization without the necessary prior preparation disrupted the livelihood of millions in the South (Castles, 2002, pp. 1149–1152). These failed economic and social transformations intensified the economic inequality and marginalized the South more than ever (Cohen and Kennedy, 2000, p. 114; Stiglitz, 2002, pp. 9–12). This in turn forced people to migrate to Western countries (Castles, 2002, p. 1163).

EU Policies of Migration and Security

Securitization of migration by Europe is rather discursive in practice and is not limited to border management and a rigorous visa process. It also involves 'psychological warfare' against migrants by limiting their access to services vital to life. This has been witnessed in the United Kingdom, France, Germany and other countries (Gustavsson, 2006). It heavily depends on border management and restriction on visa to low-skilled people.

Even if immigration to the European Union is generally securitized, it welcomes highly skilled professionals from Africa. The legislative proposal for an EU Blue Card scheme is a mechanism to meet the growing need for skilled labor. It provides for a fast processing of migration by removing barriers in the visa process and by granting freedom of mobility within the European Union. The Blue Card provides attractive conditions for the admission and residence of highly qualified immigrants needed for the EU economy.

In Africa, however, brain drain (due to unethical recruitment) is one major constraint which endangers

the pursuit of the Millennium Development Goals and Poverty Reduction Strategies. The problem of brain drain is undoing the efforts of both donors and aid-receiving countries. Brain drain is, and will be, a serious policy coherence challenge to donor countries whereas for developing countries it will be another additional development challenge in the efforts of escaping the vicious cycle of poverty. Clearly the problem of brain drain does not apply to low and semi-skilled labor migrants. There is no 'labor drain'. This policy incoherence from the part of the European Union negatively affects the human security efforts of Africa.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The most famous and major African Union policy and legislative documents on migration and development are the Migration Policy Framework for Africa, the African Common Position on Migration and Development, the Joint Africa-EU Declaration on Migration and Development, and the Ouagadougou Action Plan to Combat Trafficking in Human Beings, Especially Women and Children. The whole efforts towards a comprehensive response to ensure migration remains voluntary and legal and as a factor for development have, in my opinion, to take the following points into serious consideration.

Economic Development as Soft Power Tool of the European Union

Adapting the 'Soft Power' and 'Hard Power' concepts of Joseph Nye, the EU migration agencies have to employ a mix of both 'soft' and 'hard' tools of migration management.

Reframing the methods of meeting the security challenges migration has posed is vital if the root cause of the threats of migration is to be removed. The soft power tools will be both long-term in making migration voluntary and legal through socio-economic development, and short-term through consulted cooperation on effective border and migration management. Migration could only be made more secure through efforts towards making migration voluntary and legal for all. This is only possible through the eradication of poverty and the establishment of regimes protective of human rights in the countries of origin. In short, human security is necessary for migration to remain voluntary and legal. Coherence in policies of donor countries will be essential.

At the end of the day socio-economic development of the developing countries will be the factor that ensures that migration be voluntary and legal. Only human security will ensure that migration remain legal and secure, and contribute to the development of all

countries of destination, transit and origin. Economic development and economic growth are vital to facilitating poverty reduction, human rights protection, and the Millennium Development Goals. Establishing peace and a social and physical security architecture in Africa is of paramount importance. This could be achieved by using the African Union as entry point for maximum impact and the African Regional Economic Communities for specific aspects of cooperation.

Such architecture would provide the minimum physical safety, social and economic standards necessary for life. This would reduce migration and also causes and breeding grounds for fundamentalism of any kind. Such architecture would provide early warning of deadly conflicts, disasters, food insecurity in the form of famine and persecution in violation of human rights that cause forced migration. Policies, cooperation and assistance targeting poverty reduction, the Millennium Development Goals, human rights protection in Africa and capacity-building of the African migration agencies is a 'soft' tool of migration management. Also, an African Migration Fund, which will be partially used to encourage legal migration could be established and supported.

The challenges of both legal and illegal migration could become an impediment to or facilitator of development depending on how it is managed by countries affected by migration. To solve this problem, my suggestion is that the central *object and purpose* of donor policy should be poverty reduction through the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. In other words, any policy that may have a direct or indirect adverse effect should be reconsidered to ensure coherence among development aid and domestic policies of donor countries.

If we take brain drain as an example of such a challenge, the Millennium Development Goals heavily bank on trained professionals particularly in sectors which are facing a critical shortage of trained human resources such as health and education. If this is true, then how could least developed countries grow fast while their human resources are depleted by migration of their most skilled professionals? Moreover, if trained professionals of poor countries are actively recruited by developed countries like the European Union, then how could public investment in education have the expected return to accelerated development efforts? Donor countries need to ensure coherence of their various policies. They also need to ensure compatibility of their policies—domestic and foreign, humanitarian and security, international development and economic competition. This exercise has to be looked at from the point of view of the intended and unintended consequences such domestic policies have on international development policies.

'Hard' Tools, with Limited Effect

Interception and apprehension, reception and detention capabilities are the 'hard' migration management tools with only short-term deterrence effects for migrants fleeing poverty and death. Also, the prosecution of smugglers, traffickers and their accomplices by strengthening law enforcement measures to curb the activities through stiffer penalties for perpetrators is a 'hard' tool of migration management. The United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and its two additional Protocols (2000) are other 'hard' power tools. Organized criminal activities link migration to insecurity. Due to illegal migration of African youth and to the securitization of immigration, particularly to Europe, the youth are facing serious dangers to their life.

