

# ATLAS OF MIGRATION

Facts and figures about  
people on the move



ESCAPE,  
WORK,  
FUTURE

ROSA LUXEMBURG STIFTUNG

# IMPRINT

The **ATLAS OF MIGRATION** is published by the Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung, Berlin, Germany

Chief executive editors: Johanna Bussemer, Dorit Riethmüller

Editors: Christian Jakob (coordination), Stefanie Kron, Wenke Christoph

Managing editor: Dietmar Bartz  
Art Director: Ellen Stockmar

**Atlas**  **Manufaktur**  
52° 31' N, 13° 24' O

English Editor: Paul Mundy  
Proofreader: Maria Lanman  
Fact checking: Infotext Berlin

Contributors: Friedrich Burschel, Wenke Christoph, Johanna Elle, Sabine Hess, Christian Jakob, Bernd Kasperek, Stefanie Kron, Laura Lambert, Ramona Lenz, Carlos Lopes, Sowmya Maheswaran, Johanna Neuhauser, Mario Neumann, Jochen Oltmer, Maria Oshana, Massimo Perinelli, Maximilian Pichl, Matthias Schmidt-Sembdner, Helen Schwenken, Maurice Stierl, Christian Stock, and a team of authors.

Cover image: Ellen Stockmar

The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the publishing organization.

Editorial responsibility (V. i. S. d. P.): Alrun Kaune-Nüßlein, Rosa Luxemburg Foundation

Second English edition, October 2019

Produced by Bonifatius GmbH Druck – Buch – Verlag, Paderborn  
Climate-neutral printing on 100 percent recycled paper.



This material (except the cover picture) is licensed under Creative Commons "Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 Unported" (CC BY-SA 4.0). For the licence agreement, see <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode>, and a summary (not a substitute) at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/deed.en>.


Individual graphics from this atlas may be reproduced if the attribution "Bartz/Stockmar, CC BY 4.0" is placed next to the graphic (in case of modification: "Bartz/Stockmar (M), CC BY 4.0").



## FOR FREE DELIVERIES AND DOWNLOADS:

**Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung**, Franz-Mehring-Platz 1, 10243 Berlin, Germany  
[www.rosalux.de/atlasofmigration](http://www.rosalux.de/atlasofmigration)

The **ATLAS OF MIGRATION** is also published as **ATLAS DER MIGRATION** in German.  
[www.rosalux.de/atlasdermigration](http://www.rosalux.de/atlasdermigration)



# ATLAS OF MIGRATION

Facts and figures about  
people on the move

**SECOND EDITION**  
**2019**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## 02 IMPRINT

## 06 INTRODUCTION

## 08 12 BRIEF LESSONS ABOUT THE WORLD OF MIGRATION

## 10 HISTORY CROSSING BORDERS, BREAKING BOUNDARIES

In the last few centuries, poverty, repression and violence have forced millions of people to leave their homes. For some, the end of a perilous journey has been a better life. For others, it has meant generations of slavery.

## 12 MOBILITY HOME AWAY FROM HOME

Employment, independence and security are major drivers of migration. Movements are in flux, with cheap flights and mobile phones allowing people to keep in touch with their loved ones at home. But the traditional migration corridors are still in operation. And new boundaries mean that people who follow social ties to newly independent neighbouring countries are now considered international migrants.

## 14 MOTIVES REASONS TO MOVE

People move for many reasons. Many seek a better life for themselves and their children; others flee threats and violence; still others are displaced by natural disasters. Very often, their reasons for moving overlap.

## 16 ON THE RUN A FAILURE OF COMMUNITY

Never before have so many people found themselves fleeing for their safety. The international community often fails not only to prevent wars and conflicts, but also to protect the victims.

## 18 VISAS HOW FAT IS YOUR WALLET?

Within most of the European Union, borderless travel has become almost a matter of course – as long as you have the right passport. If you don't, but still want to travel internationally, you will quickly find that your wallet determines how far you can go.

## 20 LABOUR MIGRATION IN SEARCH OF WORK

Labour migration is politically controversial in destination countries. On one hand, the developed world has a huge demand for migrant workers, both qualified and low-wage. On the other hand, immigrant workers are often subject to racist treatment.

## 22 MOVEMENT OF LABOUR SENDING MONEY TO THE FOLKS BACK HOME

Migration and economic development go together. For the migrants' countries of origin the economic advantages outweigh the disadvantages. In particular, the harm caused by the loss of skilled workers is often overestimated. Many such workers would return if they could find good employment at home.

## 24 GENDER I AM STRONG, I AM WOMAN

Whether at work or on the move in search of a better life, women are threatened by violence and discrimination. But as with all migrants – and all women – female migrants should not be seen primarily as victims. Above all, they need stronger rights so that they can defend themselves.

## 26 IMMIGRATION LAWS DOCUMENTS FOR THE UNDOCUMENTED

Immigration laws focus mainly on attracting skilled workers and keeping

everyone else out. But they lag far behind the real world: millions of workers live and work in destination countries without any official papers. That puts them at risk of exploitation.

## **28 BORDER CONTROL OUT OF BOUNDS**

In its attempts to control migration, the EU bribes or coerces African countries to stop and detain people before they can even get to the southern shore of the Mediterranean. Development aid is being diverted to stop migrants rather than fight poverty.

## **30 SCHENGEN AND DUBLIN UNPREPARED AND UNCOORDINATED**

Europe's approach to the refugee question has been chaotic. Different countries have different interests, and refuse to compromise or show a sense of solidarity. But they all agree on policies making it harder for refugees to get asylum in the EU.

## **32 THE MEDITERRANEAN AND THE SAHARA DEATHS IN THE DESERT**

Europe's southern border is the deadliest in the world. Thousands of people have drowned trying to reach the northern shore of the Mediterranean. They are now dying of thirst in the Sahara.

## **34 DEPORTATIONS GOODBYE AND DON'T COME BACK**

Faced with deportation, a distressing number of asylum applicants kill themselves in their desperation. Deporting someone is a lot more expensive than allowing them to stay, earn a living and pay taxes in their host country.

## **36 INTEGRATION ARRIVED AND SETTLED, BUT STILL NOT HOME**

Well-integrated migrants are the ideal and many in the host society welcome them. However, migrants that are not integrated are perceived as a threat. But focusing on "integration" means ignoring the real issue, which is granting migrants social and political rights.

## **38 RIGHT-WING NATIONALISM MISPLACED FEARS, FALSE PROMISES**

Right-wing politics is on the rise across the globe. Rabble-rousers blame outsiders and minorities for the shortcomings of their own societies. Even if they do not win power, the noise they make still influences the political agenda of more moderate parties.

## **40 RIGHT-WING VIOLENCE IN GERMANY WHERE RIGHT IS WRONG**

Racism has a long and tragic history in Europe – and nowhere more so than in Germany. Alas, racism is alive and well 80 years after Nazism and the Holocaust, and is now directed at migrants as well as Jews. But resistance in broader society is growing.

## **42 MIGRANT ORGANIZATIONS LEARNING THE ROPES**

Migrants are often portrayed as helpless and in need of protection – or hopelessly divided along national, ethnic, linguistic and religious lines. That is far from the truth. In reality, they help each other when in need, and help those who come after them.

## **44 SOLIDARITY CITIES A COUNTERWEIGHT TO XENOPHOBIA**

Refugees not only have rights; they also enrich the society and economy of the places where they settle. Enlightened local politicians recognize this. They provide a much-needed counterweight to the shrill tones of populists that call for yet more deportations.

## **46 CIVIL SOCIETY FROM SYMPATHY TO SOLIDARITY**

Activists throughout Europe have long agitated for the rights of migrants and refugees. But their numbers were small – until the summer of 2015, when the influx of people across Europe's borders stimulated an outpouring of sympathy, practical help, and political engagement.

## **48 AUTHORS AND SOURCES FOR DATA AND GRAPHICS**

# INTRODUCTION

## MIGRATION: A CONTESTED HUMAN RIGHT

**M**igration has always been part of us: it is the origin of all human societies. The movement of people across land and sea and from one continent to another is as old as humankind itself. Few nations in the modern world would be what they are today without centuries of immigration and emigration.

But today, the issue of migration is the subject of heated political debates all over the globe. Attitudes towards migration guide the opinions of citizens and politicians; they form the basis of political parties and social movements. The myths, stories and images that have emerged – and continue to emerge – around the social phenomenon of migration are correspondingly large and powerful. This is evident in the terms used to describe migration: the commonest verbal and visual images

are those of “streams”, “waves” and “flows”. All these metaphors portray migration as something to be feared, and they render invisible the individual people who are doing the migrating.

**T**his atlas aims to stimulate a political rethink by showing migration from a different angle. We present a trove of statistics and graphics in order to give a more objective basis to the debate on the left side of the political spectrum in Europe – and we hope, beyond. On the left, the continuum of views ranges from those who demand open borders to those who largely reject migration, often because they assume migrants will compete with the economically weaker members of our societies. The positive image of an open society with enough resources to go around in all areas of life stands in an apparent stark contrast to the negative image of communities that have to fight on all sides, and with each other, for those same resources. In the 2019 European parliamentary elections, the political right – from right-of-centre to populists and far-right extremists – stood

out with its nationalistic, anti-migrant rhetoric, profiting from voters' fears of social decline. Migrants in Europe are now being denied social rights on the basis of policies advocated by many of the parties that gained ground in the elections.

This atlas aims to change attitudes towards migration and migrants. The facts and figures on these pages show that while migration takes place in all parts of the world, it poses a threat neither to the destination countries nor to the countries of origin. Quite the opposite: it enriches societies across the globe not just culturally but also often in economic terms.

**M**igrants are not only victims. On the contrary, they take their fate into their own hands. This is illustrated in the contributions in this atlas that describe the struggles associated with migration – against racism and for the rights of immigrants and refugees. Innumerable movements of solidarity have emerged in Europe and around the world. Together they fight

against deportations, xenophobia and far-right populism, and for the right to social and cultural participation, decent work, adequate housing, education and health care.

**M**igration has many realities and facets. This atlas promotes a differentiated approach and a recognition of the facts. In the current social climate, courage is needed to address this issue in a calm and informed manner – and to recognize that immigration broadens and strengthens democracy in our societies. For we live in post-migration societies, in which the freedom of movement and protection of refugees should be regarded as human rights.

Florian Weis, Johanna Bussemer,  
Christian Jakob, Wenke Christoph, Stefanie Kron,  
Dorit Riethmüller, Franziska Albrecht  
Editors

## 12 BRIEF LESSONS

# ABOUT THE WORLD OF MIGRATION

**1** Humankind has always been on the move. The **HISTORY OF HUMANITY** is also the history of migration. All modern societies and all nations on Earth are the result of mobility.



**2** Ever more people live and work in other countries. Most of them move to **BIG CITIES**. Even though there are now more migrants than ever, their **NUMBERS** are still **TINY** compared to the world's population.



**3** Migrants are often **SELF-EMPLOYED** or take **BADLY** paid jobs – partly because they are denied social benefits. They **CONTRIBUTE** to the economic development of their host societies, and thus to everyone's **WELL-BEING**.



**4** **WELL-EDUCATED** individuals often leave poor countries and move abroad in search of work and higher salaries. Because they generally **SEND** part of their earnings **BACK HOME**, and, in some cases, **RETURN** with better qualifications and skills, migration is also good for developing countries.




**5** The European Union is trying to stop migrants **FAR FROM ITS OWN SHORES**. In doing so, it implicitly accepts serious human-rights violations. Especially in Africa, people can **NO LONGER** move **FREELY** in their own countries.



**6** People from the Global North can get **VISAS** easily. They can travel almost everywhere **UNHINDERED** and can emigrate to many other countries. Such freedom of movement is **DENIED MOST** other people in the world.









**7** For the poor and the record numbers of refugees, there is **NO LEGAL WAY** to migrate. They must often **PAY** people-smugglers large sums to cross a border. Migrations routes are **VERY DANGEROUS**; many people **DIE** while on the road.


**8** When migrants arrive at their destination, they are often subject to **DISCRIMINATION**. They are paid lower wages, have to settle for inferior housing and get fewer career opportunities. Such discrimination may last **YEARS** – and their **CHILDREN** and **GRANDCHILDREN** may still be regarded as “foreign”.




**9** **RACISM** is by no means a consequence of migration. Whether immigrant minorities are treated with **HOSTILITY** or repression depends mainly on whether migration is accepted as normal or **AS A THREAT**.



**10** An increasing number of **WOMEN AND GIRLS** migrate alone – to **FLEE** from danger, to **EARN** a decent living, to take control of their **OWN LIVES**, or to **HELP** their families. They need special **PROTECTION** on the way.



**11** Migrants' **CONTRIBUTIONS** to the economy are welcomed, but they must often **FIGHT** for their rights. **OTHERS** can also benefit from such struggles – including local workers who join in the battle against **EXPLOITATION**.



**12** A **SOCIETY** in which locals and migrants live together in peace is **NORMAL**, and not an exception. The basis for this is **SOLIDARITY** – the readiness to share.

## HISTORY

# CROSSING BORDERS, BREAKING BOUNDARIES

In the last few centuries, poverty, repression and violence have forced millions of people to leave their homes. For some, the end of a perilous journey has been a better life. For others, it has meant generations of slavery.

**H**uman history is the history of migration. Human-kind did not suddenly begin to up sticks and move in the modern era. Long before modern transport existed, people would move over long distances. And the idea that past migrations were permanent is a myth: return flows, seasonal migrations and variability have been features of local, regional and global movements in the past, just as they are in the present day.

Global migration – mobility from one continent to another – has been a major feature only since the start of

the colonial era, and slavery played a big part. From the 16th century onward, 10 to 12 million people were shipped from Africa to Europe and the Americas. In East Africa, another 6 million people were captured and sold, mainly to rulers on the Arabian Peninsula.

