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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

1.0 Introduction

The concept of security has over time been subject to a number of definitions that culminate in its complexity as well as its subject matter. Michael argues that security can be categorized into military security, political security, economic security, environmental security and lastly societal security\(^1\). Immigration is cross cutting because it can have effect on political security, economic security and societal security. This is elaborated further in chapter two. Security has traditionally been a major concern in the International System and as a result, security studies have broadened the concept of security by moving from the traditional threats which hitherto would have required a military approach to solve and now cover any aspect of society which the leaders consider to be a threat. This traditional view is realist in nature as the understanding of security is perceived to be the extent to which a state can militarily protect itself. Lippmann summarized this well with his statement that

\[\text{“a nation is secure to the extent to which it is not in danger of having to sacrifice core values, if it wishes to avoid war, and is able, if challenged, to maintain them by victory in such a war”}.\]\(^2\)

According to Esses,\(^3\) security should be viewed as emancipation where; “emancipation is the freeing of people (as individuals and groups) from the physical and human constraints which stop them carrying out what they would freely choose to do. Security and emancipation are two sides of the same coin.


Recently, global migration is probably one of the most cited, yet also most contested, areas of the new security agenda, which emerged at the end of the Cold War, and resulted in a broadening and deepening of our understanding of what constitutes a security threat or challenge. Migration therefore is increasingly being viewed as a security issue in recent security studies. The duality of threats apparently caused by migration to both national sovereignty and human security are largely reflected in much of the recent academic literature. In establishing the relationship between security and global migration, Booth, states that issues of migration lend themselves very easily to securitization. Migration has gained from globalization which has substantially enhanced the movement of people around the world through modern modes of transport and the availability of information on the internet which makes it easier for people to access information on movement.

National security is comprised of several components, which include the physical security of the citizens and economic security among others. An influx of immigrants triggers security concerns on the receiving states primarily based on these two elements. This is more so with the rising incidents of terrorism whose impact on society far outweighs the positive economic contribution that immigrants bring to the receiving state through skilled labour. A case in point is the xenophobic attack on immigrants that took place in South Africa in 2015. Another example is the terrorist attack in New York on 11th September 2001 which marked a turning point on the relationship between immigrants and the receiving States. There was now a direct link between immigration and insecurity as all the suicide bombers were immigrants. Since then, governments have put in more resource to ensure stringent immigration controls.

---

Choucri thus suggests that the use of the Comprehensive Security Framework of the Copenhagen School offers the most suitable epistemological approach to the examination of the linkage between migration and security.\(^5\)

**1.1 Background of the study**

Immigration is ranking high on the political agenda of many countries. This is more so in Europe and in the United States of America whereby major political decisions whose impact is felt worldwide are partly influenced by Immigration. A recent example is the July 23\(^{rd}\) 2016 referendum in the United Kingdom whereby Britain voted to exit from the European Union (Brexit). One of the strong campaign agenda of the “out” group was that the free movement of persons and the right to settle anywhere within the European Union (Immigration) was detrimental to the British people.

Immigration was also seen as undermining British sovereignty because decisions made by British courts of law could be appealed at the European court of Justice whose decision was binding to the British jurisdiction\(^6\). In America, the Republican Presidential candidate publically stated that he will build a wall on the US/Mexican border to keep away Mexican immigrants from crossing the border to the U.S illegally. In addition, Rubin, contends that the proliferation of the conflicts leads to the influx of migrants and the uncontrolled movement of people from one country to another which makes the trafficking of illegal arms easier, thus increasing insecurity and vulnerability within and between communities.


Rubin further observes that one of the challenges encompassing migration is the fact that global migration tend to alter the order of a given society usually seen as a body of persons that are united for or by some object or by a certain characteristic, such as language, culture or geographical placement.\(^7\) It is on this background of heightened phenomenon of immigration that this study is premised. Nevertheless, it is important to note that immigration or movement of people from their place of domicile to settle in new lands is as old as mankind.

### 1.2 Statement of the problem

Understanding international migration from a human Security perspective is an issue which has dominated debate on security especially because media and politicians portraying immigrants as an economic burden to the receiving state. They use descriptive words like “influx” or “floods” to influence the citizens who in turn feel insecure.

A recent development in the debate of global security contends that global immigration depresses wages and reduces the available employment opportunities of the receiving nation. Rubin however, counter this misguided view and asserts that immigration creates jobs and enhances the economy of the host country. Human migration has taken place throughout history and has at times been considered as a threat, but more often as an opportunity.

When migration was experienced from Europe to other parts of the world, it was viewed as an opportunity, and when the trend reversed to one of immigration into Europe, it was seen as a security threat. Recent estimates of the volume of migration into Europe and other developed countries in the 21st century corresponds roughly to the volume of migration

---

outflow in the 19th century. General believed that those immigrants who have had the courage to leave one country and move to another are often enterprising and entrepreneurial, even if poor. As such, in many countries, immigrants often set up small businesses. They however, become easy targets when the general economic conditions in that host country worsen.

Security issues however have over time been confined to a state’s capability to militarily protect itself. Zajda and Joseph contends that contemporary approach allows for the individual analysis of state sectors and the security levels that are accorded to each sector of the state. The approach makes valid the essence of human security; which has received more focus since the end of the cold war.

Moreover, people become immigrants because they have fled worsening conditions or persecution. In that situation, although they may live in another country, it may initially be quite difficult to adapt and change practices and customs. In such situations immigrants are clearly seen as different and in worsening economic times can be seen as sapping away resources that could otherwise have been used for local populations. The settlement of populations in areas other than that of birth is migration. It is this settlement that is considered as a security threat to societies.

Okoth contends that the settlement of populations in host communities and states can either be accepted or opposed by the hosts. Kenya as a host state has over time recorded on a number of occasions as having being opposed and in acceptance of the integration of foreign societies in Europe. Of particular interest to the role played by Kenya as a host state, the question arises as to whether Kenya in accepting new societies is infringing on its own

---

societies security. And if so, what is Kenya doing in regards to societal integration that is as a result of migration.\footnote{Okoth N Wilberforce. The fallacy and trap of Immigration Policies. International Journal of Foreign Politics. Volume 06. 2015) 78} The study examines the research problem that seeks to investigate the role that migration plays in the maintenance of societal security

According to the Kenya Police Service Annual Crime Report of 2015, concerns on migration are born out of the fact that the world is currently experiencing an unprecedented spate of violent extremism through terrorist attacks on unsuspecting innocent civilian populations. Fingers are more often than not pointed at immigrants. This study intends to answer the question whether Immigrants are a security threat or whether they add value to both the sending and the receiving state. The answer to this question will not only add to knowledge on whether there is a link between migration and violence but will also serve to inform on Immigration policy.

1.3 Purpose of the study

i. Examine the causes of global migration and vulnerability of host countries in the region to insecurity and the capacities of these countries to respond.

ii. Determine the extent to which global immigration impacts radicalization of vulnerable groups and pose as state insecurity.

iii. Analyze the various factors and strategies to counter security threats caused by global migration.

1.4 Literature Review

This section is dedicated to literature review on the theoretical underpinnings and empirical reviews. The important aspects of this chapter are propositions emerging from the theoretical and empirical gaps. It also presents a conceptualization of the study. Furthermore,
it provides references of similar or related empirical studies to support the findings of the research.

1.4.1 The Paradigm of Immigration

Hirschman posits that managing migration flows and preventing illegal migration has been the preserve of the state\textsuperscript{11}. This has its origin from the Westphalia Treaty of 1648 which transformed the European countries from theocratic administrations by the Catholic Church to state-centric administrations as currently constituted. Sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference with the affairs of other states became the norms that guided relations between states. Over time, people confined within the borders develop nationalism and a strong sense of belonging to their nation.

They therefore consider people moving from other countries to theirs without authorization from the government as intruders who should be kept off. On Immigration and Refugees, Devetak asserts that; “As the reification of borders intensified in the 19\textsuperscript{th} and the 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries, citizenship became an essential part of “belonging” to a state as well as indicating the strength of the state itself. Hence the categorization of those “outside” the state developed as a way of ascertaining who belonged and who did not.”\textsuperscript{12} Countries therefore develop policies whose objective is to stave off such unwanted people. Most of these policies have failed as the movement of people continue to rise from year to year. This movement has been enhanced by factors like economic deprivation, demographic or population pressure and personal insecurity caused by conflict. These factors push people away from their countries of domicile\textsuperscript{13}. Forces of globalization in turn act as catalysts to movement of people. On economic deprivation, the difference that exists between countries in their levels of


\textsuperscript{12} Richard Devetak, Anthony Burke, and Jim George. \textit{Introduction to International Relations}.

\textsuperscript{13} Jose Antonio Alonso. \textit{Economic & Social Affairs. CDP Background paper No. 11(E)}. December 2011
development and respective demographic dynamics has taken a huge proportion. In particular, the gap between the richest region on the planet and the poorest is 19 to 1. The richest region has 19 times per capita income than the poorest. Grinding poverty therefore pushes people out of their countries to go out and search for livelihoods elsewhere. The migration flow in this aspect is mainly from the third world countries to Europe, Australia and North America.

The main factor that influences this movement is the north – south economic divide. This movement is international or global while there are other flows within regions and within sub regions. The north – south immigration flow is explained by Castle who says that “The north – south is a useful general term for the growing disparities in income, social conditions, human rights and security linked to globalization. This creates a considerable pressure to migrants in search of better living conditions and greater personal freedom and security. Since weak economies and weak states generally go together, people move both to escape impoverishment and human rights abuse. Such multiple motivations lead to a migration- asylum nexus, which make it hard to distinguish clearly between economic migrants and refugees.

Thus the perceived migration crises, is really a crises in north – south relations caused by uneven development and gross inequality. Migration control is essentially about regulating north – south relations.”

1.4.2 Complexities of the current migration flows

In order to understand the current migration flows more comprehensively, it is important to look at past immigration trends whose impact is still felt to date. Khalid Khan

---

14 Ibid page 10
16 Stephen Castle; *Ethnic and Racial Studies Vol.* 27,( 2March 2004)211
posits that in the 18th and 19th century, 12 million slaves were moved from Africa to America. The colonial era saw many Europeans leaving their countries and settling in the new colonies. The reverse happened after decolonization. During the period between 1850 and 1930, America had tremendous industrial growth and they needed labour. European economies were stagnating at that time and there was a huge flow of migrants from Europe to America.

The other significant historical event was the economic growth that Europe experienced after the Second World War. Many people moved from North Africa to Europe. It is the same period when one million Britons went to Australia for settlement. As Koser puts it; “Migration is associated with significant global events, revolutions, wars and rise and fall of empires; that it is associated with significant change – economic expansion, nation building, and political transformation and that it is associated with significant problems – conflicts persecution and dispossession. Migration has mattered throughout history and continues to matter today”17

Further to the north–south divide that is described above, globalization features prominently in the immigration debate. It is not by itself a course of immigration but a catalyst to migration. This is well articulated by the journal Globalization 101 which states as follows; “A variety of reasons lie behind migration. People may migrate in order to improve their economic situation, or to escape civil strife persecution and environmental disasters. Traditionally, the reasons encouraging an individual to migrate were categorised as “push” or “pull” factors. Globalization has introduced a third set of motivations called “network” factors which include free flow of information, improved global communication and faster

and lower cost of transportation. While network factors are not a direct course of migration, they do facilitate it”.

Apart from globalization and the north – south divide, the absence or abuse of human rights is another course of migration. Human rights as defined in the United Nation’s Charter whose preamble is a pledge to protect humanity from world wars and to uphold human rights and the dignity of mankind. Kabahona in” Improving Human Security in the Horn of Africa through the Observance of Human Rights” connects the latter to forced migration. He observes that human rights are basic needs which are inherent and inalienable. Dignity of human existence is hinged on the observance of human rights. When people cannot live in dignity, they are forced out and therefore migrate to areas where these rights are observed. The movement could be internal which may result to internally displaced persons (IDPs) or external to other countries within the region or overseas. Governments or any other authorities concerned do not give these rights since they are inalienable but are supposed to ensure that they are observed. Closely connected but not limited to the above is the focus on human security. This concept focuses on the security of the individual as of paramount importance unlike in the past where any form of security was studied or implemented with the state being the focal point.

Nkabahona describes it as the absence of fear that is caused by war and the absence of want that is caused by hunger and diseases. This is what is also recognised by the United Nations Charter”. Perhaps this is best illustrated by the United Nations Development Programme report 0f 1994, which states that nations have accumulated arms continuously for

---

20 Alex Nkabahona. Human Security, Setting the Agenda for Horn of Africa.ed. by MakumiMwagiru. 3-39 (25)
21 Ibid. p27
the purpose of protecting their security. For most people today, a feeling of insecurity arises more from worries about daily life than from the dread of a cataclysmic world event.

