

PHILOSOPHICAL PERSPECTIVES AND POLICY ON MIGRATION: TOWARDS A SUPRANATIONAL PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN AFRICAN AND EUROPEAN UNIONS

By

Kow Kwegya Amissah Abraham
Department of Classics and Philosophy
University of Cape Coast Ghana
kow.abraham@ucc.edu.gh

Abstract

The task of this study is to critically explore the various perspectives on migration – philosophical and policy, and to propose for effective cooperation policies between the European Union and the African Union in curbing the influx of irregular migrants as well as policies of admission/readmission for undocumented migrants. We establish that migration sometimes creates enormous problems for both sending and receiving countries, such as patches of extremism, brain drain, huge numbers of recorded deaths, etc. However, we hypothesized that better concerted effort at the supranational level is an important regulatory approach to effectively minimize the dangers and negative effects of the current spate of voluntary illegal migration from Africa to Europe. Our position is that strong collaborative effort anchored on robust theoretical foundation is a potent complementary solution to make migration a development-oriented phenomenon rather than being a problem for governments to always deal with.

Keywords: Migration, Policy, Philosophy, Cooperation, African Union, European Union.

Introduction

Migration by Africans to Europe continues to be a major issue for countries in both continents. The resultant factors range from economic differences, security, demographic issues, labour, wage/remuneration differences as well as non-economic incentives. Statistically, by 2015 there were approximately 244 million people living and working outside their country of origin globally (International Migration Report, 2015). This is an increase from 173 million as at the year 2000. Of the 2015 statistics, 19.5 million were refugees whilst the rest were generally considered as economic migrants

According to the Migration Policy Framework on Africa and Plan for Africa (2018-2030) African Union Policy Framework on Migration, in 2016 alone, more than 5,000 people lost their lives from illegal crossing of the Mediterranean Sea to Europe. With the non-existent of data, more deaths could even be recorded from migrants crossing the Red Sea and the Sahara Desert. Generally, migration in Africa is divided into pre-colonial, colonial and post-colonial periods. We note that the pattern of migration is shaped by links with colonial powers. For instance, citizens from French speaking Africa (francophone) are more likely to be inclined to migrate to France and other French speaking countries. Same is the case for the Anglophone countries in Africa. Over the last 15 years, there has been a steady increase in migration with majority being young people under the age of 30 years.

In 2015, the AU Heads of State and Government issued the Declaration on Migration to combat human trafficking, speed up visa free regimes, the expedite actions to facilitate free movement. With reference to migration governance, AU's Agenda 2030 calls for effective migration governance in Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 10, by urging countries to reduce inequality within and among countries by facilitating orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through the implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies (AU Policy Framework on Migration, 2016). It is

important to note that much as the policy framework extensively deals with the emerging issues on migration, its focus on a regional corporation especially between the European and African Unions is very minimal if not non-existent.

With reference to receiving states in Western Europe, European Union (EU) policymaking and praxis have focused on both regular and irregular migration. The practice has been to design and implement policies to regulate mobility whilst allowing member states to elicit their own regulatory policies. The policy direction has evolved into various theoretical and empirical propositions whereby migration is emphasized in terms of border management and security. In spite of the various regulatory policies and praxis, there is the high spate of illegal/irregular migrants crossing the Mediterranean Sea under harsh conditions, especially from Africa, into Europe. Within the European Union, trends of migration had been affected by EU rules which oblige states to privilege EU citizens in making certain policies such as hiring decisions (EU Immigration).

The wave and effect of migration instrumentally make it difficult for individual countries. Additionally, regional integration has moved states towards supranational organizations and block community decision-making. These have affected policy design and framework for migration, even though member states still have their comprehensive policies which ought to be in consonance with the regional position. With the growing concern of how migration can be regulated to benefit countries and to also ensure the safety of migrants, this study proposes to look at how irregular migration can be better regulated through comprehensive cooperation and coordination at the supranational level.

Through this we propose for better collaborative efforts between the African and European Unions to better regulate migration at the policy level for member states to implement. The motivation for this work is that, the dangerous voyages undertaken by Africans across the Mediterranean and the Sahara Desert are all aimed at finding settlements in Europe. To this, as individual countries seek to implement developmental policies, create opportunities for the youth and also minimize illegal migration, their efforts can be complemented at the supranational level by regional bodies, in this case the African and European Unions to better regulate the spate of these dangerous voyages.

Migration: Conceptualizations

Migration and mobility have been prominent issues for states and policy makers. Migration is broadly defined as a permanent or semi-permanent change of residence (Lee, 1966). This encompasses the two broad conceptions of migration: involuntary and voluntary migration. Many factors are adduced to explain these phenomena. Central to explaining the push and pull factors are economic analysis and demography. The *rolling-waves* of globalization have gradually turned the world into an inter-connected and a homogenous entity, which has resonated the possibility for transnational citizenship conception whereby people now perceive themselves as citizens without borders. This phenomenon has made many countries multi-ethnic and culturally diverse. Thus, the current trend of international migration reemphasizes the rippling effects of globalization. This has made countries which were conceived as 'closed' to be opening their doors to legal migration. Even more important is the awakening of a plethora of academic and policy discussions on international migration. The results are an elicitation of theoretical bases to understand the dynamics of migration. More relatable is how the trend of contemporary migration makes it imperative for harnessing *verschiedene* perspectives and multi-faceted approaches at analyzing it.