In the early 19th century, the number of Europeans turning their backs on the old continent rose rapidly. Some of these migrants took the land route, trekking east and settling in the Asiatic parts of the Russian Empire. A much larger number crossed oceans: of the 55 to 60 million people who went overseas between 1815 and 1930, more than two-thirds went to North America. Another fifth voyaged to South America. Seven percent ended up in Australia and New Zealand. Wherever they settled, the composition of the population changed radically: new European communities emerged.


The end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century, the peak of Europe's emigration wave, also marks the beginning of Europe as a destination for immigrants, a trend that finally took hold after the Second World War. Many people came from the former colonies, especially to cities such as London, Paris and Brussels. As a result of the economic upswing in Western Europe after the war, national governments recruited "guest workers" from Southern Europe. These workers later brought their families to join them. Before the fall of the Iron Curtain in 1989, many people fled, or moved, from the former Eastern Bloc to the West. After 1989 their numbers rose considerably.

The liberalization of its immigration laws in 1965 led to a second wave of migration to the United States. By 2016, the number of foreign-born residents in the US had reached 41 million, of these, 25 percent were of Mexican origin.

Migrants rarely go to a completely unknown foreign country – not today, and not in the past. Networks often play a considerable role in guiding mobility. Migration has never been an end in itself: the temporary or permanent stay in a new location is intended to give migrants the opportunity to have a bigger say in shaping their own lives. That is the case for people seeking employment and educational opportunities, as well as the pursuit of self-determination, for example the desire to escape from

### MILLIONS IN SEARCH OF A NEW HOME

Historical migration in three world regions, five-year periods, millions



\* Includes Manchuria, Japan, Central Asia

© ATLAS OF MIGRATION / MCKEOWN

*Industrialization, urbanization and new transportation methods stimulated mobility. And many indigenous peoples came to be dominated by outsiders*

Origins and destinations of migrants, 1500–1914, selected, millions of migrants



One trigger for migration has always been violence, or threats of violence. People react to armed conflict by leaving unsafe places. Forcing people to move away to make it easier to consolidate power or further political goals is by no means new. Refugee movements, expulsions and deportations occur when particular groups – usually state actors – threaten life and limb, restrict rights and freedoms, limit opportunities for political participation, or inhibit sovereignty and individual or collective security to such an extent that people see no other option than to leave their homes.

*From colonial times to the industrial era, more than 100 million people took part in major long-distance movements – or were sold*

Migration, especially over long distances, is a very demanding social process. Nevertheless, it remains a constant of human development. No modern society, no current nation-state, and no major city would exist without it. —

# HOME AWAY FROM HOME

**Employment, independence and security are major drivers of migration. Movements are in flux, with cheap flights and mobile phones allowing people to keep in touch with their loved ones at home. But the traditional migration corridors are still in operation. And new boundaries mean that people who follow social ties to newly independent neighbouring countries are now considered international migrants.**

**T**he media often give the impression that people in poor countries will do just about anything to reach Europe or the US. But such movements account for only a small part of the global flow of migrants. Every country experiences movement across its borders – international migration – or movements within its boundaries – internal migration. Migration is a worldwide phenomenon.

The United Nations estimates that in 2017 some 258 million people were living either temporarily or permanently in other countries. This figure has tripled in the course of a generation: in 1970 there were 84 million international migrants, in 1990 there were 153 million and since the turn of the millennium the number has increased by a further 85 million. However, the proportion has scarcely changed: in 1970, the global percentage was 2.3 percent; in 2017 it had gone up slightly to 3.4 percent.

The number of people who leave their birthplace but stay in the same country is much higher. In 2005, the United Nations estimated the number of internal migrants at 763 million. In 2017, in China alone, this category included 244 million people. India, the United States, and even Germany with its economic gradient from west down to the east, experience big internal movements, often from rural to urban areas, and from economically depressed regions to growth centres.

Global migration is on the rise for various reasons. In some areas, conflicts and wars force people to flee. In others, globalization of the economy is a major cause of migration. Old migration corridors still play a role. They arose between neighbouring countries (such as from Italy to Switzerland), through a history of colonialism (as from India to the United Kingdom) or through long-standing trade relationships (as between China and East Africa).

Today almost two-thirds of all international migrants live in developed countries. But even the low-income

countries are also home to 11 million new arrivals. Almost half of all international migrants come from just 20 countries.

Europe and North America were long the most important destinations. In the meantime, the focus has gradually switched to Asia. Since the turn of the millennium, Asia has become the end point for more than 30 million international migrants: more than any other region in this period. Over 40 percent of these migrants come from Asia. Broad migration corridors have emerged between the countries of South and Southeast Asia and the Gulf states, with their high demand for labour. Construction and household workers already make up the majority of the population in the Gulf. In the United Arab Emirates, 88 percent of the population are foreign nationals, including 3.3 million people from India alone.

These migration corridors show that despite all the technical progress in transport and telecommunications, geography still plays a big role. Most people migrate within their home region. The drawing of new boundaries, such as in the former Soviet Union, means that people who follow family, ethnic and historical ties to newly independent neighbouring countries are now considered international migrants. But the Mexico-US migration corridor is still the busiest of all. In 2017, the United States was home to 98 percent of all Mexicans living abroad – some 12.7 million people. Flight from conflict or natural disasters usually takes place within a particular region. In 2000, the Turkish border police registered only 1,400 irregular border crossings from neighbouring Syria; by the start of 2019, the civil war had pushed the number of Syrian refugees in Turkey up to 3.6 million.


Migration has many facets, not just permanent emigration or immigration. Many people return home after studying or working abroad for a period. That includes so-called “expats”: workers who are stationed in a foreign country for a period of time to perform managerial or service jobs. Others move on, and still others move back and forth between their home countries and one or more destinations. “Digital nomads” – generally people from wealthy countries who live cheaply in poorer regions – get a lot of media attention but they are a minority. —

*Not many on a global scale: international migrants account for around 3 percent of the world's population*


## WAY TO GO

An overview of international migration


Migrant movements within and between six world regions, millions, 2017




Numbers in millions and distribution by gender, percent, 2017



Numbers in millions and distribution by gender



Distribution of migrants by destination region, percent, 2017



differences due to rounding

© ATLAS OF MIGRATION / ILO, UN



# REASONS TO MOVE

People move for many reasons. Many seek a better life for themselves and their children; others flee threats and violence; still others are displaced by natural disasters. Very often, their reasons for moving overlap.

**T**wenty-year-old Mody Boubou Coulibaly from Mali worked as a construction worker in Nouakchott, the capital of neighbouring Mauritania. On 9 May 2016, he jumped from the third storey of an unfinished building and died soon afterwards of his injuries. He felt forced into this desperate act after being harassed by a policeman. Coulibaly's offence was that he had overstayed his period of legal residence in Mauritania. He could not afford the 85 euros he needed for a residency permit.

Since 2017, Mauritania has been an associate member of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), which includes Mali and 14 other countries in the region. At its founding in 1975, a key question for ECOWAS was how to overcome the boundaries imposed by the colonial powers and allow the citizens of West Africa freedom of movement within the region. Mobility in this part of the world is not only vital for life, it is also a deeply rooted in local cultures.

Within West Africa, many people have always been

mobile and have moved to another country for a period of time. A stay in a foreign land was often an important step towards adulthood, making it possible for those who left to return home with enough savings to start a family. Before the colonial era, travelling merchants helped spur the gold trade and maintained long-distance commerce relations.

In the 1960s and 70s, many francophone West Africans went to France to work, quite legally, with visas. That is scarcely possible today. Because the journey to Europe has become so perilous, it is mainly young people who take to the road. The motives of such “irregular” migrants are not just the prospect of a job and income; they also want to further their education, gain experience, achieve a particular lifestyle, or join family members who are already abroad.


In the summer of 2018, IOM, the United Nations Migration Agency, surveyed more than 5,400 migrants travelling through transportation nodes such as bus stations in West Africa. Of these, 83 percent were men and 17 percent women. Four out of every five respondents said they were travelling for economic reasons. That is similar to the situation in Latin America, where in the same year the Washington-based Center for Immigration Studies questioned people in Honduras about their reasons for migrating to the United States. A large majority, 82.9 percent, mentioned unemployment and income prospects; 11.3 percent named violence and insecurity.

The assumption that migration is mainly a reaction to especially bad living conditions is mistaken. The poorest people simply lack the wherewithal to move anywhere. It is therefore a misconception that successful development aid and investments will lead to less migration. In fact, socioeconomic development is more likely to promote migration rather than to reduce it. The theory of a “migration hump”, coined in the 1990s, predicts that when a country has reached a certain income level the number of emigrants begins to sink. But the close correlation between income level and the tendency to emigrate that this model predicts neglects other important factors. These include the demographic trends in the countries of origin and destination, the copycat effect, and obstacles such as visa and entry requirements – and of course global economic and environmental changes.

The lifestyles and production methods of the devel-

## COMING AND GOING

Migration flows of over 2 million people between individual countries, officially registered, to 2017, millions



\* United Arab Emirates


© ATLAS OF MIGRATION / KNOXAD

*Flight from war and terror, the desire for a better life, traditional links, and new borders – these are the factors that determine the sources and destinations of migrants*


## GOOD REASONS TO GET GOING

Triggers of migration, selected


**Wars and armed conflicts** – Annual review of the Study Group on the Causes of War, University of Hamburg, end 2018




**Unequal access to income, health care and education** – Inequality-adjusted Human Development Index (IHDI), 2017



**Violations of human rights** – the example of the CIVICUS rating of civil society openness and freedom, 2019



**Climate crisis, rising seas levels, endangered farming systems** – the example of soil degradation, UN Environment Programme, no date



oped world are hastening climate change and destroying the livelihoods of many people in the developing world. According to the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre, part of the Norwegian Refugee Council, between 2008 and 2017 a total of 246.1 million people were displaced by natural disasters. A total of 18.8 million people were displaced in 2017 alone.

We have always had natural disasters, but climate-related migration is on the increase. The terms “environmental migrants”, “environmentally displaced persons” or “climate refugees” are used to describe the people affected. Although the United Nations defines some environmental factors as a reason for flight, the people involved still have no legal right to protection. People who cannot survive in their home countries are not regarded as regular refugees in Europe but as “irregular” migrants or “economic refugees”.

*Where lives are in danger or prospects are dim, flight and emigration follow. People are often ready to go back home if the situation there improves*

“Irregular” migration also arises because capital and goods can be mobile without regard to the environment or human rights, while people can be denied legal routes to migrate or flee. Many people leave their home countries for compelling reasons, such as armed conflict or political or religious persecution. They shape the image of global migration, but they make up only a small part of it: around 71 million refugees and internally displaced people, compared to around 258 million migrants.


Often people are on the move for a variety of overlapping reasons – and those reasons may change over time. Development assistance, repatriation, border closures and criminalization will not be able to change this. —

# A FAILURE OF COMMUNITY

Never before have so many people found themselves fleeing for their safety. The international community often fails not only to prevent wars and conflicts, but also to protect the victims.

Every year on 20 June, World Refugee Day, the United Nations publishes the latest refugee numbers. Six of the last seven years have broken the previous record. The statistics are a "thermometer of world events", says the UNHCR, the UN's Refugee Agency.

The number of people fleeing to Europe has fallen dramatically as the European Union borders have been sealed off. But globally, the numbers are going in the opposite direction: the UNHCR estimates that a total of 71.4 million people were in need of protection at the end of 2017 – approximately 50 million more than in 2000, and more than ever before. Statistically speaking, nearly one in every 100 people is either displaced within his or her own country, is seeking asylum, is recognized as a refugee, or is stateless. Over 16.2 million people took flight in 2006 alone – an average of 44,000 people every day. Over half (52 percent) of the refugees registered by UNHCR are children.



Above all, these numbers confirm the failure of the international community in resolving conflicts. The majority of these people are fleeing long-lasting conflicts such as the armed conflict in the Democratic Republic of Congo, war, as in South Sudan, or the brutal expulsion of Rohingya from Myanmar to Bangladesh.

In 2017, more than two-thirds of the world's refugees came from just five countries. Syria was top of the list with more people fleeing than anywhere else. Since the start of the civil war in 2011, 6.2 million of the estimated population of 20 million have fled within the country's borders. Another 5.7 million have escaped abroad. Today, one in every three refugees worldwide comes from Syria. By the end of 2017, more than 2.6 million people had fled from Afghanistan, followed by South Sudan with 2.4 million and Myanmar, where 1.2 million members of the Muslim Rohingya minority were forced to leave the country.

Most displaced people do not travel far – they stay in their own country. Around 39 of the 71.4 million are so-called internally displaced persons. Contrary to the overheated debate in Europe and the United States, only a small proportion of displaced people end up in the developed world. Some 85 percent of international refugees find refuge in the developing world.


Turkey has been one of the top refugee hosting countries for some time. An estimated 3.7 million people have found sanctuary there, most of them from Syria. Pakistan comes next, with 1.4 million refugees, although the government has started to turn away Afghans. Approximately 1.1 million people have arrived in Uganda from two of its neighbouring countries: the Democratic Republic of Congo and South Sudan. The civil war in the fertile South Sudan has caused a drastic food crisis, showing once again how closely war and poverty are interlinked as causes of flight.

At the end of 2017, Germany, which has admitted 970,000 refugees, ranked sixth top hosting country worldwide. The UNHCR statistics do not include individuals whose asylum procedures are still ongoing, or people who are not recognized as refugees but whose residence is "tolerated" in Germany. If these people are included, Germany would come in at around 1.3 million, and would pull past Iran and Lebanon into 4th place.

If population figures are taken into account, the picture for Germany looks rather different. With 11.6 refugees

*The numbers of refugees and displaced people recorded by the UN Refugee Agency has more than doubled in eight years*





admitted for every 1,000 inhabitants, Germany is far from being the most welcoming land on Earth. Lebanon, which is far less well-off, has accepted 164 refugees per 1,000 inhabitants, the highest number in the world. Jordan has 71, Turkey 43. In Europe, Sweden is the country with the most refugees in relative terms: almost 24 people per 1,000 inhabitants.


