What we learn from facts and figures

Mobility is a universal feature of humanity. People have been mobile and migrating since the beginning of time, and will not stop doing so. There are as many reasons to migrate internationally as there are migrants, and those reasons are often overlapping. Personal motivations, poverty, conflicts, fear of persecution, natural disasters, human rights violations, and gender discrimination are but a few factors that could play a role in the decision to migrate. There are numerous fragile states in the world that do not belong to the poorest countries, but that have created an environment that pushes people to look for a better place elsewhere. It is not only poverty that motivates people to cross borders.

Many research studies [2] provide evidence showing that it is not the poorest of the poor who migrate internationally, because these people do not have the means to do so. The majority of migrants do not originate from the least developed countries. For example, leading migrant-sending countries in the world such as Mexico, China and the Philippines [3] are among several countries with increasing socio-economic development indicators.

In fact, research has confirmed that in the short and medium-term, socio-economic development of the country tends to stimulate international migration [4]. Michael Clemens from the Centre for Global Development also demonstrated that "over the course of "mobility transition", emigration generally rises with economic development until countries reach upper-middle income and only thereafter falls"[5].

Raised expectations and better access to resources contribute to make migration seem more thinkable. Only at a [much] later stage, out-migration will gradually decrease [fig. 1].

This migration hump is interrelated with the level of human development. As the study led by Hein de Haas shows, the percentage of people moving abroad is higher in countries with a medium level of human development. Conversely, countries with low level of development have a low percentage of emigrants, even less than countries which are ranked very high in the human development index [fig. 2] [6].

Do you agree?

[...] "...The idea is to keep people where they are by making a considerable effort for development and education of young people so they do not intend to leave... "[1]

[François Hollande - President of France - September 2015]

We often hear...

Poverty is the root cause of international migration. The poorest of the poor are the ones who migrate in search of better economic opportunities and decent living conditions in developed countries, as they have no future in their homeland. Thus, by helping to improve the general economic conditions of developing countries, the rates of emigration to the developed world would also be reduced. Policies and practices to reduce the stream of international migrants should focus on poverty eradication, which in turn could impact human mobility.
Our vision

The right to leave any country, including one's own is recognized by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and people should be able to choose whether they want to migrate. If development policies should serve one migration-related objective, it should be to create the conditions of that choice. As long as there are no economic opportunities for a decent life, as long as war and human rights violations prevail and fragile states exist, migration will remain a necessity rather than an option.
In order to shed light on this question, we should refer to EU principles. The primary objective of development aid is to reduce and, in the long-term, to eradicate poverty, as enshrined in Article 208 of the Lisbon Treaty. The main goal of development aid is not to "prevent people from migrating". Development aid substantially contributes to improve livelihood options, access to education, enhances social equality and economic growth, and as such contributes to make migration a choice rather than a necessity in the long term.

To make the reduction of "irregular" migration a primary goal of development aid would imply the selection of aid-receiving countries based on the fact that they are migrant-sending countries or on the assumption that they can curb migration to Europe, rather than based on their development needs. Following this logic, countries such as Haiti, Cambodia and the Central African Republic with little presence in Frontex statistics on irregular migration, would then find themselves with less development aid, while they are still among the least developed countries.

Do you agree?

[... ] "We now have to take all the necessary steps to prevent young Africans from boarding a boat in Libya"

(Liliane Ploumen ■ Minister for Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation ■ the Netherlands)

We often hear...

In the midst of the ongoing refugee crisis in the Mediterranean, development aid and cooperation are important instruments in preventing or reducing irregular migration to Europe, with the idea that the EU should step up to “find structural solutions in Africa that tackle the root causes of migration”.
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Regardless of the idea on which it is based, using development aid as a tool to curb migration can even be counter-productive. Many research studies have proved that development actually stimulates migration in the short-term [see myth 1]: the poorest people are not the ones who migrate internationally, simply because they do not have the means and resources to do so [See myths 1 and 3].

The instrumentalization of development aid for migration management purposes therefore cannot be justified either by EU principles or by its "effectiveness". Nevertheless, EU leaders often use this approach in their electoral rhetoric, in an attempt to garner political and electoral support.