It thus seems indubitable that the high spate of migration has been explained in terms of the growing acceptance of globalization. Through globalization, goods and services are transferred across international borders quickly and without duress. Globalization is conceived as a process of transnational and transcultural integration of both human and non-human activities.

According to Al-Rodham (2006), globalization cannot be wholly defined to encompass the totality of the integration and transfer processes. However, globalization can be described as involving economic integration, policy transfer across borders, cultural integration and the transmission of knowledge (Nikitin and Elliot, 2000). Globalization has thus made the concept of a 'global village' more pragmatic than a mirage. The movement of goods, services and people has been made easy. The role played by globalization in migration has however been seen as less by some scholars, as compared to the free movement of goods and services across borders in centuries past. Obstfeld and Taylor (2002) assert that mobility of goods and capital from one country to the other was easier in times past than it is presently. The above view has been emphasized by Chriswick and Hatton (2002) with the opinion that the current situation is the implementation of immigration policies to prevent free movement. This notwithstanding, there is a steady increase in migration pressure on developed countries. Smith and Edmonston (1997) reveal that as at 1994, the United States alone had a total of 3.6 million people on waiting list for admission as migrants. Again, Europe receives an estimated 400,000 to 500,000 migrants every year. The general conception has been that most migrants flee economic hardships and poverty. This used to be the case in the 19th Century whereby migration from sending countries dwindled with the high rate of development in those countries. Hatton and Williamson (2003) confirm that comparatively, few people emigrate from poorer countries than from countries with a higher per capita income. This means that migration has become a very expensive venture, requiring migrant to, at least, be able to pay for their ferry from their home countries to destination countries. We conceive that most migrants, especially illegal migrants, are middle class citizens or those with enormous family support, in terms of contributions to pay for the cost of their trip.

African migrants represent a sizeable part of migrants offering both skilled and unskilled labour needs as well as engaging in illegal migration. Europe receives the greater number of African migrants. Statistically, a total 31 million Africans were estimated to live outside their country by 2010 (African Union Commission, 2010). This includes inter-continental and intra-continental migration. In 2009, migration of Africans to Europe represented 29 percent of the total migrant people (African Union Commission, 2010). As part of the global trend, Europe attracts about 2 million migrants each year. If the trend continues, it is estimated that for the next 40 years, the number of people migrating will increase 40 percent (Mansoor and Quillin, 2006). These instances make migration an important issue for both the global south and the global north.

The paradigm shift of state politics towards regionalism or supranational organization has seen states relinquishing pertinent decision-making process to these organizations. This seems to have resulted in the evolvement of regional organizations as a 'container'. In this vein, the European Union (EU) has assumed an important position in decision-making that affect continental Europe including issues of migration. The problem however, is that states through its sovereign rights also have national policies on migration, asylum and integration. As a result, EU policies are to be in consonance with national policies which are mostly guided by public opinion, prevailing political ideology and citizen protection.

The recurrent effects of migration affect both sending and receiving countries. Indeed, Europe and Africa face one of the greatest migration issues emanating from the rights of migrants to the rights of citizens in terms of job availability and security. In this context, migration has been construed in many forms according to the prevailing political ideology; whilst others see it as a border management and protection issue, some construe it as an opportunity for labour options for especially aging populations with low birth rates.

Historically, migration in Europe shifted from internal migration or emigration to the influx of citizens from outside of the continent after 1960. Many reasons accounted for this but

we conceive that the need for labour after World War II necessitated that countries either use the pre-existing ties with former colonies in Africa and Asia to feed the needed labour shortages or engage in a guest-worker scheme through a bilateral agreement with other developing countries to provide labour. We note here that the push and pull factors have predominantly been economic in outlook. To appreciate this phenomenon, perspectives and effects, there has been the need to look at the theoretical underpinnings and to understand the dynamics of migrations. Here, neoclassical theorists conceive of the cause for migration as the quest for individual income maximization. Thus, the existence of wage differences motivates people to move from their countries to other countries. This theory was basically to explain labour migration as a conduit of economic development (Harris & Todaro, 1970). In this sense a country with low wage will see its labour force move to a high wages country. This seems to be the driving force for many African migrants. For instance, Ghana loses almost 40% of its trained doctors as a result of brain-drain; also, it has almost 2 million trained nurses living in New York City alone. The driving force is the working environment and the wage difference.

Another dimension is seen as a micro-economic individual choice (Sjaastad, 1962). Here, individuals migrate based on the cost-benefit analysis of how much positive returns will be accrued. This makes international migration a form of human capital investment. The potency of this theory lies in the prevailing income access and financing of business and other monetary acquisition options existing for developing countries. The family system in Africa is extended in nature. There is the continuous affiliation to clans and long distant family relations; as a result, one owes a certain degree of allegiance to the clan, the extended family and then the nuclear family. The complexities of the family system make major decision not a sole determination by an individual. Again, the communitarian system also demands resource sharing and so, there are instances when family properties like lands, livestock, cash crops, etc, are sold or used as collateral for loans to help a member through education or to even pay for his expenses to migrate.