Compared to the national economic outputs, the countries hosting the largest number of refugees are South Sudan, Uganda, Chad and Niger. These countries cannot adequately cater to refugees' needs, and are forced to rely on the international community for support. But the international community not only fails to resolve conflicts, it also fails to deal with their consequences. For example, the huge numbers of refugees from Syria resulted in part from a reduction in food aid to the UN's World Food Programme, which depends heavily on voluntary donations from governments. Members of the European Union were deeply involved in restricting this aid.

All humanitarian aid programmes complain that emergency aid for refugees is seriously underfunded. The stressful experience of fleeing becomes life-threatening for many people. Right at the bottom of the list of priorities are long-term refugees, who must often live in camps

*Most refugees and displaced people live in or on the edges of war zones or areas with armed conflict*

for a decade or more. These include people who have fled from Somalia to Kenya to escape violence perpetrated by Islamist militias, and who face bleak prospects there. The situation could be improved with relatively few resources – if only the political will were there. —

*In proportion to their populations, Syria's neighbours have taken in far more refugees than Germany has*



# HOW FAT IS YOUR WALLET?

Within most of the European Union, borderless travel has become almost a matter of course – as long as you have the right passport. If you don't, but still want to travel internationally, you will quickly find that your wallet determines how far you can go.

**T**he Universal Declaration of Human Rights grants everyone the right to move freely within a state and to choose his or her place of residence. Everyone is free to leave any country, including his or her own one, and to return to his or her own land. So there is a globally recognized human right to move freely within one's own country, to settle and to emigrate. This right is not respected everywhere: China and Tunisia, for example, restrict it.

What does not exist is the unrestricted right to travel to another country. Nation-states instead control access to their territory through entry permits, i.e., by granting or refusing visas. This results in enormous global inequalities. If you hold a German passport, you can enter 127 countries without a visa, obtain a visa on entry in another 40 countries, and need to apply for a visa beforehand in only 31 countries. Afghanistan is on the other end of the scale. Holders of an Afghan passport may only travel to five other countries without a visa. They can obtain a visa

on arrival in another 25, but they need to apply for one beforehand in 168 countries.


The Global Passport Power Rank 2019, which measures the importance of citizenship for freedom of movement, puts the United Arab Emirates at the top, followed by Luxembourg, Finland and Spain in joint second place. Germany and eight other countries are joint third. Citizens of these countries enjoy a high degree of freedom of movement. Conversely, entry to Germany (for example) without a visa is possible only for citizens of the other 27 EU members, five EU candidate countries, and 67 other countries, including important political and economic partners such as Japan and the United States. The citizens of over 100 countries have to undergo an often complex and costly application process to get a visa, even if they want to make only a quick visit to the EU.

To do this, applicants have to disclose their private lives and reveal information about third parties: how much do you have in your bank account? What do you want to do in Europe? Who is your employer there? Who invited you? Where are you going to stay? Who will cover the costs of your visit? And of course, will you leave the

*Golden visas in the European Union were designed to promote investment. In fact, they speed up immigration for the well-to-do*

## WELCOME TO THE WEALTHY

EU members that issue "golden visas" in return for investments, purchase of government bonds or property, and average annual capital inflows thereby created, 2012–17, number of citizenships or residence permits issued and two main countries of origin of applicants



\* Some figures since 2010 and/or until 2018. France, Luxembourg, Netherlands: no data. Austria: data incomplete. Figures partly include family members. Cyprus, Malta: no information on countries of origin

country when your visa expires?

If authorities do not believe that you really intend to leave, they will refuse your application. The visa department has a free hand here. There are no binding criteria, and you have no way of objecting. The procedure offers lots of room for arbitrary discrimination and corruption. From 2008 to 2010, German consulates in Africa, South America and Eastern Europe issued visas in return for bribes. In 2018, it became known that consular workers in Lebanon had sold early appointments enabling people to skip the long queues for visa applications.

In 2017, the consulates of the EU member states issued around 14.6 million visas. They refused 1.3 million applications. These refusals were distributed very unevenly. The Polish consulate in Irbil, in northern Iraq, rejected over 60 percent of all applications; around 40 percent of applications at the French consulate in Lagos, Nigeria, were unsuccessful. Belgian consular officials in Japan, on the other hand, rejected only one in every 50 applications.

For many would-be travellers, the costs are an insurmountable hurdle. If you are applying for a visa because you want to study in the EU, you may have to pay up to 8,800 euros into a special blocked account, from which money can be withdrawn only in the country where you will study. This money is intended to cover your living expenses for at least one year. The low wage levels in Africa and the Middle East mean that such a sum may be way out of reach. This rule effectively excludes the possibility of supporting yourself by working while you are studying.

The most dramatic illustration of how the size of your wallet determines your freedom of movement is the so-called “golden visa”. These go to foreigners who have invested a certain amount of money in their destination country. A count by the anti-corruption NGO Transparency International in 2018 found that over 20 countries had such a programme. The 14 European countries among them are all EU members. Greece, for example, will issue a visa to someone who has invested 250,000 euros in Greek property.

Germany has a similar rule – though it is not classified as a golden visa. Since 2004, someone who invests a large sum in their own company in Germany can qualify for an “investor visa”. The company must be “securely financed” and “viable”. Initially, 250,000 euros was enough; nowadays, the location of the business must also show promise for favourable development. If the project is successful and generates a livelihood, the applicant can look forward to a permanent residency permit after three years. —


*Among the many restrictions to freedom of movement, one principle can be recognized: the poorer the country you come from, the harder it is to go anywhere*

## PASSPORT, PLEASE

Freedom of movement according to nationality and passport, 2019


How many countries can citizens of each country travel to without a visa?

■ 30–70 ■ 71–100 ■ 101–140 ■ 141–172




Which countries can German passport holders travel to, under what conditions?

■ freely, no visa required  
■ visa on arrival  
■ online document\* before travel  
■ visa in passport before travel



Citizens of which countries can enter Germany without a visa?

■ without visa ■ with visa



# IN SEARCH OF WORK

Labour migration is politically controversial in destination countries. On one hand, the developed world has a huge demand for migrant workers, both qualified and low-wage. On the other hand, immigrant workers are often subject to racist treatment.

Labour migration can develop in various ways. It often has its origins in relations between former colonial powers and their colonies – such as the USA and the Philippines or between France and Senegal. Global value chains also stimulate labour migration, which is why many Bolivians work in São Paulo's textile industry in neighbouring Brazil. Educational migration makes it

possible for young people to work overseas after a period of study abroad. In addition, regional political and economic groupings, such as the European Union or the Economic Community of West African States, often facilitate the free movement of workers.

The economic goals of labour migration are in constant flux. Since the 1970s, manufacturing jobs in Western Europe have lost much of their importance. Structural change has created service economies, with consequences regarding the demand for migrant labour. In the 1960s, manufacturing industry – for example in Germany – had a major demand for unskilled workers. German firms recruited large numbers of workers from Italy, Portugal and especially Turkey. Such strategies are still supported politically today, for example for seasonal jobs and work contracts in the construction sector, farming and abattoirs.


In Western Europe, the immigration of young, qualified workers is nowadays regarded as a means of dealing with the lack of skilled labour and the ageing of societies. Nevertheless, professional regulations and political considerations often prevent the recognition of foreign university and technical qualifications. Many of the people affected are forced to work in jobs that are below their actual qualification levels – a phenomenon known as "deskilling". Teachers and doctors from the Middle East or Eastern Europe are often found employed as domestic workers or nurses. Globally, women dominate in these types of activities because it is assumed that their gender gives them what are known as "care competencies".

For refugees, getting a job means negotiating a legal and social obstacle course. The Geneva Convention on Refugees states that refugees who reside legally in a state are entitled to be employed or self-employed. But according to the Global Refugee Work Rights Report, refugees were excluded from working legally in seven of the 15 host countries studied. Some countries impose further hurdles: high fees and complex bureaucratic processes to get a work permit, language barriers, an obligation to live in a camp, and not least, racial discrimination on the job market.

Opening up the job market for actual and would-be migrants is a political hot potato. Economic interests are not the only factors that come into play. The issue is subject to negotiations among a plethora of actors: companies,


## DOWNGRADED ABROAD

Highly qualified women (e.g., graduates) in professions with medium or low qualification requirements, 15 to 65-year-olds, selected countries, 2017, percent



© ATLAS OF MIGRATION / OECD

*Female migrants face even more discrimination in the labour market than do local women, and many more must work in jobs for which they are overqualified*



business associations, trade unions, political bodies, government authorities and nongovernment organizations. Private actors such as job-placement agencies and transnational temporary employment agencies are also gaining importance. The migrants themselves – the key players and the people most affected – are usually invisible in the public debate.

What impact does labour migration have on employment conditions in the host countries? This is also subject to debate. There is no proven statistical link between high immigration rates and high unemployment or falling wages. There is some evidence that immigration has the opposite effect: that it can stimulate the economy and reduce unemployment among the local population. And then there is the segmentation of the labour market: migrants, especially new arrivals, often do not compete for the same jobs as longstanding residents, but fill vacancies in unpopular types of work.

Such controversies mean that some trade unions have a schizophrenic position towards migration. They swing from international and works-based solidarity on one hand, and representing their national members' interests on the other. Many migrants cannot take part in industrial

*The population decline in Central and Eastern Europe reduces the number of potential migrants who can work in the health and care professions in the West*

disputes because they do not enjoy the same rights as natives in many countries. They live in fear of being sacked or even deported if they make too much noise.

Some unions, however, have developed successful strategies for migrants. In Brazil, Hong Kong and Italy, they cooperate with the migrants' own organizations. This has enabled them to organize successful campaigns in the area of domestic work. In the United States, worker centers help to support low-wage workers, including many undocumented migrants. They are gateway organizations that provide workers with information and various services. In Switzerland, around 65 percent of construction workers are immigrants. Unions organized them decades ago. They spoke to the migrants in their native languages, gave them information about their labour rights, worked closely with their organizations, and supported them in elected bodies. Many successful strikes can be traced back to active members who originally came from Italy, Spain, Portugal or former Yugoslavia. —



# SENDING MONEY TO THE FOLKS BACK HOME

Migration and economic development go together. For the migrants' countries of origin the economic advantages outweigh the disadvantages. In particular, the harm caused by the loss of skilled workers is often overestimated. Many such workers would return if they could find good employment at home.

For years there have been alarmist warnings about the consequences of migration for the destination countries – especially in Europe – as well as for the countries of origin. For the latter, most concern centres on the "brain drain": the emigration of skilled workers. Poor countries lose workers that they desperately need for their economic development, goes this argument. Particular focus is on the expensive education given to people who end up leaving their country.

In 2017, some 36 million of the world's 258 million international migrants came from the African continent.


Since 2010, Africa has spent more than 2 billion US dollars to educate doctors who have then emigrated. The amount spent by African governments on university education, is, measured in terms of economic output, among the highest in the world. A place at university for a year costs twice to three times the average inhabitant's annual income. In Niger, it is 5.6 times higher. In Asia, by contrast, countries spend only half the per-capita income on a university place.

Despite all this, migration still does not mean a loss for Africa. Relatively few skilled Africans leave their country of origin. For the countries south of the Sahara the figure is only 0.4 percent; for North Africa it is 0.7 percent. In Europe (not counting Eastern Europe), 1.7 percent do so. Of those Africans who emigrate, many stay in the continent: they migrate elsewhere in Africa. Some African countries even promote the migration of qualified individuals within the continent. South Africa and Kenya have recently signed or revised deals with their neighbours, making it easier for qualified workers to enter.

One in eight skilled migrants leaves both his or her home country and the African continent behind. Most of them head for Europe or North America. But for this African diaspora, the rapid economic growth of many African countries provides a strong incentive to return. One survey found that if enough jobs were available, nine out of every ten African PhDs who now live in another part of the world would seriously consider returning to pursue their careers in Africa.

A look at the remittances that migrants send to their families reveals that the benefits of temporary or long-term emigration from Africa outweigh the shortcomings. In 2017, African migrants transferred some 69.5 billion dollars through official channels to their home countries. That was seven times more than in 2000. The World Bank estimates that between 2010 and 2018, a total of 673 billion dollars flowed into Africa in this way. Add in all the money flowing through other channels – such as cash carried by travellers – and the sum would be considerably higher.


The poorest countries suffer a particular disadvantage in terms of money-transfer costs. It is a lot more expensive



*Five years after the financial crisis of 2008/9, remittances by migrants in the USA had recovered to their previous levels. They are now increasing by 5–10 percent a year*

## NECESSARY, HELPFUL, EFFECTIVE

Significance of remittances\* for the economies of African recipient countries in percent of economic output (2017), and increases in remittances to countries to which over 1 billion US dollars were transferred in 2018, in million US dollars



\* Remittances: money transfers from migrant workers to their home countries

© ATLAS OF MIGRATION / WELTBANK

to send money to sub-Saharan Africa than to other parts of the world. In December 2018, the transfer fees were almost nine percent of the amount being transferred; transfers to Latin America cost six percent. As long as that does not change, money will continue to find its way to Africa through informal routes, invisible to official statistics. The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals aim to lower the costs of transfers worldwide to just three percent.

While remittances are on the up, official development assistance is stagnant. In 2017, sub-Saharan Africa received a total of 26 billion dollars, less than half the remittances into the region. Remittances are also higher than foreign direct investment in Africa, which amounted to 42 million dollars in 2017.

Most remittances go to wives, mothers, daughters or sisters. And even though female migrants tend to earn less than men, women send around half of global transfers – a higher percentage of their income than their male counterparts. A 2014 study that was conducted in 77 developing countries confirmed the effectiveness of remittances in combatting poverty. Private households can pay

*Remittances from migrant workers are an effective means of combatting poverty and stimulating investment*

for education or loans. They support entrepreneurial activities, such as to pay for machinery or vehicles, or to buy goods to sell in a local shop.

