

WORKSHOP

The Politics of Migration Policies:

Towards an empirically grounded, comparative political theory of migration politics

Paris, 17-18 December 2018

Workshop organised by H el ene Thiollet and Katharina Natter within the CERI research programme “Action Publique Ailleurs” and in partnership with Agence Fran aise de D veloppement (AFD).

Much scholarly attention has been devoted to migration policy and politics, with a research tradition anchored in ‘Western liberal democracies’. Yet, little or no systematic comparative work of global scope explored the impact of political variables on migration policies. Drawing upon the regional expertise of participants spanning the entire globe, we seek to kick-start a systematic discussion on the political determinants of migration policy.

The purpose of the workshop is to use comparisons across time and across countries in order to reflect on migration theories from a comparative empirical perspective. It investigates the impact of political variables such as regime change, political institutions, or policy practices on migration politics. Our central question is: *How do political variables shape the management of immigration and emigration?*

Using different levels of analysis and entry points, the contributions will remedy the deficit in research on migration politics in non-western countries, illiberal contexts and undemocratic regimes across time and space by particularly engaging with the following issues:

- historical variations in migration politics within and across countries as a result of regime change, state formation, nation-state ideology or revolution
- the dynamics of migration politics in democratic vs. un-democratic contexts, such as the role of civil society, legal actors, employers, international organizations, inter-institutional dynamics within the state bureaucracy or international norms
- illiberal migration policies across the globe and across political regimes
- the formal and informal politics of state and non-state actors involved in the making of migration policies
- the political determinants of migration regulation and migration policy efficacy in the Global South
- the linkages between immigration and emigration politics

PROGRAM

Monday 17 December 2018: Immigration patterns

9h-10h: Welcome & Keynote

- H el ene Thiollet (CNRS CERI Sciences Po) & Katharina Natter (University of Amsterdam): Welcome and workshop roadmap
- James Hollifield (Southern Methodist University): “Keynote: The Emerging Migration State”

10h00-10h30: Coffee break

10h30-12h30: Session 1

The control gap debate revisited: the politics of immigration policymaking

- Blanca Garc es-Mascare nas (CIDOB / UPF Barcelona): “Beyond methodological Western-centrism: the control gap debate reconsidered from a global perspective”
- David FitzGerald (University of California San Diego): “International Norms: When do they Shape Immigration Policies in the Americas?”
- Feline Freier (Universidad del Pac fico): “The politics behind Latin America’s ‘generosity’ towards migrants”
- Virginie Guiraudon (CNRS CEE Sciences Po): “European liberal democracies and the migration policy mix”

Discussant: Catherine Wihtol de Wenden (CNRS CERI Sciences Po)

12h30-13h30: Lunch

13h30-15h30: Session 2

The control/implementation gap: de jure and de facto immigration and refugee policies

- Erin Aeran Chung (Johns Hopkins University): “The Side Doors of Immigration: Immigration Policy without Immigrants in East Asia”
- Oliver Bakewell (University of Manchester): “The Locus of Migration Policy: reflections from two African case studies”
- Darshan Vigneswaran (University of Amsterdam): “The Complex Character of Movement Control Regimes: How Non-Immigration Policies Determine Immigration Policy Outcomes”
- Daniel Naujoks (Columbia University): “Immigration and Refugee Governance in India”

Discussant: Hein de Haas (University of Amsterdam)

15h30-16h: Coffee break

16h-17h30: Session 3

Illiberal(ising) immigration and asylum politics: structures and policy changes

- Céline Cantat (Central European University): “The politics of post-socialist transition and migration in Hungary”
- Hélène Thiollet (CNRS CERI Sciences Po): “Migrants, Markets and Monarchs. An anatomy of change in Saudi Arabia (1991-2018)”
- Gerasimos Tsourapas (University of Birmingham): “The Refugee Rentier State in the Middle East”

Discussant: Hélène le Bail (CNRS CERI Sciences Po)