Further theoretical bases are given by the dual labour theory which basically traces international migration to the labour demands of modern industrial societies. It observes that the major cause of international migration is as a result of a strong and lasting demand for labour by industrial nations (Piore, 1979). The strength of this lies in the wide disparity gap that exists between developed and developing economies. Massey et al (1993), conceive of this pull factor as entailing inflation, labour demography supplies, etc. The world system theory contributes to the position that within the process of capitalist development, migration becomes the outcome of the disruptions that take place (Massey et al, 1993). Thus, the quest for land, raw materials, high profits, cheap labour, etc, propel multi-national companies to penetrate into poor countries and their action dislocate people many of which are forced to migrate and those with means; internationally migrate.

Philosophical Perspectives

Even though literature and philosophical discourses on migration as a geographical movement of people from one place to another for the purposes of longer periods of settlement has been minimal, there seems to be a current awakening of philosophers to discuss this issue mainly because of it has currently become topical in international affairs. Philosophical discussions on migration have been driven by the conversation on the evolving acquisition of citizenship and the recognizable criteria in that regard. In Aristotle's *Politics* as edited by Newman (1902), membership in the city-states was restrictive and hence represented the initial stage of republican exclusionism. However, the emerging Roman Empire after this period was characterized by freedom of movement and multiple citizenship (Lane, 2018). We note that ancient thinkers such as Democritus, Antiphon, Diogenes, Epicurus, Cicero, Seneca and Marcus Aurelius were responsible, in part for the wave of cosmopolitanism in the modern world. This, in the long run, led to the tradition of moral inclusiveness. With the Treaty of

Westphalia, modern state was formed on the basis of notions such as absolute sovereignty and non-intervention. Modern political philosophy with its attendant democratic ideas has been concerned with constitutional limitations and liberal ideas. For instance, Locke in his conception of citizenship propose for a consensual form where by every adult is at liberty to choose and consent to what government he will want to put himself under. Sidgwick (2012) also discusses the issue of membership of a state and rejects the idea that the individual has unrestricted right of entry. Further, he asserts that it is wrong to impose on states to freely admit immigrants as a matter of international duty. A state, for him, must have the right to admit aliens on its own terms and be able to impose terms on entrants and transiting individuals. Sidgwick (2012) however admits that the rigour of exclusion might be limited by distributive justice especially when there is the possibility that the admission of aliens will generally be advantageous to the country admitting them.

The discourse on migration is conceived within the Universalists and Particularist traditions. The Universalist tradition is anchored on three main schools of thought, firstly the utilitarian ideas of happiness, utility principle, welfare and basic needs. Secondly, deontological approaches which propose for different varieties of equal rights such as egalitarianism, basic rights, libertarian right to property, etc. Thirdly greater duty and virtue-oriented theories. Particularist approaches emanates from moderate patriotism, liberal nationalism, socio-democratic welfare states, communitarianism, nationalism, neo-Hegelianism. These two approaches perspectivize migration according to the effects that are evident to them. Indeed, one cannot perceive of only negative or positive effects of migration, however, the discourse on which the approach will promote as the concept of the ideal state accounts for the internal difference therein.

It is important to note that Universalists promote the idea of egalitarianism, which is basically against ascriptive privileges. Thus, it is incompatible with the strong exclusionary effects of citizenship (Pogge, 1997). In this vein, there seem to be nothing like *prima facie* moral privileges ascribed to members of a particular state. Free mobility then becomes an important moral principle and as a result must be recognized as a legal human right, which is independent of issues such as poverty and distributive justice. Central to the argument of open borders is the idea of free movement. This is conceived as a basic moral right of natural persons; this is because it is a vital prerequisite for other freedoms such as self-determination, autonomy, equality of opportunity, etc. This right is, however, not absolute; they can be overridden by the provision of law to protect national security, public order, public health, etc. Thus we recognize that curtailed rights and liberties are allowed as long as they do not suffocate the basic inalienable rights of the individual. In another vein, other philosophers argue for closed borders on the bases that recognizing a moral duty do not obligate the individual to uncurtailed rights. This means that moral priority should be given to compatriots of the state since rights also goes with duties. Further, there should be the protection of ethno-national cultures for states. For Miller (2010), justice in immigration requires the state to fairly respond to the claims of individuals who want to join it. This response must be based on the relations of the individual with the state and the reasons adduced by such a person as the basis upon which he will want to join the state. Central to this is how the state deals with competing claims from migrants and the criteria with which the state prioritizes such claims. For instance, refugees may have stronger claims than economic migrants. Whilst many reasons can be adduced as justification for strong exclusion, there can be social justice reasons why fair treatment and border opening may be justified. For instance, migrants are able to provide services, which the locals/national are either unable or unwilling to provide. Miller (2010) further observes that a just immigration policy is one, which does not only establish unconditional right of admission to refugees, but also develops consistent criteria and offer appropriate treatment to prospective migrants.

Migration in Europe: Policy and Praxis

Migration gained much prominence in European politics especially after 1945. Migration in Europe has been categorized into three: skilled labour migrants who are still considered as economic actors, unskilled and/or family relations of migrants who are mostly invited and finally humanitarian migrants who are those fleeing persecution, violence and/or natural disasters and mostly seek asylum. European Union member states have employed several measures at regulating migration. Attempts at these regulations are evident in the policies implemented at the state and regional levels. These policies have undoubtedly been restrictive with reference to instances such as asylum systems and border management. It is important to note that the policy of restrictive migration has triggered effects on other policy areas such as race and xenophobia, labour, citizenship and even elections.

