



South Africa at Crossroads: The Integration of International Migrants', a Diplomatic Acuity or Aversion?

Toyin Cotties Adetiba

PhD, Department of Political and International Studies, University of Zululand, South Africa

E-mail: AdetibaT@unizulu.ac.za

<http://dx.doi.org/10.47814/ijssrr.v7i1.1717>

Abstract

Migration is as old as human existence, linked to the failure at the point of departure vis-à-vis the perceived opportunity that exist in the new place, thus explaining why [black African] migrants move to South Africa for greener pasture. Migration can be clustered into political boundaries, methods of decision-making, as well as patterns of the movement of migrants. This work is centered on cross political boundary migration. Using qualitative method of approach and neoclassical theory of economics, this work believes that the endless stress on migration as an economic process can be used to explain the reasons behind migration [in the first instance to escape poverty and unemployment back at home while trying to improve incomes and life-chances in migrants' newly found home. This work also believes that the integration of migrants is a major concern for societies with major challenge of social cohesion, group relations, economic and social progress like South Africa. We live in a world in which the free movement of capital, goods, and technology has become a virtue. Consequently, the management and transformation of migration into a mutually beneficial process by the South African government calls for policy frameworks to make it a win-win for both the sending and the receiving country while bringing gains to South Africa. This work conclude that South Africa needs to create a receptive environment for skilled migrants who are willing to stay and take up a permanent residency of the country. Nevertheless, South Africa must take the responsibility of educating public opinion on the need to promote and expand high-skilled immigration, while affirming a national preference for South Africa's national interests.

Keywords: *Migration; National Interest; Development; Economy; Integration*

Introduction

Migration is as old as human existence. It is linked to the failure at the point of departure vis-à-vis the perceived opportunity that exist in the new place, thus explaining why [black African] migrants move to South Africa for greener pasture. According to the United Nations Department of Economic and Social

Affairs (2013) humans have existed for as long as they have migrated, while spreading goods, cultures, and their ideas globally. From this report, there are close to 232 million international migrants. This, according to the report, represents no more than 3.2 per cent of the world's population of which two-thirds live in either Europe or Asia.

The World Economic Forum (2017) however, asserts that migration can be clustered into political boundaries, methods of decision-making, as well as patterns of the movement of migrants. Judging from the title of this work, the study is centered on cross political boundary migration. It therefore means that migration may be internal or international. While internal migration occurs within the same country. This includes migrating from suburban to urban and rural to urban, contrariwise, international migration involves the movement of people across the international borders (World Economic Forum, 2017). Asare (2012) offers that internal migration involves relocating to a new house inside the state or province, within the country of origin. This movement may be induced by new job, marriage etc. In contrast, international migration involves relocating to a new country, or continent. This may be induced by some pull factors in the country one is migrating to or some push factors in the country of origin (Nwosu et al. 2022). Migration could be considered involuntary or voluntary, however, this is dependent on the circumstances surrounding the departure of the migrant (Nwosu et al. 2022)

According to Crush et al., (2005) Southern Africa has a long history of intra-regional migration, dating back to the mid nineteenth century. Undoubtedly, migration was the single most significant factor that tied the various colonies and countries of the sub-continent together into a single regional labour market during the twentieth century. McDonald (2000) however, believe that in the cause of time the entrenched patterns of migration in the sub-continent have undergone some sort of major restructuring. Southern Africa is therefore considered as a region on the move owing to several broader changes that have taken place thus ordering a shift towards intra-regional mobility (Crush et al., 2005).

The end of apartheid [a system designed by the ruling white minority, to control movement and exclude outsiders] produced new opportunities for internal and cross-border mobility. The subsequent integration of South Africa with the SADC region brought a major increase in legal and undocumented/illegal cross-border flows and new forms of mobility (Crush et al., 2005). Crush, and McDonald (2002) add that the reconnection of the region with the global economy opened the region to forms of migration commonly associated with globalization.

Dodson (1998) in his contribution believes that the growing rural and urban poverty and unemployment have somewhat pushed more people out of households in search of a livelihood, justifying World Economic Forum (2017) assertion on migrating from rural to urban area. Williams, et al., (2002) added that the rapid diffusion of HIV/AIDS also impacted considerably on migration. The countries of the SADC of which South Africa is a very strong member, till date are still dealing with the legacy of mass displacement and forced migration as a result of the civil wars in some of the SADC countries such as Mozambique, Angola, Congo DRC etc. in addition to recurrent civil strife in the rest of Africa. Hence the influx of refugee and new kinds of asylum seeker to and within SADC and South Africa in particular.