The higher the contribution of remittances to a country's economic activity, the more they help fight poverty. Big effects were measured in countries where remittances accounted for over five percent of the annual economic output. That was the case in one out of every four countries in Africa; eight of them are among the least developed countries. If remittances to such countries go up by ten percent, the poverty gap – a measure of how far below the poverty line the average poor person lives – shrinks by 3.5 percent.

Migration and development belong together. Regulated, circular migration – in which migrants return home after a certain length of time – is a win-win situation for both source and destination countries. It would be a cause for alarm if such migration were to cease. —

# I AM STRONG, I AM WOMAN

**Whether at work or on the move in search of a better life, women are threatened by violence and discrimination. But as with all migrants – and all women – female migrants should not be seen primarily as victims. Above all, they need stronger rights so that they can defend themselves.**

**W**omen and girls may be affected by migration or flight in special ways. When their partners and fathers leave, they are often left behind in their home countries in the most difficult circumstances. If they themselves set off on the road, they may be subjected to physical and psychological violence at every stage of their migration or flight, simply because of their gender.

A particular group of perpetrators is often blamed for violence against women: the traffickers. The media often refer to their cruelty and the assaults they commit – reports that are used to justify tougher action against them. But in fact, women are often subject to violence from

many different sides. A key factor is the existence of borders, and the male border agents who control them.

However, migrating or fleeing women and girls should not be seen only as victims. They are engaged in a struggle for freedom and independence for themselves and for others. They play strong roles as breadwinners of their families, want to assert their rights and seek to shape a new life for themselves.


Male-dominated social structures may influence migration decisions. For example, a male family head may decide that a woman should go off in search of work because she has a chance to earn more than her male relatives. On the other hand, a woman may be denied the chance to seek a job elsewhere because she does not have the same freedoms as men.

Despite the barriers, more women than ever before are on the move. Nearly half – 48 percent – of international migrants are women, and they make up half of all refugees. But the proportions vary widely from place to place. In Indonesia, the Philippines and Sri Lanka, the majority of emigrants are women. Until 2009, women in Myanmar were not allowed to work abroad. In 2014, they still accounted for just 20 percent of such migrants, according to official statistics. In Thailand, where traditionally few women emigrate for work, they also make up just one-fifth of migrants.

Emigrants are poorly protected by labour laws. Employers often confiscate their workers' passports. Finding work in a foreign land often incurs high costs – such as for private job-placement services and travel, which worker must first pay off. Women workers may also be at risk of sexual exploitation.

Nevertheless, women are increasingly taking control of where they go and what they do, for example by deciding how much they send back home to their families as remittances, and what the money is used for. This general process is known as the “feminization of migration”. Although women on average earn just 80 percent of what men earn, migrant female workers often send back a larger proportion of their income to their home country.

But the active aspects of female mobility get little attention. Women refugees in particular are portrayed as passive, leading automatically to the question of how best to protect them. The UN Refugee Agency and nongovernment organizations have many guidelines. In addition,




*Very different migration patterns in a single region reflect different motives and triggers for moving*



## MIGRANT WOMEN WORK MORE

Employment of migrant and locally born women by region, aged 15 years and above, and equivalent global figures for women and men, 2017, in percent



© ATLAS OF MIGRATION / ILO

there are legally binding rules such as the Istanbul Convention – the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence – along with provisions of the European Union’s Reception Conditions Directive.

Germany has seen few legal efforts to meet the special needs of female refugees. An exception was the Immigration Law of 2004, which recognizes female-specific reasons for flight. In 2015, the German Institute for Human Rights warned that women’s needs for protection were scarcely considered in refugee accommodation, although violence against women had been a major international issue for more than 20 years. Basic essentials were lacking – and still are: clean, separate washrooms, protection from conflict with men, and access to information specially for women. Plans to protect the residents of refugee accommodation that take women’s needs into account have been made since 2016. But these new projects often have a very narrow focus on especially vulnerable people, such as women travelling alone with their children. They offer very little in the way of dealing with the wider problems of refugee life.

The one-sided focus on protection and vulnerability


*In many sectors, it is mainly female migrants who are forced into work by traffickers and their clients*

*In the Middle East, domestic workers and nannies make life comfortable for many in the middle and upper classes. But too many are paid miserly wages*

rather than on the strengths of refugee women supports the idea that they need to be rescued. They could do without being portrayed as victims. What women need is not just effective protection, but the same rights as everyone else. —

## MODERN SLAVERY

Share of women among the victims of trafficking by economic sector, 2005–15, in percent



e.g., for hospitality, 82 percent of all trafficking victims in the hospitality industry are female

© ATLAS OF MIGRATION / IOM

# DOCUMENTS FOR THE UNDOCUMENTED

**Immigration laws focus mainly on attracting skilled workers and keeping everyone else out. But they lag far behind the real world: millions of workers live and work in destination countries without any official papers. That puts them at risk of exploitation.**

Immigration laws are national rules that try to control migration. They specify who may reside in a country, under what conditions, and for how long. Germany, for example, adopted a residence law in 2005 with the full title “Act on the Residence, Employment and Integration of Foreigners in Germany”, which is supposed to regulate and limit immigration. The entry of citizens from Member States of the European Union is governed by a separate law, the Freedom of Movement Act. In the debate over migration control, the phrase “immigration law” has become established as a collective term for ideas that entail more legal migration.

Canada’s system is often seen as a model; its immigration legislation is regarded as liberal. Canada has set


itself the goal of significantly increasing its immigrant numbers. It uses a points system that purports to measure the apparent usefulness of potential migrants for the Canadian economy. Would-be migrants get points for their education, professional experience, language skills and age. Australia, Austria, New Zealand and the United Kingdom also have similar points systems.

With a population of around 37 million, Canada attracted 286,000 immigrants in 2017. Some 160,000 used the points system as their entry ticket. For Germany with its larger population, this would correspond to 358,000 immigrants per year. In reality, the German authorities issued just 130,000 residency permits, of which only 50,000 went to people who had moved to Germany in that year. Foreigners often find it difficult to come to Germany to work, even though, according to the Ministry of the Interior, it is among the countries with “the fewest restrictions on the immigration of skilled and highly qualified workers”.

The term “immigration law” results from liberal positions in Germany’s migration law. This prioritizes qualified workers. Despite their many differences, Canada’s “economic classes” approach, Germany’s residence law and many other immigration laws around the world all have something in common: they are primarily concerned with labour migration. When countries realize that they have a shortage of skilled labour they loosen entry restrictions for “useful” workers.

Just who is considered useful depends on how valuable his or her skills are deemed for the country’s economy, and, as a result, for its society. If the applicant’s skills are valuable enough, any presumed disadvantages associated with his or her arrival are regarded as acceptable. As a rule, immigration laws do not exist to grant rights to new residents, but to separate attractive from unattractive immigrants. Germany, for example, maintains a list of around 50 occupations where there is a shortage of workers: in skilled trades, manufacturing and the care professions. Workers with the right training can come into the country, and young people can get the vocational training they need there.


After years of discussion, the German government adopted a draft “Immigration Act for Skilled Workers”,



*Economists and liberal market politicians tend to see migration from an economic point of view. Migrants’ rights take second place*

## THE UN MIGRATION PACT

Votes on the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration,  
UN General Assembly, 19 December 2018



which drops the list of desired occupations and instead merely requires applicants have vocational training. But as its name implies, this proposed law aims to attract economically useful people to Germany. The law will probably still not open up the frequently demanded window that allows people whose asylum applications have been rejected to reside in Germany legally if they have a job.

Around the world, labour migration does not occur only with the right papers and stamps. Many migrant workers arrive in other ways, unofficially and uncontrolled, with a student visa or without an entry permit. They work nonetheless, often in poor conditions. The construction, catering and farming industries in many countries rely on migrant workers in precarious official circumstances.

In the United States, around 11 million people live and work without a residence permit. To reduce the competition for wages and to push up the tax take, some countries have repeatedly carried out legalization campaigns. In Spain, undocumented migrants can get a work permit if they are employed in a job that is subject to social security contributions. Within a space of 15 years, Italy pushed through five legalization measures to combat the shadow economy. In 2002 alone, 650,000 immigrants were granted the right to stay.


*In construction, gastronomy and farming – illegal migrants can find work in such jobs but at miserable wages... until the authorities hunt them down*

*Right-wing governments around the world reject even the tiniest steps towards recognizing the human rights of migrants*

Legalization attempts are not confined to the developed world. In 2012, Morocco set itself a migration agenda, launching its first legalization campaign in 2013. This gave 14,000 unofficial migrants a residence permit. Another campaign followed in 2016. But fewer people were legalized than the government had expected: Morocco cannot compete with Europe, the powerful magnet just across the Mediterranean. —

## IN DEMAND AND IN DANGER

Persons staying illegally in the European Union,  
by country of origin, 2018



differences due to rounding

© ATLAS OF MIGRATION / FRONTEx

## OUT OF BOUNDS

**In its attempts to control migration, the EU bribes or coerces African countries to stop and detain people before they can even get to the southern shore of the Mediterranean. Development aid is being diverted to stop migrants rather than fight poverty.**


**T**he external boundaries of the European Union have expanded beyond its own territory. The EU is pushing its border guards further and further away from Europe itself. Today, countries deep in the Sahara or the Middle East are cooperation partners in Europe's "migration management". Just a few years ago, the EU only monitored its own external border; now it is increasingly targeting the transit and origin countries of migrants. People who don't have an entry permit are deterred from even trying to reach Europe.

While it wants to keep freedom of movement within the Schengen area, Europe is making sure that the same freedom is restricted in Africa. It is turning its neighbours, near and far, into auxiliary policemen. With detention camps, deterrence campaigns, forgery-proof passports for Africa and military aid, the long arm of Europe's border service stands in the way of migrants thousands of kilometres away from Europe's shores.

One method of payment is to fork out generous dollops of classical development assistance, tied to the condition that refugees are stopped or taken back. Between 2000 and 2015, European states and the EU itself have paid or approved some 3 billion euros to African governments to combat migration. As the Balkans became established as the main route for Syrian refugees between Turkey and Germany, the EU tried to conclude a major multilateral agreement with Africa to control migration.


It was not successful at first, but the EU persevered. It set up a 4.1-billion-euro Emergency Trust Fund for Africa and paid up to 6 billion euros to Turkey. Another 4.1 billion went to an External Investment Plan for economic development in Africa. Here too, addressing "the root causes of irregular migration" is one of the goals. In total, in the past 19 years the EU has approved at least 15 billion euros to ensure that refugees and irregular migrants stay where they are. In November 2017, European Parliament president Antonio Tajani called for an incredible 40 to 50 billion euros to be pumped into Africa between 2020 and 2026 – in part to stem the flow of migrants.

*New programmes have been created to give development projects an additional purpose – prevention of migration. For instance, the Emergency Trust Fund for Africa*



## SURVIVED AND ARRIVED

People in distress rescued from the central Mediterranean, by ownership of rescue vessel, persons per month



The EU is currently paying African governments for the extra costs that they incur to control migration. It covers the costs of food and tents for refugees detained in Sudan or Libya. It pays for jeeps or ships for the border police in Niger and the repatriation of deportees. EU money also goes to detention camps. But it gives even more, as a kind of bonus: an extra chunk of development aid.

For refugees, it is becoming ever harder to find a safe place to stay. And for migrant workers, it is becoming ever more dangerous to reach a place where they can start looking for a job. But those are not the only consequences. The more Europe tries to control migration, the harder it is for many Africans to move within their own continent, and even within their own country.

Some African states, including Tunisia, have made it a punishable offence to emigrate with the aim of applying for asylum in Europe. Libya does not even bother with such a law: it simply locks migrants up. Burkina Faso has set up checkpoints where none existed before. The Democratic Republic of Congo has introduced biometric passports that many of its citizens cannot afford. Morocco has agreed to take back deportees from Europe – even if they are not its own citizens. In Sudan, soldiers block migration routes, while Senegal even permits European officials to do this themselves. Algeria has closed its borders not just for migrants in transit, but also for its own citizens if they want to leave irregularly.

The money paid in return for controlling migration is increasingly being counted as development assistance. This constitutes the misappropriation of funds that are intended to alleviate poverty and need. It also contradicts the purpose of development assistance, because remittances that migrant workers send back home are a bless-

*Whether the governments the EU works with are democratic or not is of little importance when it comes to stopping migration*


*Between January 2016 and April 2018, 329,000 people were rescued in the central Mediterranean; 7,800 deaths were reported*

ing for poor countries. Civil society in Africa hardly realizes that development assistance and migration control are increasingly intertwined. On the whole, the negotiations take place in secret.

In its new Partnership Framework of 2016, the EU has made cooperation in border controls a condition for assistance. It offers “a mix of positive and negative incentives” to encourage countries to cooperate with the EU and to ensure consequences for those that refuse to do so. Development aid has become a means of exerting pressure on some of the poorest countries in the world. —

## TASK-ORIENTED

Political activities of the European Border and Coast Guard Agency, Frontex, outside the EU, selected, 2018





# UNPREPARED AND UNCOORDINATED

Europe's approach to the refugee question has been chaotic. Different countries have different interests, and refuse to compromise or show a sense of solidarity. But they all agree on policies making it harder for refugees to get asylum in the EU.

Europe's migration and border policies go back to the 1980s. At their core are two treaties, both signed in 1990. The first, the Schengen Convention, abolished internal border controls within the EU. The second, the Dublin Regulation, came into force in 1997; it determines which country is responsible for processing asylum applications. "Dublin" became the heart of the Common European Asylum System, established in 2003, which aimed to harmonize asylum laws within the EU.