What development aid should bring...

Bakary and Moussa are both Mauritanians. They have been living in France for respectively 42 and 10 years. Bakary is retired, while Moussa is employed. They are both involved in the non-profit sector and carry out solidarity actions in France as well as in Mauritania. They say: "Are they [decision makers] making good use of development aid? Does it create jobs or provide opportunities? They want to retain young people [in Mauritania] but with what? There are many people who, if they had the choice, would not come to Europe. Many of them return to Mauritania when they have the means to do so. What we need is to resolve issues that force people to leave their country by fighting poverty, creating opportunities and improving people’s living conditions. It is not Frontex that will provide answers to all these issues. Furthermore, does aid really reach those who need it most? They [policy makers] should focus on the effectiveness of aid instead of trying to prevent people from moving as they have always done!"

Our vision

- Migration has been part of human history since its very beginning. People have the right to leave their country. Such a right needs to be respected in the sending, host and receiving country. Overall, migration should be seen as an opportunity, not as a threat.
- Policies should support human rights, decency, dignity, well-being and welcoming of people in need.
- Development cooperation is not an answer to so-called "irregular" migration. Irregular migration can only be addressed by tackling the root causes of forced migration and displacement and by creating regular and safe migration options for those who are forced or wish to migrate.
- Development aid should never be used as a bargaining chip to prevent migration, but should continue to be needs-based and aim to eradicate poverty, as stipulated in the Lisbon Treaty.
- Greater policy coherence between migration and development should be explored – across policies such as trade, fisheries, agriculture, consumption and taxation. The impact of those policies on people’s livelihoods, on migration dynamics and on development aid needs to be taken into account.
- Development aid should be used to implement long-term strategies and not be diverted to support short-term emergency responses.
What we learn from facts and figures

Today, it is estimated that there are 232 million international migrants across the world [1]. An "international migrant" is considered any person [man, woman or child] living outside of his/her country of birth. International migrants represent just over 3% of the world population. Even if international migration is more important in terms of numbers today, the ratio of the total number of international migrants over the world population has remained stable over the last 25 years – the percentage was 2.9% in 1990 [2].

On the one hand, most international migratory movements take place between developing countries: in 2013, 35.5% of all international migrants [82.3 million people] [2] who represent the largest share of international migration flows, were coming from a developing country and had settled in another developing country.

On the other hand, migrants from the Global South living in the Global North represented 81.9 million people [2], accounting for only one third of international migration and 1% of the world population.

The outlook of international migration is not complete without considering migration of people from the North who are living outside of their country of birth. They are migrants too, even if they are often called “expats”! In 2013, they numbered 67.4 million: 53.7 million who settled in another developed country and 13.7 million who lived in a developing country.
Our vision

Mobility has always been an integral part of human nature and has always contributed to building and nurturing the economic, social and cultural wealth of the world. Instead of being considered as a social and human issue, migration is often used as a scapegoat for electoral purposes.

Thus, the political discourse on migration varies from one day to another and consequently aggravates the gap between the perceptions and the reality of the migration phenomenon.

Media and politicians must shy away from populist rhetoric and use factual data when talking about migration!

Wherever they come from [South or North], migrants mainly settle in a country near to their own or with which they have historical or cultural ties.

When having a closer look at the number of non-EU migrants within the EU, statistics show that in 2011, migrants from countries with a low Human Development Index* [HDI] – mainly Sub-Saharan African and South Asian countries – represent only 7.6% of the total number of international migrants [2]. The other 92.4% of migrants came from countries with a medium or high level of development. The majority of non-EU migrants in the EU come from another European country [37.2%] [3]. For example in 2012, nearly one in two migrants who arrived in France was born in another European country, while only three out of ten came from an African country [4].

Statistics show that the truth is far from the commonly-used “clichés” that spread the idea of human movement taking place only from poor to rich countries.