Most people instinctively understand what security means. It means safety from the constant threats of hunger, disease, crime and repression. It also means protections from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of our daily life. (UNDP)"^{22}. Threats emanating from lack of the securities mentioned above trigger human migration to where they are assured. The heightened security measures on Immigration by the U.S government have been shared with security agents in developing countries to assist them identify and arrest terrorists.

Change in Immigration laws and creation of new institutions like the DHS are seen as tools to fight terrorism."^{23} The recent escalation of terrorist attacks in Europe especially in France and Belgium pose a challenge as to whether stricter border controls are doing enough to avert terrorism. The attackers are using new and innovative methods like in the Nice attack in France whereby a delivery truck was used to mow down hundreds of people, 80 of whom died."^{24} However, there is a clear connection between terrorism and Immigration because almost all the attacker in the France and Belgium attacks were executed by immigrants.

It must be noted that these attacks are not done by new arrivals but by home ground citizens albeit descendants of immigrant families. Special focus therefore needs to be given to immigrant communities who settled in the western cities. Why are they more prone to radicalization and violence than the indigenous people in the same society?

---


^{24} Bill Stonehem, Truck Attack in France.Terrorism in Europe. (First Rank Publishing, 2016)1
Further to the above, there is increased public opinion that a rise in the number of immigrants has an exponential relationship with the rise in criminality which translates to a degeneration of public security. But this is disputed by the argument that due to the possibility of deportation, immigrants are extra cautious. In addition, since the receiving country provides them with job opportunities which allow them to have a better life, they would not risk involvement in criminal activities. The threat to public safety as a result of criminality is constructed other than real.

In a broad sense, the security of a country’s societal values is part of its national security. The country should therefore be able to uphold its inherent character despite changes in its surrounding that threaten this national character. Immigration is one of the issues that threaten the ability of a society to retain its essential character religion, language and culture. When immigrants settle in the receiving state, they settle in with their traditions which have an influence if not a threat on the culture and traditions of the indigenous people. Some of these threats may include how the states perceive their cultural, linguistic, religious, or national identity. Diving a bit deeper, all of the above are driven by a country’s national values. Values and beliefs are learnt in a national culture. The level of friction that comes from the mixture of cultures resulting from immigration is determined by the ability or policy of the receiving country to embrace multiculturalism. Those that embrace it are in danger of losing their cultural identity especially if the population of the immigrants is growing faster than that of the indigenous people.

Integration of immigrants into the society of the receiving state or lack of it can also lead to insecurity. A case in point is America where failure to integrate leads to segregation

which may lead to discrimination and racism. The failure to integrate is excused by the argument that each group would like to maintain their traditions.\textsuperscript{27}

However, there are countries which have taken a different approach and view immigrants as contributing positively to the development of the economy and therefore they should be accepted as valuable members of the society.\textsuperscript{28} Canada for instance has supported multiculturalism and assimilation which encourages integration and view immigrants not as a threat but as an opportunity that adds value in terms of economic development. This is a more objective approach unlike in the U.S whose policies are more subjective and generalise immigrants as a threat to national heritage\textsuperscript{29}

There is evidence discounting claims that immigration is a major threat to national security. Security in this case includes internal security, economic security and societal security\textsuperscript{30}. Whereas these claims, especially if perpetuated by government agent and the media are aimed at controlling migration flows, they may have a negative effect in that immigrants bring new skills which are essential to economic growth.

It is irrefutable that most of those who plan and execute terrorist attacks especially in Europe and America are people from outside these countries. However, there are those who hold the opinion that this has been used to condemn immigration as a whole without considering the great benefits that come with it. There is evidence that terrorists will still


\textsuperscript{29} Sven Steinmo, \textit{Growing Apart? America and Europe in the 21st Century}. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007)171

attack even with the many measures that governments put in place to avert them. This is because measures like border controls are well known by the attackers and they therefore circumvent them. In fact few attackers have been arrested before they execute the attack despite elaborate security installations.\textsuperscript{31} A case in point is the attack at the Ataturk airport in Istanbul, Turkey on 28\textsuperscript{th} June 2016 which was reported to be one of the most secure airports in the world.

Furthermore, terrorists are using more sophisticated methods using state of the art technology. It is reported that they are now using drones to monitor their targets\textsuperscript{32}. This calls for states to use advanced technology to detect and counter terrorist activities. As stated earlier, states that have high concentration of immigrants do not have equally high crime rates or terrorism. The U.S for instance has a huge number of undocumented immigrants who do not pose any security risk\textsuperscript{33}. This study will therefore endeavour to separate criminal activities and terrorism from the phenomenon of immigration.

Martell introduces a new perspective as to how immigration is viewed in the receiving country. He discounts the security threat argument and sees it as a racial issue. Racism though prevalent is not practised openly and therefore can be hidden in arguments against immigration. He argues that “racism and xenophobia clouds judgement on the effects of migration. They lead to exaggerated perceptions of the scales of migration. Significant as migration is, even in a globalised era, the vast majority of the people stay put. The ties of family, friends, community, work and obstacles to migration such as cost and political barrier

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{31}Karl p. Mueller.\textit{Striking first: preemptive and preventive attack in the U.S. national policy.} (Santa Monica. CA: RAND project Air force. 2006) 101-103
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{32} Benjamin Wittes. \textit{Future of violence- robots and germs, hackers and drones}. (New York Amberly Publishing house 2016) 110-123
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{33}Bryan, Roberts, Alden and John Whitley.\textit{Managing illegal immigration to the United States. How effective is enforcement.} (New York, NY, Council on foreign relations 2013) 33-37
\end{flushright}
inhibit it. 97.5% of the world’s population live in the country of their birth (UNHCR 2000).”

1.4.3 Securitization of immigration

Securitization of immigration has associated the movement of persons with insecurity. This view was brought into focus after the end of the cold war when securitized occurrences like immigration became part of non-state actors in international relations. Other non-state actors include terrorist groups like Al Qaida. As Faist puts it, “Most noteworthy, not all these issues are necessarily state centred”, as in the old paradigm about national security. It is thus not surprising that the post-cold war period has seen efforts to view international migration as an important regional and geo-strategic dynamic with potentially crucial effects upon societies and their securities (Weiner 1995).”

On economic security, critics argue that unskilled labour consume more in terms of social services than they produce. Griswold argues that low skilled immigrants flocking the destination country lead to a negative effect on the economy from the perspective of government resources. It is further argued that less skilled workers consume more government resources than they are able to pay back in of form of tax deductions. This increases the tax burden on the tax payer and immigration critics therefore claim that free migration and welfare states cannot exist simultaneously.

On the other hand, those in favour of immigration argue that that the benefits outweigh the negative effect. They say that immigrants move in to the new country with a focused mind of making their lives better through new job opportunities. They are therefore

---

likely to work more and contribute more to the economy than the native born individuals. An interesting fact is that states with the lowest social spending are the same with the highest immigrant population, thus affirming the argument that the skills that immigrants bring play a significant role in the economic development of the receiving state.

Remittances are another aspect of immigration which has an impact on the people of the sending state. “Cross- country analysis indicates that remittances are related to greater economic inequalities in Africa and in Latin America. However, other studies suggest that migration enhances the welfare of the rural poor disproportionately. Examples of this include Mexico and rural Egypt among other regions.”

Migration is a variable that responds to social, political and economic events which trigger an upsurge in the movement of persons or slows it down. This is well illustrated by the economic recession that the world experienced in 2008 and 2009. Bimal Gosh captures it as follows. “The corrosive effects of the great recession, the worst since 1930- on labour markets and labour forces are not well known. These in turn are driving changes in migration policy and patterns, changes that can significantly influence social peace, interstate relations and the pace of global economic recovery. Yet these immigration issues have thus far received little attention.”

In addition, international migration is seen as an economic threat to the receiving country and a brain drain from the country of origin specifically because it is the most energetic young people who constitute the work force that migrates. Charles Hirschman say that “migrants tend to crowd the cities where they become an underclass exploited by

---

38Ibid
unscrupulous employers and landlords. In addition to creating social problems, migrants are alleged to lower wage standards and to take jobs from domestic workers.”

1.5 Justification of the study

This study fills the gaps on Migration and also examines the positive and negative impact it has at both national and global level. In the United Kingdom for example, the National Health Service (NHS) which is reputed to be among the best in the world is supported heavily by doctors, nurses and other cadres of health workers from Africa, Asia and the Caribbean countries. On the negative side, atrocious acts of extreme violence have been committed by migrants. Students from Saudi Arabia who had migrated to the US to study piloting at U.S institutions committed the September 9th 2001 terrorist attack of the world trade centre. How can the above dichotomous nature of migration be explained? On the one hand, they add value to society but on the other hand, they are dangerous killers of innocent people.

This study will also examine migration as a commodity responding to the forces of supply and demand in labour terms. If both skilled and unskilled labour is needed to run the factories in Europe and America, then workers will move from developing countries to fill in the gap. This move is facilitated by the borderless phenomenon of globalization, which has eased access to information and travelling. As the workers move globally, no element of violence is detected in them. At what point does an innocent immigrant turn out to be a terrorist? The answer to this question justifies this study.

Mass movement of persons does not happen by itself. It is triggered by an event which has implications at global level. A good example is the fall of communism in 1989
which saw mass movement of people from Eastern Europe to Western Europe in search of better employment opportunities. Official statistics indicate that 12 million people moved from East to Western Europe after the end of the cold war.\textsuperscript{43}

The effects of the Arab spring uprising which started in December 2010 is still being felt today through the number of refugees and asylum seekers crossing the Mediterranean Sea in dangerous boats to Europe through Italy. Research needs to be done to come up with early warning systems on immigration flows caused by political events like those mentioned above. The research will provide recommendations on policy guideline that can answer pertinent questions. For instance, how will Europe look like demographically, socially, politically and economically thirty years from today when the children of the new immigrants in Europe entrench themselves in society and in the labour market.\textsuperscript{44} In other words, how will Europe of the future look like? In addition to the above, one of the core functions of a state is to provide security for its citizens. The rise of violent extremisms coursed by migrants is challenging governments in this core mandate of providing security. Governments have developed policies to counter this threat, most of which have been inclined towards putting in more controls, yet violent extremist has continued to rise. In addition to tightening controls in border management, other measures, which focus on societies in which immigrants live, need to be explored. This study aims at coming up with practical measures that can be applied at societal level.


\textsuperscript{44}Reid Ellis., Alfredo Fernando. \textit{Causes and aftermaths of the economic, political and cultural migration in the area of the Caribbean and Central America during the XXith century}. Paris: Publibook, 2007.
1.6 Theoretical framework

The phenomenon of migration can be explained using the realist theory as far as push factors are concerned. Governments in the developing world where migrants come from are Machiavellian in nature. Most of them come to power through disputed elections and once they are in office, they spent considerable time and public resources consolidating power and ensuring that they keep it indefinitely. Good examples are the regimes in Zimbabwe, Uganda, Rwanda and Burundi which is at the brink of a civil war.

These regimes end up attracting descent from the public who demand for change but their demands are ruthlessly clamped down with opposition leaders ending up in prison through tramped up charges. The political repression becomes intolerable and many people run away for fear of being persecuted due to their political persuasions. Most of these regimes have the poorest economies where poverty is rampant. Its citizens therefore not only run away from political repression, civil strife and human rights abuse but also from poverty. On the other hand, migrants perceive Europe and the U.S as countries that do not have these conflicts and therefore are attractive to run to with the hope of starting a better life. They are attracted by the advanced economies, human rights, freedoms and adherence to law and order. However, immigrants do not find the good life that they anticipate. Instead, they are viewed as foreigners who have invaded the economic and social life of the indigenous people. They are also made scapegoats for the declining job market for the local people.

A conflict ensures political unrest which lead to discrimination of immigrants and asylum seekers and outright xenophobia which is not different to racism. This conflict is escalated by politicians and made into a major political agenda and labelled as a security

---

threat. The receiving countries therefore take a statist realist approach whereby they portray immigrants as intruders interfering with the territorial integrity of the country. Security studies have broadened the concept of security by moving from the traditional threats which hitherto would have required a military approach to solve and now cover any aspect of society which the leaders consider to be a threat. This has been done through the securitization approach which will form the theoretical framework in which this study will be undertaken. This approach was first developed by the Copenhagen School of Security Studies.

The process starts when a state actor or leader declares that an issue or a phenomenon is a threat to society or to a referent object within society. He therefore calls for extraordinary measures to be taken to prevent this threat and by so doing protect society or the referent object. The leader politicizes and manipulates the issue to a point that he gets approval from the public to deploy measures outside the normal acceptable norms and societal democratic practices. There are several globally recognized theorists that are associated with the development of the concept of securitization who include Ole Waever, Jaap de Wilde, and Barry Buzan. The three are professors of international studies and have been involved in various works related to the issue of security including security theories, defense policies, and theories related to international relations.

Securitization of migration has its roots in the dynamics of the north to south divide whereby the world is constantly fed with images of chaos and disorder in the south by the media. This condition in the south triggers movement of people from the south to the north.