In migration, some states can be categorized as migrant sending states while some can be regarded as migrant receiving states. By interpretation, countries that are experiencing social, political, and economic challenges can be categorize as migrant sending states, Mozambique, Malawi, Zimbabwe, Democratic Republic of Congo, Rwanda etc. fall into this category while countries with stable social political and economic system can be seen as migrant receiving states. Within the SADC, South Africa fall into this category owing to its relative and better economic development [in Africa]. It thus means that more people, goods, services, and ideas made their way to the Rainbow nation, albeit not always easily, cheaply, or legally. One contributory factor to South Africa's recognition by other states and its citizens was the reincorporation of the country into the international system thus, contributing to new [migration policy] pressures on policy makers (Klotz, 2000).

Without mincing words, migration is a cross-cutting phenomenon, it needs to be integrated into all facets of state policymaking and planning. So far, the migrant stream that attracts most public and official attention is illegal migration, driven by some sort of social and economic circumstances and, in some cases, desperation. Following the introduction and acceptance of inclusive governance in 1994, there has been a broader array of voices that informs debate, both within the parliamentary process and from society generally on migration in South Africa. While there has been significant research previously conducted on migration, there has been little systematic work migration and diplomacy. To a large extent, if migration policy must change, there must be an explanation that goes as to whether such changes, if implemented, will benefit South Africa diplomatically or not.

The main objective of this study is to examine the rhetoric about international migrants and determine whether it's a diplomatic acuity or aversion to South Africa? The rest of the paper is structured as follows: the methodology is considered in section two, section three will focus on literature review and theoretical presentation followed by migration diplomacy, analysis, and discussion on international migration', a diplomatic acuity or aversion to South Africa? while the conclusion and suggestions are examined in section five.

Research Methodology

Every research must involve an explicit, disciplined, systematic [planned, ordered, and public] approach to find out the most appropriate results. This paper relies on qualitative methodology. Qualitative research is a form of social action that stresses on the way of people interpret and make sense of their experiences to understand the social reality of individuals (Mohajan, 2018). To qualitative researchers what matter most are people's belief, experience, and meaning systems from the perspective of the people. Qualitative research is rooted in social and cultural anthropology, philosophy, psychology, history, and sociology. Traditionally, the goal of the qualitative method is to seek for a deep understanding of a particular research phenomenon (Domholdt, 1993). Qualitative research seeks to describe and interpret issues or phenomena systematically from the point of view of the individual or population being studied, and to generate new concepts and theories.

Literature and Theoretical Consideration

Historically, and in the contemporary, migration is majorly driven by the desire for a better economic situation. Hence the argument that the major causes of migration are economic (Grigg, 1977). King and Collyer (2016) have argued that although this is true but, of lately and at the moment, people migrate for diverse of reasons, which include education, lifestyle, love, or a better climate, significantly, economic migration remains, not least in migration discourse as well as the discussions over how migration should be managed. For example, in South Africa emphasis is laid on economic migrants, as it is applied to migrants whose influx should be strictly controlled, and if possible suppressed. However, there is limit to this where it has to do with an expected benefit to the economy of the country.

Fundamentally, the endless stress on migration as an economic process can be used to explain the reasons behind migration [in the first instance to escape poverty and unemployment back at home while trying to improve incomes and life-chances in their newly "found" home], nevertheless not much has been said about the integration of international migrants which is a major concern for societies with major challenge of social cohesion, group relations, economic and social progress.

According to Robinson (1998: 118) the concept of integration is chaotic. Robinson claimed that it is a word used by many but understood differently by most of its users. Thus, suggesting that the concept is individualized, contested as well as contextual. Thus, corroborating the statement by Heath and Schneider (2021) and Castle et al. (2001) that there is no single settled and generally accepted definition

of the concept of integration, theory or model of immigrant and international migrant integration. By implication, this concept has continued to be controversially and hotly debated among scholars of international migration.

