

Summary of the Final Paper  
**International Migration: the Kaleidoscope of Global Dynamics**

*by*

Giulia Polimeno, no. 068762

Prof. Arlo Poletti, Supervisor

Department of Political Science

LUISS Guido Carli, Roma

A.Y. 2013 – 2014

The present study stems from the certainty that nowadays, as never before, international migration reflects an important global change and significantly affects, not only the internal policies of a country, but also the international relations between people and their foreign policies in all variable dimensions. As a matter of fact, in relation to the performance of the economic and financial flows, to the new emerging social and cultural relations that transcend the states boundaries as they are traditionally intended, to the technological innovations in the areas of communications and transports, to the conflicts, to the natural disasters and all the other countless causes that the globalization has made evident, international migration, even though fluctuating, revealed those degenerative changes that, not appropriately directed, are at the base of its decline. In particular, these changes result to be the main indicators of, not only global, but also regional, national, subnational and local transformation, through significant variation at the demographic, social, economic and political levels in the countries of origin and in the countries of transit and destination, significantly influencing the broader regional dynamics and consequently the global international phenomena. This conviction stems from the fact that *migration is the fundamental phenomenon which characterizes the global era in which we live*, taking into account that in the last half-century individual mobility has been increasing steadily and the flow of people across national borders seems to have been growing considerably. The United Nations Population Division estimates that the total number of international migrants - defined as people born in a different country than the one in which they currently reside - has risen from 79 million in 1960 to 175 million in 2000 and to 232 million in 2013. Nevertheless, considering that in the same period the growth of the world's population was four billion, we can assume that the international migration rate has been less dramatic than it results in the collective perception, moving from 2,2% in 1960 to 2,6% in 1990 and to 3,2% in 2013. In particular, the latest official data of 2013 indicate that the United States continue to host the largest number of international migrants, amounted to 46 million, followed by Russia (11 million), Germany (10

million), Saudi Arabia (9 million), United Arab Emirates and Great Britain (8 million for each). Always in 2013, the corridor with the highest intensity was Asia-Asia with over 54 million of international migrants, followed by the Europe-Europe corridor which reached an average figure of 0,6 million of international migrants per year and by the Latin American/Caribbean-North America corridor, which has been gradually decreasing during the three year period 2010-2013 to 0,3 million per year, overcome also by the Africa-Africa corridor which attained the third place. As mentioned, international migration in Europe has practically doubled, rising in the last three years, from 1 to 1,9 million per year<sup>1</sup> and leading Europe to receive more than 72 million international migrants in 2013. In terms of absolute numbers, between 1990 and 2013, Europe has reached the second place in the ranking with 23 million international migrants (1 million per year), after North America and before Asia. Of the 23 million international migrants, 43% were born in Europe, 22% in Asia, 18% in Africa and 14% in Latin America and Caribbean as evidence of the diversity of migration flows if compared with those of the other major areas of reference. By narrowing the field of observation from Europe to the European Union, at the beginning of 2012, among more than 500 million EU residents there are nearly 50 million of born abroad and 34,4 million of foreign citizens, equivalent to 6,8% of the total population. At present, all the European societies (beside France, Germany and Great Britain, which already had substantial contingents of immigrants within them in the 60s) have supplied to a decrease of births and national populations through the incorporation of substantial contingents of immigrants (*from 20,7% in Switzerland, to 8,9% in Germany, from 7,5% in Benelux to 8% in France*<sup>2</sup>), variously distributed among EU immigrants (especially from Bulgaria, Poland and Romania), Eastern Europe (Ukraine, Russia, Moldova) and other continents. Similarly, or rather specularly, the current situation in Southern European countries is that national populations, certainly downsized compared to twenty years ago (due to the birth rate decrease), generally grew due to substantial contingents of immigrants, consolidated on percentages almost similar to those of Central and Northern European countries (over 10% immigrants in Spain, 7,4% in Italy and 7,3% in Greece). In particular, Italy has emerged as a relevant outlet area for international migration flows, passing from just over 3 million foreign residents in 2007 to about 4,5 million in 2012, corresponding to 7,4% of the total population. The “age of migration” or rather of “migrations”, moreover, has seen a proliferation of new and varied types of migration and international mobility, which constitute the fundamental elements for the definition of the increasing complex map of power and, consequently, of the international relations that have been

---

<sup>1</sup> The value of net international migration refers to the difference between the number of immigrants and the number of emigrants. It is positive in the case of population growth and negative in the case of reduction.