In an attempt to prevent this movement and the subsequent influx, the state actors politicize and highlight it as a risk and threat to security of the civilized western world.\textsuperscript{49} It is on this basis that immigration has been securitized. A good example of a country that has securitized immigration is the U.S with the turning point being the terrorist attack of 11\textsuperscript{th} september 2001 that left over 3000 people dead. Copenhagen School’s most prominent critic is Bill McSweeney who is also credited for having coined the term Copenhagen School.

Although the School deals with various international relations concepts, the most prominent one is securitization that was developed by Ole Weaver who maintains that social constructs are behind the perception that people have concerning immigration and other international relation concepts. In addition, the concept of international politics is also intertwined. According to the scholars, “Securitization is a more extreme version of politicization”.\textsuperscript{50} In addition, “the issue is part of public policy, requiring government decisions and resources allocation, or, more rarely, some other form of communal government”. On defining securitization, Copenhagen School maintains, “the exact definition and criteria of securitization is constituted by the inter-subjective establishment of an existential threat with a saliency sufficient to have substantial political effects”.\textsuperscript{51}

They also maintain that by labeling topic as security concerns, the overall securitization process starts. This is because the main reason for securitizing immigration has not been agreed among researcher yet implying that there are political reasons connected to it. Copenhagen School has made it clear that securitization is not independent but dependent. Here, securitization depends on the audience’s acceptance.

\textsuperscript{49} Maggie Ibrahim. The securitization of migration: A racial discourse. Blackwell publishing limited, Oxford 2005\textsuperscript{1}
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Without acceptance, securitization would not have an impact but politics make it a major issue bringing out points like jobs being taken away by foreigners and acts of terrorism being carried out by immigrants. However, adequate research does not exist to support this. In fact, an increasing number of attacks are currently being carried out by natives. The Copenhagen School, for its intense scrutiny of securitization of immigration has fallen victim of criticism by proponents of the securitization. Specifically, it has been criticized on the idea that it may render the subject of security studies incoherent. Besides these main securitization aspects, the most securitized is migration with the main reason being internal security. Again, migration has been securitized by political bodies for own political interests. As described earlier, securitization only works when the target population is convinced of the security aspect behind it even without proving the authenticity of the issue. With regard to migration, the public is convinced on various areas that include their social welfare and services that the immigrants may consume even when they come into the country as refugees. Other areas of convincing the citizens include employment. As identified earlier, a key effect of immigration to the receiving country is a reduction in the wages as a result of abundance of skills and immigrants that do not mind lower payment. This affects the natives in that their opportunities to be paid higher or even to get an employment diminish significantly. This makes them view immigration from the perspective of security because they employment security is endangered by influx of people willing to take lower wages.

Moreover, they may be convinced through a more serious issue which is cited as the major effect of migration, though not supported by research, which is internal security or terrorism. Copenhagen School acknowledges this and adds that migration is securitized from various perspectives including asylum issues. From a constructivism standpoint, politicians

convince the public that asylum only adds more people to the country reducing wages further. Politicians also use their political might and fear to convince people to categorize migration as a security threat. With a close scrutiny of the US, prior to 9/11, the securitization of migration was projected to the side of social welfare and employment. However, following the attacks, the concept of immigration as a threat to national security has become an important issue leading to the establishment of various policies and departments to enforce these legislations including the Department of Homeland Security that guards the country both from the inside and outside through international relations. Following 9/11, terrorism quickly became the main ground for groundwork framing on migration. It also affected certain races leading to racism especially directed to the Muslim community who are, to date, viewed as terrorists because the terrorists of 9/11 were all followers of Islam.

The other group that was affected is the Mexican immigrants as the Mexican-US border started being viewed as a security threat, again, after 9/11. A different example is the EU that securitizes immigration for an entirely different reason. To the EU, terrorism is not the main concern but culture and identity. It is correct that immigration affects culture and identity because migrants bring new identities that they intend to keep and that could affect those of the natives. This is why the EU focuses on restricting external borders and free movement as well as elimination of the internal borders. The EU also uses the claim that immigrants have the capacity to threaten its economy as a point of reference in securitization. This has been used to, peculiarly, reduce the rights of third country nationals strengthening immigration as a security issue. Some of these effects as they pertain to migration are accurate while others are inherently false. As such, it is important to comprehend and differentiate what is accurate from the incorrect information.

---

The securitization approach, which is also referred to as the Copenhagen school of security studies model, is the theoretical framework in which this study will be undertaken. This model was conceptualised and developed by two scholars, Barry Buzan and Ole Waever. According to the Copenhagen School, securitization is described as “the inter subjective and socially constructed process by which a threat to a particular referent object is acknowledged and deemed worth protecting”.  

Catherine Charrett further posits that “securitization as a model of analysing security processes has gained much importance in recent years and it is being employed by many authors in their examination of security politics in all sectors. This interdisciplinary works include the study of securitization of varying issues such as terrorism, transnational crime, immigration, women rights, disease, natural disasters and identity. Accordingly and as Alan Collins puts it, “Security now includes anything that threatens the welfare of the society especially concerning its culture and identity as well as an occurrence that can affect the performance the economy of the subject nation.”

According to Jonna Nyman and Anthony Burke, the Copenhagen School of Security Studies is related to constructivism. It is primarily concerned with how threats to a nation’s national security are socially constructed. Political figures work to ensure that the public would view certain issues as threats to national security, which gives them the green light to
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undertake actions to mitigate the constructed threats.\textsuperscript{61} If for instance the government portrays to its citizens that immigration is a threat to their survival and national interests, the phenomenon of immigration becomes a security threat and the people give the government authority to confront it by all means including tight border control and detention of immigrants.

To that end, behavior in the pursuit of personal interests, assuming the unit of analysis is a rational actor, is often mathematically calculable in an experimental framework and through careful interpretation (verstehen), is explainable. If such behavior is explainable and predictable, it is capable of being molded as well. Using RCT’s strict methods-based approach such empowers theorists to comprehend the rationality behind terrorism and hopefully edge closer to uncovering what incentives may be offered as legitimate alternatives. It is on this premise that this study is undertaken through the Copenhagen School model of securitization.

\textbf{1.7 Research Hypotheses}

\textit{i.} There is significant relationship between global migration and vulnerability of host countries in the region to insecurity and the capacities of these countries to respond.

\textit{ii.} Global immigration impacts radicalization of vulnerable groups and pose states insecurity.

\textit{iii.} There is need for various factors and strategies to counter security threats caused by global migration.

\textbf{1.8 Research Methodology}

This study will use both primary and secondary data. The primary data will be obtained through interviews and questionnaires. The interviewing will take a direct format,

which involves the presentation of an oral stimulus in form of a question and a verbal response from the respondent.

1.8.1 Research Design

This study will adopt a case study research design. This design is preferred because it permits gathering of data from the respondents in natural settings and the data to be collected will be qualitative in nature. This design will give the researcher an in-depth understanding of the broad objective of this study is to assess the of Impact of Global Migration on Security with reference to East African Region. According to Saunders; Lewis and Thornhill (2009) research design is the arrangement of conditions for collection and analysis of data in a manner that aims to combine relevance to the research purpose with economy in procedure.

1.8.2 Data Collection

The research instrument that will be used to collect data in this study is a questionnaire. Data was collected using the questionnaire which will be administered to 5 (five) respondents in the Ministry of immigration and that of Interior and Coordination. The questionnaires will be divided into two sections and will be administered by using the drop and pick method. The respondents will include (Director GeneralNIS, Director CID, PS Interior and Coordination of National Government, Director Immigration services and Inspector General of Police). The given respondents were chosen as they were most appropriate in giving information on the impact of global migration on security. The researcher created rapport with the respondents then personally administered these questionnaires.

This instrument of data collection enables the researcher to control the setting; it is flexible as one can probe and in the process get in-depth information; it has a large response rate; one can adopt the language to the ability of the respondents; one can also control the
environment and the question order; and, most importantly it the respondent alone, who answers with no assistance from the researcher or any other person. The questionnaire will be administered to respondents. It will be structured with both closed and open ended questions. First, the respondents will be drawn from the local and international humanitarian organisations fraternity in Kenya. The researcher will use a questionnaire to collect data from the Ministry of Immigration and that of Interior security, NIS and Kenya Police.

1.8.3 Data Analysis

The data collected from the respondents will be both quantitative and qualitative in nature. The data will be analyzed using content analysis which will enable the researcher to reduce a large mass of data to simpler, more understandable terms hence making it easier to understand the data that will be used\textsuperscript{62}. The researcher used content analysis to analyze the data through describing phenomena, classifying it and seeing how the concepts interconnect as will be indicated by the respondents. The research was conducted through a descriptive research design. Descriptive research design is an intensive, descriptive and holistic analysis of a single entity. This method enables the researcher use smaller sample for in-depth analysis, describe and explain rather than predict the phenomenon under study. In this method, data was collected either by administering questionnaires to the respondents. These approaches of analysis are preferred because they give results that are predictable, directed and comprehensive.

1.9 Scope and Limitation of the Study

The scope of this study will be the Ministry of Immigration, UNHCR offices in Kenya, The Ministry of Interior Security, police and the NIS. Other factors other than the immigration, insurgent groups and their ideological beliefs and the influence of the dominant

elite may also be responsible for insecurity in the region making widening the scope of the study and making it difficult to draw a clear line.

Despite its theoretical and empirical input to conflict diffusion processes, this proposal anticipate to has several limitations, which though will offer scope for future research. The researcher anticipate not get enough information required because the respondents may not be willing and ready to answer the research questions as they are asked. Most the top key security managers may as well be in and out of the office for their usual meeting thus not getting time to respond to the problem of the study. This will be solved by creating a convenient time with them so that their part of response is included in the research. The organization under survey has policies regarding to information confidentiality and employees are restricted on which information they may share with non-members of the organization. However, the researcher will overcome this by assuring the respondents that the information collected will be kept very confidential.

1.8 Chapter outline

This research work is structured in five chapters as follows.

Chapter one: It starts with an introduction and gives a background of the research problem. It then proceeds to outline the statement of the research problem, research objectives, academic and policy justification of the research, literature review, and theoretical framework, hypothesis of the study, methodology and chapter outline.

Chapter two: It will examine the phenomena of global migration, national security and the dynamics that course the immigration flows. This will include globalization, human security and the push and pull factors. In other word, this chapter will examine why immigrants move from their countries of origin.
Chapter three: This chapter focuses on the threats posed by migration and examine why this phenomenon has gained such high attention in recent times. It will also examine the effect on both the sending state and the receiving state. It will also examine the policies that states use to control migration and whether they are effective. Particular reference will be made regarding migration policy in Kenya.

Chapter four: This chapter is a critical analysis of the data collected and an expose on the findings from the data analysis. It will also look at possible solution which would be used to limit the current tension associated with immigrants.

Chapter five: This chapter consists of the conclusion of the study and recommendations. The recommendations could be used to inform on policy decisions and could also highlight areas of further research on this dynamic subject.
CHAPTER TWO
GLOBAL IMMIGRATION AND NATIONAL SECURITY

2.1 Introduction

Chapter one established the foundation of the project through the identification of the emerging divergent views of security analysis. From these divergent views, the study of global migration is a thorny issue as far as its impact on states’ security is concerned. Along with this, chapter two seeks to analyze the convergences between global immigration and nation’s security, hence showing through theory that migration does play a role in security.

2.2 Evolution and Immigration Patterns

There are certain terms commonly used when describing movement of people which need to be defined from the onset. These include migration, immigration, and emigration. These terms are closely related and they only differ according to the state of the movement at any given time. To migrate is to move from one place or country to another either temporarily or permanently. It can also include a pattern of back and forth movements of individuals in and out of nations. It is important to note that migration can be voluntary or non-voluntary, the latter of which is referred to as forced migration. The scale of migration occurs at different levels. These include global or intercontinental level where movement is from continent to continent, at intracontinental level where movement is within countries in the same continent and at sub regional level where movement is within countries in a sub region. 63

Emigration is the act of leaving one's resident country with the intent to settle elsewhere. 64 Immigration on the other hand describes the movement of persons into one
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country from another.\textsuperscript{65} Emigration involves leaving one’s country and moving to another country.\textsuperscript{66} For instance, when someone moves from U.K and settles in the U.S, it can be said that they emigrated from the U.K. Immigration, on the other hand, is moving into a nation that is not one’s own.\textsuperscript{67} In the previous example, it is accurate to state that someone immigrated into the U.S from the U.K. It can be effectively argued that migration incorporates both emigration and immigration. Certain terminologies that describe the people involved in the movement emerge from these terms. They include immigrant to refer to a person settling in a new country, emigrant or a person leaving their native country, and a migrant or a person who moves between places either temporarily or permanently.

Migration flows have an effect on both the country of origin and the one that receives them. The greatest concern is of terrorist attacks from criminals disguised as migrants. Further to this, some migrants cross the border illegally with the intention of settling permanently in the country they move to. They are not criminals and their intention is to earn a better life in the destination country. A good example here is the U.S/ Mexico border that has been the source of controversy as Mexicans cross into the US to escape poverty and embrace the American way of life that is much better.