19h30: Dinner

Tuesday 18 December 2018: Hybrid and emigration patterns

9h-10h30: Session 4

Changing regimes, hybrid migration patterns: the multilayer politics of immigration and emigration policies

- Els van Dongen (Nanyang Technological University): “Four Key Points from Chinese Migration Policies”
- Amin Moghadam (Princeton University): “Politics of Citizenship and Migration in a post-revolutionary Iran”
- Katharina Natter (University of Amsterdam): “Tunisian migration politics throughout the revolution: The democratization-migrants’ rights nexus revisited”

Discussant : Laurence Louer (CERI Sciences Po)

10h30-11h: Coffee break

11h-12h30: Session 5

The drivers and actors of emigration politics

- Gaim Kibreab (London South Bank University): “The Politics of Emigration in Eritrea”
- Fiona Adamson (SOAS University of London): “Turkey’s ‘Diaspora Engagement’ Policies: Transnational Citizenship or ‘Remote Control’ Authoritarianism?”
- Stefan Rother (University of Freiburg): “The ‘gold standard’ for labour export? The role of civil society in shaping Philippine migration policies”

Discussant: Jim Hollifield (Southern Methodist University)

12h30-13h30: Concluding discussion and publication prospects

- Hein de Haas (University of Amsterdam)
- Hélène Thiollet (CNRS CERI Sciences Po)
- Katharina Natter (University of Amsterdam)

13h30: Lunch

Keynote

The Emerging Migration State

Jim Hollifield, Southern Methodist University, jhollifi@mail.smu.edu

Alongside trade and investment, migration is a defining feature of the international political economy, and states struggle to regulate migration and mobility. People move across borders for many reasons—economic, social and political—but rights are the key to migration governance, as modern states strive to fulfill three key functions: maintaining security, promoting trade and investment, and regulating migration. International migration and mobility raise a host of security concerns for states in the global north and the south. The garrison state was linked with the trading state in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The twentieth and twenty-first centuries have seen the emergence of the migration state, where managing migration is as important as providing for national security and economic well-being. In this paper I define the migration state, using a series of indicators, including migration flows, stocks, and policy—a proxy measure of rights—to explain why some states are more open to migration than others over time, how migration has contributed to interdependence in the post-1945 era, and what the implications of more open borders are for economic growth and political development.

Session 1

The control gap debate revisited: the politics of immigration policymaking

Beyond methodological Western-centrism: the control gap debate reconsidered from a global perspective

Blanca Garcés-Masareñas, CIDOB / UPF Barcelona, bgarces@cidob.org

Theories of migration policies have paid particular attention to the questions why migration policies fail or why liberal states accept unwanted migration. While this literature offers greater understanding of the political and legal processes underlying the immigration policymaking, their scope is markedly limited by their methodological westerncentrism, that is, the naturalisation of the Western liberal democratic state as the exclusive unit for comparative studies. This presentation aims to go beyond the traditional geographies of migration research to reconsider “from the outside” to what extent liberal democracies are unique in their response to migration. The comparison between Malaysia and Spain will show that liberal politics do not automatically translate into liberal policies and vice versa. Where politics seem to make a difference for policies is when we look at the nature of the immigration policymaking and the degree of restriction imposed on those already in the country. The current EU response to the so-called “refugee crisis” also shows that rights constraints are being bypassed by the externalisation of migration control and the shift from asylum to humanitarianism.

International Norms: When do they Shape Immigration Policies in the Americas?