<sup>2</sup> The French law considers anyone born in France as French citizen; 13% of births in France comes from the North African community.

declining till the rise of a new and different transnational dimension. The map of power is notoriously at the basis of the interactions between states, traditionally understood, or among a plurality of actors (e.g. states, international organizations, transnational actors), and of the varied agendas of assemblies that have been evolving from pure reference to the Gross Domestic Product, to the population and territory dimensions and to military strength (Waltz), to more complex variations that have been including ever more, in the increasing globalization of phenomena, the emerging technologies, research and development, the main sources of profits, human capital, investments, international assistance, military expenses, energy sources, nuclear weapons and yet the gross domestic product. In this context, if realists like Morgenthau and neo-realists such as Waltz have theorized the country as a unitary rational actor with the prevailing responsibility to maximize power, to protect its territory and its population and to pursue its national interests, Rosecrance has defined the status of negotiation having outlined, for the countries traditionally assumed, the risks linked to the extension to the global market, and Keohane and Nye were among the promulgators, in an increasingly interdependent world, of a widespread conception of power that is based on changing elements over time in a globalizing vision. In this sense the concepts of *Soft Power*<sup>3</sup>, *Hard Power*<sup>4</sup> and *Smart Power*<sup>5</sup> have been introduced in subsequent evolutions. Therefore this study, recognizing migration as a fundamental phenomenon characterizing the global era in which we live and as a fundamental factor of power in the exercise of Smart Power for direct and indirect connections with the different power factors declined in the context of International Relations, tries to provide a unified view of the phenomenon from which one can grasp the centrality, rather than arguments to systematize in theories in a logic of cause and effect, with the knowledge that *"science starts only with problems", and is visualized as "progressing from problems to problems"* as the philosopher Karl Popper used to say. In this sense, *in the first part of the text, the contours of international migration, in its "progressing", are outlined according to a holistic comprehensive approach. Then, in the second part, this study tries to explore the "problems" with specific reference to four case studies that, confirming/refusing the approach of the study, allow to enter*

---

<sup>3</sup> In the article appeared in 1998 in *Foreign Affairs*, Keohane and Nye have provided the following definition: "Soft power is the ability to get desired outcomes because others want what you want. It is the ability to achieve goals through attraction rather than coercion. It works by convincing others to follow or getting them to agree to norms and institutions that produced the desired behaviour. Soft power can rest on the appeal of one's ideas or culture or the ability to set the agenda through standards and institutions that shape the preferences of others. It depends largely on the persuasiveness of the free information that an actor seeks to transmit. If a state can make its power legitimate in the eyes of others and establish international institutions that encourage others to define their interests in compatible ways, it may not need to expend as many costly traditional economic and military resources ... Hence one of the distinctive features of soft power is that it is less tangible, because it is located in "the context in which the relationship exists".

<sup>4</sup> Generally, it is possible to define "Hard Power" in opposition to "Soft Power" as, in the words of Nye, "concrete, measurable and predictable" because it is based on "objective" and material assets. Hard power is considered to be one of the tenets of classical political realism. In this view, (in the meaning of Waltz) a country is considered to be powerful on the basis of "the size of population and territory, resource endowment, economic capability, military strength, political stability and competence".

<sup>5</sup> The "Center for Strategic and International Studies" defines it as "an approach that underscores the necessity of a strong military, but also invests heavily in alliances, partnerships, and institutions of all levels to expand influence and establish legitimacy of action".

*("science start") in the North-South, East-West dynamics, proceeding to the center (destination countries) from the peripheries (countries of origin) and semi-peripheries of the World (transit countries).* With reference to the case studies related to four countries of the main areas of origin of the immigrants in Italy, the following cases are examined: Ukraine for the Eastern Europe area, Tunisia for North Africa, India for Eastern Asia and Ecuador for Latin America, which are currently under international attention for, respectively, the internal disorders in the country and the bilateral relations with Russia, the repercussions of the Arab Spring, the Marò case and the international cocaine trafficking.