* Index incorporating indicators for life expectancy, literacy rates, educational attainment and GDP per capita
What we learn from facts and figures

Migrants contribute significantly to the development of their countries of origin, as well as their countries of destination, through the transfer of money, skills, technology, governance models, values and ideas.

According to UN data, there were 232 million international migrants in the world in 2013. About 180 million of these came from developing countries and sent money home regularly. According to the Work Bank estimates for 2015, these migrants sent a total of 440 billion dollars to their families and friends, an amount that is three times more than the total of global foreign aid. This amount is expected to reach $479 billion by 2017. In 2013, at country level, India received 72 billion dollars, which is larger than its IT exports; in Egypt, remittances are three times the size of revenues from the Suez Canal; in Tajikistan, remittances account for 42 percent of GDP and in poorer, smaller, fragile, crisis-affected countries such as Somalia or Haiti, remittances are a lifeline.

Often acting as insurances, those remittances have an extremely important impact on the lives of families and communities who remained in the countries of origin, protecting their livelihood, especially in times of difficulty or crisis. Unlike foreign development aid, remittances go directly to families and friends. Most importantly, unlike foreign investments, remittances do not cease at the first signs of difficulties in migrant sending countries. Migrants’ capacity to support their families through remittances depends on their status and employment contract: an irregular status undermines such capacity as some migrants in precarious situations receive little or no money for their work. Advocating for more regular migration channels with lesser human and material costs is therefore a more effective way of helping those who remained in the countries of origin and of promoting development in those countries.

The expression “brain drain” is frequently used to negatively characterise the impact of migration on countries of origin. It was first coined by the British Royal Society to describe the outflow of scientists and technologists to the United States and Canada in the 1950s and early 1960s. This concept has since proven to be a misleading label. Research-based evidence suggests that the loss of skills in a migrant sending country is far more complex, with both short and long-term consequences on sustainable development. It is now suggested that the expression “skill flow” [brain drain / brain gain] is more appropriate to describe the temporary and permanent movement of skilled and unskilled workers.
Our vision

The right to leave one’s country is an essential component of human liberty and, as such, should be safeguarded.

Rather than aiming for “zero-migration” as a condition for the development of countries of the global South, efforts are needed to encourage migration through the opening of regular channels, without raising social, economic and above all, human costs of migration. Measures that encourage circular migration are far more effective in promoting the development of countries of origin.
We often hear...

Migrants settle in a new country which can provide them with jobs, skills development or training opportunities. They have access to better health services and their children have access to quality education systems. Thus, migration is considered a good opportunity for the individual who migrates. At the same time, migrants leave behind their country of origin for which they are no longer an asset in terms of contribution to development. At best, their families can expect to receive small remittances, which may help to cover minor expenses.

Migrants, like any other individual, are led by a legitimate desire for a better life. They are above all transnational subjects belonging to two territories: the country of residence and the country of origin. Most migrants maintain relations with their countries of origin. Today, such contacts are greatly facilitated by information and communication means that enable migrants to maintain links with their countries of origin on a more regular or, in some cases, daily basis.

Remittances are considered to be the best-known and most documented link between migration and development. According to the World Bank, remittances were estimated at around $581 billion dollars [530 billion euros] in 2014, and represented more than twice the amount of development aid granted by countries from the Global North. Thus, for many developing countries, remittances represent the main source of foreign currency. Remittances are private savings that have proven to be resistant to economic crises and that help to increase the income of migrant families, thus enabling them to ensure the coverage of expenses such as food, health and education. By supporting daily consumption, they also contribute to the economy of the country of origin, and increase investment in the social sector. For instance, the survey conducted in 11 countries of Latin America and the Caribbean by the World Bank reveals that remittances “have also helped to reduce poverty and social inequality levels” in these countries [1].