The idea behind the Dublin Regulation is to avoid multiple asylum applications in various EU member states. Various criteria were set to determine which member is responsible for a particular application, such as the coun-


try where the applicant first set foot in the EU, or family ties in a member state. A decision is then taken. Refugees cannot simply choose in which country they would prefer to apply for asylum.

It quickly emerged that in the overwhelming majority of cases, the country-of-entry criterion was applied – especially after 2005, when the fingerprints of all individuals apprehended during an irregular border crossing or persons who had applied for asylum were recorded in the EURODAC database. This makes it possible to quickly identify which country is responsible for processing the persons and the individuals concerned can then be deported to that country.

As a result, because the main escape routes to Europe – across the Aegean and the central Mediterranean – lead to Greece and Italy, these two countries found themselves responsible for the vast majority of asylum procedures in the first decade of the millennium. Instead of a harmonized European asylum system that offered asylum seekers similar conditions, the asylum standards in the EU began to diverge. The southern countries were overwhelmed, and asylum seekers there often had to survive on the streets, while the number of asylum procedures in the northern countries fell sharply. In Germany, the number of asylum applications fell from just under 140,000 in 1999 – 95,000 initial and 43,000 subsequent applications – to less than 20,000 in 2007. The bureaucracy-heavy Dublin system did not work well even then, although relatively few asylum seekers were arriving.

Things changed in 2011. The European border authorities had increasingly relied on cooperation with North African governments. The revolutions of the Arab Spring largely put an end to this cooperation, and the border controls in the Mediterranean temporarily collapsed. At the same time, the number of violent conflicts around the world increased, pushing more refugees towards Europe. And courts began to enforce the human rights of refugees. Immediate deportations back across the Mediterranean without due procedure were banned, as were Dublin-based deportations to Greece, where the people involved were being ill-treated.

The effectiveness of Dublin system worsened. South-



*The wars in Yugoslavia, the Persian Gulf and Syria produced peaks in the numbers of asylum seekers*

## THE GREAT EXCLUSION

The Schengen Area  
and its neighbours, 2019

□ Boundary of the Schengen Area  
(no checks at internal borders,  
with temporary exceptions)

In Schengen Area:  
■ EU member states  
■ Non-EU members

Outside Schengen Area:  
■ EU member states  
■ West Balkans (no visa required  
with biometric passport,  
Kosovo: visa required)  
■ Eastern Europe and  
non-European countries  
(visa required for entry)

AL: Albania, AT: Austria, BA: Bosnia and Herzegovina, BE: Belgium, BG: Bulgaria, CH: Switzerland, CY: Cyprus, CZ: Czech Republic, DE: Germany, DK: Denmark, EE: Estonia, ES: Spain, FI: Finland, FR: France, GR: Greece, HR: Croatia, HU: Hungary, IE: Ireland, IT: Italy, LI: Liechtenstein, LT: Lithuania, LU: Luxembourg, LV: Latvia, ME: Montenegro, MK: North Macedonia, MT: Malta, NL: Netherlands, NO: Norway, PL: Poland, PT: Portugal, RO: Romania, RS: Serbia, SE: Sweden, SI: Slovenia, SK: Slovakia, UK: United Kingdom, XK: Kosovo

ern member states avoided taking the fingerprints of new arrivals. They knew that most asylum seekers would make their way north anyway. Increasing numbers of refugees resisted being deported or successfully filed complaints in the courts.

In 2015, in the “summer of migration”, the system collapsed. Hundreds of thousands of people, mainly from Syria, sought a route from Turkey into Greece. From there they came via the so-called “Balkan route” into the heart of the EU. The Union was unprepared and reacted in an uncoordinated way. The longstanding contradictions between its member states and institutions were laid bare. In September 2015, an increasing number of EU members reintroduced border controls. In February 2016, Austria enforced the closure of the Balkan route at all EU border crossings. The controls were still in force in 2019. The Schengen freedom of movement, which does away with systematic identity checks at the border, has since been on standby mode in many locations.

The lowest common denominator in the EU has since been to shift migration controls back into Turkey and Africa. In “hotspot centres” along the Greek and Italian

*Defending Europe against people fleeing poverty and war: free movement within the EU goes hand in hand with beefed-up security at its external borders*

coasts, Frontex (the European Border and Coast Guard Agency) and the European Asylum Support Office sort the arrivals, denying many access to the asylum system, and sending them back.

In the argument about the reforms needed in European asylum law, unity exists on just one issue: that conditions for asylum seekers should be made more difficult. The main point of dispute is how to distribute asylum seekers in a more equitable way across the EU. Some states, including Hungary and Poland, refuse in principle to accept asylum seekers, while Italy demands solidarity from other EU members and at the same time torpedoes efforts to rescue people from the Mediterranean. The points of contention give rise to the impression of a clash between the different approaches to dealing with the international flow of refugees. But the various sides differ only in their wishes as to how repressive migration policies should be. —

# DEATHS IN THE DESERT

**Europe's southern border is the deadliest in the world. Thousands of people have drowned trying to reach the northern shore of the Mediterranean. They are now dying of thirst in the Sahara.**

**T**he United Nations Migration Organization IOM began keeping track of how many people die while fleeing or at international borders in 2014. By no means are all deaths counted: the number of unreported cases is likely to be high. According to various counts, an estimated 4,685 to 4,736 people died in 2018. The deaths were unevenly distributed across regions.

In all of Asia, home to two-thirds of the world's population, the IOM noted just 186 deaths. In the Americas it was 589, including those on the border between Mexico and the USA, where brutal, criminal gangs operate the trafficking business. But 2,299 cases were registered in and around the Mediterranean. No border in the world is more deadly than Europe's border. At the same time, no sea is more closely monitored than the Mediterranean.

Legal regulations such as Germany's Residence Act are also responsible for making Europe's borders so dangerous. Section 63 of this law states "that a carrier may


only transport foreigners into Germany if they are in possession of a required passport and a required residence title". All other EU member states have similar requirements. As a result, bus and coach companies, ferry operators and airlines check passengers' passports and visas before they are allowed on board. If the companies fail to do this, they may face hefty fines and risk losing their licences.

Refugees are automatically turned away. They cannot simply board a ferry or plane to cross the Mediterranean. So instead of booking a crossing with the ferry from Tunis to Palermo for 35 euros, they pay a four-figure sum to people smugglers' so that they can clamber aboard a rubber dinghy on the Libyan coast. In 2018, more than 5 percent of those who attempted such a journey across the central Mediterranean drowned before they reached their destination.

In 2014, at the instigation of the EU, the Italian search and rescue mission "Mare Nostrum" was suspended after just one year of operation. In the following years, European civil society groups put together a fleet of private vessels that rescued tens of thousands of people from the sea and brought them to Italy. But because the EU and its member states still refused to accept some of these refugees, the Italian justice system and then the government of Malta took action against the rescue workers. They were charged, most of their ships were put out of operation, and their permits were withdrawn. By 2019, hardly any rescuers remained.

The number of unreported deaths is rising, because many accidents go undocumented. The criminalization of private rescue missions has unsettled commercial shipping. Merchant vessels are required to sail to the locations of accidents and save people in need. But cases are being reported of commercial vessels choosing other routes to avoid having to comply with this obligation. Many captains fear that with castaways on board they will be refused permission to dock at any European port, and their owners will have to pay contractual penalties for delays in the voyage.

Migration controls have had deadly consequences in the Sahara. In 2015, Italy and the EU tried to set up EUNAVFOR MED, an anti-trafficking military mission, in Libya. But Libya's rulers refused to allow the EU to operate on its territory. As a result, its southern



*Without the "Mare Nostrum" rescue operation and privately funded rescue missions, many more people would have drowned. Italy ended "Mare Nostrum" in 2014*




## ROADS TO GO DOWN

Phases in the EU's migration policies, and deaths of migrants registered by the network United for Intercultural Action


Before the unification of the EU's asylum policies (Seville summit)

1 Jul 1998–30 Jun 2002




From the Seville summit to cooperation with African coastal states

1 Jul 2002–30 Jun 2006




After start of more intensive controls by the border security force Frontex

1 Jul 2006–30 Apr 2009




During planning of border security service Eurosur

1 May 2009–25 Oct 2012




Until end of Italian rescue operation "Mare Nostrum"

26 Oct 2012–31 Oct 2014



Since start of Frontex operation "Triton" and afterwards

1 Nov 2014–1 Apr 2019



neighbour, Niger, became a focus of Europe's migration controls.

Niger's government saw an opportunity to receive financial aid from Brussels. It passed a law in 2015, prohibiting the transport and accommodation of migrants in the northern part of the country. Violations would be subject to fines and up to 30 years in prison. The Nigerian government put the law into effect after a visit by Germany's Chancellor, Angela Merkel, in the autumn of 2016. President Mahamadou Issoufou demanded a billion euros in return for cooperation: he received the money a year later.

By the end of 2018, the army and the police had arrested 213 drivers and confiscated 52 vehicles north of Agadez, a desert city in northern Niger. As a result, many people who relied on the transport industry lost their livelihoods. At first, the EU agreed to pay compensation. But by the end of 2018, only one in 20 of the once over 6,500 drivers and hostel operators had received a sum of around 1,500 euros so they could start a new life.

According to the EU, Niger's migration policies have cut the number of migrants in transit by a massive 95 per-

*The stricter the checks at sea get, the riskier the methods people use to get into the EU – with fatal consequences*

cent. But exactly how many people still cross the Sahara is unclear. To avoid the military checkpoints, the smugglers choose longer, more dangerous routes away from the main trails. The risk of accidents has increased. No one knows how high the death toll is. According to IOM estimates, around 30,000 migrants have met their deaths in the Sahara, including thousands who were forced to walk through the desert from Algeria to the border with Niger since 2014. The public prosecutor's office in the centrally located city of Agadez claims to have counted just 84 deaths in 2016 and 2017.

The Sahara is too vast to ever track down all the deaths. And even if corpses are found, they are often buried without their identity being clarified or their relatives informed. In December 2017, Vincent Cochetel, a leading diplomat with the UN Refugee Agency, said that more people now die in the Sahara than in the Mediterranean. But nobody is even counting them. —

# GOODBYE AND DON'T COME BACK

**Faced with deportation, a distressing number of asylum applicants kill themselves in their desperation. Deporting someone is a lot more expensive than allowing them to stay, earn a living and pay taxes in their host country.**

If an asylum application is rejected, the applicant is given a short amount of time to leave the country. After that, the authorities can resort to measures such as deportation. This is one of the harshest actions a state can take against the wishes of an individual. The person may be interned before he or she is deported. Under some circumstances, individuals can be deprived of their liberty for up to 18 months in the EU.

Between 2000 and 2017, Germany deported 314,000 people. In 2018, it was just under 24,000, or an average of 65 people a day. The largest number of people affected came from southeastern Europe: from Albania (3,400 people), Kosovo (2,700) and Serbia (2,400). Within the EU, asylum seekers are often deported to the country they first set foot in, and where they are required to process their asylum claim. In 2017, Germany deported or transferred around 4,400 individuals to Italy, 1,200 to Poland, and

540 to France. Some of these people were then immediately further deported, either to their country of origin or to another country they had transited through.

A deportation is not just a harmless administrative exercise. Deaths occur repeatedly – though governments do not keep a central record of these. The Dutch nongovernment organization United for Intercultural Action attempts to document such cases across Europe. Between 1994 and 2018, it counted 139 deaths directly linked to deportations. These included suicides committed in detention centres while awaiting deportation. The number of unreported cases is thought to be much higher.


Frequently carried out at night and without warning, deportations can generate a great deal of anxiety. Those affected are torn away from their familiar environment – even if they are at school or in hospital. The deportations are often met with resistance. Classmates, colleagues, friends, doctors, neighbours and other refugees in the same accommodation protest loudly, and sometimes successfully.

A deportation cannot always be carried out. For instance, if the person's passport is missing, if the person has an illness that would be aggravated by the deportation or that cannot be treated in his or her home country. Pregnant women are in principle protected, but cases often occur where police turn a blind eye and deport the expectant mother and unborn child, exposing both to major health risks. If rejected applicants cannot be deported, they often are granted a "tolerated" status. In mid-2018, around 181,000 people living in Germany had this status. Over 33,000 had been in this situation for more than six years. They live in constant fear of being picked up and taken to the airport.

Some families have children who were born and are growing up in the host country. They have little or no connection to the country they are being sent to. Between 1999 and 2008, nearly 22,000 people, most of them Roma, were deported from Germany to Kosovo. Another 15,000 people followed between 2009 and 2013, according to the Roma Center, a nongovernment organization. These people had found refuge in Germany in the 1990s during the Balkan wars. Many had children in their new homes. The Roma Centre assumes that 60 to 70 percent of the people deported were children for whom Kosovo was completely new.


## LESS THAN HALF MAKE IT THROUGH

Approved and rejected asylum applications in the EU, 2009 to 2018, and results of appeal proceedings 2018, in thousands



© ATLAS OF MIGRATION / EUROSTAT

*Around one-third of appeals against rejected asylum applications are granted. This shows the unreliability of initial court decisions*



*A snapshot from early 2018 shows the main places that migrants are sent to if they do not leave of their own accord*

There are often demands for tougher deportation laws against people who commit crimes in their host country. Since 2016, the German government has deported such individuals to Afghanistan, a country where they face serious dangers. But a constitutional state has criminal law to deal with offenders. Deporting offenders subjects them to a double punishment.

Despite everyone's right to have state-imposed measures reviewed by an independent court with the help of a lawyer, complaints against deportation orders are often denigrated or impeded through legal means, such as through the EU Return Directive of 2008. One German government minister even coined the derogatory term "anti-deportation industry" – a phrase that was named the German "non-word of 2018".

