

CHRISTOPHE BERTOSSI

Head of the “Migrations, Identities, Citizenship” Programme at IFRI

International migrations have accelerated, over the past two decades, the growing importance of refugee flows in the world and the development of South-South flows have been added to South-North migration. This shows a trend towards globalization both in terms of overall volume of migrants in the world (from 120 to 200 million since 1990), and in terms of migratory routes: all areas in the world are affected by migrations today. Having long been considered as areas of departure, some countries have become transit areas (Morocco, Algeria or Mexico). That Mexico even turns one day into a net immigration country as emphasized by JM Gomez Robledo, is not excluded. Mr. Bedjaoui indicated that migrants represent 40% of Gulf countries population or 26% of that of Saudi Arabia. C. Bertossi emphasized another important change: migrants are no longer just men but also women and sometimes unaccompanied minors; migrants' profiles have also changed, and it is not the most destitute people who are part of international mobility. The factors creating migration are less to be found in development discrepancies between North and South than in the individual migrants' project to reach an improved human capital (health, education, occupation). Migrants do not flee “poverty”: they invest in migration because they have a project. This dimension is not understood by the migration policies of Northern countries (for example about co-development as a possible alternative to migration).

International migration is an essential resource for the social and economic development of countries of origin. But these respective gains are sometimes contradictory. Some countries of origin are very dependent on migrants' remittances (for instance 15% of Cape Verde GDP). If the distribution of these transfers remains very heterogeneous depending on the emigration country, these financial flows are increasing steadily (300 billion dollars in 2007). Mr. Bedjaoui showed how much, for countries of origin, migration constitutes a service export, a counterpart of financial remittances. At the same time, it raises other problems, particularly regarding the link between migration and development. Migrant financial remittances would have perverse effects (import at the expense of local production, use for unproductive or only social purpose having an inflationist impact). To that is added the issue of brain drain or brain looting. Between a third and half of university graduates from countries such as Angola, Burundi, Ghana, Kenya, Mauritius, Mozambique, Sierra Leone, Uganda and Tanzania live on a permanent basis in an OECD country. This proportion reaches 60% for Jamaica, Haiti or Trinidad and Tobago. Migration could therefore exacerbate inequalities in Southern countries. To brain drain is added a brain waste in welcome countries because immigrants, sometimes very skilled, do not always have jobs that match their skills, sometimes due to discrimination in labor markets in advanced countries.

Symmetrically, migration constitutes an indispensable resource for the economies of destination countries: immigrant workers are deeply necessary for the advanced economies, this concerns highly skilled but also low-skilled jobs. Population aging and the decrease in the ratio between active and non-active people in advanced countries strengthen their dependency toward immigrant populations. Immigrants contribute to social system funding in Northern countries, they stimulate domestic demand and improve the economic performance of host countries.

However, these diverse positive contributions to the economies of advanced countries are rarely pointed out by governments to the public. This constitutes a major constraint that affects the orientation of the migration policies of host countries, given the excessive politicization of migration issues experienced by electoral competition in these countries. According to C. Bertossi, governments are betting their political legitimacy on their ability to show the public that they can manage to control migration flows and to protect both the territories (border security policy), labor markets (concept of employment opposability) and national identities (debates on integration). The paradox is that these policies are not efficient (national sovereignty weakened by the international law that protects asylum seekers and family migrants; importance of economic dynamics in international migration) and that they no longer reflect the needs of advanced countries. Northern countries therefore lock themselves into a dilemma that they must imperatively resolve today: they are increasingly dependent on the success of migration policies that cannot succeed.

This reveals the importance of international migration issues and the urgency of finding a global policy response, based on cooperation between States and on a dialogue within inter-state organizations. The objective should not be



the militarization of borders but a common international effort to control and structure global migration according to the needs of all parties: departure countries, transit countries, and destination countries, but also migrants themselves, who are the main actors of the global migration phenomenon and of globalization itself.

However, the migration phenomenon today is beyond the reach of such global cooperation, despite some progress in international law and the involvement of some international organizations (such as ILO). JM Gomez Robledo underlined the low level of institutionalization at the international level in the regulation of migration, despite the existence of the International Organization for Migration (IOM). Regarding the UN Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of their Families, it has not been ratified or signed by any of the Northern countries, not even European ones. All three speakers concluded on the need to articulate comprehensive regulation on international migration with the question of development and of human rights. These two aspects are likely to more efficiently increase overall border security than can "wall" policies between Mexico and the USA (a more and more politicized issue after the 11th September 2001, because of many amalgams between migration and terrorism) and even in the Mediterranean area (Frontex).

This also suggests a common reflection on the role of States in this global governance. If states do not disappear, the concept of national sovereignty becomes more and more relative, especially in the European example where member states are gradually moving towards a common European migration policy (information system, visas, control at borders, readmission agreements, etc.). The regional level is increasingly relevant to address these questions, in Europe, America, Africa and Asia. This however requires the reinvention of other migration policies, beyond the sole goal of border security and without reproducing, at the regional level, the national logic which has until now lead to the definition of migration policies in terms of immigration.