Historically, the period between 1820 and 1913 experienced the largest migration from Europe to the New World involving about 50 million Europeans (Hatton and Williamson 2003). Similarly, the 1880s experienced high mobility of Eastern and Southern Europeans with Italy and parts of the Austro-Hungarian Empire being the pioneers. Africans have experienced forced migration through slavery until its abolition. Most Africans who migrated in the mid and late 20th century were conceived as refugees. Indeed, during this period, Africa accounted for one third of the total population of work refugees. Even that, most are seen to return with personal reasons ranging from cultural identity to ethnicities (Rogge 1994, Makanga 1994).

The EU regulatory policies on migration also allows for states to elicit national policies which has mainly been dependent on bilateral cooperation with sending countries. EU policies have taken these main approaches at restrictive migration to implementing measures for the purposes of changing the push factors in the sending countries, engage sending countries to increase their border controls and border management at the main entry points at irregular migrants, etc. Regulatory difficulty has been dependent on EU internal policy implementation approach as well as the external or the push factors such as conflicts, poverty, natural disasters, etc. At the pivot of EU policy on regulating irregular migration is intensifying border controls through the use of military and semi military forces. These have been the case in places such as Ceuta, Melilla, Lampedusa, etc. The objective is to curb the entering into the Union, unskilled migrants who are considered as social rather than economic actors. Even more intensive is the creation of buffer zones in, especially, the Magreb countries (de Haas, 2010).

The recent trend of policy direction is the sovereignty of member states to manage issues of migration, integration and citizenship. As a result, there are growing bilateral agreements between member states and sending countries to curb the rate of irregular migration. We posit that there is mostly a gap between migration policies and the policy outcomes. This is so because in spite of the implementation of the several border control policies, there still is an increase in irregular migration into Europe; even more worrying is how to deal with migrants who have been refused entry at the main border posts, especially when there is no clear policy and agreement of re-admission with sending countries. This is against the background that humanitarian disasters and conflicts in sub-Saharan Africa have reduced in the past decade.

It is important to note that EU legislations on migration have either been through intergovernmental cooperation, community legislation or individual state legislation (Niessen, 1992). In other words, migration policies have to a greater extent been dependent on, and determine by member states as a matter of national policy. Again, European Union migration policy has been seen as taking into account all forms of mobility. The perceived division of competencies at the EU level is seen as a contributor to perceived problems faced by its own policy on migration. The major shortcoming here is the inherent ambiguity that prevails in the EU migration policy framework. This notwithstanding, the EU is seen to have the most comprehensive migration policy among all the regional bodies; the Tampere Programme which dealt with developing common migration policy and the Hague Programme which dealt with

both regular and irregular migration and the Stockholm Programme which also coordinated border management (Collett, 2014). These are policy frameworks aimed at comprehensively governing and managing migration issues.

Furthermore, the EU has had external cooperation on migration issues in the recent past. For instance, the Budapest Process in 1991 was led by Germany with the concerted effort of other EU countries to fight illegal migration. Through this, two issues were prioritized: border management and asylum policy. Even more, the 1994 International Conference on Migration and Development stressed cooperation to deal with migration at the international level. There were also the Berne Initiative (2001-2005) led by Switzerland at drafting a comprehensive migration policy. The Global Approach to Migration (2005) recognizes migration as a cross border issue that demanded collaborative efforts of all states across continent. We note that the first action destination was about Africa. The EU has on this basis engaged and invested in conferences and programmes such as Rabat (2006), Tripoli (2006), etc, to deal with issues of migration in Africa.

The problems faced by these initiatives were that there was little cooperation especially when national interests did not correlate with the position of the organizations. This made member countries very unwilling to implement outcomes. The major policy *lacuna* has been the existing policy choice among member states. On the one hand, some now look at migration in terms of labour markets and demographic change and thus favour a policy direction that focus on legal migration in the light of migration and development. On the other hand, some rather favour border management and asylum with its attendant activities.

De Haas (2008) conceives that there has been a persistent phenomenon of irregular migration from Africans crossing the Mediterranean since the 1990s when Spain and Italy introduced the visa requirements. Although southern Europe experiences extensive migration from inhabitants of the Maghreb, many sub-Saharan Africans have been involved. Border management controls have been put in place including military stations (Lutterbeck, 2006). Goldschmidt (2006) also recognizes the erection of fences in areas around the borders with the Mediterranean. According to Belguendouz (2006), there has been instances whereby the EU has pressurized some North African states to prevent their territories from being used as transit points. This view is also emphasized by Boubakri (2004) that a state like Morocco had, on an occasion, been asked to implement a stricter immigration laws by the EU. This buttresses the point that migration has, for most time, been considered as a border issue which has predominantly been between states.

Migration in/of Africa(ns): Policy reflection

The African Union's frameworks adopted in 2006 comprise of the African Common Position on Migration and Development and the Migration Policy Framework, then further drafted the the Migration Policy Framework for Africa and Plan of Action – 2018-20130. These policy frameworks cover a range of issues including migration and development, labour migration, irregular migration, border management, human rights of migrants, migration data, etc. The objective of these frameworks is to address migration issues and ensure integration, development, stability and security. The major downside of these frameworks is that they are not legally binding and strictly enforceable on states and as a result implementation is left at the discretion of member states based on their priorities and resources. The corollary is that since member countries have many pressing issues to deal with, like natural disasters, armed conflict, poverty and other economic problems, they pay little or no attention to the issues raised in the frameworks. Further, the African Common Position on Migration and Development allowed for a deliberation on migration at the national, continental and the international levels (African Union Commission, 2010). The action plan among other things was meant to create a legal framework to deal with illegal migration, deepening and managing

migration agreements, balancing the freedom of movements and humanitarian obligation to protect between legal migrants.