Conceptually, there is need to state that integration is a multi-layered process. To a large extent, this includes the [legal] socio-political, economic, and cultural religious realms. Each of these contains different though controversial aspects of life associated with migration. For example, housing, employment, education, access to health facility, and sporting rights etc. Within the transnational perspective, migrants are considered [simultaneous] as part of two different social worlds, those of their origin and destination society and possibly, a diasporic social space. From an integration viewpoint, the question is, what is the relationship between migrants' integration process, or their state of integration, in the host country/society, and the effect this has or have had on their capability to initiate or participate in the development of their host countries.

As a concept, integration is becoming contested both in policymaking and in academia, thus, giving an increasing focus on the role of the receiving society for achieving a higher degree of integration of migrants (Hellgren, 2015). Zapata-Barrero (2012, cited in Hellgren, 2015) believe that integration is increasingly being considered a two-way process whereby both the migrants and the receiving society are expected to adapt to each other and create new, intercultural basis for mutual identification and solidarity.

ECRE (1999), concur that integration is a long-term two-way process of change, and it relates to both the conditions for and the actual participation of migrants in all aspects of life of the host country. It therefore means that, integration can be viewed as a voluntary action that immigrants have to perform but it is hindered by their different culture which is a function of their attitudinal and psychological inclination to embracing the new way of life commandeered by their new environment. Hence the reason for more policies by the host countries that focuses on integration, which informed the reasons why migrants are constructed as problematic. To this end, Pasetti (2014) holds that the integration of immigrants allows them to participate in the host society at the same level as natives. The unequal social and economic power relation between immigrants and host society is underlined, with the consequence that the host society, its institutional structure, and its reaction to the migrants are therefore far more decisive for the outcome of the process than the migrants themselves.

According to Duru (2021) Social science scholars in the various disciplines that research on migration such as economics, law, demography, history, geography, sociology, anthropology, political science, among others in an attempt to unravel the causes, effects and dynamics of migration have spawned a wide variety of theories. These theories are Harris and Todaro (1970) neo-classical migration theory [with its components subsumed in micro and macro levels, believed to have originated from the theory initiated by Ravenstein's (1885 and 1889) laws of migration and followed by Lee (1966) push-pull theory of migration., Mabogunje (1970) migration systems theory, Zelinsky (1971) mobility transition theory, Stark (1978); Stark (1991) new economics theory of migration, Piore (1979) dual labour-market theory, Skeldon (1990) migration transitions theory, Massey (1990) cumulative causation theory among others.

Abreu (2012) further argued that the factors that enter into the decision to migrate and the process of migration as presented by Lee is summed as follows: those factors associated with the area of origin; those factors associated with the area of destination; factors associated with intervening obstacles or challenges; and personal factors. By implication, the decision to migrate is consequently the result of a [cost-benefit] in comparison to the pull factors and push of both areas notwithstanding those constraints such as distance, information, and personal factors.

It can therefore be proposed that, to explain why international migration begins, each of these scholars seeks to explain the same thing, but employed fundamentally different concepts, assumptions, and frames of reference (Massey et al., 1993). Contrary to this assertion, de Haas (2021:1) believes that

the field of migration studies has remained an under theorised field of social inquiry. This study however, employed the neoclassical theory of migration to drive home the case for integration of international migrants. Central to research in migration is the problem associated with the challenge of a central body of theories that summarizes or generalizes the accrued insights of a vast amount of empirical research in migration, that can serve as a reference point to examining, interpreting and understand facts and findings in migration that can guide future research.

To a large extent, the neoclassical theory of migration is believed to be one of the oldest and most commonly used theory to explain migration. To this end Todaro (1969) offers that international migration is connected to the global demand and supply of labour. Thus, suggesting that countries with scarce labor supply and high demand will likely have high wages that attract migrants from [poor] countries with a surplus of labour.

In general, migration theories can be divided into two main categories, macro, and micro-level. As presented in the work of **Lewis**, Economic development with unlimited supplies of labour published in 1954, the neo-classical theory of migration at the macro-level is a phenomenon that is associated with the existence of labour supply and demand disproportions between the sending [and apparently poor] countries and destination countries. The pull factor which is the resulting differentials in wages somewhat cause migrants to move from low-wage, labour-surplus countries to high-wage, labour-scarce countries. In his explanation, **Lewis** suggests that the process of economic development is inherently absorbed by the modern sector of the surplus labour from the traditional sector, and that the accepted competition by the migrant workers enables the modern sector to lower its wages to the level practiced in the traditional sector, thus explaining the high profits and capital rents that characterize the modern sector in these countries.