Although remittances are important, they are only the tip of the iceberg when it comes to migrants’ contributions to their countries of origin. These contributions are also reflected in many local development initiatives, carried out by diaspora associations. These projects are implemented in areas such as agriculture, water and sanitation, environment, income-generating activities, culture, education and health. In France for instance, the dynamism of diaspora organisations encouraged the Government and local authorities to create support mechanisms for these initiatives. Between 2003 and 2015, the OSIM Project Support Programme [PRA/OSIM] carried by FORIM and supported by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and
Our vision

The Koniakary example provides guidance on the ways and means to maximize migrants’ contribution to the development of their countries of origin. In that regard, it is about:

- Ensuring that there is a significant reduction in transaction costs of migrant remittances to increase the share of remittances reaching families and communities
- Supporting diaspora associations’ initiatives for the countries of origin by establishing support mechanisms and dedicated funds
- Promoting transnational networking of migrant organisations and fostering their capacities for action
- Involving migrants in the definition of development strategies

All this implies, first and foremost, a real recognition of migrants as full development partners and not as adjustment variables by policy makers from both developed and developing countries.

Finally, the flow of ideas, knowledge and skills must be facilitated as a result of the recognition of the contribution of mobility as a vehicle for development.
What we learn from facts and figures

Migrants move temporarily or permanently seeking international protection, better employment, education opportunities, etc., which are often lacking in their home countries. Two-thirds of all international migrants (including refugees) are workers, almost 3 out of 4 are employed in services and 11.5 million work as domestic workers [1]. As such, they greatly contribute to the economy of destination countries. Whilst the socio-economic impact of migration is complex to measure, overall migration is beneficial to the receiving economies in relation to the labour market and economic growth [2].

According to the OECD, migrants accounted for 70% of the increase in the workforce in Europe over the past ten years [2], demonstrating their willingness to seek employment and rebuild their lives for themselves and their families.

Migrants often contribute more in taxes and social contributions than they receive in benefits. For example, European immigrants who have arrived in the UK since 2000, have contributed more than 20 billion pounds to UK public finances and 64% more in taxes than benefits [3].

Migration boosts the working age population and the economy. European countries have the world’s most rapidly ageing populations. This means there are more people at the retirement age than there are young people entering the workforce. As people live longer, public services are also under huge pressure. In Germany, due to an ageing population, there are around 597,000 jobs available in the health and care sectors, as well as in engineering, carpentry etc. Although migration is not a solution, it is key for sustainable development [4]. Moreover, the recent increase in arrivals of refugees in Europe has created further opportunities to boost economic output. The German investment bank Berenberg has already estimated that the arrival of refugees could boost economic output in the eurozone by 0.2% by the end of 2015 [5].

Do you agree?

We often hear...

Migrants create an economic burden for the countries they settle in, due to the pressure they place on welfare services, especially during times of economic downturn. Migration is therefore not beneficial to the host country.

[... “Immigration costs France 35 billion euros per year according to the most optimistic estimates, and 70 billion euros per year according to the most pessimistic ones.”

[Marine Le Pen – Le Figaro – October 2012]
Our vision

To ensure that everyone, regardless of his/her nationality, country of origin or any other ground has equal [access to] rights, we call for:

- Real facts and figures about migrants to be shared, including migrant contribution to their countries of origin and destination.
- More safe and regular migration routes to prevent persistent issues of exploitation, harm, abuse of migrants and refugees.
- Social promotion and professional inclusion of migrants in host countries, with equal access to economic opportunities.
- The signature and ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

The improved protection of migrants will contribute to maximize their capacity to participate in society, both in the countries of origin and destination. This must be taken into account in national and local policies.

Farah is a former child refugee from Somalia. He moved to Kenya when he was 3 years old. At the age of 16, Farah undertook a highly dangerous journey to reach Europe, through Uganda, South Sudan, Sudan, Libya and the Mediterranean Sea. Eventually Farah’s asylum application was accepted in Malta.

"[...] What was I going to do in Malta? I saw the racism, xenophobia, and anti-immigration sentiment when I arrived; I was not expecting that, after all we had been through. But was I just going to sit here and do nothing? I said to myself: "I am going speak up, and go after my dreams, and prove to these people that I can contribute, we can contribute positively to society. [...] I am not here to take anyone's jobs, or change someone's society, or be a burden, I am going to prove to them [...]". So I worked immediately and left the social benefits that the government was giving out [...]. I also enrolled in school to do my A-levels, I started a blog with Malta’s leading newspapers where I would speak about my experience as well as the experiences of other refugees and do interviews [on] women topics, detention topics, integration, human rights, my own story. I then partnered with an international organisation called Terre des Hommes, a child rights organisation, based in Brussels and Geneva, and I did a short video for a campaign of theirs called "Destination Unknown", to document children on the move [...]".