Sub-Saharan African countries have been reluctant on policies such as cooperation on readmission. There is also the lack of zeal in dealing with curbing the migration of their citizens especially through creating enormous opportunities for the youth and the other social classes of people who will be greatly enticed to migrate. The reason for this may be due, in part, to lack of resources, priorities and corruption where by resources meant for such interventions end up in the pockets of the ruling class. The focus of many African states has mainly been to access the EU labour market, and an emphasis on migration and development. These have made it difficult to elicit a comprehensive policy framework on migration between the European Union and the African Union. In Africa, the complexities of policies/policy, its implementation and divisive focus accounts for the major challenges. It is important to note that the EU has more capacity at the supranational level to implement its policies than the AU. This is so, especially, when there is no specific AU body/secretariat to support policy making on migration and development.

Historical antecedents have emphasized that Africa has experienced many moments of mass exodus of people from the continent. The factors have been varied with examples such as slavery, colonialism, poverty, violent conflict, etc, (Adepoju, 2003). After World War II, Europe has been a major receiver and destination for most African migrants. We note that apart from slavery, the second largest event to send many African across the continent was violent conflict. Indeed, twenty-seven out of the fifty-three countries in Africa were engaged in armed conflict between 1993-2002, the result was that by 2005, 18% of all Africans were refugees which represented one third (1/3) of world refugee population (Kohnert, 2007).

By 2005, there were approximately 4.6 million Africans living in Europe with two-thirds coming from North Africa, specifically Tunisia, Morocco and Algeria. Most of these African migrants predominantly live in Britain, France, Germany and Italy. International Organization for Migration (2006) estimated that there were about 8 million irregular African migrants in the European Union. This emphasizes the necessity to regulate migration through a concerted effort between the European Union and the African Union.

Migrants and EU-AU Cooperation

There is evidence of International cooperation to curb migration among states from different continents. There has been a collaborative effort between Spain and Morocco as well as Italy and Libya since 2003 (de Haas, 2008). Most of these efforts have been pivoted on exchanging, migrant prevention for aid and other financial support. This was also observed earlier by Chaloff (2005), who recognized that as part of the agreement between Italy and Libya, there was some quota of work permit granted to immigrants on temporary bases. Barros et al, (2002), recognize that the EU countries have signed many agreements with many African countries on the bases of readmission. However, the effectiveness of such agreements leaves much to be desired. Collyer (2006), alludes to the difficulty in practicing such agreements since departed immigrants eventually find their way back to Europe. The necessity for inter-state cooperation agreements is potent, however, the shift towards a broader cooperation agreement between the EU and the AU is an additional dimension to the regulation.

The means of regulating illegal migration is a recipe for increased illegal migration. Boswell (2003), opines that the stringent attempt to restrict access to asylum has increased the levels of illegal migration. Even more, measures to curb irregular migration have pushed migrants to employ more dangerous means to enter into Europe. On these bases, there is the need to look at migration in a multi-faceted manner; engage sending countries to be stricter, control their borders and then work at the factors that influence people to migrate.

The general conception of migration has separated the developmental aspects from the social change aspects. To reintegrate this, de Haas (2010) proposes the need to see migration as a process that is an integral part of broader transformation processes embodied in the term “development”, with its internal, self-sustaining and self-undermining dynamics. As far as development is concerned there has been a division between migration optimists and pessimists (Taylor: 1999). As an optimist theory, neo-classical migration theory perceives migration as a form of optimal allocation of resources to benefit both sending and receiving countries (de Haas: 2010). In this sense, migration ceases once there is equilibrium on the wage level (Massey et al: 1998). The views that migration translates into development have been challenged in several ways. Even for sending countries, migration is, sometimes, seen as a means of depleting its human capacity by attracting all the skilled labour (Papademetiou, 1985). The policy debate on migration and development reflects the dynamics at which development theories shift. Migration in this sense also has adverse effect on the receiving countries in terms of job availability for citizens, a phenomenon which can easily translate into all xenophobia. The conception of migration as a security issue has also emanated the need to further regulate it. Equally relevant is the motivation of receiving states and currently supranational organizations, in this case the EU, on how to approach migration issues. This receptive conception determines the policy directions of the receiving states. Here, we conceive that the pivotal issues driving policy-making keep shifting focus. The imbalance can however be resolved with a comprehensive policy framework by a homogenous supranational entity with absolute power on decision-making on migration.

Concerning receptive conception, migrants up until the early 1980s were conceived as economic actors. Germany and Netherlands opted for guest-worker scheme to attract migrants as labour options. Netherlands, in this sense, has sizeable foreign population comprising predominantly of Surinam and Morocco origins whilst Germany also has the Turkish, Cameroonian and Polish migrants. It is also realized that European countries that were vibrant in acquiring colonies like Britain and France relied on the ties with former colonies for labour support during the 1960s. Thus France is seen to have a large section of Algerians and Moroccans whilst the British has Indians and Pakistanis as well as others from Anglophone Africa.

The collapse of the European borders between states as a result of the expansion of the European Union and the freedom of movement among EU member states have made migration predominantly centered on third-country national. Thus people who were from countries outside of the EU to Europe of which most are from Africa and Asia are considered as third country nationals.