Other individuals overstay their visas and start making a living illegally although they may not have malicious intentions. As a result, the U.S and European countries have instituted very strict laws that restrict free movement of people. In addition to the above, some sections of the society in the receiving countries complain that their employment
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opportunities are being taken by illegal immigrants whose wages are lower than the allowed minimum because they are in the country illegally.

In the same way that there is distinct citizenship laws in different countries concerning migration, the definition of who a ‘foreigner’ is differs considerably from country to country. Using the U.S and Germany as examples, German law stipulates that anyone born in the country and his parents are not German citizens is not a citizens which is the opposite in the case of the U.S.\(^{68}\) These lead to the establishment of different laws that not only hamper the comparison of these numbers across countries but also affect the precise estimation of the foreign populations living in these countries.

Some countries are referred to as traditional receiving countries while others are considered as traditional sending countries. This is determined by the number of relocations documented. The latter include North America and Western Europe with the US leading as a traditional receiving country. The primary sending countries especially to the U.S include the UK, China, India, Italy, and Mexico. Movement from European countries to the U.S is for legal migrants while that from developing countries to the West is mixed with both legal and illegal migrants.\(^{69}\) The reasons why people migrate or move from their country of domicile to other locations is explained by what is referred to as push and pull factors. What pushes people to move and what pulls them to where they are moving to? These factors range from economic, social, political and religious reasons among others. Economic factors are mainly driven by job opportunities and the differentials in earning with the destination country having more attractive figures, availability of employment opportunities and educational opportunities that may be connected with career opportunities in the destination country.


Political instability in countries of origin lead to civil unrest which triggers forced migration. Interference with individual freedoms based on religious believes can lead to the affected people escaping the oppression. Saudi Arabia is notorious for oppressing women who may deem it necessary to relocate so that they can enjoy their freedom in democratic nations such as the U.S. The freedoms curtailed are wide and range from choice in how and what they dress, to driving.

Immigrants encounter challenges in their countries of destination but the benefits outweigh the challenges. A cost benefit analysis therefore precedes the decision to migrate. For instance the U.S is a preferred destination for two main reasons, employment and education. The U.S has good employment opportunities for the skilled and the quality of education is higher than in most of the countries of origin. It is also highly likely for a person to get employment in many other countries including countries of origin when they have qualifications from America institutions of higher learning.

Such advantages attract people from their countries of origin. Other factors which prompt movement of people include climate change whereby some people especially the wealthy move to the tropics when it is winter in the northern hemisphere and go back in summer. It is also fairly common for people to migrate so as to be close to their family
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members who had migrated and settled earlier.\textsuperscript{72} This movement is referred to as “chain migration” whereby the people that migrated earlier send money to their relatives to facilitate their movement to join them. This results to the formation of what is referred to as “immigration fields” whereby migrants from the same location end up forming a community within the cities that they settle in.\textsuperscript{73} For instance many cities in Europe and America have a China town within them.

Regardless of the reason that people have for emigrating as stipulated above, the effect of the migration flow is felt by both the sending and the receiving state. Most research, however, has concentrated on how the flow affects the receiving state and little attention is paid on the effect that this phenomenon has on the sending country. A key reason behind this is the securitization of immigration by most favourite destination countries like the U.S and the U.K, both of which have very strict immigration laws. This approach has prioritized and put immigration at the top of social, political and economic agenda which eclipse the effect on the sending state.

One of the effects of immigration on the sending state is the loss of human resources. The bulk of those who emigrate in search of better employment abroad are young people who are energetic, some of whom have skills and form the productive labour force. As a result of relocation, the country loses important skills that it may have spent resources in training the migrating individual. However, the loss is relative depending on several factors that include whether the emigrant is skilled, whether the country had direct input in training the emigrant to acquire the skills, and whether the emigrant sends remittances.


\textsuperscript{73} National Geographic. Human migration guide (6-8) 2005) 1
Emigration leads to a fall in the quantity and quality of labour which may lead to a reduction in domestic output. Much as this is a negative impact, it nevertheless creates a shortage of skilled labour which leads to an increase in the demand of those left behind. As the law of supply and demand dictates, a shortage in the supply of labour results into an increase in the wages which is a surprising positive effect to the skilled labour left behind in the sending country. The negative aspect of this is that increase in wages leads to a commensurate increase in the cost of production. In addition to this, since the emigrants were consumers in the sending country, they cause an aggregate drop in the demand for goods and services. In these circumstances, a chain of events is triggered by emigration which affects the sending state negatively. These include but not limited to a rise in wages, reduction in employment, increase in prices, and a reduction in output. Emigration may also have another negative social effect when the emigrant is the main income earner in a specific household. However, if they send remittances, the negative impact is offset.

The economic impact of emigration on the receiving state runs opposite to those of the sending state. The immediate effect on the receiving country is a reduction in wages caused by the fact that migration leads to a surplus supply of labour in the destination markets which push the wages downwards. In other instances, the illegal immigrants are exploited by being offered very low wages which fall below the legal minimum. This lowers employment opportunity for the local indigenous people whose wage expectations are much higher. A conflict ensures between the two with the later accusing immigrants of messing up their job market. This is notwithstanding the fact that immigrants have a positive impact on the economy since they lower the cost of production through a reduction in the wage bill.
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from accepting lower wages, the incoming immigrants could also have more skills than the local people which further reduce chances of the latter finding employment.\textsuperscript{76}

The above notwithstanding, many countries of Western Europe, U.S, Canada and Australia use a point based system to allow immigrants into their countries. In this system, the reason for entry in the visa application is determined and assessed by what these countries consider as priority. In the U.K for instance, there are five tiers of visas. Tier 1 is for investors and “high value migrants” who are automatically given long term visas. Skilled workers fall under category 2 and they also qualify for long term visas. Students are under category 4 and other visitors are categorized differently.\textsuperscript{77} With this system, these countries ensure that they allow only the immigrants that are of benefit to them to enter their country. This fortifies the argument that immigrants contribute substantially to the economies of the receiving countries. Suffice it to say that such skills would have been utilized to develop the country of origin if there were favorable conditions to prevent the individuals from emigrating.

Apart from the economic effect that immigration has on the receiving country as described above, the impact is also felt at societal level which is as a result of the cultural differences associated with the phenomenon. Taken positively, cultural diversity enriches society as each culture embraces the beneficial aspects of the other which can lead to the loosening of the grip of racism.\textsuperscript{78} Cultural diversity therefore enables people to appreciate humanity. The down side of this is when the migrants are assimilated into society and they
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lose their traditions and culture over time. This can lead to identity crisis for immigrants which can negate the positive impact of cultural diversity.\textsuperscript{79}

Apart from cultural diversity, immigrants put pressure on social amenities which can lead to conflict and a reason for the indigenous people rejecting them. The main pressure is felt in the education, health, and housing sectors that may suffer from the pressure of excessive use when they are used by more people that they were designed for. Another fairly uncommon but possible cause of suspicion of immigrants by indigenous people is the risk of outbreaks of contagious infection that may be brought by immigrants. Although emigrants are screened before leaving countries of origin, it is probable for an infection to come from an illegal immigrant who did not go through official channels.

Citizens of the host countries view immigrants as the cause of most of their problems especially those associated with inadequate access to social services. However this view is not homogeneous and applicable to all. Different countries have different views concerning the issue of immigration depending on the information that their leaders have fed them. Those with a positive and welcoming attitude rarely experience the negative aspects of immigration and in its place have a healthy economy that is fuelled significantly by the immigrants.

Chopra et al posit that the destination country benefits from the fact that labour supply is enhanced by immigrants which directly translates into increased employment, increase in production of goods and services resulting to a high growth in GDP and the general welfare
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of the people.\textsuperscript{80} A section of immigrant labour consists of individuals with invaluable high skills that it uses for innovation which further boosts the economies of the receiving countries. Further to this, immigrants with law skills free the workforce of the indigenous people to engage in occupations with higher production output which further increases production. Moreover, immigrants generally offer cheaper labour than the natives which brings the cost of producing goods and services down. The cheaper goods and services have a competitive edge and a comparative advantage in the market which boosts the economy further.

When a country wants to reject immigration, it securitizes the issue making the immigrants look like security threats with a terrorist tag. In the past the immigrants were exploited by being offered very low wages which fall below the legal minimum. They create a social environment that does not encourage assimilation leading to segregation of different people groups and ultimately to discrimination based on racism.\textsuperscript{81} At this point, immigrants are viewed as aliens regardless of their immigration status which leads to a breakdown of social order and the locals treating them as second class citizens. They find it difficult to, access descent housing because most of it is controlled by indigenous people while educational institutions are divided according to skin colour.

Incidents of racial profiling increase which escalates racial tension. A good example is the U.S where racism is rampant and where different groups live separately. Such environment becomes a healthy ground for radicalization of the discriminated groups which may lead to terrorism. In spite of all these, immigrants still contribute to the economy of the
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receiving state. On the other hand, welcoming countries like Canada enjoy positive outcomes of immigration due to good public relationship and low levels of racism in addition to successful assimilation.

2.3 Effects of Global migration on National Security

Immigration affects security in many ways. It starts with the impact on receiving states but develops trends which are similar globally. The first aspect to consider in terms of how immigration affects security is to assess its impact on societal security. As Weaver explains, security of society, “concerns the ability of a society to persist in its essential character under changing conditions and possible or actual threats”.82 The societal variables of the natives that are affected by immigrants include culture, language, national identity, and religious believes. These consist of national values which are considered to be under threat in the receiving country.83 This is because migrants have come with their own religion, language, and cultural beliefs.

Immigration affects economic security of both the host and the sending states. It may affect the destination country by excess workforces and the opposite will be felt in the country of origin through the ‘brain drain’ effect. In addition, although the sending countries lose skills, they may gain a lot from remittances. The World Bank confirms that by 2012, world remittances were above $406 billion, which translates to high benefits in the countries of origin.84
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Empirical studies for Germany focus foremost on direct fiscal effects of immigration. Using data from the German Socio-Economic Panel for 2010, Ulrich\textsuperscript{85} estimated tax paid and welfare benefits received by Germans and immigrants. In spite of the fact that immigrants paid less tax than Germans, on balance, their fiscal impact on the German public budget was positive in 2010. This can be attributed to immigrants’ high net contribution to the pension system. At the same time, immigrants draw disproportionately on unemployment, social security and child benefits.

Some traditional receiving countries like Turkey are resilient on the influence of migrants because of their inclusive policy on identity. They do not securitize immigration on grounds of cultural threats. Turkey started supporting multiculturalism in 1971 by adopting a policy of preserving the identities of all people groups that settled there. As a result, they have been successful in engaging immigrants to fuel their economic development.\textsuperscript{86} With the example of Turkey sited above, securitization of immigration as a threat to the national social security structure falls in the purview of a socially constructed claim. Secondly, the expanded definition of security categorises the economy as an integral part of national security. It is a referent object that needs to be safeguarded from external infiltration. In this regard, any phenomenon that has an effect on the economy can be securitized if the effect is perceived to be negative. It is on this premises that the impact of immigration which is an ever growing phenomenon is addressed. They are also perceived as a threat to the welfare state and to the social security system. In this context, the receiving states security structure is affected. However, it should be noted that this threat is subjective because it depends on how the host country defines itself implying that some countries may not be affected if their national


identity is well defined. This is why some countries perceive immigrants as a threat while others embrace and see them as part of cultural diversity.\textsuperscript{87}

Immigrants also remit taxes which enhance the national budget and contribute towards provision of public goods like health, infrastructure and defence. Labelling migration as a security issue is problematic because it overlooks these benefits. However, job security in the receiving country is affected by a reduction in wages. In spite of this, the degree of effect on wages is not as high to justify restrictive immigration policies. It may be ironical to note that immigration leads to population growth creating jobs while simultaneously providing the manpower for these jobs. This is because when the wages drop, employers are able to employ many people and they are available because of immigration. Therefore, as Copenhagen School maintains, contrary to the belief that immigration depresses wages and reduces the available employment opportunities, immigration creates jobs in reality and enhances the economy of the host country. The belief that asylum seekers and refugees are a burden to the economy has been exaggerated through media terms like ‘floods’ and ‘influx’ of people leading to the public developing fear of insecurity from lack of social services.