"I work, I pay my taxes, I study, I am just part of the society."
In an increasingly competitive global economy, Europe should only accept highly skilled migrants [1]

MYTH

Between 2000 and 2008, the number of workers in elementary occupations contributed to 20% of the total employment growth with a growth rate of 22% compared to an average of 10% [3]. Less-skilled occupations constitute the largest share of jobs in the European labour market [4]. For example, in Italy, business forecasts estimate that 40% of the demand for workers is for persons with only minimum education [5]. This demonstrates that EU member States’ economies also depend on low-wage jobs.

In most European countries, some of the sectors where labour shortages have already been felt are currently relying on low-skilled migration, due to a skills or geographical mismatch between the labour demand and supply. The supply of workers for less-skilled jobs is undermined by the fact that native labour workforce tends to avoid low-status, low-wage jobs, as well as jobs that are situated in remote locations [6]. For example, in agriculture, native-born workers are difficult to attract because of low wages, location and working conditions, as well as the seasonal nature of most jobs in the sector.

Low-wage occupations are expected to see an overall growth, notably in food preparation and services, retail sales and customer service, personal and home care aides, construction and transportation, in particular for activities which are not mechanised yet.

The logic whereby restricting low-wage labour migration will prevent migrant workers from coming is unrealistic. In the absence of official labour migration channels, migrants tend to resort to smugglers as their only way to come to Europe. Besides, imposing those

Do you agree?

[..] "In a number of low-skilled sectors, British workers are being displaced by foreign workers who are willing to accept salaries below the living wage" [2]

[UK’s centre-left’s arguments on the negative impact of low-skilled immigration on native workers – Summarized by Christina Boswell – Professor of Politics at Edinburgh University]

We often hear...

In a globalised world where competition among world economies is increasing and the working age population is expected to decline, there are shortages in key sectors such as science, technology, engineering and healthcare. Highly-skilled workers are the only response to the economic challenge the EU is facing. In contrast, doors should close in sectors that require a lower-skilled workforce. More migration in low-skilled sectors may have both a quantitative [less labour demand for the native-born] and a qualitative [risk of social dumping] impact on the labour market. In other words, native-born and migrant workers would be competing for the same blue-collar jobs, at a time when unemployment in the EU remains high as a consequence of the economic and social downturn.
Despite high unemployment rates in some Member States, labour markets in the EU require substantial net immigration of persons with different levels of skills and qualification. However, to date, national and EU migration policies continue to offer few possibilities to migrant workers from third countries to receive work and residence permits to work regularly in these sectors. As a consequence, the need for lower-skilled workers is often “met” by informal and irregular employment and accompanied by severe abuse and exploitation [7].

On the contrary, more labour migration may not create social dumping but may improve working conditions for native-born workers. Indeed, when migrants’ skills are complementary to those of local workers, all workers experience increased productivity which can be expected to lead to a rise in the wages of existing workers [8].

Finally, empirical studies show that low-skilled immigrants successfully integrate into specific sectors of the economy without “stealing” jobs from native-born workers [9]. The idea whereby if migrants are employed, natives will lose their jobs as a consequence, is largely based on the misconception that the number of jobs in an economy is fixed. The reality is that immigration may create some new job opportunities, including for the native-born. As consumers of goods and services, investors and entrepreneurs, migrants can create greater demand for labour and thus increase wages and employment in the economy [10].

This tool was developed by FORM and ICMC, in collaboration with the CONCORD Migration and Development Taskforce, with the support of the EU, Fondation de France and AFD. Graphisme & Illustrations Fabienne Venet

---

**A domestic worker in Europe**

Monica is from a small village in Chile. She first came to Belgium in 2010 on a tourist visa, but overstayed her visa because she found domestic work easily. Monica has since been living in Brussels undocumented, as Belgium policy makes it extremely difficult to obtain a work permit. Despite the risk of exploitation, Monica works in numerous houses in Brussels and is mostly employed by employers of EU institutions.