David FitzGerald, University of California San Diego, dfitzger@ucsd.edu

Scholars dispute whether and how much international norms shape the immigration policies of sovereign countries (Betts and Orchard 2014). While Posner (2014) argues that international human rights law is inconsequential in practice, Hamlin (2014) and Boswell and Geddes (2011) maintain that rights norms channeled through autonomous judiciaries are significant brakes on executive action. This paper examines immigration and nationality policies of countries in the Western Hemisphere that seek to select, reduce, or ban the immigration of targeted national, racial, or religious groups to assess the conditions under which international norms matter in the making of national immigration and nationality policies. Since the 1930s, the overt use of these categories has sharply declined across the Western Hemisphere. That decline was led by the consolidation of a system of decolonized nation-states, whose demands were made salient in powerful countries of immigration by linking the issue of immigration to the issue of support in two global contests of survival, that delegitimized race as a criterion of selection. Middle powers such as Canada, Brazil, and Mexico have used progressive immigration policies to polish their international brands, and in so doing, help consolidate international norms around acceptable grounds for selection. The possible expressions of all of these policies include substantive and/or symbolic changes. Over the long run, changes intended to be symbolic can become substantive as they provide a legal basis and political cultural repertoire for challenging rollbacks.

The presidency of Donald Trump in the United States is a natural experiment testing the conditions under which international norms matter. The Trump administration has aggressively advanced a xenophobic populism targeting Latino, Muslim, and African immigrants in the context of a broad attack on trade and security norms in the international arena as well as national standards of politically reputable speech. I argue that just because norms have weaker constraints on the Trump administration than previous administrations does not mean they never mattered, or do not matter at all now. Rather, the Trump phenomenon highlights the historical contingency of norms, which are sticky but never engraved in stone. In a polarized domestic environment, international norms are not systematically reinforced, though there is a backlash from more than half of the country's population that draws on a domestic political repertoire of openness to immigration and immigrant rights. The major immediate constraints on Trump have not been international pressure, but rather the federal judiciary, which ignores international norms and draws instead on shifting interpretations of the U.S. constitution. These judicial constraints themselves are highly contingent as courts become less autonomous from polarized partisan politics.

The politics behind Latin America's 'generosity' towards migrants

Feline Freier, Universidad del Pacífico, lf.freierd@up.edu.pe

In the past two decades, immigration policies in Latin America developed in stark contrast to other regions. Whereas most countries moved towards more restrictive policies, many Latin American countries liberalized their immigration and refugee policy frameworks as to expand individual rights in unprecedented ways. At the same time, migratory movements in Latin America are in flux, with the transit migration of Central Americans towards Mexico, and the forced displacement of Venezuelans across the region posing significant challenges to policy-makers across the region. Extra-continental immigration from Africa, Asia and the Caribbean has also increased. In a first step the paper explores the reasons for legislative policy

liberalization in the region. In a second step, the paper traces the main determinants for different reactions to both intraregional mass displacement and increasing extra-regional south-south immigration. In doing so the paper analyses the tension between liberal discourses and policies that invoke the universality of migrants' rights and free human mobility, on the one hand, and implementation gaps on the other. The paper also discusses the difference between the initial generous reception of Venezuelans in many South America countries and restrictive reactions to Central American immigration in Mexico. The contextual factors that explain Latin American migration policy-making include democratization processes, regional integration, and the geographic location vis-à-vis de United States. Political ideology and the numbers and characteristics of both immigration and emigration flows further determine whether domestic or foreign policy considerations define policy.

European liberal democracies and the migration policy mix

Virginie Guiraudon, CNRS CEE Sciences Po, virginie.guiraudon@sciencespo.fr

Since the 1990s, a number of scholars have emphasized a “policy gap” between stated policy goals and actual policy flows in liberal democracies (Cornelius, Martin and Hollifield, 1994). Gary Freeman in a 1995 seminal article sought to explain the disjunct between the majoritarian dislike for new immigration and the relative openness of migration policies as a case of “client politics” whereby interest groups enjoying from the “concentrated benefits” of immigration are able to impose their views. As Christian Joppke (1998) and myself (1997) argued at the time, there were also institutional dynamics that explained this situation, including the role of legal venues. These rational-functionalist and institutionalist perspectives seem far from constructivist approaches while in fact in each sphere, law, economics and politics (Guiraudon 1998), there were and are fierce battles over meaning: law is about interpretation, economics about prediction, and politics about framing. 1990s scholarly debates focused on postwar liberal democracies where the tension between electoral politics and human rights guarantees was exacerbated in “hard times”, periods of major economic transformation, characterized by high unemployment and permanent austerity. Are they still relevant? Do they “travel”? This paper seeks to revisit and question these debates and their premises. The “policy gap” model points to certain types of contradictions that can vary across countries. It also invites us to go further to analyse and account for dynamics over time.