Hence, Sulaiman's (2020) argument that this theory understands migration to be driven by differences in returns for labour across markets and the resulting differentials in wages between labor-rich versus capital-rich countries. Harris and Todaro (1970) elucidated that the unique feature of this model is that migration proceeds in response to the differences in rich-poor countries in terms of the rich countries are able to offer vis-à-vis the level of employment thus, playing the role of equilibrium force on such migration.

Hence Todaro and Smith (2006) argument that migration is primarily motivated by economic considerations of comparative gains and costs, which are mostly monetary and psychological and result from rational judgments [of the migrants]. Nkamleu and Fox (2006) concur that this theory basically believes that economic forces are the primary migratory drivers since it views migration as an economic phenomenon and the reason why the theory regards migrants as merely rational agents (Duru 2021), meaning that the choice of migration is taken individually, where the individual migrants have the feeling that the expected higher returns at the end would offset the cost and the risk of relocation hence the decision to migrate.

At the micro-level, Sulaiman (2020) argues that neo-classical migration theory views migrants as individual, rational actors, capable of deciding where and when to move on the basis of a cost-benefit calculation. It assumes that migrants have the freedom to choose where they want to go based on the information about their point of destination with the belief that they can be the most productive in the country of their destination. Sulaiman (2020) further argued that the neo-classical approach is to a large extent confident about the positive impacts of migration on labour-sending counties due to high expectations of reduced poverty, unemployment, and overpopulation.

Abreu (2012) however stresses that whether in a more or less oversimplifying version, and whether in its micro or macro dimensions, the fact is that the neoclassical theory of migration is nothing more nor less than a derivative application of neoclassical economics to the particular field of migration, with all of its characteristic features and assumptions such as individualism, optimization, rationality,

where the understanding of human mobility is considered as a fundamental part of broader processes of social change. While attempting to achieve a more meaningful understanding of agency and structure in migration processes.

From the above, it can be deduced that neoclassical theory sought to discuss migration among countries by concentrating on the differences in wages, labor surplus, and capital accumulation thus leading to the creation of attractive and repulsive regions and countries that determines the directions of migrants to maximize their expected return. Neoclassical theory has been criticized for neglecting the push factors of migration such as low salaries, low per capita income, job scarcity, crime and conflict, political repression, poor educational systems, poor conditions of service, climate change [including extreme weather events], lack of progression within a career, inadequate infrastructure services [such as healthcare, education, utilities, transport and water], safety and security concerns driven by ethnic, religious, racial persecution, political instability, unsustainable livelihood and resources, and limited chances of self-advancement (Duru, 2021), while ignoring market imperfections, regulating migrants and migrant societies. The theory generally ignores the effects migration will have on home and host states while leaving out the importance of policies in the management of migration.

Although individual decision to migrate increases with the level of development, with the goal to make benefits. Empirically studies have shown that in today's world, international migration is one of the key public policy areas with consequences for international relations and diplomacy. To a large extent, the movement of people has proven to continue to be a significant topic of discussion, because of its direct implications on borders that nation-states try to maintain, on the existing political and social institutions, as well as on the receiving and home societies (Waldinger and Fitzgerald, 2004). Hence the possibilities of regional integration as a response to incoming diverse migration flows.

Contextualising Migration Diplomacy

Migration is becoming a key dimension of states' diplomatic relations, particularly as the number of migrants across the world rose to 258m in 2017 alone (Tsourapas, and Adamson, 2019). In the contemporary, international migration is one of the key public policy areas with repercussions for international relations and diplomacy (Akçapar, 2017). Migration diplomacy, according to Tolay (2022) emerged in the second decade of the 20th century as a new and timely concept to unpack the nexus between foreign and migration policies and concerns. Among many research agendas at the connection between migration and international relations lies migration diplomacy. The literature on migration diplomacy focuses on inter-state relations, the use of traditional diplomatic tools, and 'the management of migration as an international issue (Adamson and Tsourapas, 2019). Adamson and Tsourapas conceive migration diplomacy as a diplomatic tools use by states to manage cross-border mobility which can include the strategic use of migration flows as a means to obtain other aims or the use of diplomatic methods to achieve goals related to migration.