EU member states deported a total of 214,000 people in 2017. These figures have remained more or less constant since 2010. Today, deportations are more rigorously enforced than they were in the past. In the autumn of 2016, Angela Merkel, the German Chancellor, announced

a "national effort" to this end. The deportation of mentally ill individuals had already been simplified. Since 2015, authorities are no longer allowed to inform the people involved when their "tolerated" status has expired.

In 2017, the so-called return rate in the EU (the number of voluntary or forced departures compared to the number of people instructed to leave) was 36 percent. The European Border and Coast Guard Agency (Frontex) aims to increase this percentage. It has been granted new powers to pay for and carry out deportations independently. It can already draw on a pool of 690 "return experts": officials who specialize in deportations. EU member states can get Frontex funds to finance deportations. Depending on the destination and the number of police accompanying the deportee, a deportation may cost tens of thousands of euros. —

# ARRIVED AND SETTLED, BUT STILL NOT HOME

**Well-integrated migrants are the ideal and many in the host society welcome them. However, migrants that are not integrated are perceived as a threat. But focusing on “integration” means ignoring the real issue, which is granting migrants social and political rights.**

**J**obs are the key to integration.” This has been frequently heard since the peak of migrant arrivals in Europe in 2015. Employment services, many political parties and many trade unions agree. But the recent history of migration shows that there is no correlation between migrants having jobs and their political and social rights.

Take Germany as an example. During the 1950s and 60s, the West German government promoted the immigration of “guest workers” from southern Europe and Turkey. In 1961, 700,000 foreigners lived and worked in Germany; by 1974 it was four million. Many West German factories would have stood idle if had it not been for these workers. At the time, most of the workers held a foreign passport. Two-thirds of them lived in dormitories and were treated as second-class citizens. As unemployment rose, the government imposed a recruitment freeze in 1973 and tried to entice workers to return home. But many chose to stay, and brought their families and friends to Germany.

Today, there are over 10 million people living in Germany who do not hold a German passport. Their contributions to Germany’s “economic miracle” after the Second World War and today’s prosperity go unrecognized. Many are deprived social and political rights, such as the right to vote. Instead, they are judged according to how well or badly they have integrated themselves into German society. The idea of integration is being used for political ends: it implies that migrants somehow bring a deficit with them, and it is up to them to compensate for this by complying with the norms of the dominant culture, by acknowledging particular values, by learning the German language, and much more.

Other voices say that integration is a task for both sides. And the government’s integration policies may open up new opportunities for migrants. But the central idea of integration is to justify discrimination against migrants by pointing to their apparent differences, and

to reinterpret “equality” as a question of adaptation. It is clear who must shoulder the blame: those who are discriminated against are responsible for the discrimination, and it is up to them to reduce it.

This opinion is reflected in the labour market in Germany. In 2015, around 36 percent of full-time workers who did not hold German citizenship worked in the low-wage sector, earning less than 10 euros an hour. For German citizens, it was just half as many. Germans earned an average of 21.5 percent more than foreigners. Between 150,000 and 300,000 Eastern European and Middle Eastern women have undocumented jobs as live-in domestic workers in private households: they care for family members, clean, cook and live with the families that employ them.

A statement by Horst Seehofer, Germany’s current Minister of the Interior, shows how racist the prevailing understanding of integration is. In 2011, he said his Christian Social Union would “resist until the last bullet”, in order to stop immigration into the welfare system. But immigration always includes the social system. Liberal economists know this: they calculate that the German economy needs an annual intake of 146,000 immigrants from outside the EU – every year until 2060. Pretty much every one of these people will pay taxes and social security.

In 2017, the employment rate of German citizens was over 70 percent; among immigrants from other EU countries it was four percentage points higher. Labour market researchers forecast that after five years, half of all current refugees in Germany will have found work. Fifteen years after their arrival, 75 percent will have done so.


That means, though, that many of the hundreds of thousands of people who arrived in Germany in 2015 will have to survive on social security for a long time to come – as opponents of migrants like to point out. But this presents a skewed picture of the economic role of migration.

For statutory health insurance providers, immigrants relieve and stabilize their balance sheets. Most of the migrants are young. They tend to incur lower health costs than the average client, and they slow down the rise in the average age of the insured. Pension funds say that foreign workers from EU countries contribute the same amount as German citizens, and positively influence the income situation of state-run pension funds. Foreigners are thought to have contributed around one-


## A NEW SOURCE OF CHEAP LABOUR

Foreigners on the German labour market and the danger of a job downgrade


Proportion of foreigners among 15- to 75-year-olds, by nationality, in percent



Employees paying social insurance contributions in the top seven job categories, by nationality



Job levels of refugees before and after arrival, 18 to 65-year-olds, by gender, percent, 2017



tenth of the 2.2 percent economic growth experienced in 2017: without them, many job vacancies would have remained unfilled.

In other words, economists say that migrants contribute to both public health services and overall prosperity. Their significance to the German economy is undisputed. But claims of “poor integration” and slogans like “until the last bullet” mean this: racism and right-wing political rhetoric are not necessarily aimed at cutting migration.

*Getting migrants into the labour market is not enough. Their qualifications have to be recognized and they need further education and training*

Rather, they aim to deprive migrants of their rights and to render their work and their achievements invisible: exploitation is OK, recognition is out. The response to this is not integration policy, but the granting of social and political rights. Those are the real keys to integration. —



# MISPLACED FEARS, FALSE PROMISES

Right-wing politics is on the rise across the globe. Rabble-rousers blame outsiders and minorities for the shortcomings of their own societies. Even if they do not win power, the noise they make still influences the political agenda of more moderate parties.


It matters not a jot whether people are fleeing war and misery, are looking for work, want to settle permanently, or are members of a minority that has been in the country for ages: nationalist movements constantly drum up fears that their “homeland is being threatened” or “alienated” by outsiders. They portray flight and migration as threats to existence.

This account is one of the basic narratives of racism. It serves to close the ranks of an allegedly old-established

society against intrusion by people who do not belong, thus preserving the health and purity of a homogenous people and its culture. That such a pure, isolated population or nation no longer exists in the modern world, and perhaps never existed, does not bother the right-wing demagogues.

They also spread the myth of the impending invasion of “millions of people who might set off at any moment”, and in doing so would spread dangerous, infectious diseases. This kind of stigmatization helps populists push for a turnaround, a system change, a final blow, against the “establishment parties”, the “corrupt system” and the “decadent elite”.

*In several countries, right-wing populists have created majorities that promote a policy of national isolation*



Such nonsense is part of the canon of similar movements across the globe – in the rich post-industrial world, in middle-income countries, and in the developing world. US President Trump labels a migrant caravan of a few thousand people from the poor countries of Central America towards the United States as a national security threat. The right-wing president of Brazil, Jair Bolsonaro, made a big deal of rejecting the United Nations migration pact. Propaganda against the Rohingya minority in Myanmar, already deprived of their basic rights, led to the expulsion of hundreds of thousands of them into neighbouring Bangladesh.


In Europe, authoritarian populist movements demonize migrants and other minorities as “invaders” out to destroy the culture of the nations where they live. An antisemitic notion of exploitative, traitorous elites comes into play here. The government wants to replace the native population and their high welfare standards with a cheap mass of workers, says the new-right author Renaud Camus in his book, “The Great Replacement”. These alleged plans for a repopulation are invoked by groups such as the right-wing Identitarian Movement, along with terrorists such as the attacker who massacred Muslim immigrants in Christchurch, New Zealand, in 2019. Right-wing populist campaigns against the adoption of the UN’s migration pact at the end of 2018 focused on the alleged plans by nefarious powers against the Western World.

Political utterances continue to roll back the boundaries of what is acceptable to say. The Italian Interior Minister, Matteo Salvini, describes refugees as “human meat”. A newspaper run by the right-wing populist Freedom Party of Austria, then part of the government, published a poem that compared migrants to rats and warned against a mixing of cultures. In 2018, the German Interior Minister, Horst Seehofer, declared migration to be the “mother of all problems”. After several serious crimes committed by immigrants, the Alternative für Deutschland, a right-wing authoritarian party, spoke of “knife immigration” and “barbaric, Muslim, gang-raping hordes of men”. Violence against women is painted as an imported problem brought into Germany by non-white males. Stirring up fears of immigration is cheap propaganda that has deadly consequences: the number of racially motivated attacks on refugees in Germany rose sharply after 2015.

Whether the rightist narratives gain traction and populists win political support depends also on the number of migrants who actually live in a country. But committed welcome initiatives also play a big role in countering such tendencies, as does a democratic political culture that rejects agitation against minorities. That can be seen in German states with a high proportion of migrants, such as Hamburg, Bremen and North Rhine-Westphalia. People there are much less likely to vote for right-wing parties than in states with fewer migrants – a phenomenon that can also be observed at a

## IMAGINARY ENEMY

Proportion of foreigners in population, 2015, and results of Alternative für Deutschland (right-wing party) in federal elections, by district, in percent



*What is true for whole countries is true within countries: in areas where many migrants live, right-wing populist slogans do not catch on well*

national level. Right-wing parties have been successful in the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Poland and the Baltic states in recent years, although relatively few refugees have made their way to these countries. Hungary’s anti-refugee premier, Viktor Orbán, started restricting human rights after he was elected in 2010 – but initially those of native Hungarians. —

# WHERE RIGHT IS WRONG

**Racism has a long and tragic history in Europe – and nowhere more so than in Germany. Alas, racism is alive and well 80 years after Nazism and the Holocaust, and is now directed at migrants as well as Jews. But resistance in broader society is growing.**

Racially motivated violence runs through German history, even after the Second World War, in both western and eastern parts of the country. It has hit Jews, Roma and Sinti, Afro-Germans, and immigrants from southern Europe and the developing world. Back in the 1960s there were attacks on the first “guest workers” from southern Europe. In 1973, Willy Brandt’s social-democratic government halted the recruitment of such workers because of concerns over high unemployment. Pressure rose on migrant communities to return home. But many of the migrants decided to stay; they started families and businesses, and became immigrants.

In 1982, Helmut Kohl’s newly elected conservative government planned to halve the number of Turkish citizens in Germany. Racist attacks occurred in the wake of the strong “Turks Out” mood that marked the 1980s. New right-wing extremist parties emerged, and rapidly growing skinhead and hooligan groups carried out the violence.


After the reunification of Germany in 1990, the violence increased further. By 2017, nearly 200 people had been killed in right-wing attacks – many of which were

classified by the authorities as non-political crimes. Most of the murders occurred in the 1990s: in 1992 alone, at least 24 people were killed. Without the resistance within the migrant communities and the strengthening of the antifascist movement, the numbers would probably have been higher.

Racist violence after 1989 was motivated by nationalism and was given a strong boost by German reunification. A period of pogroms began. In 1991, neo-Nazis and former workmates in Hoyerswerda, a town in Saxony in East Germany, attacked former contract workers from Mozambique, and then asylum seekers. Local residents greeted the attackers with applause. Instead of protecting the victims, the government of Saxony evacuated 240 of them, helping the racists achieve their goal of a “foreigner-free” town. The local district government announced that “the vast majority” of the residents had expressed their strong support for the violent acts. In 1992, right-wing youths in the Lichtenhagen district of Rostock in Mecklenburg–Western Pomerania tried to set fire to a building where over 100 former contract workers from Vietnam lived – to the applause of up to 3,000 onlookers. Only four of the hundreds of perpetrators were actually imprisoned – they served sentences of between two and three years.

In the eyes of many, media headlines such as “The boat is full” legitimized the use of violence. In 1993, the mainstream political parties – conservatives, social democrats and liberals – severely curtailed the right to asylum, pointing explicitly to racist violence. The youth-work approaches used at the time accepted young people as they were, in an attempt to wean them away from the far right. But in smaller towns, especially in the east, these approaches merely gave neo-Nazis control over youth clubs. This has allowed a climate of impunity to become entrenched among the radical right that is still present today. A wave of racist violence also hit former West Germany: a total of 18 people died in arson attacks in the towns of Mölln in 1992, Solingen in 1993 and Lübeck in 1996. Many more were injured.

At the end of the 1990s, a new generation of right-wing terrorists emerged, organized into networks such as “Blood & Honour”, which was, and still is, active throughout Germany and Europe. In Thuringia, in the east, a terrorist cell developed out of a Nazi group, “Thüringer Heimatschutz” (Thuringia Home Defence) which had been




*The number of attacks may be falling, but they still occur all over the country, and they may increase again at any time*



## A CULTURE OF VIOLENCE AND MURDER

Victims killed by right-wing violence since 1990 in Germany



led and financed by liaison officers of the government's domestic intelligence service. Between 2000 and 2007, members of this cell, the National Socialist Underground, murdered nine migrants and a policewoman, attempted another 43 murders, and committed a string of other attacks and assaults.

Until the cell revealed itself in 2011, the police and judiciary had suspected only the victims' relatives or survivors as possible perpetrators. These innocent people were monitored by the authorities, interrogated, unsettled by false information, and socially isolated. The relatives called the investigations an "attack after the attack" and saw themselves as victims of renewed violence. The press supported the switch in roles from victims to perpetrators: in their opinion the crimes issued from an integration-resistant, criminal, foreign subculture. The combination of neo-Nazis, politics, secret service, police, judiciary and media pitched racist interpretations of events right into the centre of society.

After the "migration summer" of 2015, racist violence reached new heights. In 2016, the Federal Police registered nearly 1,000 attacks on refugee accommodation

*Faded memories, superficial investigations, files destroyed long ago – many murders remain unresolved*

and more than 2,500 crimes against asylum seekers and refugees. In 2018, the situation escalated, as in Chemnitz, a city in Saxony, where migrants were hunted down. While the pogroms in Rostock and Hoyerswerda mainly involved young people, the middle-aged were now out on the streets. Yesterday's youth movement has given rise to a militant scene in Germany that can look back on almost 30 years of racist violence.