On the politics dimension, there is little doubt that anti-immigrant parties have had significant electoral successes in democratic elections across Europe and, in fact, that mainstream parties in government, while often denouncing the far right and calling for a cordon sanitaire to exclude them from power, have increasingly mimicked their identitarian and securitarian rhetoric. On the economy dimension, some sectors still rely on migrant labor (regular/irregular/temporary, formal/informal) such as construction, hotels/restaurants, agriculture and increasingly in the care sector given demographic change including ageing and women participation in the labor force. The business sector is still relatively open to migration, skilled and unskilled, on utilitarian grounds. On the law dimension, the tug of war between human rights activists using litigation and administrations is ongoing but the enthusiasm of “postnational” scholars has been dampened. In any case, it has not been a full-proof solution given the few resources of litigation activists. They have faced since the 1990s the strategies of immigration bureaucracies who sought to avoid legal scrutiny through EU venues and the externalization of border policies, mainly to stem the arrival of asylum-seekers and implement a system of locks and canals that would filter the welcome from the undesirable migrants. The paper will conclude on the relevance of analytical models that concerned the US and West European states for other

European cases and beyond. They are not meant to apply to immigration countries that are neither liberal nor democratic, where natives are not exposed to economic shocks. Yet many countries fall within a grey zone: illiberal democracies, countries with varying degrees of unemployment and welfare safety nets, where immigration can become a highly politicized issue. There are also OECD cases such as Australia where the policy mix aims at resolving contradictory forces.

Session 2

The control/implementation gap: de jure and de facto immigration and refugee policies

The Side Doors of Immigration: Immigration Policy without Immigrants in East Asia

Erin Aeran Chung, Johns Hopkins University, echung@jhu.edu

South Korea and Japan are negative cases of immigration in which immigration levels are extremely low relative to both states' historical, social, and/or cultural linkages with and levels of development vis-à-vis other states in the region and beyond. Despite labor shortages and impending demographic crises, why and how have Korea and Japan been able to maintain relatively closed migrant labor policies? More broadly, what pushes countries to either further regulate or liberalize their migrant labor policies? Are certain types of labor migrants preferred over others, and if so, how and why? Dominant theories of migration have concentrated on immigration patterns in North America, Europe, and Australia, and although they are helpful in understanding labor migration across a wide array of countries, they are often inadequate in explaining patterns among countries that have resisted large-scale importation of foreign labor. I will examine how Korea and Japan's de jure and de facto labor migration policies have enabled both states to maintain low levels of immigration while securing necessary foreign labor through "side doors." Further comparative research that disaggregates de jure and de facto labor migration and their different logics has the potential to contribute fresh insights into how immigration policies shape migrant inflows, settlement, and rights.

The Locus of Migration Policy: reflections from two African case studies

Oliver Bakewell, University of Manchester, oliver.bakewell@manchester.ac.uk

In this paper, I want to reflect on where migration policy comes from and where it is implemented. I will draw on material from two empirical studies; first, my long-standing work on the Zambia-Angola border; and second, more recent material that has examined the out-workings of migration management in Bosasso, a coastal town in Puntland, Somalia. In the first case, we are concerned with the way that national policy enshrined in law is (productively) subverted by local actors, operating according to well-ordered conventions that match local, and to some extent national, priorities. In Puntland, we are concerned with how the international discourse on migration management, which is focused on making movement legible to states (and international actors) – reducing irregular movement and registering people on the move as potential aid recipients – plays out on the ground. Here we see the contrast of interests in and responses to migration between different arms of the state. In using the term locus, I am thinking about the linkages between where 'policy' originates (whether the national capital or international agreements) and the different sites (both physical and institutional) where it is

interpreted and implemented. I hope this might be part of a wide argument about how idea of 'good' migration policy emerge and spread in superficial ways across many parts of Africa, creating a cling film covering but leaving the underlying (often unstated) interests in mobility largely untouched.