However, immigration can also have a negative effect on the economic security of the host state. This is especially so when the religious and ethnic divide between immigrants and the natives escalate to violent conflict levels. In such instances, governments are forced to spend more on recruiting and equipping the police and other security related services which diverts funds from other more economic related activities like public investment in infrastructure and education.\textsuperscript{88} Furthermore, if the political tension escalates, it could trigger
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capital and skilled labour flight to other stable countries and therefore slow economic growth.\textsuperscript{89}

Thirdly, the impact of the events of 11\textsuperscript{th} September 2001 terrorist attack in New York, the London and Madrid bombings, were a game changer in the relationship between immigrants and the host country specifically because all who executed the attack were foreigners. Earlier on, there was the 1998 U.S Embassy bombing in Nairobi and Daressalam which were also carried out by foreigners. Recent attacks in France, Belgium, U.S and Turkey were all planned and executed by foreigners. As a result, the U.S and Western European countries have changed policy and created new institutions like the Homeland Security to deal specifically with tightening border management. Schengen visa regulations have also been tightened while the U.K created the United Kingdom Border Agency (UKBA) to deal with the terrorist threat posed by Immigrants. The impact of all these attacks has been the creation of fear and suspicion of immigrants by the native people. This is happening at both local and global level. Most governments argue that due to the high number of immigrants, the best way to prevent malicious people from entering is by restricting the number that enters annually as this will give adequate the time to screen everyone.

Border control and immigration policies are part of the measures development to fight against war on terror. However, the connection between immigration and terrorism is questionable because it has not been confirmed as a real threat to national security. For instance, immigration into the US was at all times high before 9/11 and such attacks had not yet happened.\textsuperscript{90} It also designates certain groups as terrorists which fuels racism. As a result,

public opinion is impacted negatively thus providing more evidence for social construction of these views.

In addition to this, failure by governments to keep out the small number of malicious individuals who commit terrorist acts should not justify securitization. The situation would be better if governments would succeed in apprehending the criminals. Irrespective of this, formation of a correlation between immigration and terrorism is also problematic because it causes alienation, racial profiling, and exclusion of immigrants. It is also appropriate to assess the concept of criminality as it related to immigration because most countries claim that immigrants are the most prone to committing crimes although this has been disapproved by research that has shown clearly that natives are more prone to crime. Moreover, the Copenhagen school has claimed that immigrants, especially those that moved for economic reasons, are more cautious on how they conduct themselves as they would lose the only chance they have for making their lives better if they would be arrested. When arrested, they are mostly imprisoned in special prisons made for immigrants or even deported.

The issue of whether immigration is related to insecurity is also a concept of perception versus reality. This is because it has not been proven whether this is the case although most of the research points in the opposite direction. Therefore, public perception concerning this correlation is erroneous and a fault of social construction of instilled ideas. The correlation between immigration and terrorism and insecurity is either non-existent or very weak. As such, it can be argue that host governments only securitize the issue for their

---

own political reasons and to deliberately prohibit and restrict immigration. Hence, securitization in this case is therefore exaggerated.

Although there could be some elements of authenticity in some of the claims, although there are countries that have taken the unexpected turns like Canada leading to surprising results, which discounts EU’s claims of restricting immigration because of national identity. Moreover, most researchers have not found a connection between migration and terrorism or insecurity of any kind and even a correlation with lack of employment. In fact, immigration should be encouraged in all countries because, as research confirms, it encourages economic development, more jobs and does not affect national identity provided the host country has it appropriately defined.

2.4: Conclusion

The analysis of the role that global migration plays in both the sending and host nation’s security has been examined in the chapter. Indeed migration does play a key role in the establishment of internal as well as external security measures of a country depending on the influx of migrants in that country. With securitization, migration comes first as the main threat to societal security. Moreover, the issues of linking migration to state security is not new as it has been there since the establishment of states that date back to the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia that established states as the most powerful actors in the international system. This treaty gave states political legitimacy and consequently, migration will remain inevitable as the states of the world continue to interact.

The chapter concludes that immigration affects economic security of both the host and the sending states. Immigrants with law skills free the workforce of the indigenous people to engage in occupations with higher production output which further increases production. Moreover, it was established that immigrants generally offer cheaper labour than the natives
which brings the cost of producing goods and services down. The cheaper goods and services have a competitive edge and a comparative advantage in the market which boosts the economy further.
3.1 Introduction

Migration is a phenomenon that must be understood in the context of the complex and interlinked flows of goods, finance and people. While global flows of goods and finance are supported and encouraged as part of a liberalist notion of development, commerce and also security, the flow of people is increasingly being tackled with a variety of restrictive migration management policies which aim at curtailing it. Indeed, under international law, states are entitled to control movement across their borders. It can be argued that ‘states use migration control measures to demonstrate their sovereign control over territory and to palliate public concerns that sovereignty is being undermined.’ States determine who can enter and who can reside and work in their territories and do so through their migration management and border management policies. This entitlement to control who enters and who resides is restricted by a number of specific provisions of international law and human rights obligations.92

Furthermore, not all types of migration are considered a threat to warrant curtailment. For example migration within the European Union and between developed countries is in general not at the focus of restrictive migration management and border management policies (although one must note occasional attempts by some EU countries to limit intra-EU migration and to weaken the so called Schengen regime which allows for border-less travel within the EU). Thus, arguably migration as a broad, generic term does not really help us in the effort to explore whether migration is a security threat. Clearly, it would be difficult to claim that migration overall is a security issue. More specific terms are necessary. The

literature on the subject uses several different categories and terms for the type of migration that may cause security challenges. While some authors attempt to explain differences in attitudes towards migrants by discussing a division into acceptable and unacceptable migrants, and polls and studies also point to the fact that racial considerations play a role in attitudes towards migrants, these categories do not lend themselves easily to a discussion of security implications.

The most useful categorization as far as security studies are concerned may be one that refers to the status of migrants. In particular, there is reference to undocumented migration, unauthorized migration, clandestine migration, illegal migration, and irregular migration. Such migration flows are increasingly perceived by the governments and citizens of wealthier countries as a security threat.

Papademetriou argues that

‘(n)o aspect of ... interdependence seems to be more visible to the publics of advanced industrial societies than the movement of people. And no part of that movement is proving pricklier to manage effectively, or more difficult for publics to come to terms with, than irregular (also known as unauthorized, undocumented, or illegal) migration.’

Indeed, recent polls also point to this: the Migration Observatory’s Report on public opinion on immigration in Britain suggests that publics distinguish between legal and illegal migration and that opposition to migration if often focused on illegal migration.

While the terms used by scholars, policy-makers and media are similar in that they refer to those migrants who are not authorized by countries of destination (and in some cases by countries of origin and transit), there are reservations about the impact these terms may

---


have on the perceptions of such migrants and on the consequences of such perceptions for policy-making and the welfare of migrants, inter. In fact, some authors actually point out that all of the terms available do not do justice to the phenomenon, and attempt to find new terms (such as ‘desperate migration’, or in the context of the Mediterranean ‘boat people’). Most of the persons forcibly displaced in the Middle East are the result of the civil wars in Iraq, Libya, Syria and Yemen as well as from the long-running Israeli-Palestinian conflict. In addition, tens of thousands of additional desperate migrants are arriving in North Africa from countries beyond the region. Growing numbers of migrants from Africa, especially from the Sahel region, notably Eritrea and Somali, and South Asia, particularly from Afghanistan, are traveling treacherous routes in hopes of being smuggled to the safety and opportunities offered in Europe. In 2014 more than 219,000 illegal migrants crossed the Mediterranean into Europe from North Africa, with an estimated 3,600 perishing at sea. An estimated 1,250 migrants drowned during April trying to reach Europe. For the purpose of this paper, the term ‘irregular migration’, which although not universally accepted, and not very precise (it encompasses a variety of types of migrants: economic migrants, asylum seekers, refugees) is used by organizations such as the International Organization for Migration and the European Union, will be applied. IOM defines irregular migration as migration that takes place outside the regulatory norms of the sending, transit and receiving countries.95

Thus, ‘from the perspective of destination countries it is entry, stay or work in a country without the necessary authorization or documents required under immigration regulations. From the perspective of the sending country, the irregularity is for example seen in cases in which a person crosses an international boundary without a valid passport or travel document or does not fulfil the administrative requirements for leaving the country. It has

been noted that the number of irregular migrants have been growing. Authors point out that 
this is the result of several trends. Jose Antonio Alonso\textsuperscript{96} further states that the first one is 
increased mobility as a result of globalization, and advances in transport and 
communications, and indeed also the general growth of migration. The second one is the 
increasing limitation of legal migration possibilities, as governments respond by restrictions. 
The third is that there is substantial mismatch between the supply and demand sides for 
labour. And the fourth is that cases of mass migration often result from mass infringements of 
human rights and conflict, such as is the case in Syria, Libya, Iraq or the Middle East. 

The EU does not provide an estimate of the numbers of irregular immigrants, but 
points to the fact that ‘in 2009, the number of non-EU nationals apprehended in the EU was 
about 570 000 (7 % less than in 2008) with the increase being attributed to lack of clarity and 
control on who enters developed countries and stays in them. The Clandestino project 
provides an estimate of the numbers of irregular migrants in the EU for 2008 as 1.9-3.8 
million. This estimate is used widely in relevant literature. With the EU population reported 
as 505.7 million, the size of irregular migration cannot in itself really constitute the 
problematic part. Rather, it is the trend of growing numbers of migrants and irregular 
migrants, and it is the lack of clarity and control on who enters developed countries and stays 
in them and for what purpose, associated with irregular migration, that causes real or 
imagined threat perceptions. 

3.2 States and Human Security 

The public debate on the migration-security nexus tends to focus on a variety of 
 aspects related to national security, understood as the protection and promotion of the well-
being of the citizens and legal residents of the State and its territory. As Khalid Koser argues,

‘the perception of migration as a threat to national security has certainly heightened in recent years, in part in response to the rapid rise in the number of international migrants (…) and especially of ‘irregular’ or ‘illegal’ migrants ⁹⁷.

There are of course other factors that may intensify that threat: if such irregular migration is large scale or occurs during periods of recession. Real or imagined links to terrorism, organized crime and health threats are at the core of the perception of irregular migration as a security threat. Surely security concerns of this kind must be taken seriously and migration management and border management policies designed to respond are needed. However, most authors argue that the relevance of such links tends to be overestimated.

Such perceptions also emphasize threats to the social and economic fabrics of countries of destination. This may be the case, because clearly, migrants ‘are also different: they bring new lifestyles and languages, traditions and values. Throughout human history, the outsider, the ‘other’, has been the focus of suspicion and often hatred.’ At the same time, the debate on migration and security reflects the general trend in security studies to move beyond the national security perspective to embrace a human security perspective.

While the national security perspective focuses on border management challenges that may undermine a state’s sovereignty as well as migration’s real or imagined threats to the population of countries of destination, human security as an alternative approach to migration has placed the migrant as the referent object of threats. The structural violence that causes many to migrate, the impact of deportation and detention policies and the hazards to personal safety of migrants resulting from the increasing reluctance of states to offer

sanctuary to those genuinely in need are some of the aspects of the nexus between migration and human security.98

Arguably thus, from the human security perspective, ‘the main imperative is not to curb migration by all possible means but rather to prevent the loss of life especially in the Mediterranean, protect the migrants against the human smugglers and ensure the rights of genuine refugees.’99 Koser argues that understanding migration as a national security issue has consequences for the kind of policies that are used to counter the threat. Thus, it is used to justify ‘greater surveillance, detention, deportation and more restrictive policies’.

This in turn has an impact on the human security of migrants (by encouraging them to use more dangerous routes, using migrant smugglers and human traffickers, limiting the possibilities of reaching access to safe countries), and publics (by encouraging anti-immigrants tendencies), which in turn also has an impact on the human security of migrants. This is certainly true for the Mediterranean region. It is for this reason that it can be argued that human security threats to irregular migrants by far outweigh the national security threats that they may create. In fact, the two approaches (national security and human security) are often seen as standing in tension with each other100.

Thus, the debate centres on the question of whose security it is that we ought to be concerned about – is it really the security of states that should be focused on, or should we be studying the impact first and foremost on the humans, in this case the irregular migrants? Kerwin101 argues however pointedly that ‘(h)uman security is often set against the concept of

national security, but the two need not be at odds. Properly crafted national security policies should further human security.

However, the human security framework moves the migration discussion beyond national security’s narrow preoccupation with border control, detention, and the criminalization of migrants, and opens it to the conditions of insecurity that drive irregular and crisis migration. Human security also asks whether policies developed out of a misguided view of national security put people in less secure positions, like the hands of traffickers and smugglers.’ Thus, adequate migration management and border management policies would address national security problems while enhancing human security of the migrants. This, arguably, is a rather complex task.102

3.3 Debate on the State Security and Migration Nexus

Another aspect of the ongoing debate on the migration-security nexus focuses to a large degree on security challenges to developed countries as countries of destination, and a number of scholars point to the fact that the impact on developing countries as countries of destination but also of transit and of origin is neglected. Migration is of course not purely a South-North phenomenon. Indeed, migration routes or pathways can be summarized as follows: there are South–North, South– South, North–South or North–North migrations, as the IOM outlines in the latest edition of its World Migration Report.103

Most migrants (and irregular migrants) do not arrive in European countries, but rather in developing countries, which are used as countries of transit or as the final destination, which disproportionatley carry the brunt of the impact and costs of migration caused for


example by the Syria crisis or the situation in Iraq. Yet, their voices are hardly heard in the debate. Thus, the Euro-centric nature of the debate concentrates on impact on developed countries, even though irregular migration affects poorer countries disproportionately harder.