The pogroms of 1992 were met with demonstrations and candle-light vigils, and effective resistance came mainly from antifascists and the migrants themselves. A change in recent years, brought about by the arrival of thousands of refugees in 2015, led to the so-called "welcome culture" and demonstrations in 2018 with tens of thousands of participants, organized by groups including the nationwide alliance #unteilbar ("inseparable"), #ausgehetzt in Bavaria, and Welcome United. These movements are also the fruit of the struggles and debates in the 1990s. —

# LEARNING THE ROPES

**Migrants are often portrayed as helpless and in need of protection – or hopelessly divided along national, ethnic, linguistic and religious lines. That is far from the truth. In reality, they help each other when in need, and help those who come after them.**

**W**hen you arrive in a new country, you need someone to show you the ropes. You can usually get help from compatriots who have arrived before you. They provide accommodation, orientation, protection and sometimes work for those that follow them. This is true both for migrant workers as well as for political refugees: someone is almost always there. Social, economic and political structures and networks exist between countries of origin and destination that assist those who travel.

How migrants organize and support each other generally depends on the relationships and circumstances in their home countries. The traditional diaspora organizations helped each other out and advocated for new arrivals to be granted residence permits. Examples are the Kurds and the opponents of the Chilean dictator Augusto Pinochet who fled to Western Europe to escape violence or imprisonment.

A new refugee movement started in Germany in the 1990s. These refugees did not abandon their links to their home countries, but nor did they divide up by ethnici-

ty. They regarded their broader solidarity and the criticism of Germany's responsibility for the situation in their home countries as a means of continuing their opposition while in exile. The slogan of the Caravan for the Rights of Refugees, one of the groups founded during this period, was "We are here because you have destroyed our countries".


This changed again in 2012, with yet another new generation of the refugee movement. The refugees continued to address the causes of flight and spoke about the theft of raw materials, wars and climate injustice. But they did so with a view to the developing world as a whole, rather than their individual countries of origin: the right to stay should be correspondingly broad, they said.

Refugees in Germany achieved a string of improvements between 1994 and 2012, by organizing themselves and striking alliances with other civil society groups. Bans on employment were loosened and levels of social support were raised. Irregular migrant workers in Spain achieved similar gains. Irregular migration usually entails irregular work: risky and subject to wage fraud, repression and the use of force, as in the agricultural sector in southern Spain. Since the 1990s, the often-undocumented workers in the vegetable plantations of Andalusia have come together in the trade union SOC-SAT, and have been able to make considerable improvements in their situation, prevent termination of their employment, and secure higher wages.


Collective political action is often the most important goal of migrants' organizations. In the US, millions

## ISOLATED AND UNDER CONTROL

Foreigners in East Germany by nationality, 1989



*Contract workers in East Germany stayed for just a few years. They were segregated, had little contact with Germans and were not permitted to form organizations*



downed their tools on 1 May 2006 to protest the tightening of immigration laws. Many restaurants and businesses run by immigrants stayed closed. The same happened on 1 March 2010 in Europe, when thousands of migrants in Italy and France went on strike under the motto “24 hours without us”.

The conflicts in the US and Europe are the same. Western societies are sealing off their social systems. But they still need cheap labour and employ migrants as cleaners, carers, construction workers and farmhands, all of whom are largely denied any social and political rights.

Forms of collective solidarity are to be found everywhere along migration routes, and where migrant flows pause. Informal networks of people who help each other in everyday life have formed in places like the woods of Nador in Morocco, where many Africans wait for the chance to get into the Spanish exclave of Melilla. Networks also form in places where people are forced to return. For instance, refugees from central African countries, deported from Spain to Mali in West Africa who are too deeply in debt to go back to their home villages, where they fear being branded as failures. In Bamako, the capital of Mali, they founded ARACEM, an association to improve their situation, which is extremely precarious in terms of accommodation, food and medical and psycho-social support.

*The “caravans” of migrants from Central America began getting a lot of attention only after the Mexican border became a major political issue in the USA*

Togolese migrants had similar problems after they were deported from Europe when a particularly repressive phase of the ruling Eyadéma clan ended in the late 1990s. They founded the Association of Deported from Togo, or ATE, to find practical ways to deal with the failure of their migration project. Today they advise young Togolese who have been flown back from Libyan internment camps in chartered planes without their ever having set foot in Europe or having had a chance to earn money there.

Sometimes relatives form alliances because this is the last chance they have to find out what has happened to their lost children. In Tunisia it is the mothers of the “Harraga”, the young North Africans who wanted to cross the Mediterranean and have not been heard from since. In Mexico, on 14 May 2018, the “Caravan of Mothers of Missing Migrants” went along part of the Mexican migration route, searching for news of their children in twelve states. At a summit in Mexico City at the end of 2018, the mothers and other relatives from Latin America and Africa discussed how to obtain information and the right to search for their sons and daughters who have disappeared. —

# A COUNTERWEIGHT TO XENOPHOBIA

**Refugees not only have rights; they also enrich the society and economy of the places where they settle. Enlightened local politicians recognize this. They provide a much-needed counterweight to the shrill tones of populists that call for yet more deportations.**

In the early summer of 2018, the new right-wing populist government of Italy ordered the country's ports to be closed to rescue ships belonging to nongovernment organizations. By doing so, it has put a stop to the civilian rescue missions in the central Mediterranean. In response, numerous leaders of European cities, including Barcelona, Berlin, Palermo and Naples, declared their jurisdictions to be cities of refuge. Naples has a deeply rooted tradition of solidarity, said the mayor, Luigi de Magistris.

Various networks of "solidarity cities" have been formed in Europe since 2015. The first such place in modern times was in fact a village. On 1 July 1998, a boat with 200 refugees landed near Riace, on the coast of Calabria in the "toe" of southern Italy. The refugees came from the Kurdish areas of Iraq, Syria and Turkey. At the time, Riace, a small commune with around 2,000 inhabitants, was in danger of turning into a ghost town, because ever more residents were moving away to bigger cities in Italy or abroad. The mayor, Domenico Lucano, welcomed the


refugees into his village and began to revitalize Riace. But in October 2018, the Italian authorities arrested him, accusing him of "facilitating illegal immigration". Though he has since been released from custody, he was barred from entering Riace for several months. His trial began in April 2019.

A model for the European networks may be the 500-plus North American "Sanctuary Cities". This movement, which includes Toronto, Los Angeles, New York as well as many other cities and rural districts, developed in the 1980s. Spurred by the protests of refugees from the wars in Central America, a number of mayors and city governments forbade their local authorities and police from cooperating with federal immigration officials in Washington. This made, and continues to make, deportations considerably more difficult.


Some local authorities are concerned about much more than merely protecting people from being deported. Cities such as New York and San Francisco issue their own municipal identify papers, so-called "city IDs". They make it easier for people without regularized residence status to deal with the local authorities, for example to register their children at a public school or sign a rental contract. But since President Trump took office in 2016, these cities have been under political pressure. The Trump Administration repeatedly threatens to cut off their funding if they refuse to cooperate with the authorities in pursuing and deporting undocumented individuals.

In Europe, the cities that offer solidarity and refuge are mainly in the United Kingdom, Germany, Switzerland and around the Mediterranean. Some of them are members of "Solidarity Cities", a network of European municipal governments. The network is not an activist initiative, it is a political forum. The members are mainly port cities such as Barcelona, Naples, Palermo, Thessaloniki and Athens. The alliance demands that the European Commission increase funding for social infrastructure in those cities where, because of their geographic location, most refugees arrive or already live.

Grassroots activists are also doing all they can to support the solidarity cities. In 2017, refugee councils, migrant



*Solidarity Cities are an informal network in which European cities exchange views on local responses to the situation of refugees*



organizations, left-wing movements, urban NGOs, church groups and scientists in numerous German and Swiss cities called an alternative network into being. Its name, “Solidarity City” is almost identical. The various marine rescue missions provide international connections. The aims include the direct acceptance of refugees and a stop to deportations, as well as the wider democratization of urban life.

What initially appear to be two separate topics – EU border policies and social rights in cities – are in fact closely connected. Solidarity cities are experimenting with innovative ideas such as municipal IDs. They want to decouple the exercise of rights from citizenship. In doing so, they at least implicitly strengthen the right to international freedom of movement and seek to apply global social rights in the local political sphere. Not least, the solidarity cities create a democratic counterweight to the growing strength of right-wing populist parties in national governments in the EU.

This is especially clear in the Charter of Palermo, formulated by its mayor, Leoluca Orlando, in 2015. This charter has since been referred to by many solidarity cities in Europe. The Charter calls for the abolition of residence

*Half of the US population lives in “Sanctuary Cities” or in participating counties and states*

permits, and for civil and social rights to be linked to the place of residence instead of depending on a person’s official status. People should have an unconditional right to international mobility: “Everyone should instead be recognized as having the right to choose where to live, the right to live better and not to die”. —

*More and more cities, towns and districts are turning against Europe’s isolationist policies and want to provide safe havens for migrants*





# FROM SYMPATHY TO SOLIDARITY

Activists throughout Europe have long agitated for the rights of migrants and refugees. But their numbers were small – until the summer of 2015, when the influx of people across Europe’s borders stimulated an outpouring of sympathy, practical help, and political engagement.

Some called it the “refugee crisis”. Others were more positive, calling it the “long summer of migration”, a period that began when more than a million people crossed the borders of the European Union in 2015/16. Many of these new arrivals pushed on to reach the heart of the continent. They were met by a myriad of initiatives to support them. In Germany, the readiness to help was dubbed the “Willkommenskultur”, the “welcome culture”. The German migration researcher, Werner Schiffauer, estimates that by mid-2016, some 15,000 projects had been set up in Germany in connection with refugees, drawing in over five million people. Similar projects appeared in other countries in Europe.

The project members organized themselves in an attempt to provide the new arrivals with access to information, education, accommodation, health care, work and community life. According to a study by the Berlin Institute for Integration and Migration Research, or BIM,

their goal was to help others and smooth their way into a new life. Because of the situation in Syria, locals had a different attitude towards the new wave of refugees as compared with migrants in previous years. Volunteers over the age of fifty, in particular, had a greater-than-average understanding of war as a cause of flight, the study found.


Through their practical work and personal connections, many volunteers realized that asylum procedures could be very difficult, and what it meant for someone to leave their homeland and experience racism. Such realizations also transformed their feelings of solidarity and compassion for individual fates into critical opinions towards government migration and border-control policies. Many volunteers saw their commitment as an expression of their opposition to xenophobia: 90 percent of the volunteers questioned by BIM said they wanted to send a signal against racial discrimination.

A problem with the “welcome culture” was that the government withdrew from its responsibilities. Activist jumped in to fill the gaps – as in Berlin, the German capital, where assistance for the new arrivals was inadequate.

*For more than one-third of the volunteers in the many initiatives to help refugees, this was the first time they had ever become involved in civil society actions*

## MAJOR MOBILIZATION

Share of helpers in Germany who were not active elsewhere before their voluntary work with refugees



Allensbach-Umfrage, 2017

© ATLAS OF MIGRATION / ALLENSBACH



This was clearly recognizable to many of the helpers who accused the state of deliberate failure.

Politically motivated movements of solidarity with migrants had long existed on the left of the political spectrum. These activists expressed their fundamental criticism of global injustice via slogans and networks such as “No one is illegal”. They did not see migrants as passive victims, but as active political players who were ready to resist oppression. Many of the new activists found the allies they needed to hinder deportations in this anti-racist European scene. Back in 1999, the campaign “Deportation Class” had protested against deportation flights by Lufthansa, the German flag carrier.

The older generation of solidarity groupings was often at the forefront along the Balkan route during the long summer of migration. They organized accommodation, food and medical care, documented the force used by the police, and offered direct help for people to escape, for example during the “march of hope” from Hungary to Austria and Germany in September 2015. The march itself, however, was initiated and carried out mainly by the migrants themselves.

Since then, a close degree of cooperation has developed between the older and younger generations who show solidarity with the migrants. Since the refugee strikes and marches that began in 2012, and especially since the summer of migration in 2015, an increasing number of civil society groups have become involved. These are groups that were not necessarily on the left of the political spectrum, or were not regarded as being part of the “migrant-solidarity” scene. These included many churches, trade unions, schools and even companies that have taken political action to prevent deportations. They have been able to take advantage of strategies developed by political activists over several decades.

New forms of solidarity with migrants are also appearing around the Mediterranean. Since 2014, ships belonging to several nongovernmental organizations have managed to save tens of thousands of people from drowning. Governments have criminalized them for their actions. A big Europe-wide movement has formed in protest; surely, it insists, saving lives cannot be a crime. Together with the nongovernment organizations, emergency phone operators from Europe and Africa staff a hotline that people can call at any time of the day or night if they are in distress at sea. That makes it impossible for state actors such as the coastguard to ignore the refugees’ emergency calls.