The Complex Character of Movement Control Regimes: How Non-Immigration Policies Determine Immigration Policy Outcomes

Darshan Vigneswaran, University of Amsterdam, D.V.Vigneswaran@uva.nl

Immigration control policies are strikingly similar across the globe, yet their outcomes vary substantially. In some places, migrants are heavily surveilled, routinely arrested, detained in large numbers and deported en masse. In other places, less so. Researchers have consistently pointed to the possibility that non-immigration policy - particularly policy-making in the criminal justice system - may account for this variation (Coleman, Bosworth, Stumpf, Golash-Boza, Doty). However, we have yet to fully understand this form of variation and theorise its impacts. In what ways and what contexts do non-immigration policies matter? Do all non-immigration policies matter equally, and if not, which ones matter more?

One of the main reasons why we lack answers to these questions is the absence of a global, comparative research agenda. Theories and models focussing on the outcomes of immigration control policy have been primarily based upon an idealised and image of a developed, functionally organised and liberal-democratic state. On the few occasions where this research has examined non-OECD states, it has commonly paid most attention to those attributes they lack, and therefore commonly failed to understand their unique characteristics and capabilities. This North-South dissonance has been less prominent amongst studies - commonly ethnographic or richly qualitative - of immigration control practice, which are deeply attentive to the complex sets of factors which determine what is done in the name of immigration control in a given country or place. However, this body of research has commonly thumbed its nose at traditional policy questions, assuming that micro-political dynamics or structural processes carry the day. Neither body of literature speaks much to the other. As a result, there have been few efforts to use practice-based accounts from both North and South to explain national-scale variations in immigration policy outcomes.

This paper seeks to overcome this gap, and to better understand and more explicitly theorise the complex manner in which non-immigration policy shapes immigration policy outcomes. The empirical entry point for this argument is the counter-intuitive observation that weak states make tough territory: some of the less powerful administrative apparatuses in the developing world - including Thailand, Malaysia and South Africa - generate deportation rates that dwarf those of much more capacitated and generally capable states. I explore to what extent these outcomes are attributable to these countries' past and present non-immigration, movement control policies and use these empirical inquiries to map out how this might sharpen research into immigration control outcomes globally, including the 'poor performing' OECD states.

Immigration and Refugee Governance in India

Daniel Naujoks, Columbia University, daniel.naujoks@columbia.edu

Countries in the Global South host half of the world's migrants--be they from other developing or from more developed countries. Despite this fact, immigration policy responses in the South

have attracted little scholarly attention. This paper sheds light on India's challenges in the field of immigration that economic growth, a changing labor market and India's global aspirations pose. Colonial-time laws still constitute the bulk of the legal framework and different policies exist for neighboring countries, ethnic immigration, refugees and economic immigrants. It is argued that there exist both, inclusive and exclusive policy paradigms and that there is an apparent lack of laws and concrete policies. India's policies are shaped by an emerging paradigm shift that is based on the country's self-understanding as an emigration country, perceived security threats, increasing human trafficking, irregular migration, mostly from Bangladesh, as well as refugee populations. Further, policies are influenced by policy beliefs in institutions, such as the Ministry of Home Affairs, the changing self-image as a global player, as well as economic needs to fill existing skill gaps in the growing economy, both with persons of Indian descent living abroad and highly-skilled immigrants. The paper assesses the complex interplay of these factors and political discussions on the subject, as well as their notorious absence from the debate.