From a human security and national security perspective, migration management presents a far greater security challenge to weak states than to developed states, whether the latter are destination countries, transit countries or countries of origin. ‘Less developed countries have their own concerns about unauthorized migration. These include the seeming gross disregard for the human rights, labour rights, and other basic rights of their nationals who enter the illegal immigration stream, and the trafficking industry that has grown around such movements. It is also the brain drain that irregular migration movements cause, and the impact on social and economic situation in the countries of origin, but also countries of transit. Furthermore, for states of origin, irregular migration often is an essential economic factor for both their citizens and their economies because of remittances, now probably approaching $404 billion (in 2015). The outlook for remittances remains strong. It is also in some cases a ‘security valve’, allowing young people without hope in their own country to pursue their future elsewhere, thus curtailing the danger of social explosions in countries of origins faced with demographic and economic challenges.104

It is these perspectives that are often overlooked in the debate on the security-migration nexus. It is clear, that given such different interests, broader policies aimed at addressing the security-migration nexus, will have to reconcile the positions of developed countries of destination and developing countries of destination, transit and origin. Without such an effort, the efficiency of EU’s migration management and border management

policies will be severely limited. Indeed, the proper approach to the migration–security debate needs to focus on the needs of developing countries just as much as developed countries, and on countries of transit and origin just as much as on countries of destination.

3.4 Consequences of Securitization of Migration

Mueller and Sciubbas suggest that securitization of migrants and migration, especially irregular migration, increases the perception of migration as a threat to national security. Securitization is understood as the process in which perceptions of security problems emerge and evolve as a result of speech acts. Migration is one such securitized security threat. Threat perceptions related to migration have heightened in recent years, because, the security agenda has been linked to many aspects of policy (broadening and widening of the concept of security), there has been a rapid rise in the numbers of migrants crossing borders and especially of irregular migrants.

The notion of ‘the war on terrorism’ and other so-called transnational threats has been linked to migration, especially irregular migration. As Lutterbecks says, ‘(o)ne consequence of this growing preoccupation in European countries with irregular migration and (supposedly) related transnational challenges from across the Mediterranean has been a considerable expansion and intensification of policing and law enforcement activities in and across the Mediterranean sea. This has involved both an increasing deployment and upgrading of various types of security forces involved in policing the Mediterranean, as well as a considerable deepening of law enforcement co-operation between countries north and south of the Mediterranean.’ Apart from this, it is used to justify detention, deportation, pushback and other restrictive policies105.

The irregular migrants are from North Africa and sub-Saharan, and others making their way to North Africa in order to reach the northern shore of the Mediterranean. They increasingly turn to more dangerous routes and to human smugglers and traffickers, and pay exorbitant fees to board dangerously small and overcrowded vessels. It also limits their chances of reaching access to safe countries. Thousands of migrants have died in recent years trying to reach the shores of Italy, Malta, Spain and Greece.

3.5 Situation in the Mediterranean Sea

Indeed ‘the Mediterranean sea is considered one of the most important gateways through which undocumented immigrants seek to reach the EU.’ There has been a considerable increase of numbers of irregular migrants arriving on boats since 2011, especially in Italy, but also other northern Mediterranean states. The majority of irregular migrants arrive in the EU across the Mediterranean Sea. Frontex, the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union reports that in the second quarter of 2014, 90% of the irregular migrants arriving in the EU were reported from its sea border, mostly in southern Italy.

Frontex suggests also that ‘It has been a truly disastrous year for irregular migrants attempting the perilous sea-crossing from North Africa to Europe. A troubling spike in serious armed conflicts around the world, from Mali in West Africa through to Gaza, Syria, Iraq and beyond, has proved a bonanza for the people smugglers – with strife-torn Libya now by far the most favoured point of departure. The figures are staggering.’ So far some 2500 are known to have drowned in 2014 while attempting to cross the Mediterranean as irregular
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migrants. The EU response to the situation in the Mediterranean points to an unresolved tension between a national security and human security approach.

While the rhetoric points to both humanitarian considerations of saving lives and guaranteeing human rights of irregular migrants, and to the need to address the root causes of such increased migration (conflicts, human rights abuses, poverty, and socio-economic factors such as unemployment in the countries of origin), the response focuses largely on measures intended to curtail the irregular migration by means of migration management and border management. The Italian Mare Nostrum operation which, after particularly glaring cases of loss of lives in the Mediterranean, provided humanitarian help to boat people in need, is scheduled to conclude, although as of 1 November 2014, there were conflicting reports on this issue.

The EU’s Frontex operation Triton that was intended to succeed the Italian operation as of 1 November 2014 could only be agreed upon after considerable debates among the EU states. The Triton operation will be confined to a 30-mile zone around Italy’s coastal waters, possess a third of Mare Nostrum’s maritime capacities, and be coordinated through Frontex. It is reported that ‘the UK Foreign Office stirred ire in Brussels when it announced that it would not participate in any future operations, because of their “pulling factor” in encouraging economic migrants to set sail for Europe’. This stance points to the difficulties in conceptualizing migration policies that take into account the human security perspective.

---


Part of the explanation may be that, as Joseph Chamie, former director of the UN Population Division argues, ‘would-be host nations confront a dilemma: aid adds incentives for more people to undertake treacherous journeys. Public opinion and the changing political landscape in a number of EU member countries, in which right wing forces became stronger in the last number of years, are likely to further impact on changing the balance of national security and human security approaches towards irregular migration. But the securitization of migration, especially irregular migration, poses significant consequences and hidden costs and creates a vicious cycle of supply and demand for security. Such processes serve short-term needs but arguably not the long-term interests of the developed countries of destination with respect to the preservation of human rights and liberal values.

3.6 Conclusion

This chapter paid attention to the question whether migration can be understood as a security issue. It first asked which terms help us to understand which aspect of migration may be helpful in formulating the claim that in some cases migration can be considered a security issue, relevant for national security and/or human security.

It suggested that it is irregular migration that is seen as posing both national security and human security threats. While the two perspectives on migration and security are often seen as contradictory, they can be brought together by adequate migration and border management policies, which take human security of migrants into account. It then asks the question ‘whose security’ is relevant in such a debate, states or humans, developed countries or developing countries, countries of destination or countries of transit and origin? It suggests
that while currently policies and practices tend to focus on developed states of destination; this has an impact on the effectiveness of policies\textsuperscript{110}.

Leaders in their speeches on security indicate that it has significant implications in term of laws, norms, policies and procedures. In the migration context, the label has been used to justify harsh and restrictive policies. These policies impact the migrants, resulting in inability of asylum seekers to access safe countries, migrants smuggling and human trafficking, unsafe passages and contributing to a growing anti-migrants tendencies. They also result in a gap between the protection that migrants formally enjoyed under international law and the realities they experience as they travel and work across different countries.

4.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the interpretation and presentation of the findings obtained from the field. Qualitative and quantitative analysis have been used to discuss the findings of the study.

4.2: Global migration and Vulnerability of Host Countries

The study sought to establish the vulnerability of host Countries as far as security is concerned resulting from global migration. The study paid attention to the association of migrants with terror activities, the socio-economic differences between migrants and host communities and national security, migration effects on host Countries and Strategies to counter security threats caused by global migration.

4.2.1: Association of migrants with terror activities

Kenya has approved and plaid a part in all efforts, national or multilateral directed towards rooting out and fighting international terrorism efficiently. Although there is reportedly no proof that acts of terror attacks in Kenya are committed by asylum-seekers, the government has been keen in keeping an eye on migrants and refugee camps such as Daadab and Kakuma. Its concern is to put in place supplementary security based routine safeguards and at the same time striking a proper balance with the refugee protection provisions under international law. Kenya has raised security concerns linked to refugee camps which have led to the declaration to close Daadab refugee camp\textsuperscript{111}.

According to Khalid:

\textsuperscript{111} Pooley, Colin and Turnbull, Jean. \textit{Migration And Mobility In Britain Since The Eighteenth Century}. New York: Routledge, 2005.
“Given the current situation in Somalia, with the asylum seekers population so huge, fleeing a war-torn region, there is sufficient proof that a group of the migrants is much more likely to contain Islamic radicals creating an entirely unsecure, dangerous, and untenable state of affairs for Kenyans.”112

The main question for what has become a refugee catastrophe in Kenya is what happens next, as thousands of exiled persons move to a country dealing with its own economic problems. This is because they may never find what they're looking for, and locals may not be contented with their being there. All the while, the skirmishes from which the migrants are fleeing show no signs of concluding. It's a volatile mix that could breed violence. There exists seething anti-immigrant and nationalist sentiments in Kenya that could boil over as more and more arrivals continue to flow in. Security officials are also fearful that some among the migrants may have bad motives. Authorities in Kenya are as such already setting up de facto internment camps in attempts to document the huge flow of persons into the country.113

It’s worth noting that some of those coming in are genuine asylum seekers fleeing violence, and possibly had to give up or obliterate their identification papers if they had any hope of leaving the borders of their country. Others are traditional economic migrants who are taking advantage of the exodus to see to it that they attain their long-held hopes of making it to Kenya as asylum seekers. But Kenya may not offer the answers these migrants are looking for, which may spark a sense of disenchantment that could eventually become dangerous.

According to Alex Abuga:

"They very well may be radicalized because it will not be the paradise they thought it would be. The refugees think that once in Kenya, everything will be okay. They face years and years of hard life and poverty."114

Mr. Khalid,
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“What this means is in two, to five years' time, we may have some real problems within these communities, as persons within these communities may pose real threats to us.”

Another respondent, Mr Zack argued that:

"These people, (the local communities), they told me they will come. There are no walls stopping them. They say that if they find the doors closed, they will come in through the windows. They say they will come over and over again until they feel that we are indeed serious about combating and ousting the terrorists. If the asylum seekers are treated as a temporary humanitarian problem rather than as a long-term assimilation challenge, then we are likely to see this problem deteriorate. Radicals will be among those who provide the social support, religious and educational support for the migrants creating a predicament where none existed."

The asylum seekers need a long term solution that includes political privileges, educational maintenance, and economic support as well as immediate humanitarian support. If they cannot be integrated into the local society, then they risk propagating, or even exacerbating, the tensions between non-Muslim and Muslim societies in Kenya. The actual security risks were at first low, but the probable ones are substantial in the wake of terrorist groups like Alshabaab. Provision of policing, service, and local governance in general need to be there for the long haul. The worst thing Kenya can do would be to invite in hundreds of thousands of asylum seekers in a fit of sympathy and then lose interest.

Alex Abuga, a security consultant at the Refugee Consortium of Kenya noted that due to the links between migrants and terror activities, Kenya remains apprehensive over migrants and insecurity. The main concern is twofold: that bona fide refugee may be victimized due to public prejudice and unduly restrictive legislative or administrative measures, and that cautiously built refugee safeguard standards may be done away with. Any discussion on security safeguards should start from the supposition that migrants are themselves running away from persecution and hostility, including terrorist acts, and are not the perpetrators. The second starting point is that the international refugee mechanisms do not provide a safe haven.

---
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to terrorists and do not defend them from criminal prosecution\textsuperscript{118}. On the contrary, international mechanisms render the identification of persons engaged in terrorist activities possible and necessary, forecast their removal from refugee status and do not protect them against either expulsion or criminal prosecution, including to their country of origin.

It is regrettable that there seems to be an increasing tendency towards the criminalisation of migrants. While there are some persons in both categories who may be associated with grave crime, this does not mean that the bulk should be doomed by association with the few. Migrants increasingly have to overcome presumptions about the validity of their claims and being subjected to long procedures which stem from their ethnicity, or their mode of arrival. The fact that migrants may have arrived illegally does not vitiate the base of their claim. Because they have a certain religious or ethnic background, which may be shared by those, who have committed serious crimes, does not mean they themselves, are criminals who ought to be expelled.

\textbf{4.2.2: Socio-economic differences between migrants and host communities and Kenya’s National Security}

The respondents argued that socio-economic differences between migrants and host communities breed conflict and compromises Kenya’s national security. Beyond that immediate problem facing migrants lays the ever increasing ultra-nationalism in parts of the country where even elected leaders adopting anti-immigrant rhetoric are gaining support.