Indeed, a well managed border would facilitate migration from and within Africa. A key challenge is therefore to establish a balance allowing states to meet their humanitarian obligations to refugees and others eligible for protection while concurrently addressing the need to manage borders effectively. A better border management needs the strengthening of the border management systems in terms of technology, infrastructure, business process for inspection of travelers, and training of staff.

References

- African and European Union. 2006. "Joint Africa-EU Declaration on Migration and Development." Tripoli: 22–23 November.
- African Union. 2006. *The Migration Policy Framework for Africa*. Executive Council African Union, 9th Ordinary Session, 25–29 June, Banjul, The Gambia Ex.Cl/276 (ix).
- Barry, J. and Jefferys, A. 2003. "A bridge too far: aid agencies and the military in humanitarian response." Paper delivered at 2003 Summer Institute *Legal and Social Realities of Forced Migration*, Asch Center for Study of Ethnopolitical conflicts, University of Pennsylvania, 10 June–8 August. Also available at <<http://www.psych.upenn.edu/sacsec>>.
- Carens, Joseph 1998. "The Ethics of Refugee Policy: The Problems of Asylum in western States." Unpublished paper, Department of Political Science, University of Toronto.
- Castles, Stephen 2000. *Ethnicity and Globalization*, London: SAGA Publications Ltd.
- _____. 2002. "Migration and Community Formation under Conditions of Globalization." *International Migration Review*. No 36, pp. 1143–1168.

- Chimni, B.S. 1998. "The geopolitics of refugee studies: a view from the south." *Journal of Refugee Studies*, No 11, pp. 4, 355–363.
- _____. 1998a. "The Global Refugee Problem in the 21st Century and the Emerging Security Paradigm: A Disturbing Trend." In A. Anghie and G. Sturgess, *Legal Vision of the 21st Century: Essays in the Honour of Judge Christopher Weeramantry*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
- Cohen, R. and Kennedy, P. 2000. *The Global Sociology*, Basingstoke, Palgrave.
- Gibney, Matthew 1999 "The Legal-Institutional Conceptualization." *Participant's Handbook, International Summer School in Forced Migration*. 8–26 July 2002, Refugee Studies Center, Oxford
- _____. 2003 "The State of Asylum: Democratization, Judicialization and the Evolution of Refugee Policy." In Susan Kneebone, *The Refugee Convention 50 Years on: Globalization and International Law*. Ashgate Publishing.
- Goodwin-Gill, Guy 1996 reprinted 1998. *The Refugee in International Law*, 2nd edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gustavsson, Jakob 2006. *Securitization of Immigration and Asylum: A Critical Look at Security Structure in Europe*, Unpublished Masters thesis. Lund University, Sweden.
- International Labour Organization. 2006. *International Labour Migration and Development: The ILO Perspective*. 61st Session of the General Assembly, High-Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development, New York, 14–15 September, Geneva, September.
- _____. 2002. *Tripartite Forum on Labour Migration in Southern Africa*. Pretoria, 26–29 November 2002
- Hansen, Art, and Anthony Oliver-Smith, eds. 1982. *Involuntary Migration and Resettlement*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview.
- Kymlicka W. 2003 "Current Trends in Accommodating Ethnic Diversity in Liberal Democracies." Paper delivered at 2003 Summer Institute *Legal and Social Realities of Forced Migration*, Asch Center for Study of Ethnopolitical conflicts, University of Pennsylvania, 10 June–8 August. Also available at <<http://www.psych.upenn.edu/sacsec>>.
- Layton-Henry, Zig 1994. "Britain: Would-be Zero Immigration Country." In Cornelius, Wayne A. et al.. *Controlling Immigration: A Global Perspective*. Sage
- Lundquist, Jennifer Hickee and Douglas Massey. 2003 "The Contra War and Nicaraguan Migration to the US." Paper delivered at 2003 Summer Institute *Legal and Social Realities of Forced Migration*, Asch Center for Study of Ethnopolitical conflicts, University of Pennsylvania, 10 June–8 August. Also available at <<http://www.psych.upenn.edu/sacsec>>.
- Martin, Phillip. 1994. "Germany: Reluctant Land of Immigration." In Cornelius, Wayne et al., *Controlling Immigration: A Global Perspective*. Sage.
- Norwegian Refugee Council. 2008. *Internally Displaced People: A Global Survey*, Internet update. Available at <http://www.idpproject.org/regions/Africa_idps.htm>.
- Stiglitz, Joseph. 2002. *Globalization and its Discontents*, London, Penguin.
- Tirman, John. 2004. "The Migration-Security Nexus." *GSC Quarterly*, Summer/Fall. New York: Social Science Research Council.
- Turton, David. 2003. "Conceptualising Forced Migration." *Working Paper No. 12*. Oxford: Refugee Studies Centre, University of Oxford.
- United Nations Commission for Human Settlements. 2001. *Cities in a Globalizing World: Global Report on Human Settlements*. London and Sterling, VA: Earthscan.
- United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. 2001. *Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement* (online), OCHA publications, OCHA. Available at <<http://www.reliefweb.int/ocha-ol/pub/idp-gp/idp.htm>>.
- United Nations Population Division. 2002. *International Migration Report*.
- Weiner, Myron. 1995. "Security, Stability and International Migration." In M. Weiner. *The Global Migration Crisis*. Chapter 6, pp. 191–195. Westview: Boulder.