Session 3

Illiberal(ising) immigration and asylum politics: structures and policy changes

The politics of post-socialist transition and migration in Hungary

Céline Cantat, Central European University, celinemcantat@gmail.com

This presentation focuses on the relation between the post-socialist transition and migration policy and politics in Hungary. Starting from the discourses of migration crisis that emerged in the country as of 2015, I will examine the connection between structural changes in the 'transition' period (including the emergence of capitalist social relations and Hungary's accession to the European Union) and the establishment of particularly exclusionary discourses and policies concerning asylum seekers and refugees. I will argue that the Hungarian authorities' production of the migrant/refugee as a deviant Other in recent years is connected to longer-term structural changes in post-socialist Hungary, which also affect other social groups. Finally, I will explore the contradictions that emerge from this political discourse and practice, in particular the way in which labour migration is in turn organised in order to address labour shortage in a country still characterised by important emigration flows.

Migrants, Markets and Monarchs. An anatomy of change in Saudi Arabia (1991-2018)

Helene Thiollet, CNRS CERI Sciences Po, helene.thiollet@sciencespo.fr

This article explores the dynamics of socio-political changes in Saudi Arabia from the Gulf war to the Arab Springs. Alongside harsh repression and buy-out of political opponents, successive Saudi governments crafted social reforms to address the structural causes of potential mass popular uprising and ensure regime security. In an oil-rich country dependent upon foreign labour, the reforms primarily focused on migration and employment issues as key sectors deemed to fuel socio-economic discontent. I first offer an archaeology of the politicisation of migration from the Gulf crisis to the Arab Springs, unveiling government's progressive efforts to control immigration and use immigrants as scapegoats in context of economic and political crises. Secondly, I explain how, in both cases, dynamics for reforms are tied to individual

political agendas of power-seeking princes and structural transformations within the State. Thirdly, I discuss the impact of reforms that attempt to change the terms of the rent-based social contract. The 2011 reforms reinforce social and labour-based segmentation between nationals and foreigners while unveiling dynamics of social change linked to the entrenched presence of foreigners in the country. The anatomy of reforms in Saudi Arabia contributes to a wider analysis on the articulation of political and socio-economic changes in undemocratic and illiberal contexts. It engages from a seemingly marginal standpoint with the debate on the democratic deficit and political change of oil-based rentier economies.

The Refugee Rentier State in the Middle East

Gerasimos Tsourapas, University of Birmingham, g.tsourapas@bham.ac.uk

How does forced migration affect host states and, in particular, how does it impact upon states' domestic and foreign policy decision-making? The relevant literature on refugee politics, dominated by a focus on Global North processes, has yet to fully explore how states of first asylum, most commonly located in the Global South, respond to this challenge. This project examines how forced migration encourages host states to employ their position in order to extract revenue from other state or non-state actors for maintaining refugee groups within their borders. It explores the workings of refugee rentier states, namely states seeking to leverage their position as host states of displaced communities for material gain. It focuses on the Syrian refugee crisis, examining the foreign-policy responses of three major host states – Jordan, Lebanon, and Turkey – and the negotiations around the EU-Turkey Deal, as well as the Lebanon and Jordan Compacts. While all three states engaged in post-2011 refugee rent-seeking behaviour, Jordan and Lebanon deployed a backscratching strategy based on bargains, while Turkey deployed a blackmailing strategy based on threats. Employing primary sources in English and Arabic, the article inductively examines how the choice of strategy depended on the host state's size of refugee community and domestic elites' perception of their state's geostrategic importance vis-à-vis the target state(s). The article concludes with a discussion on the significance of its findings for understanding the international dimension of the Syrian refugee crisis and paves the way for future research on the effects of forced displacement on host states' political development.

Session 4

Changing regimes, hybrid migration patterns: the multilayer politics of immigration and emigration policies