*Finally, the third part, identifying the major challenges at the global, regional, national, subnational and local levels and identifying potential perspectives and opportunities, intends to get, not so much into the merits of a model, but rather into the importance of reviewing the essence of international relations in the declination of policies which are able to reflect the changed and changing conditions of reference in the view of globalization phenomena that many experts have outlined, but which have not brought to a theory with established parameters yet. These parameters are difficult to detect and they are not supported by irrefutable evidence as well. Despite the lack of a theoretical method and a diversified reference framework, the analysis conducted has led to the evidence of a drawing in which populations are maneuvered as armies, allies collide under the shield of national interests for maneuver on the populations of third countries, national brands are outsourced, individuals take charge of institutional responsibilities without guarantees, and the toxic derivatives of globalization (mainly, but not only, trafficking of drugs and human beings) capitalize on a trade of 500 billion dollars per year, similar to that of energy sources or other major commodities.*

All in the background of a Governance, which configures (cf. *Mondo Caos* by Roberto Menotti):

- a United Nations system not able to ensure an effective international governance because of the restatement, at its internal, of the “political fragmentation of a world of states”;
- European Union not capable, at least in its current form, of a suitable alternative to state sovereignty as anchored to the idea of an international environment built at the end of World War II which no longer exists in reality;
- an alternative state sovereignty on the ashes of the political fragmentation of the states in an increasingly globalized world, simplified by the commonality of the web;
- a legislative framework of reference at the international, European and national level, which is articulated and complex, not always harmonized as well, that could find its way of future development in a shared definition of few clear targets, variously integrated.

In this sense, the eight goals<sup>6</sup> of the Millennium set by the United Nations in 2000 for the 2015 year and *the awareness that international migration, when it is safe, legal and voluntary, is the oldest development strategy for poverty reduction*, could be a proper basis to set the agenda for an ambitious development in the document "The future we want", on which the member states of the United Nations have been working, to integrate into a unified, osmotic and interdependent vision with the "Europe 2020, a strategy for growth" in the framework of the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility and with the 2020 Report about the "Choices of foreign policy" of the Analysis and Development Unit/Strategic Reflection Group of the Italian Foreign Ministry. Aristide Zolberg, an expert in American migration phenomena, in the book "A Nation by Design. Immigration Policy in the Fashioning of America" of 2006, wrote: «*The world can be conceptualized as a global field of social interactions structured by demographic, cultural, economic, and political processes occurring within and among societies. Each of these processes simultaneously contributes to the shaping of the others and is in turn conditioned by them. In any particular historical period, these interactions form an identifiable configuration of world conditions that pattern population movements into a migration epoch*». The study concludes, with the certainty to have left many questions unanswered, that «the partial falsification of our initial assumptions provides grounds for reflecting upon more fundamental problems. We are led to think more critically, as Popper would suggest, about bold, interesting and relevant theories, which transcend binary North-South frameworks (or East–West). A fruitful path of enquiry will build upon the copious literature advocating a more fluid understanding of power and global governance (Held and McGrew, 2007). The central question must thus concern the conditions that allow a country to influence its counterpart by relying on migration at a given point along the soft-hard power continuum. The reflection that less tangible power is also less coercive (Nye, 2004) opens up new paradigms for studying emerging dynamics between countries. This necessitates further in-depth empirical discussion. While migration and International Relations are no longer at the periphery of academic research (Betts, 2009 and Koslowski, 2009) in-depth empirical studies on the multifaceted manner in which migration agreements are discussed and implemented remain missing. They may provide renewed impetus for thinking beyond entrenched and supposedly righteous assumptions on North-South/East-West cleavages. Why the gate was, and is, open to some and closed to others is a blend of many elements: presidential and congressional personalities and policies, judicial decisions, bureaucratic agendas, prejudices and conventional wisdom, pressure from groups and public opinion, the health of the economy and

---

<sup>6</sup> The eight goals are: to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger, make primary education universal, promote gender equality and autonomy for women, reduce child mortality, improve maternal health, combat HIV, malaria and other diseases, ensure environmental sustainability, develop a global partnership for development.

the happenstance of history. Together these elements are like the bits of colored glass in kaleidoscope. Shaken at one time, they form a particular immigration and refugee policy. Shaken at another time, they take shape as another immigration and refugee policy» (Zuckers in his astute review of U.S. refugee policy).

*«No other force - not trade, not capital flows - has the potential to transform lives in sustainable, positive ways and on the scale that migration does», Peter Sutherland, United Nations Special Representative of the Secretary-General (SRSG) for International Migration.*