Though, a contested area, the mobility of persons provides a forum within which international diplomacy may play a key role. With constant flow of a large number of immigrants and refugees across the globe and Africa in particular, it is imperative for countries to come to terms with the challenges of integration. Beyond the immediate and evident diplomatic perspective within the school of migration, there are obviously some sort of sociocultural, political, economic, and demographic implications of the mass movement of people from the wider society to and from different countries.

Fundamentally, migration diplomacy is significantly important to the contemporary world politics. Adamson and Tsourapas (2019) highlights that little or no attention has been paid to how migration is impacting the conduct of international politics in the twenty-first century, this includes the fields of interstate relations and diplomacy. Hence Hollifield argument that the current migration state is the one in which the management of migration flows is central to state functions and interests (Hollifield, 2004). By interpretation, states have always developed a multiplicity of sociocultural, security, political,

and economic policies aiming at responding to or regulating various forms of migration and, both voluntary and involuntary. While trying to make every “productive and functional” attempt to manage the impact of migration domestically, with particular attention to the effects of population mobility on the economy.

Debatably, migration is intrinsically a fundamental and important area of states’ bilateral and to a large extent multilateral diplomatic relations, just as states for centuries have been engaging with one another in areas relating to trade, human rights, economics, culture, environment, war, and peace. Adamson and Tsourapas (2019:116) believe that not all attempts to manage the flow of migration amounts to migration diplomacy, nor the whole gamut of issues related to migration and migrants’ affairs fall under the scope of migration diplomacy. Further to this, any state’s ability to effectively use diplomatic tools and processes vis-à-vis the process of migration will depend on other factors, which include its overall power and available socioeconomic resources.

Therefore, migration diplomacy is premise on the ability of a state to explores how cross-border population mobility can be linked to state diplomatic aims and objectives. Although a state’s migration diplomacy may not be glossed over its overall migration policies however, and to a large extent these are relevant when it is included as part of state’s foreign relations and diplomacy. Greenhill (2002) puts forward that diplomacy has always been about negotiation, while migration diplomacy centers on how states employ an effective management of cross-border population mobility vis-à-vis their international relations, or how diplomacy is used to obtain state’s goals relating to migration. By interpretation, the inclusivity of migration diplomacy in state’s foreign relations can include the strategic use of migration flows as a means to obtaining other diplomatic goals or the use of diplomacy as a means to achieving the goals related to migration.

Kishan (2008:74) stresses that migration is a complex issue which interlinks with many other [diplomatic] subjects and areas, in bilateral, regional, and global relations. To project and advance the enlightened diplomatic interests of one's country, a consistent migration policy with stability as well as development needs to be closely integrated with the country’s political, economic, and its public diplomacy. Thus, migration diplomacy habitually relies on issues that links and can be used as a means for states to pursue other goals, such as boosting their security, achieving social and economic interests, while advancing their soft power through public diplomacy (Adamson and Tsourapas, 2019).

Further to this, some states have had to resort to engaging migration diplomacy with other states while trying to oust, deportation of illegal migrants, or transfer of migrants based on internal security concerns although the fundamental human rights of the migrants might be violated where it is not done properly. Greenhill (2010) offers that migration diplomacy can be used for nation building. This was the case of 1947 Partition of India, where the forced displacement of more than 14 million people along religious lines accompanied the creation of the Republic of India and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. Adamson and Tsourapas (2019) also highlights that migration diplomacy can also be used for security purposes where the flow of migration is viewed as a conduit pipe for terrorism or seen as a means of strengthening organized crime. Hence the reason why bilateral extradition treaties are often used as a means to remove perceived to be security threat to a state’s territory.

Scholars like Hui, Weng-Tat (1997) Wickramasekara (2015) are of the opinion that it is possible for states to use forms of migration diplomacy to achieve economic purposes in addition to bilateral agreements and MOUs on migration which are diplomatic tools that states frequently employed to manage the flow of [unskilled and high skilled] migrant workers. For example, the United States for years, have developed a migration diplomacy policy through Diversity Visa Lottery Programme that allows the recruitment of foreign talent and foreign workers from abroad.