Four Key Points from Chinese Migration Policies

Els Van Dongen, Nanyang Technological University, EVanDongen@ntu.edu.sg

In a European or North American context, “migration” is commonly associated with the threat posed by the influx of lower-skilled immigrants or refugees and the need to protect borders. Looking at “migration” from a Chinese perspective offers a very different picture. In this presentation, I will focus on four key points that can offer wider theoretical insights. Firstly, apart from regime change, China's position in the global economic system and its perception of

this position greatly affects policies, which is why a historical approach to the topic is relevant. Secondly, in China, internal and external migration are directly linked through the primary concern of stability (wending) and they should hence be studied in relation. Thirdly, as opposed to the association of “migration” with lower-skilled migrants especially, in a Chinese context, highly skilled migration and attracting “talent” are a crucial aspect of migration policies. Fourthly, because millions of Chinese have emigrated from China, another core element of Chinese migration policies are policies targeted at the Chinese “diaspora” and this involves return migration policies. I will outline the economic, political, and cultural features of this policy system of “overseas Chinese work” (qiaowu gongzuo) and pay special attention to the role of the “state” and governmental, semi-governmental and non-governmental institutions and organizations and their interaction in a “networked state” model. Finally, I will indicate what these four factors can possibly contribute to our understanding of the politics of migration from a comparative perspective.

Politics of Citizenship and Migration in a post-revolutionary Iran

Amin Moghadam, Princeton University, aminhm@yahoo.fr

The politics of migration of the Islamic Republic of Iran (IRI), since its inception in 1979, as a country of both emigration and immigration have been modulated by several inflections. As a party to the 1951 Geneva Convention, the first years of welcoming policies based on intra-faith solidarity and the Islamic ideology of the new regime have given way to a pragmatic vision of immigration management. For instance, the IRI put forward its reservations to some of the articles of the convention notably by segmenting access to the labor market for refugees and implementing limitations to the freedom of movement based on a designated geography. The discretionary control over the modalities of circulations and residencies of Afghans in particular, and the volatility of regulations, have deteriorated the already precarious situation of migrants while occasionally benefiting the IRI economically and sometimes politically in its relationship with neighboring countries. On the other hand, societal debate over restricted access to citizenship for second or third generation migrants and children of mixed marriages, mirrors issues which Iranian citizenship has to deal with in a context of a diasporic nation. Dual nationality has become a widespread phenomenon and has been frequently debated in Iranian society since some high level political figures have been also accused of being dual nationals. While the de facto tolerance of dual-nationality bears witness to the strength of interdependencies between the State and some parts of the diaspora, security concerns have also exposed dual nationals to arbitrary arrests whereby creating an atmosphere of distrust for their return. The recent devaluation of the Rial and the media exposure of corruption scandals have undoubtedly revealed the perverse effects of sanctions, but also highlighted the transnational opportunities from which various state bodies have benefited from. In sum, this presentation will address how inconsistencies of the politics of migration of IRI eventually reveal the autonomy of the transnational field that the political system is slow to recognize.

Tunisian migration politics throughout the revolution: The democratization-migrants’ rights nexus revisited

Katharina Natter, University of Amsterdam, k.natter@uva.nl

What is the impact of regime change on the politics of migration ? How do revolution and democratization affect migration policymaking dynamics? The Tunisian case provides crucial

insights into how democratization shapes policymaking processes and inter-actor dynamics on immigration and emigration. The empirical analysis suggests (1) that the effects of democratization on the politics of migration are ambiguous - more political freedoms for citizens of the polity and more democratic policy processes do not necessarily go hand in hand with rights-based approaches to migration - and (2) that the need to democratically legitimize policies plays out differently for emigration and immigration. The paper ultimately shows that while existing theories of migration policy and public policy making can account for some of these observed dynamics, new empirical insights also suggest theoretical innovation. Through the dialogue between novel empirics and established theories, this paper seeks to contribute to ongoing contemporary debates on the politics of migration policy at a global level.

Session 5

The drivers and actors of emigration politics

The Politics of Emigration in Eritrea

Gaim Kibreab, London South Bank University, kibreabg@lsbu.ac.uk

The aim of this paper is to examine the post-independence Eritrean government's policy on emigration. The specific objectives are to examine: the factors that motivate the government to adopt the existing migration regime; the extent to which the government has been able and willing to enforce a consistent emigration policy; and the outcome the policy in a historical perspective. Emigration policy refers to all measures put in place to facilitate/promote or control/curtail mobility. The mobility in question refers to outward and return movements.