Pius Arthurs cited images showing mostly male migrants as evidence that:

\begin{quote}
"Persons fleeing their country leaving their families back home do not do so to flee persecution. It is clearly for economic purposes. We educate our fellow citizens about the dangers of migration."
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{119} Pius A.B. ‘Urban Refugees’. Forced Migration Research Guide
Such sentiments and the likelihood for perpetration of fear mongering make migrants vulnerable and well poised for recruitment by organizations like the Islamic State and other terrorist groups, who perceive any crisis as an opportunity to debase any sense of unity between Kenyan communities. Even the perception that an attack has been committed by migrants stoke fears and stimulate suspicion and doubt between Kenyan nationals and those hoping to call the country their home as was seen in the Westgate attack.\textsuperscript{120}

Jonathan Walters argued that:

"It only takes a few persons who perpetrated a large-scale act of violence, and what that does then is put a stain on all the asylum seekers. Then, everyone becomes a suspect. Furthermore, there's a potential here for something I don't think local politicians have thought through."\textsuperscript{121}

Jonathan Walters from the Norwegian Council in Kenya,

"There is likely to be more financial problems for Kenyans and people are quite anxious with the situation as it is, even before the immigrants arrive. The last thing anyone wants is that kind of polarization eating into the fabric of society, since it can develop an impetus of its own."\textsuperscript{122}

He continues to say

"These migrants are going to continue flowing in whether we want them or not," as such Kenya must act. It is now, and we must stop looking for excuses about terrorists."

From the above responses from Jonathan Walters, it is Kenya's moral and legal duty, to receive the migrants as best it can. But terrorism is not the only issue people have about migrants. Many are also concerned that the migrants will become an economic burden. Some respondents stated that migrants will take away their jobs as well as social benefits. For others, negative attitudes towards the Muslims community are tied to the belief that Muslims are not ready to participate in the building of the larger society. In all the respondents polled,

\textsuperscript{120}ibid
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the dominant view is that Muslims want to be distinctive from the rest of society rather than assume the nation’s traditions and lifestyle.

While most people think the recent increase of asylum seekers could lead to more terrorism, there are fears that Muslims already living in Kenya might sympathize with the extremists. However, the portion of respondents believing that most or a majority of the Muslims in the country support groups like ISIS and Alshabaab is less than 5% of the whole population. The refugee catastrophe has brought into sharp focus deep-rooted ideological divides over the views of the minority and diversity. This resonates well with the view that people on the ideological right express more concerns about migrants, hold more negative attitudes toward minorities and have less enthusiasm for a diverse society.123

Supporters of conservative political parties, e.g. Democratic Party, Kenya African National Union, Jubilee Alliance are of a much more negative attitude toward asylum seekers and Muslims and are much more cynical about the benefits of a diverse society. Some respondents held the opinion that there are fears, for instance, that the increase in the numbers of migrants will lead to more terrorism and in the process harm the economy. Ideology is not the only dividing line in Kenyan thoughts on migrants, however. The level of education and the age bracket also matter, with the older generation and the less educated persons expressing more pessimistic views about migrants and minorities. Along with worries about asylum seekers and minorities, the study finds mixed observations regarding the overall value of cultural diversity. The findings in this study on Kenya are not unique. In a similar study in the America, when asked whether having an escalating number of persons of many different, ethnic backgrounds and nationalities in their country makes their community a worse place to

live, a better place or does not make much difference either way, over half of the respondents said growing diversity makes things worse\textsuperscript{124}.

### 4.2.3 Migration effects on host Countries

Trends in crime throughout East Africa, specifically Kenya, are frequently evolving, giving law enforcement agents the difficult task of remaining vigilant\textsuperscript{125}. Surrounding Kenya is the failed state of Somalia, war-torn Sudan, and crime-ridden Ethiopia and Uganda. Without proper border control, there is simply no realistic way to create a secure country\textsuperscript{126}. The U.S. Legal Attaché in Nairobi makes it very clear that there is no way to accurately know the number of people crossing through the Somalia-Kenya border. However, he would estimate that 100,000 undocumented foreigners make entry into or exit Kenya every day. This figure is exceptionally upsetting when it is considered that Somalia houses al-Shabab, a terrorist group with self-declared ties to al-Qaeda.\textsuperscript{127}

The presence of al-Qaeda in Kenya was directly responsible for the 1998 bombing of the U.S. embassy in Nairobi. This act left an innate hatred of the terrorist group by nearly every Kenyan.\textsuperscript{128} Besides the 1998 terrorist attacks that left over 200 people dead in Kenya, there was another significant attack that occurred in 2002. The Kikambala bombing in Mombasa was equally gruesome and created more cause for concern among Kenyans and law enforcement officials worldwide. A pro-Palestinian organization from Lebanon planted a


\textsuperscript{128}\textsuperscript{Lippmann L. May, Michael Ibrahim, Cohen, Jeffrey H. and Pinar Yazgan. Conflict, Insecurity and Mobility. London: Transnational Press, 2016.}
bomb at an Israeli owned hotel in Mombasa killing and injuring dozens of people. The international response was firm and expected but it was later made public that the Intelligence Community worldwide had knowledge of an imminent terrorist attack and failed to act on the information. Described as a permissive environment for terrorist operations, Kenya is an attractive targets for Al Qaida and its affiliates like Al-Shabaab.

Kenya has a history of international terrorist activity. This is largely attributed to weak state institutions which are unable to meet the security needs of their citizens. This is compounded by porous borders, widespread corruption and inadequate policing. In addition to this, Kenya hosts enticing Western targets such as large expatriate communities, businesses and NGOs. The U.S. State Department considers al-Shabab, which controls portions of Somalia, to be a terrorist organization with ties to al-Qaeda and says that al-Shabab has targeted non-Muslims and those who have converted from Islam to other religions. According to the Council on Foreign Relations, al-Shabab is “fighting for the creation of a fundamentalist Islamic state in Somalia.” The number of people killed in religion-related terrorist attacks in Kenya has dramatically increased in recent years.

According to reports analysed by the Pew Research Centre as part of ongoing global study of religious restrictions and hostilities, more than 300 people were killed, injured or displaced as a result of religion-related terrorist attacks in Kenya in 2012, more than twice as many as in 2011 and more than a five-fold increase from 2010. The Somalia-based Islamic group al-Shabaab claimed responsibility for the Nairobi’s Westgate shopping mall attack that left 62 people dead, saying that the assault was in retaliation to Kenyan military operations in Somalia.

4.2.4: Strategies to Counter Security Threats Caused By Global Migration

The study did a descriptive analysis of strategies used to counter security threats caused by global migration. From the analysis of the statistical data by the statistical package for social sciences, the following was established. The respondents were asked to rate how they felt about different variables related to threats caused by global migration. The range was from ‘strongly agree to (5)’ to ‘strongly disagree’ (1). A standard deviation of >1.5 implied little significant difference between the respondents.

Based on the responses from the respondents, it was also established that migration management presents a far greater security challenge to weak states than to developed states. This was seen true by the high mean value calculated in the analysis of 4.387. The standard deviation calculated in the analysis of 0.6135 indicated little variance from the mean mark in the responses. It was also clear that most respondents saw that irregular migration often is an essential economic factor for both their citizens and their economies because of remittances. This was noted true from the high mean calculated from the analysis of findings of 4.223. The standard deviation calculated in this case of .3921 indicated uniformity in the responses from the respondents.

4.3: Impact of Global Migration on Vulnerable Groups

The study also sought to establish the effect and impact of global migration to radicalization of vulnerable groups. It also looked at the effectiveness of the measures put in place to address radicalization that may lead to terrorism.

4.3.1 Approaches to Countering Radicalization in Kenya

Acts of terrorism have become common ways used by groups at both national and international levels to further political and socioeconomic interests. The terrorist attacks of 11
September 2001 demonstrated some cogent lessons. One is that no nation, however powerful, is above terror attacks. In fact, “powerful nations are even more vulnerable to attacks than the weak ones.” 131

The study further sought information on the factors that hinder counter terrorism in Kenya. Respondents noted that Kenya does not properly monitor its borders and aliens in the country. It also came out strongly that personnel in the Antiterrorism Police Unit were overworked. Poor remuneration of security agencies was also seen as largely contributing to personnel being demoralized and therefore do not perform as expected. Inadequate funding of security agencies stood out as a factor that hinders counter terrorism. The public was blamed for not taking interest in the fight against terrorism particularly for failing to give information to the police.

4.3.2 Addressing radicalism in counter-terrorism Efforts

Terrorism as is argued is the extreme posture of radicalism. It has multiple foundations and to understand these underlying forces, security studies need to adopt more interdisciplinary perspectives to the causes, operations as well as counter terrorism mechanisms. An ideal breeding ground for recruitment emerges when various social, cultural, economic, political, and psychological factors come together. But even when such negative dynamics converge, different terrorist networks still have different political objectives. Despite such complications and multiplicity of reasons, all terrorist groups share one common objective; the willingness to kill or harm civilians for their cause. This is why terrorism is ultimately a major security concern. Therefore, there is no reason to repudiating that counter-terrorism is primarily about securing the state and protecting civilians from the thereat and effects of a terrorist attack in case the plan is not interdicted. This requires greatest vigilance in safety

measures, intelligence gathering, law enforcement, interagency coordination, and, when necessary, the use of force\textsuperscript{132}.

Terrorist networks as it were would not be deterred by anything less than comprehensive security measures. The debate about the root causes of terrorism, however, is not about counterterrorism. Advocates of the root cause approach are interested in fighting the conditions that create terrorism as this will eliminate the terrorists themselves.

The development agenda is not about terrorists themselves, but rather those most susceptible to the goals and messages of terrorism. It is precisely within this broader context that an approach that goes beyond the narrow confines of terrorism and counter-terrorism is important. Fighting radicalism rather than ‘terrorism provides a better paradigm and framework for a number of reasons. First, radicalism more accurately reflects the political and ideological dimension of the threat. No matter how diverse the causes, motivations, and ideologies behind terrorism, all attempts at premeditated violence against civilians share the traits of violent radicalism. Secondly, while terrorism is a deadly security challenge, radicalism is primarily a political threat against which non-coercive measures should be given a chance. There is nothing preordained in the possible transition from radicalism to terrorism.

All terrorists, by definition, are extremists. Yet all radicals do not end up as terrorists. In fact, only a few radicals venture into terrorism\textsuperscript{133}. At the same time, it is clear that most terrorists start their individual journey towards extremist violence first by becoming radicalized. Since radicalism is often a precursor to terrorism, focusing on radicalism amounts to preventing terrorism at an earlier stage, before it is too late for non-coercive measures. Finally, radicalism, unlike terrorism, has social dimensions. There are radicalized societies where acts


of terrorism find some sympathy and degree of support. It is impossible to talk about terrorism as a social phenomenon, however. There are no societies that are predisposed to terrorist activities as being proposed albeit mistakenly. The relative popularity of certain terrorist networks in the Islamic world can only be explained within the framework of such radicalized societies where extreme violence finds an environment of legitimacy and implicit support. Such radicalized societies are permeated by a deep sense of collective frustration, humiliation, and deprivation relative to expectations. This radicalized social locale is easily manipulated and exploited by terrorists. This is why focusing on the collective grievances behind radicalism is probably the most effective way of addressing the root causes of terrorism. This effort at prevention can be conceived of as a first line of defense against terrorism. The goal is to reduce the social, economic, and political appeal of terrorism by isolating terrorists and winning over potential recruits. Once the challenge is defined as such, the next and more difficult step is to identify an effective strategy to fight radicalism.

The socio-economic and political context where radicalism takes root, particularly among Muslims, presents an urgent situation for counter-terrorism campaigners. This enabling environment can be altered most effectively by focusing on relative deprivation and human development. Breeding grounds for radicalism and terrorist recruitment emerge not necessarily under conditions of abject poverty and deprivation, but rather when negative social, economic, and political trends converge. In fact, when analysed in a broader framework of socio-economic and political deprivation, the societal support for terrorism and radicalism gains greater relevance. Dismissing the social and economic causes of radicalism on the grounds that some terrorists have middle-class backgrounds as happens at times is rather one-dimensional and deceptive. Nonetheless, closer scrutiny tends to confirm that

---

weak, failing, and failed states; ungoverned spaces; and civil wars that create safe havens for terrorism are all in underdeveloped parts of the world, not in the industrialized countries.

Terrorism is not necessarily caused by socio-economic problems, but there is certainly a correlation between deprivation and radicalism. The more challenging question is relative deprivation and the absence of opportunities relative to expectations. The scale of youth frustration is compounded by a demographic explosion, growing expectations, weak state capacity, and diminishing opportunities for upward mobility in most parts of the Muslim world. Globalization further exacerbates this situation because restive Muslim masses of both genders are caught in the growing tension between religious tradition and western modernity that is emerging as a global culture\textsuperscript{135}.

### 4.3.3 Threats to Kenya’s Security

Kenya is the epicenter for East African economic, political, and humanitarian dialogue. It is a major player regionally and recognized internationally because it has been one of the most prosperous and politically stable countries in East Africa. To understand the present decision by the government to opt for national security leading to the decision to close down Dadaab refugee camp over humanitarianism, it is important to appreciate Kenya’s major domestic issues, which cause it to repeatedly bleed from terrorist activities and attacks hence more wary as a result of heightened vulnerability to external attack\textsuperscript{136}. These issues range from weak legal regime, exclusion, political intolerance, marginalization, poverty, restiveness and youth bulge coupled with joblessness. These factors provide ready and already hopeless pool from which terror networks recruit followers. The threat from Al-Shabaab to Kenya’s political and territorial integrity is therefore not a threat that Kenya can choose to ignore. The


presence of huge Somali refugee population has also enabled the Al-Shabaab to use the refugee camps as sanctuaries and offer a ready reserve of would-be terrorists.