Niessen (1992), examines intergovernmental cooperation on migration with the position that when it comes to the admission of third country nationals in Europe, member states have maintained their sovereignty at decision making. However, the EU has always encouraged bilateral agreements to regulate the situation of many third-country national workers within the member states. Thus, where there is greater cooperation among member states on migration, external cooperation is either minimal or nonexistent. We further add that the external cooperation at the EU and AU level has been weak. Furthermore, Brown (2002), recognizes that the international corporation has increased much between the EU and the Latin American countries. We conceive that this cooperation also exists with African states but very weak at the regional level. Effective cooperation will go a long way at better regulating migration of Africans into Europe. This position draws thought that managing migration through international cooperation will be less costly compared with managing it through bilateral relations.

Immigrants as economic players were not dependent on their region or country of origin, rather on the prevailing situation in Europe at the time. However, from the 1980s to date, the conception of migrants has changed from being economic players to social actors to a very large extent. We note that events surrounding the collapse of the Soviet Empire, insurgent conflicts in Africa and other natural disasters in other parts of the world pushed people to migrate to Europe to either join their families or to escape violence and harsh natural disasters. As a result, receptive conception became more of humanitarian migration than economic. This informed the change of conception from economic actors to social actors. We note here that with such a conception, migrants were seen as people seeking to enjoy social welfare and other benefits of European countries which has aptly affected policymaking decision on migration.

Again, Goodman (2014) takes a look at immigration policy-making in Europe and how issues of migration are regulated. She recognizes that the current conception of immigrants as social actors has affected the treatment of migrants in Europe especially when migrants continue to hold their culture in the strictest sense. The corollary has been instances such as the headscarf debate in France. Again, the ever-increasing problem with national and supranational policies sometimes runs parallel from each other. To this end, there is an existing difficulty on how to ensure policy harmony between member states and the supranational organizations, in this context the EU and AU. Cornelius (2004) in contributing to the discourse opines that there are consistent gaps between the policies on immigration and the actual policy outcomes. To this extent, Givens and Luedtke (2004) add their view to the debate by asserting that the regulation of migration becomes stricter when the political stakes becomes high. On this basis, there is always the need for expert knowledge on immigration policy making rather than the politics of it (Boswell et al, 2011). With all these articulated positions, we recognize that the role of regional bodies at cooperation to curb and regulate migration is muted.

Supranational Cooperation: A Reflection

International cooperation has been very much witnessed especially in terms of economic policies, security and trade related issues. In these sectors, we see bilateral and multilateral agreements among individual states and regional bodies. Notably, most of this cooperation are pushed by international organizations such as the Bretton Wood Institutions. Less stressed, however, is international or supranational cooperation on migration. Sykes (2013), observe that equally important in concerted efforts at dealing with national issues are international cooperation on migration. Migration has been considered much more as a broader issue encompassing cultural preservation, welfarism, economic protection, etc, than as a developmental issue. This explains the ubiquitous nature with which developed countries are restricting migration with policies and programmes. In both Africa and Europe, migration decisions are mostly left for national or domestic determination. These states become responsible for their asylum policies, legal promulgations for both skilled and unskilled migrants, working permit and residency status, etc.

Supranational cooperation on migration is important for various reasons. Notable of the many reasons is the position that it with such cooperation makes it easier for a concerted effort to be reached on both ends of the migration continuum. In this light, countries which are geographically located at entry points like Italy, Spain, etc, are save the hustle of having to enter into cooperation agreements with several states at the same time. Again, such a supranational agreement has the better tendency of regularizing migration and ensuring safety of migrants than inter-state cooperation. This is because agreement between inter-states are centered on strict border protection as is in the case of Lampedusa. This will eliminate individual state policies that tend to favor national governments that are in this case receiving country. Especially so because, when these receiving states act non-cooperatively the benefits of their non-cooperative policy is localized rather than tend to other foreigners. However, with

a corporative posture, policy outcome is all encompassing on both foreigners and citizens. Additionally, there is international harmony whereby countries get to understand the national policies and legal frameworks of others that they are cooperating with through regional bodies. Migrants are citizens of other countries that may or may not have bilateral or multilateral relations with receiving countries. A concerted effort at regulation creates a platform for international coordination and familiarization beyond issues of migration.

It is important to note that voluntary migration issues in Europe, have been conceived in terms of movement of workers. Internally, there is evidence of cooperation among EU member states. For instance, Niessen (1992) observes that the EU has major control in the areas of asylum and admissions policies. The internal cooperation in other respects such as economic factors have proved useful and beneficial to participating countries. For instance, agreements for dependency and economic integration led to the creation of the European Coal and Steel community (1952), the European Atomic Energy Community (1958) and the council of Europe established in 1949. These developments strengthen the idea that if cooperation in the area of migration is strengthened, there is the tendency to witness a positive output for both sending and receiving states.

The myriad of cooperation in various sectors sometimes leads to conflict of interest among member countries. Niessen (1992) observes that a major conflict among member countries is on migration. This is mostly explained by the limited scope of migration policies in Europe. As part of economic integration, there has been the entrenchment of free movement of people within Europe. These people have mostly been seen at sectors of work. With the creation of the European Space in 1991, movements of people across borders within Europe among their nineteen member states was very much easier with no restrictions at all. The problem was with third country Nationals (TCNs). These were excluded from free movement and those who were admitted have restricted rules on admission guiding them.