It is often assumed that the Eritrean government's emigration policy is one of the most restrictive in the world. Human rights organisations and analysts even compare the state with North Korea not only in terms of its poor human rights performance but also in terms of its rigorous emigration policy. Its repressive and restrictive emigration policy is inextricably linked to the Eritrean national service (ENS), which has over time degenerated into open-ended burden bordering modern slavery. As a result, the ENS and its direct and indirect detrimental effects on citizens' rights, the economy and social fabric of Eritrean polity have been the major drivers of forced migration. The central *raison d'être* of the government's emigration policy has been underpinned by an apparent determination to stop exit of citizens who flee in search of protection and livelihood.

Although on the surface, Eritrea appears to have one of the most restrictive emigration policies in the world; ironically, the country has been one of the major refugee-producing countries in world. Although there are no reliable statistics, in 2015 between 3,000 and 5,000 fled to Sudan and Ethiopia every month. The overwhelming majority are often stuck in the two neighbouring countries notwithstanding their obsession to join their diasporic brethren in Europe, North America, Australia and elsewhere. The other irony concerning the Eritrean government's restrictive emigration policy is the survival of the Eritrean state is dependent on remittance.

Turkey's 'Diaspora Engagement' Policies: Transnational Citizenship or 'Remote Control' Authoritarianism?

Fiona Adamson, SOAS University of London, fa33@soas.ac.uk

State-led 'diaspora engagement' strategies have been analysed as progressive forms of 'migration governance' or 'transnational citizenship.' (Bauböck 2005, Gamlen 2014). Yet this obscures the ways in which state-led diaspora engagement can also include elements of transnational repression (Moss 2016) leading to forms of 'remote control' authoritarianism. This article examines the Janus-faced nature of state-led transnational diaspora engagement via the case of Turkey. It argues that authoritarian practices (Glasius 2018a,b) have played a role in the creating, controlling and targeting of "its" diaspora(s), contributing to processes of diaspora formation, diaspora governance and transnational repression. The case of Turkey calls attention to the 'dark side' of diaspora engagement policies – pointing to the potential for diaspora engagement and management policies to contribute to the transnationalization of state-led authoritarian practices.

The "gold standard" for labour export? The role of civil society in shaping Philippine migration policies

Stefan Rother, University of Freiburg, mail@stefan-rother.de

With more than 10 percent of its population living temporarily or permanently abroad and remittances accounting for around 10% of the country's gross domestic product (GDP), the Philippines rank among the major countries of origin for labour migration. Over the past decades, the Philippines have been characterized as a "labor broker" (Rodriguez 1999) and "perhaps the prototype of a labor-exporting country" (Semyonov/Gorodzeisky 2004: 6). The country has been continuously praised in policy circles for its "Best Practices to Manage Migration" (Martin, et al. 2004) and for establishing a system of "unrivalled sophistication" (Agunias October 2008: 1). Even if one does not fully subscribe to these characterizations, the country undoubtedly represents a case study that stand in stark contrast to the dominant research assumptions on migration politics: The Philippines can be seen as a democracy – albeit a "defective" one (Croissant 2004) – and is seen as a role model in the region for its strong migration policies.

One of the defining characteristics of the Philippines is a long tradition of civil society organizing and engagement, ranging back to the era of the dictator Ferdinand Marcos. This paper will focus on the significant role civil society has played in the promotion of rights-based migration policies and its influence on the formulation of migration legislation: Starting from the – successful - protests against the proposed "forced remittances" under Marcos in 1982, including the "Magna Carta [sic] of Overseas Filipinos", that was introduced as a response to the wide-spread protests after the execution of a Philippine domestic worker in Singapore in 1995 and leading up to current developments under President Duterte. Besides issues of rights and protection, the paper also discusses contrasting narratives on migration: While the government continues to frame migrants as "national heroes" , migrant activists question the labour export policy as a commodification of labour and shine light on the root causes of migration – since after four decades of increasing labour out-migration, the Philippines can be seen as a case of "migration instead of development" (Rother 2012).