Such direct interventions are expressions of a new, more radical form of solidarity. They transcend national boundaries and go beyond both humanitarian motives and aid for integration. —

*When Italy ended its rescue mission “Mare Nostrum” at the end of 2014, private rescue ships took over. Many were financed from Germany and Spain*

## SURVIVING ON DONATIONS

Ships of nongovernment organizations used for rescues at sea, with vessel length

### **Aquarius, 77 m**

(since August 2018 Aquarius 2), 2016–2018 chartered by SOS Méditerranée, over 10,000 people rescued

### **Bourbon Argos, 69 m** **Phoenix, 40 m**

*Bourbon Argos*: operated from 2015 to 2017 by MSF and Migrant Offshore Aid Station (MOAS, Malta); *Phoenix*: since 2014 for MOAS in the Mediterranean, since 2017 in the Bay of Bengal

### **VOS Hestia, 59 m**

from 2016 to 2018 in action as rescue ship of the NGO Save the Children, Berlin

### **Iuventa, 33 m**

2016/17 in action for “Jugend rettet”, Berlin

### **Minden, 23 m**

2016/17 in action for the nonprofit LifeBoat gGmbH, Hamburg

### **Open Arms, 37 m**

2017 to 2018 in action for the Spanish NGO Proactiva Open Arms

### **Aita Mari, 32 m**

since 2018 in operation in the Aegean for SMH, Spain

### **VOS Prudence, 75 m**

2017 deployed for Doctors Without Borders, Belgium

### **Mare Jonio, 37 m**

Observation vessel of Mediterranea Saving Humans, also rescue at sea

### **Sea-Eye, 26 m** **Alan Kurdi, 39 m**

*Sea-Eye*: 2015 to 2018 in service for the Sea-Eye Association, Regensburg; *Alan Kurdi*: since 2018 in service for Sea-Eye in cooperation with Proem-Aid, Spain, first as *Professor Albrecht Penck*

### **Seefuchs, 27 m** **Sea-Watch 3, 50 m**

*Seefuchs*: purchased 2017 by Sea-Eye, in service until 2018; *Sea-Watch 3*: purchased 2015 by Doctors Without Borders, Spain, and in service as *Dignity I*, taken over 2017 by Sea-Watch

### **Mare Liberum, 21 m**

2015 purchased as *Sea-Watch* by the Sea-Watch Association, Berlin, and used in the Mediterranean; handed over as *Mare Liberum* to the Mare Liberum Association, Berlin to observe coastguards in the Aegean

### **Lifeline, 32 m**

Purchased 2015 by the Sea-Watch Association, Berlin, and operated as *Sea-Watch 2*; sold 2016 to the NGO Mission Lifeline, Dresden, and used until 2018

Since summer 2018, political pressure has led to confiscations, flag withdrawals, port bans and threats of punishment against those responsible for ships; as a result, several operators have had to suspend or stop their rescue missions.

## AUTHORS AND SOURCES FOR DATA AND GRAPHICS

All online links were checked in June 2019. See page 2 for the websites where you can download a clickable PDF of this atlas.

### 10–11 HISTORY: CROSSING BORDERS, BREAKING BOUNDARIES by Jochen Oltmer

**p.10:** Adam McKeown, Global Migration 1846–1940, Journal of World History 15 (2004), p.165, slide 11, <https://bit.ly/2IgiRTA>. – **p.11:** uoregon.edu, Slave trade, <https://bit.ly/2JUJ7q1>, <https://bit.ly/2WFy4ae>. Voyages: The Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade Database, <https://bit.ly/2ZatfDr>, <https://bit.ly/2wJz7aB>. WHAP heritage, <http://bit.ly/2ERzBjn>.

### 12–13 MOBILITY: HOME AWAY FROM HOME by Wenke Christoph

**p.13:** International Migration Report 2017, Highlights, p.11, <http://bit.ly/2Zom6Fm>. ILO Global Estimates on International Migrant Workers, Results and Methodology, 2018, p.6 f., <http://bit.ly/2KICUCG>. Workbook UN MigrantStock\_2017, <http://bit.ly/2XpouFh>. ILO, *ibid.* p.XII.

### 14–15 MOTIVES: REASONS TO MOVE by Ramona Lenz and Sowmya Maheswaran

**p.14:** knomad.org, Bilateral Estimates of Migrant Stocks in 2017, <http://bit.ly/2JSoN8B>. – **p.15:** Universität Hamburg, Pressedienst 70/18, 5. 12. 2018, <http://bit.ly/2Z6Hp8p>. UNDP IHDI 2018, <http://bit.ly/2WleMaE>, Statistical Annex, <http://bit.ly/315WGrR>. Civicus monitor, <http://bit.ly/2JSqgvD>. Grida.no, Global soil degradation, <http://bit.ly/2EKmygO>.

### 16–17 ON THE RUN: A FAILURE OF COMMUNITY by Christian Stock

**p.16:** UNHCR Statistics, The World in Numbers, <http://bit.ly/2Z7MwoH>. – **p.17:** UNHCR Population Statistics, Time Series, <http://bit.ly/2QIj59Y>, Mid-Year Statistics, <http://bit.ly/2WELTW1>, own calculations.

### 18–19 VISAS: HOW FAT IS YOUR WALLET? by Maria Oshana

**p.18:** Transparency International, Global Witness: European Getaway. Inside the Murky World of Golden Visas, 2018, p.13 f., <http://bit.ly/31fluOo>. – **p.19:** Global Passport Power Rank 2019, <http://bit.ly/2QI2hja>. Passport Index, Compare Passports, <http://bit.ly/2JTE8pu>. Auswärtiges Amt, Übersicht zur Visumpflicht bzw. -freiheit, <http://bit.ly/2F28guX>.

### 20–21 LABOUR MIGRATION: IN SEARCH OF WORK by Helen Schwenken and Johanna Neuhauser

**p.20:** OECD, Zusammen wachsen. Integration von Zuwanderern 2018, p.161, <http://bit.ly/2wxvnZs>. – **p.21:** Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, Bevölkerungsstand und -entwicklung, 2017 und 2050, <http://bit.ly/1cyKv8P>.

### 22–23 MOVEMENT OF LABOUR: SENDING MONEY TO THE FOLKS BACK HOME by Carlos Lopes

**p.22:** CEMLA, Remittances to Latin America and the Caribbean 2017–2018, <http://bit.ly/2Z8yvaG>. – **p.23:** knomad.org, Migrant remittance inflows, April 2019, <http://bit.ly/2JWKO6j>.

### 24–25 GENDER: I AM STRONG, I AM WOMAN by Sabine Hess and Johanna Elle

**p.24:** ILO, Deployment of women migrant workers from selected ASEAN Member States, 2000–14, 2015, <http://bit.ly/2Wot5eH>. – **p.25:** ILO Global Estimates on International Migrant Workers, Results and Methodology, 2018, p.7, 19, 48 ff., <http://bit.ly/2KICUCG>. IOM, World Migration Report 2018, p.309, <http://bit.ly/2HT4KVk>.

## **26–27 IMMIGRATION LAWS: DOCUMENTS FOR THE UNDOCUMENTED by a team of authors**

**p.26:** Destatis, 13. koordinierte Bevölkerungsvorausberechnung für Deutschland, <http://bit.ly/2K1VBJ7>. Eurostat, Employment rate, Code t2020\_10, <http://bit.ly/2H0dmem>, own calculation. – **p.27:** Wikipedia, Global Compact for Migration, <http://bit.ly/2EPQfjo>. Frontex, Risk Analysis for 2019, p.45, <http://bit.ly/2KpOk8w>.

## **28–29 BORDER CONTROL: OUT OF BOUNDS by Christian Jakob**

**p.28:** EU Emergency Trust Fund for Africa, State of Play and Financial resources, Mai 2019, <http://bit.ly/2lh68jB>. European Court of Auditors, Special Report No. 32/2018, <http://bit.ly/2Kjvno6>. Encyclopaedia Britannica, The Migration Morass in the Mediterranean, <http://bit.ly/2Z2TVWp>. – **p.29:** IOM data query. Frontex, Africa-Frontex Intelligence Community Joint Report 2017, p.8, <http://bit.ly/2JWP3if>. Frontex, Programming Document 2018–2020, p.200, <http://bit.ly/2ESxoE2>.

## **30–31 SCHENGEN AND DUBLIN: UNPREPARED AND UNCOORDINATED by Bernd Kasperek and Matthias Schmidt-Semdbner**

**p.30:** CE, Infographic, Asylum applications in the EU, 1990–2018, <http://bit.ly/2MnyxcV>. Eurostat, Code tps00191, <http://bit.ly/2Xj1hER>. – **p.31:** Wikipedia, Schengener Abkommen article, <http://bit.ly/317B66b>.

## **32–33 THE MEDITERRANEAN AND THE SAHARA: DEATHS IN THE DESERT by Laura Lambert**

**p.32:** IOM, Missing Migrants, <http://bit.ly/2JREpJH>. – **p.33:** United against racism, List of 35,597 documented deaths of refugees and migrants (...), Le Monde diplomatique, Atlas der Globalisierung, 2012, p.51, Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung, Europa-Atlas, 2014, p.33, own count, situation as of 1 april 2019, <http://bit.ly/2lAbaYL>.

## **34–35 DEPORTATIONS: GOODBYE AND DON'T COME BACK by Maximilian Pichl**

**p.34:** Eurostat, Code migr\_asydcfsta, <http://bit.ly/2Wf14kC>. Ebd. Code migr\_asydcfina,

<http://bit.ly/2Xpv5Q3>. Eurostat Asylum statistics, <http://bit.ly/2KlvCPq>. – **p.35:** Eurostat, Code migr\_eiord1, <http://bit.ly/2KoiNDX>. FAZ, 28. 6.2018, five months data recalculated for three months, <http://bit.ly/2WfTtol>.

## **36–37 INTEGRATION: ARRIVED AND SETTLED, BUT STILL NOT HOME by Mario Neumann**

**p.37:** DIW-Wochenbericht 44/2018, p.958, <http://bit.ly/2WaXWq3>. Johann Fuchs u. a., Zuwanderung und Digitalisierung, Bertelsmann-Stiftung, 2019, p.83, <http://bit.ly/2MphDuF>. DIW-Wochenbericht 4/2019, p.65, <http://bit.ly/2WPHAYt>.

## **38–39 RIGHT-WING NATIONALISM: MISPLACED FEARS, FALSE PROMISES by Friedrich Burschel**

**p.38:** Wikipedia, 2019 European Election results, <http://bit.ly/2W89yu1>. Wikipedia, Die Europawahl in den einzelnen EU-Mitgliedsstaaten, <http://bit.ly/2JTN6TG>. – **p.39:** FAZ, 21. 8.2018, <http://bit.ly/2KlUgzz>.

## **40–41 RIGHT-WING VIOLENCE IN GERMANY: WHERE RIGHT IS WRONG by Massimo Perinelli**

**p.40:** Pro Asyl, Gewalt gegen Flüchtlinge 2017, 28.12.2017, <http://bit.ly/2HR58DI>. – **p.41:** Tagesspiegel, 27.09.2018, <http://bit.ly/2QFAX50>. Wikipedia, <http://bit.ly/2QJwgr3>.

## **42–43 MIGRANT ORGANIZATIONS: LEARNING THE ROPES by Christian Jakob**

**p.42:** Klaus Bade u. a., Migration, Ausländerbeschäftigung und Asylpolitik in der DDR, Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, <http://bit.ly/2XmRJc7>. – **p.43:** Newsweek, 1.11.2018, <http://bit.ly/2JUg1Xw>, [dailykos.org](http://dailykos.org), <http://bit.ly/2QFBZyi>.

## **44–45 SOLIDARITY CITIES: A COUNTERWEIGHT TO XENOPHOBIA by Stefanie Kron**

**p.44:** Solidarity Cities, <http://bit.ly/3oYypnw>. – **p.45:** Sanctuary Cities, <http://bit.ly/2XrRvAk>. Sichere Häfen, <http://bit.ly/2Iao6Ec>.

## **46–47 CIVIL SOCIETY: FROM SYMPATHY TO SOLIDARITY by Maurice Stierl**

**p.46:** Allensbach, Engagement in der Flüchtlingshilfe, p.14, <http://bit.ly/2Wba62j>. – **p.47:** Wikipedia, <http://bit.ly/2WmU4qL>. Seebruecke.org, Freie zivile Seenotrettungsschiffe, <http://bit.ly/2Ql318j>.

## ROSA-LUXEMBURG-STIFTUNG

The Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung is a globally operating institution of political education with close links to the German political party Die Linke.

With twenty-five European and international as well as sixteen national locations it is one of the largest left-wing educational institutions in the world. In addition to migration issues, it deals with numerous focal points such as social-ecological transformation, left-wing feminism, transforming societies and statehood, anti-revisionist historical politics, and pluralistic internationalism.

The Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung is committed to a "society of the many"; with its political-educational work on migration it supports a pluralistic immigration culture shaped by numerous cultural, social, and political influences and in a state of continuous change.

Our approach to a progressive perspective on migration is closely linked to fighting for rights to participation, fair work, decent housing, a good education, health care, and dignity for all – especially for the marginalized around the world.

That is why the Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung supports migrants' struggles in Germany, Europe, and beyond for their rights, but also for global freedom of movement and open borders. At the same time, our educational work and research criticizes the normalization of xenophobic and racist attitudes in society and politics, the European tightening and advancement of border controls as far as Africa and the Middle East, the erosion of the right to asylum in the EU, the refugees dying in the Mediterranean, as well as the criminalization of flight and aiding flight, sea rescue, and solidarity movements of and with migrants.

Instead, we envision a democratic socialist society in which the free development of each and every individual irrespective of gender, origin, nationality, and religion is the precondition for the free development of all. In this society, emancipation and equality as well as various forms of democratic participation become lived reality and a meaningful, good life is possible over the long term. Therefore, our actions aim to overcome xenophobic, racist, sexist, colonial, and imperialist relations of domination and exploitation and to give all people access to the "freedom goods" indispensable for a self-determined life.

The Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung's other core concerns are the critical analysis of power relations and commitment to social-ecological reconstruction, political participation, and the social rights of all people. As an independent political foundation close to Die Linke, we support the struggles of social movements, trade unions, and left-wing non-governmental organizations in this country and many regions of the world with our educational work. In doing so we are guided by the vision of a society beyond capitalism.




### Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung

Franz-Mehring-Platz 1, 10243 Berlin, Germany,  
www.rosalux.de/en









No modern society, no current nation-state,  
and no major city would exist without migration.

from: **CROSSING BORDERS, BREAKING BOUNDARIES**, page 11

What women need is not just effective protection,  
but the same rights as everyone else.

from: **I AM STRONG, I AM WOMAN**, page 31

Western societies need cheap labour and employ migrants  
as cleaners, carers, construction workers and farmhands.

from: **LEARNING THE ROPES**, page 43

The positions of the various EU governments differ only in their  
wishes as to how repressive the migration policies should be.

From: **UNPREPARED AND UNCOORDINATED**, page 31