On cooperation, it has by norm been regulated through bilateral relations among affected countries, which is sending and receiving countries. However, there is an increased multi-lateral cooperation on migration in recent years. An example is the Puebla Process in Latin America which is basically a harmonization of asylum policies. Hollifield (2000) proposes for international cooperation on migration mainly because it will be cost effective. By this, receiving countries can avoid the cost of negotiating with each sending country. To better deal with issues of migration, Gosh (2000) avers that the existing frameworks of organizations such as the International Organization for Migration, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and other international organizations must be incorporated. This will better deal with migration flows. The problem we envisage is the harmonization of the plethora of these frameworks when state sovereignty is conceived as paramount. Again, these organizations do not have much influence on individual states and as a result, national migration policies will override these frameworks to a larger extent. However, approaching it from supranational organizations like the EU and AU which have the greatest propensity to bring sovereign states on board, will better regulate migration and highlight more on its potential to propel development. It is important to note that EU countries are increasingly seeking to regulate migration through cooperation with “sending” and “transit” countries (Boswell, 2003). This seems to have been informed by the decisions of the European council. This is because the council proposes for the integration of migration issues into the external policy of the EU (European Council, 2001).

Boswell (2003) conceives of the existing cooperation on migration as involving two main policy directions. The first is to extend the old domestic migration control which involves border control, tackling illegal entry and readmission of migrants to sending and transit countries. The second policy direction is to look at the factors, push and pull, that influence

migrants through development assistance, foreign direct investment, trade liberalization, etc. These attempts will seldom improve illegal migration, especially so when most migrants are not actually the poor in society but rather those who are able to mobilize income for such expensive but dangerous trips. On this, the proposal is a regulation at the supranational level and the activation of regionalism to limit the dangers and regulate migration. This seems plausible at a time when the EU is struggling to ascertain the most plausible form of cooperation on migration (Boswell, 2003). Control and preventive measures as well as externalization policy on migration gained control through populist postures such as seeing migrants as posing security threats, terrorists, Islamic fundamentalism and crime. Thus, policy framework that will emanate from supranational cooperation and seeks to further alleviate such fears will be pivotal in better managing migrant treatment.

The unsuccessfulness of national approach at dealing with migration issues had pushed many scholars to continue re-emphasizing the need for cooperation. In this regard, the UN (2005) proposed that governance of international migration should be improved to entail greater cooperation between states at the national level and among governments as well as international organizations. This prompted questions such as that asked by Hatton (2007) whether we should have 'WTO' for international migration. With this was the realization that migration affects societies and cultures but trade does not. Again, public opinion and policy is traditionally more hostile to immigrants than import of goods. With all addressed arguments, it becomes clear that a WTO for migration will not be possible. This informs us that a regional cooperation like what we propose between the African Union and the European Union is plausible.

Conclusion: Supranational Posture

Admittedly the enormous weaknesses of the African Union make it difficult to emphasize a cooperation policy that elicits equal implementation effort. The AU is saddled with deepening problems that seems heavier than its neck can carry, quite apart from the colossal financial constraints, there seem to be too much to be solved ranging from terrorism and security to economic issues. Issues of migration have not been at the front burner of the African Union for a while. This is mainly because African states are sending countries and many problems emanating from migration are escaped by sending countries. Thus, issues of job security, human security, xenophobia, etc, have been largely burdens borne by receiving countries and not sending countries. Despite the enormity of the challenges faced by the AU, the study proposes for a better regulation of illegal migration, which inadvertently affects the life and survival of migrants themselves, to be tackled from the supranational of the regional level with a deepening cooperation between the EU and AU.

References

- Adepoju, A. (2005). 'Migration in West Africa', Geneva: GCIM.
- African Union Commission (2010). Minimum Integration Programme Commission. Minimum Integration Programme.
<http://www.africaunion.org/root/ua/Annonces/2010/EA/MIP/MIP%20Big%20Doc%20English%20Version%20Web.pdf>
- Al-Rodhan, Nayef RF, (2006). ed. *The Geopolitical and Geosecurity Implications of Globalization*. Éditions Slatkine,.
- Belguendouz, A. (2005) *Politique Européenne de Voisinage, Barrage aux Sudistes*, Beni Snassen, Salé.
- Boswell, C. (2003). The 'external dimension' of EU immigration and asylum policy. *International Affairs*, 79(3), 619-638.