The ungoverned space in Somalia has on its part enabled the recruitment and training of the terrorists who find their way unhindered into Kenya due to the porosity of the border. Kenya therefore may have been forced to wage an overt invasion in to Somalia to tackle the Al-Shabaab threat, after having weighed the consequences including being reprimanded by the international community and the huge cost involved as another risk. The latter may have led Kenya to renegotiate its stance and accepting inclusion in the AMISOM arrangement. For the Kenyan government, it may appear to be a win-win situation as it considers pressurizing for the sending back refugees to Somalia and giving them the opportunity to take matters into their own hands concerning their own country, and at the same time counter the threats from Al-Shabaab.

4.3.4 Global migration and vulnerability Kenya

The study also did a descriptive analysis of statements relating to global migration on vulnerability of host countries. From the analysis of the statistical data, the following was established.

From the findings in the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) analysis, majority of the respondents concurred that migration flows has an effect on both the country of origin and the one that receives them. Also noted was that a great number of the respondents agreed that the reasons why people migrate or move from their country of domicile to other locations is explained by what is referred to as push and pull factors. A significant number of the respondents also agreed to the statement. The study noted generally that majority of the respondents agreed with statements that global migration creates vulnerability to insecurity arising from terrorist attacks in the host countries. The study thus established that Migration
flows have an effect on both the country of origin and the one that receives them. The greatest concern is of terrorist attacks from criminals disguised as migrants. Further to this, some migrants cross the border illegally with the intention of settling permanently in the country they move to.\textsuperscript{137} The findings collaborate with studies done by Pooley who notes that Kenya has approved and plaid a part in all efforts, national or multilateral directed towards rooting out and fighting international terrorism efficiently.

4.4 Conclusion

The study shows that Kenya’s security has been impacted by global migration from within through the rise and growth of home grown terrorism, and from without through terrorist incursions emanating from porous borders. Additionally, security organs, which include the Kenyan police. Immigration and the larger public security sector have often failed to conduct good policing with the community, which is required to gather quality intelligence evidence to carry out effective de-radicalization\textsuperscript{138}. Without addressing these factors, Kenya’s counter-terrorism strategies cannot work effectively. Building community cohesion in the face of a sustained effort by al-Shabaab to foment ethnic and religious divisions in Kenya is vital for marginalizing extremist actors and avoiding sectarian strife. Key to this will be building trust ensuring effectiveness, professionalism, and transparency of Kenya’s security sector and working in conjunction with the Kenyan societies\textsuperscript{139}. For counter terrorism efforts to be successful, they must be lead and informed by accurate intelligence and these calls for the winning of the hearts and minds of the population.


5.1 Summary

Kenya is an attractive destination and transit country for mixed migration. This entails movement of economic migrants, asylum seekers and refugees. All this falls in the category of migrants who come to Kenya regularly outside the formal laid out rules and regulations set out by the sending, transit or receiving states. Asylum seekers and refugees are part and parcel of immigrants and have had an impact on the social, economic, political and security aspects of the Kenyan society.

The study established that Kenya’s open door policy on immigrants has seen the country receive immigrants from various countries in Africa. It is clear from the respondents that Kenya provides a safe haven for persons running from civil and military strife from countries like Somalia, Burundi, South Sudan, Congo, Rwanda and Ethiopia. The study findings indicated that Kenya supports the principle that rejection of immigrants at the entry point or the border is against international law that protects such people and may amount to refoulement. This is because by rejecting them, Kenya would be risking sending the immigrants back to danger, which is in contrast to international legal responsibility on immigrants. Kenya believes that every person has the right to seek asylum and to go through individual refugee status determination. As such, each claim must be determined on its own merits, and not against negative and prejudiced assumptions stemming from personal attributes of the claimant that have nothing to do with the aspect of being a refugee.

With regard to the link between Kenya’s open door policy on immigrants and to national security, the study findings revealed that Kenya holds the position that sincere immigrants are merely the victims of terrorism and oppression, not its perpetrators. It is worth noting that
persons responsible for grave crimes are not qualified to be accorded refugee status as per the conditions set out in international refugee instruments. Kenya encourages countries to make use of those clauses thoroughly where applicable. The application of any exemption clause must be assessed individually on the basis of available evidence and must of essence be in line with basic standards of natural justice and fairness. Nonetheless, the refugee status determination processes in place which is supposed to sieve out terrorists suspects has not born much fruit in making sure that all applicants conform to minimum standards of due process and that resolutions are decided by those qualified and knowledgeable to determine who is and who is not qualified to be a refugee.

The study observes that the first challenge to tackling insecurity successfully lies in the elusiveness of the concept. The possible motivations, ideas and other factors that might drive an individual towards terrorism are numerous and complex. A single factor is therefore not necessary or sufficient to account for radicalization which may lead to terrorism. It is noted that radicalization is not a threat to society if it is not connected to violence or other unlawful acts, such as incitement to hatred, as legally defined in compliance with international human rights law. Therefore terrorist radicalization is a process whereby an individual comes to accept terrorist violence as a possible, perhaps even legitimate, course of action. This may eventually, but not necessarily, lead this person to advocate, act in support of, or engage in terrorism.

The study established that Kenya has in many cases raised security concerns that are linked to refugee camps which has contributed to the decision by the government to close Daadab refugee camp. For Kenya, the refugee situation is an emotive one that could lead to eruption of violence if not well handled. As new arrivals continue to flow in, there exists simmering anti-immigrant and nationalist sentiments that could explode. Kenyan security agencies are also concerned that some among the migrants may have ill motives. The actual security risks
were at first low, but the potential to escalate has been considered in the wake of increased activities by terrorist groups like Alshabaab.

The main concern for Kenya is that when it comes to immigrants and insecurity, bona fide immigrants may be victimized stemming from public prejudice as well as unjustifiably restrictive judicial or administrative procedures. Candid conversations on security safeguards should ideally commence from the notion that asylum seekers are themselves running away from oppression and violence that includes terrorist acts, whereas they are not the perpetrators of such acts. Nonetheless, Kenya is in support of all efforts, both bilateral and multilateral directed towards rooting out and efficiently battling international terrorism.

5.2 Conclusions

The study concludes that Kenya’s open door policy on immigrants has led to an infiltration by illegal immigrants thus contributing to an increase in insecurity and more so terrorism in the country. Although disapproval of terrorist activities by the international community has been undivided and unequivocal, their efforts to control this menace have been tarnished by differences in approach and competing concerns. Terrorism is still one of the main threats against which the international community, and above all, individual states must strive to protect their citizens. The international community not only has the right but also the duty to do so. Countries on the other hand however must also take it upon themselves to ensure that counterterrorism measures do not end up being an all-embracing one size for all concept which can be used to impede or flout recognised humanitarian standards and violations of human rights. With regard to Kenya’s open door policy, the study concludes that Kenya must endeavour to give each and every refugee an opportunity to value and enjoy their own rights but at the same time respect the rights of others.
Kenya must continually reiterate the importance of the rule of law and unequivocally condemn terrorism acts like the Garissa College attack and the Westgate Mall attach. The acts are wicked and no refugee policy should be allowed to approve refugee status of the persons involved. Kenya’s security measures on the other hand must also be firmly grounded in law and avoid viewing whole communities as suspects thereby subjecting them to harassment due to terror acts perpetrated by a handful of their members. Nor must Kenya permit the fight against terrorism become an excuse for the suppression of genuine opposition. The right to nationalism must be balanced against safeguarding fundamental freedoms of people and violation of human rights.

5.3 Recommendations

The study recommends that Kenya’s foremost response to the correlation between immigrants, immigrants and terrorism should squarely focus gathering information or intelligence on migrants, their identification as well as closely monitoring their travel both locally and internationally. Border agents should be well equipped to take fingerprints of every migrant and refugee entering the country at all entry points and log them into the system. The system should be linked to Interpol and other regional data bases that store criminal history of suspected individuals.

5.3.1 Host community development

Concerning the impact of immigrants who are a significant part of immigrants in Kenya, the study sees it as essential for the Government of Kenya to come up with strategies for host community development. By promoting development among the locals, the government will improve their livelihoods in addition to enhancing their affiliation with the refugee population. Such measures could also help improve the welfare of immigrants by decreasing the common tensions between hosts and immigrants. Specifically, the issues of food and
water security are critically important for the local communities. If locals are better equipped to sustain their lives, it is imperative that they will be less dependent on going to camps seeking for food. Providing more access to water and promoting sustainable livelihoods could therefore be one approach that could enhance positive relationship between the immigrants and the local communities.

It is imperative to balance the bridge between development and humanitarian aid. Promoting sustainable ways of livelihood could help create a more sustainable mechanism in the long-term. The dilemma however would be balancing between involving locals in hosting immigrants and limit the dependency on the camp. When or if the camp is closed, the government should put in measures to ensure survival of the local host communities who depended on the camp for survival. Presently, it is clear that the locals look forward to being involved and benefiting more from being hosts. This could be through increasing employment of locals in Non-governmental organizations, especially in the unskilled labour sector. Provision of hands-on education for the locals to be better equipped for jobs in Non-governmental organizations could increase their chances of employment.

5.3.2 Improve the social relationship between hosts and immigrants

Social tensions between locals and immigrants are witnessed regularly in refugee camps for several reasons highlighted in this study. Initiatives reported in this study to bring the communities together as one and encourage coexistence remain imperative. Peace building initiatives as well as peace education seminars conducted by the UNHCR who are mandated to run refugee camp should be enhanced and expanded to bring more players on board. Mixed schools bringing in both the locals and immigrants together should continue since it creates a good rapport and interaction between the two. Marketplaces, where locals work for immigrants have been said to be areas where conflicts start and also where mutual benefits are experienced. As such it is important to improve these areas to benefit both groups.
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APPENDIX I: QUESTIONNAIRE

General Information

In order to ensure confidentiality do not put down your name on the questionnaire but please answer the questions as honestly and objectively as possible.

Section A. (Personal Information)

Tick the following questions where its appropriate

1 Gender Male [ ]
   Female [ ]

2 Age 18 – 23 [ ]
   24 – 29 [ ]
   Above 30 [ ]

3 Number of years worked
   Less than 1 year – 5 years [ ]
   6-10 years [ ]
   11 and Over [ ]

4. Highest level of Education
   Diploma [ ]
   Degree [ ]
   Masters [ ]
   PHD [ ]
SECTION B

Global migration and vulnerability of host countries in the region

i) To what extent do you agree with the following statements on causes of global migration and vulnerability of host countries in the region to insecurity and the capacities of these countries to respond

Key: 5 = Strongly Agree 4 = Agree 3 = Neutral 2 = Disagree 1 = Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migration flows have an effect on both the country of origin and the one that receives them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some countries are referred to as traditional receiving countries while others are considered as traditional sending countries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reasons why people migrate or move from their country of domicile to other locations is explained by what is referred to as push and pull factors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political instability in countries of origin lead to civil unrest triggers forced migration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The effect of the migration flow is felt by both the sending and the receiving state.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii. What other effects do you think have an influence on global migration?

..........................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................

iii. How do you think immigration results to vulnerability of the host countries?

..........................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................
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SECTION C

Strategies to Counter Security Threats Caused By Global Migration

i) To what extent do you agree with the following statements on strategies to counter security threats caused by global migration; Use a scale of 1-5 where; 5 Strongly Agree, 4 Agree, 3 Don’t Know, 2 Disagree 1. Strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The EU does not provide an estimate of the numbers of irregular immigrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism, organized crime and health threats are at the core of the perception of irregular migration as a security threat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human security threats to irregular migrants by far outweigh the national security threats that they may create</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies developed out of a misguided view of national security put people in less secure positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration management presents a far greater security challenge to weak states than to developed states</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular migration often is an essential economic factor for both their citizens and their economies because of remittances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securitization of migrants and migration, especially irregular migration, increases the perception of migration as a threat to national security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION D

Factors and Strategies to Counter Security Threats Caused By Global Migration

i) What do you think are the strategies that should be adopted to counter security threats caused by global migration
ii) Have the already adopted strategies aided in countering security threats?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

To what extent do you agree with the following statements on strategies to counter security threats caused by global migration; Use a scale of 1-5 where; 5 Strongly Agree, 4 Agree, 3 Don’t Know, 2 Disagree 1. Strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The public debate on the migration-security nexus tends to focus on a variety of aspects related to national security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The perception of migration as a threat to national security has certainly heightened in recent years,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular migration is large scale or occurs during periods of recession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security concerns must be taken seriously and migration management and border management policies designed to respond are needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National security perspective focuses on border management challenges that may undermine a state’s sovereignty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human security threats to irregular migrants by far outweigh the national security threats that they may create</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human security is often set against the concept of national security,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human security framework moves the migration discussion beyond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration management presents a far greater security challenge to weak states than to developed states</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank You!!