“...We immigrants only do the work that they don’t want to do and that is why we are here, because we can find work [...] Amongst the people that are cleaning houses there are nurses, teachers, people with qualifications, but with their irregular status they have to stay in the informal sector. There is a lack of skills recognition and a need to facilitate the recognition of titles/studies.”

[Monica • Chilean]

---

**Our vision**

Despite high unemployment rates in some Member States, labour markets in the EU require substantial net immigration of persons with different levels of skills and qualification. However, to date, national and EU migration policies continue to offer few possibilities to migrant workers from third countries to receive work and residence permits to work regularly in these sectors. As a consequence, the need for lower-skilled workers is often “met” by informal and irregular employment in the informal economy and accompanied by severe abuse and exploitation [11].

- Data collection should be improved to ensure evidence-based labour migration policies and identify the real labour market needs [low or high skilled jobs, temporary or permanent workforce].

- National and EU labour migration policy should consider all skills levels. Low-skilled labour migration also has a positive role in enhancing growth and competitiveness in host countries.

- The structural need for low-skilled migration should be acknowledged in EU policy-making.

- Member States should create sufficient safe, transparent, permanent and/or temporary channels for labour migration to Europe, for migrants with different skills levels, in a way that reflects the real labour needs of the EU and developing countries.
What we learn from facts and figures

Out of all the myths about migration, the one on “cultural threat” is the most pernicious. Culture as much as economy, social sphere and environment, is a pillar of any society’s development. It appeals to what is the deepest and most abstract in each individual. Yet, one must not forget that migration is not the only influencing factor on culture: the expansion of individual freedoms, feminism, expanding mass culture and consumerism are just as powerful in the evolution of societies and shaping of individual identities.

History constantly reminds us that migration is part of human civilization: as such, it may be linked to coping or survival strategies, triggered by conquests, resulting from human curiosity or driven by trade. Cultures have influenced and enriched each other as individuals moved across borders. Thus, the alphabet, which enables us to write, record, transmit and structure our thoughts, has its origins in the Middle East. The figures with which we count, evaluate and plan, come from India. They arrived in Europe via the Arab people who “as so often in the field of science, […] played the role of intermediary between the inventors and the European society of the Middle Ages” [1].

Moreover, who can say that there is a European culture, unique and frozen in time? From what point should we establish that the “standard” European culture was born? The Roman Empire? The Middle Ages? The end of World War II? Needless to say, there are today more similarities between...
two Facebook profiles of teenagers in Prague and in Abidjan than between one of our Italian contemporaries and his/her Etruscan ancestors [2], even if they originate from the same country.

In addition, do we have the same references when we grow up in the Norwegian fjords, on the streets of Berlin or in the Greek countryside? The same remark goes for rural and urban areas; between the young and the elderly; between the rich and the poor; and across regional territories, etc. “Europe is diverse and we must consider it as such. Its history follows the same global path, but reveals a plurality that constitutes its richness” [3]

It would be more accurate to say that there is a plurality of cultures in Europe and that they have been forged in contact with other peoples. These cultures need to continue their constant evolution, so they do not die.

“Any culture inherits from those that preceded it and that is why it can innovate and does not remain frozen in an arrogant, fixed and established identity [...] Any culture is immigrant to itself” [4].

Here is the contradiction: on the one hand, we build our identities upon different cultures [sometimes without even knowing it] and on the other hand, we fail to acknowledge the inputs that other cultures may bring to our own identity. The promotion of diversity and multiculturalism will be the force that allows better social cohesion. Because it is immutable, human migration will continue to actively contribute to the dynamism of cultures.

Having two cultures is a chance

Virginia is from the Central African Republic. She arrived for the first time in France in 1986, at the age of 19. She completed her studies and currently works for a French local authority. She is also an associative leader.