- Boswell, C., Geddes, A., & Scholten, P. (2011). The Role of Narratives in Migration Policy-Making: A Research Framework. *The British Journal of Politics & International Relations*, 13(1), 1-11.
- Boubakri, H. (2004). 'Transit migration between Tunisia, Libya and Sub-Saharan Africa: study based on Greater Tunis'. Paper for *Regional Conference on Migrants in Transit Countries: sharing responsibility for management and protection*, Istanbul, 30 September–1 October.
- Brown, A. (2002). Multilateral approach to international migration: time for international regime? *International Studies Review*, 4(1), 177-181.
- Chaloff, J. (2005) Italy, Migration Policy Group, Brussels/Rome
- Chiswick, B. R., and T. J. Hatton (2002). 'International Migration and the Integration of Labor Markets', in M. Bordo, A. M. Taylor, and J. G. Williamson (eds), *Globalization in Historical Perspective*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Collett, E. (2014) Future EU Policy Development on Immigration and Asylum: Understanding the Challenge. Migration Policy Institute. Available from: <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/future-eu-policy-developmentimmigration-and-asylum-understanding-challenge>.
- Collyer, M. (2006). *States of insecurity: Consequences of Saharan transit migration*. Centre on Migration, Policy and Society.
- Cornelius, W. A. (2005). Controlling 'unwanted' immigration: Lessons from the United States, 1993–2004. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 31(4), 775-794.
- De Haas, H. (2008). The myth of invasion: the inconvenient realities of African migration to Europe. *Third World Quarterly*, 29(7), 1305-1322.
- De Haas, H. (2010). Migration and development: a theoretical perspective. *International Migration Review*, 44(1), 227-264.
- Givens, T., & Luedtke, A. (2004). The politics of European Union immigration policy: institutions, salience, and harmonization. *Policy Studies Journal*, 32(1), 145-165.
- Goldschmidt, E. (2006). Storming the fences: Morocco and Europe's anti-migration policy. *Middle East Report*, 36(239), 36.
- Goodman, S. W. Immigration policy-making in Europe.
- Gosh, B. (2000). *Managing migration: Time for a New International Regime?* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hatton, T.J. (2007). Should we have a WTO for international migration? *Economic policy*. 22(50), 341-383.
- Hatton, T. J., & Williamson, J. G. (2002). *What fundamentals drive world migration?* (No. w9159). National Bureau of Economic Research

- Harris, J. R., and Todaro, M. P. 1970. "Migration, unemployment, and development: A two-sector analysis." *American Economic Review* 60: 126-142.
- Hollifield, J.E (2000). 'Migration and the "new" international order: The missing regime', in B. Ghosh (ed.), *Managing Migration: Time for a New International Regime?* Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- International Organization for Migration (2006). *International Dialogue on Migration No. 7: Managing the Movement of People*, IOM, Geneva.
- International Migration Report 2015, United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, September 2016.
- Kohnert, D. (2007). African migration to Europe: obscured responsibilities and common misconceptions.
- Lane, M. (2018). A Philosophical View on States and Immigration 1. In *Globalizing Chinese Migration* (pp. 131-143). Routledge.
- Lee, E. S. (1966). A Theory of Migration. *Demography*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 47-57.
- Lutterbeck, D. (2006). Policing Migration in the Mediterranean: ESSAY. *Mediterranean politics*, 11(1), 59-82.
- Makanya, S. T. (1994). 'The Desire to Return', in T. Allen, and H. Morsink (eds), *When Refugees Go Home*. London: Africa World Press.
- Mansoor, A. M., & Quillin, B. (Eds.). (2006). *Migration and remittances: Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union*. World Bank Publications.
- Massey, D. S. (1990). "Social structure, household strategies, and the cumulative causation of migration." *Population Index* 56: 3-26.
- Massey, D. S. & Singer, A., (1998). The social process of undocumented border crossing among Mexican migrants. *International Migration Review*, 561-592.
- Massey, D. S., Arango, J., Hugo, G., Kouaouci, A., Pellegrino, A., & Taylor, J. E. (1993). Theories of international migration: a review and appraisal. *Population and development review*, 431-466.
- Migration Policy Framework for Africa and Plan of Africa 2018-2030, (2018). African Union Commission, AU Department for Social Affairs. Addis Ababa.
- Miller, D. (2010). Immigrants, nations, and citizenship. *Population and political theory*, 235-255.
- Newman, W. L. (Ed.). (1902). *The Politics of Aristotle: With an Introduction, Two Prefatory Essays and Notes Critical and Explanatory* (Vol. 3). Clarendon Press.
- Niessen, J. (1992). European Community Legislation and Intergovernmental Cooperation on Migration. *International Migration Review*, 676-684.
- Nikitin, P., & Elliott, J. (2000). Freedom and the market. In *Forum for Social Economics* (Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. 1-16). Taylor & Francis Group.

- Obstfeld, M., and A. M. Taylor (2002). 'Globalization and Capital Markets', in M. Bordo, A. M. Taylor, and J. G. Williamson (eds), *Globalization in Historical Perspective*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Papademetriou, D. G. (1985). Illusions and reality in international migration: migration and development in post World War II Greece. *International Migration*, 23(2), 211-224.
- Pogge, T. (1997). Migration and poverty. In *Citizenship and exclusion* (pp. 12-27). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Taylor, E. J. (1999). The new economics of labour migration and the role of remittances in the migration process. *International migration*, 37(1), 63-88.
- Piore, M J. (1979). *Birds of Passage: Migrant Labor in Industrial Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rogge, J. R. (1994). 'Repatriation of Refugees', in T. Allen and H. Morsink (eds), *When Refugees Go Home*. London: Africa World Press.
- Sidgwick, H. (2012). *The elements of politics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sjaastad, L. A. (1962). The costs and returns of human migration. *Journal of Political Economy* 70S: 80-93.
- Smith, J. P., & Edmonston, B. (Eds.). (1997). *The new Americans: Economic, demographic, and fiscal effects of immigration*. National Academies Press.
- Sykes, A. O. (2013). International cooperation on migration: theory and practice. *University of Chicago Law Review*. 80(1), 313-340.
- United Nations. (2005). *Migration in an Interconnected World: New Directions for Action. Report of the Global Commission on International Migration*, United Nations, New York.