She says: “My first year was hard because I missed my family and my country a lot [...] Today, I feel lucky to belong to both countries, here and there. As far as I’m concerned, having two cultures is an inexhaustible source of wealth even though I know that for some people it is seen as a handicap. The solution is to blend the two cultures and not to live them separately.”

She adds: “I would like now to deliver a message to all migrant women. I would like to tell them to have faith in themselves, to love and accept their differences.”

Notes

- Coping or survival strategies
- Conquests, driven by human curiosity or trade
- Confrontation: build our identities upon different cultures and not to acknowledge the inputs that other cultures bring to our own identity

History reminds us that migration is part of human civilization and nature

Our vision

Putting an end to the idea of a “cultural threat”, means to:

- Teach multiculturalism as a vector of knowledge and mutual recognition
- Introduce history of immigration in education curricula
- Promote cultural and transnational exchanges
- Democratize access to art and art history

This will of course depend on the States’ role in education, but also on civil society’s and every citizen’s at an individual level. Civil society should be given the means, including financial resources, to play its part to the full and lead actions on education for citizenship and international solidarity.
What we learn from facts and figures

It is extremely difficult for non-EU migrants to access social benefits in destination countries and throughout the EU, especially if the migrant cannot speak the local language and is not able to work.

Access to social benefits is very often subject to strict rules: for instance, while France’s generosity with regard to social benefits is appreciated or criticized depending on where one is situated in the political spectrum, a foreigner must have a residence and a work permit for at least 5 years to qualify for Active Solidarity Income. While the majority of irregular migrants do work, have pay slips and are subject to taxes and social security contributions, they do not enjoy any of the rights attached to it [1].

There is no statistical evidence demonstrating the existence of a “magnet effect” phenomenon. This is based on the assumption that each potential migrant has a clear comparative overview of existing welfare systems, regularization criteria or conditions to fulfill in order to qualify for refugee status in the potential countries of destination [2]. His/her decision to migrate to a chosen country would then be based on this information. In reality, the selection of a destination country by a migrant depends to a large extent on his/her financial resources. This determines the distance he/she will be able to afford. The presence of relatives in the destination country or the languages spoken are also determining factors.

We often hear...

The “welfare magnet effect” is the phenomenon whereby millions of migrants come to the EU because of welcoming reception and admission policies, regardless of their migration status. This effect was noticed when Angela Merkel announced that Germany was going to open its borders to Syrian refugees in 2015.

Immigrants’ access to social services and benefits, as well as their movement into and within the EU, should be restricted.

Do you agree?

[...] “As we offer very important social benefits to foreigners who are regularized as soon as they arrive on our territory, it creates a magnet effect...”

[Nicolas Dupont-Aignan • President of “Debout la République” • France Info • September 2015]
The fear of invasion reflects neither a past nor future reality. The political response to current migration issues should therefore facilitate greater mobility, rather than promote restrictive migration and closed borders.

Policy makers must be realistic and show courage to formulate open policies, respectful of fundamental rights, as well as economic, social and cultural rights of people on the move.

This can be developed upon evidence-based research on migration, as well as partnerships with civil society organisations and migrants themselves.
What we learn from facts and figures

The year 2015 saw an increase in the number of people trying to enter the European Union: by December 2015, over a million refugees and migrants have arrived in Europe by sea [2]. While these migratory flows are mixed [refugees, asylum seekers, “economic” migrants and other migrants], 84% of those arriving in Europe came from the world’s top 10 refugee producing countries [3]. The EU has obligations under international law towards people who are fleeing persecution. Refugees have the right to seek and enjoy asylum in another country under article 14 [4] of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Thus, all States must ensure access to people in need of protection. Refugees and asylum seekers should not be returned to circumstances where their lives would be at risk.

Besides, while some European political leaders and citizens often dramatically perceive the current migration towards Europe, here are some figures: 1 million refugees and migrants represent 1 refugee/migrant out of 1 000 EU inhabitants [5]. Even in Germany and Sweden where most of those crossing the Mediterranean are heading to, the figure remains far less than 1% of the national population. More than 85% of the persons fleeing war, conflict, persecution etc. are seeking protection in neighbouring developing countries while a very large number of people are displaced within their own country. Only 6% of the 4 million Syrians who have fled the conflict have sought safety in Europe. In comparison, 1.1 million Syrian refugees are living in Lebanon, representing a quarter of the population.

While some people come to Europe seeking protection, others come to improve the future prospects of their lives and their families. It is however difficult to make a strict distinction between those two “categories”. In an increasingly globalised world where people are more and more mobile or aspire for more mobility – due to technological opportunities, stronger transnational ties and increased access to information and literacy – and where the differences in wealth and expected wages remain important, migration has somehow become an indicator and a mirror of those differences. In such a context, “economic” migrants choose to move not only to Europe but also to developing countries, to improve their future prospects and those of their families. South-South migration is more common than South-North migration [see myth 3].

Do you agree?

[...] “Europe cannot absorb any more mass arrivals of migrants, as they risk undermining it economically and destroying it politically.” [1]

[Extract from the article EU leaders to declare: “We cannot take more migrants” • Euractiv • April 2015]

We often hear...

European countries are still struggling against the effects of the economic downturn. As a consequence, Europe cannot welcome migrants who come to look for jobs while the unemployment rates remain high all across the region. Besides, more and more migrants fail to integrate, disrupting the economic and social order and cultural identity of the receiving countries.
Our vision

- Migration is a normal phenomenon. Instead of resisting it, the EU and member States should facilitate it with a right-based approach, in line with Target 10.7 of the Post-2015 sustainable development agenda.
- The EU and its member States must offer regular and safe routes for people in need of protection, as this is the only solution to prevent the loss of lives, preserve human dignity and honour international obligations under human rights and refugee law. Besides, the existence of legal channels to Europe is the only way to fight smugglers and traffickers.
- More solidarity is needed among EU member States. The exceptional situation that countries such as Greece and Italy are experiencing requires exceptional measures, including an increased relocation effort as well as increased support to strengthen the current efforts by actors in those countries to deal with the arrivals.
- Additionally, member States should create sufficient safe, regular and transparent channels for labour migration to Europe for migrants with different skills levels in a way that would reflect the real labour needs of the EU.

People often migrate to Europe for better work opportunities and higher wages. Although politically unrecognized, some key sectors of the European economy are relying on migrant workers [See Myth 7]. While poverty, low wages, and a lack of decent employment opportunities represent significant push factors for migration, the demand for cheap labour is also a crucial pull factor for labour migration. "There are very poorly paid jobs in agriculture, in construction, in hospitality or in care for the elderly or care of young people [...] We refuse to acknowledge our underground labour market because we like the price of tomatoes in June; we like our cleaning lady to be that cheap", UN Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Migrants, François Crépeau said.

Notes
- Right to asylum
  - Universal Declaration of Human Rights
- 1 million refugees and migrants represent 1 refugee/migrant out of 1000 EU inhabitants
- Post-2015 sustainable development agendas

Spread the word!
- The EU and member States must offer more regular and safe routes.
- The EU and member States should facilitate migration with a right-based approach.
- More solidarity among EU member States.

Turkey hosts the largest number of refugees in the world

Since the upheaval in Syria in March 2011 and its ongoing violence and conflict, the number of displaced Syrians crossing the border to Turkey has increased rapidly. Turkey is currently hosting 2.5 million refugees from Syria, more than any other country worldwide. This number does not take into account the large unregistered refugee population in the country.

Such a situation has put Turkey’s reception capacity under strain: camps are often in poor conditions, overcrowded and may lack basic supplies. Over 80% of refugees live outside of camps, in towns and cities, and often have to provide for themselves. There is a significant concern for the well-being of Syrian children and young people, as the majority do not have access to education and are vulnerable to exploitation [7].

Many Syrians are looking for resettlement in a third country. Therefore Europe’s decision not to open safe and regular routes for refugees to reach Europe, has had terrifying social and political consequences: thousands are continuing to drown in the Mediterranean and Aegean seas during their journeys to the EU, and those who make it face a highly uncertain future.