Often, migration, whether inward or outbound, has always been a major national policy issue. Hence Tolay’s (2022) argument that by design, migration diplomacy embraces state’s actions and

investigates how the mobility of cross-border population/migrants is linked to the aims of states migration policies. The concept of diplomacy is one that is very relevant to understand the politics of different migration patterns in the 21st century, and one that calls for further research and critical assessment. Consequently, Adamson and Tsourapas, (2019:124) are of the opinion that migration diplomacy is a multifaceted process, in terms of the [state actors and sometimes non-states] actors involvement in policy making and the strategies they employed. Hence the reason why some states engage exclusively in emigration, immigration, or transit migration diplomacy policies, while others are able to employ multiple policies vis-à-vis a number of different actors at any one time.

International Migrants in South Africa', a Diplomatic Acuity or Aversion?

The South African policy on international migration is set out in the 1999 White Paper on International Migration. It is implemented through the Immigration Act, 2002 (Act No. 13 of 2002) and partly through the Refugees Act, 1998 (Act No. 130 of 1998). (The Department of Home Affairs, 2017). The demise of the obnoxious apartheid system and the sanctions that accompanied it brought an end to South Africa's fortified borders, both in geographical terms and in the symbolic sense of access to political power by the majority black South Africans. As a result of this, more people, goods and services and ideas were welcome in the Rainbow country. The re-admission of South Africa's into the international system debatably, has contributed to the new pressures on policy makers, particularly in the area of migration. Nevertheless, these transformations have not resulted in substantial shifts in South Africa's immigration policy. Migration is more than the movement of people across space as it entails a change in the political community Zolberg (1992).

According to Tati (2008), the long-awaited inclusive governance brought the African National Congress (ANC) to power in 1994; as it stands, the ANC led government has had to deal with numerous social, political, and economic challenges, of which one is related to the formulation and implementation of an immigration policy regime that suits the transformative and developmental needs of the nation. Therefore, the political discourse on immigration has been over the past years increasingly focused on curtailing the increasing number of irregular migrations [which has translated to an upsurge of illegal migrants in the former apartheid enclave.

To a large extent South Africa remains the main country in Africa with an increasing immigration from different parts of the world. Notwithstanding the influx of migrants to the country, the "Mandela country" is also facing the challenge of a massive emigration of its skilled labour to developed countries such the United States, Australia, etc. Tati (2008) expresses the opinion that within the new global structures of production, South Africa can be regarded as an emerging economy along with countries such as India and Brazil. Interestingly, South Africa is a member of the BRICS nation. The BRICS nations (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) are among countries considered as potential emerging superpowers. This accounts for one of the reasons why the country is considered to have the potential for attracting international migrants from different countries within and outside Africa.

Maunganidze (2021) seem to agree that prior to the demise of apartheid in the Rainbow nation, South Africa has been the primary destination country in the region, however the pattern of migration have changed following the attainment of the inclusive governance. Thus, South Africa has moved towards a more inclusive, diverse, and open society, and more regular migration from other African and non-African countries.

Debatably, South Africa's migration policy and practice reflects migration developments in other countries of destination for migrants (Maunganidze, 2021). Observably, South Africa has been facing an increase pressure and criticisms in its immigration and anti-migrant sentiments. This has led policymakers in the country to adopt migration policies that somewhat place exclusive deterrence over inclusivity that might engenders integration that focus on the gains of the presence of legal skilled and unskilled average migrants.

To a large extent South Africa is considered to be open to free movement of migrant [in principle], nonetheless, the former apartheid enclave is wary of how this might influence its economy cum domestic job market. It is pertinent for South Africa policymakers to look more closely at its migration policies and see how South Africa can benefit from the [legal] migrants and their states of origin diplomatically.

On paper, the South African migration policy is considered to be a well drafted and balanced policy contrariwise, it is underpinned by its restrictiveness and its enforcement practices. Evaluating South Africa's migration policy, Johnson and Altbeker (2011) expresses the opinion that South Africa's migration policies should be informed by their impact on the countries they affect most [its neighbouring states], owing to its relative strongest economy in Southern Africa and by extension Africa, which has always attracted both skilled and unskilled migrants from other countries.

Comparatively, the issues on migration confronting [policymakers] in South Africa are somewhat comparable to those engaging their counterparts in North America. For example, Johnson and Altbeker (2011) offers that the US, has struggled to develop, and implement effective policies for managing migration and the flow of migrants through its border with Mexico and several other countries in Central America. Very similar to the challenges confronting South Africa vis-à-vis migration is its inability to convince its citizens and politicians alike that the more open its migration policies the better it is for its national interest. While seeking to balance its security concerns with the potential economic benefits of greater economic integration, South Africa faces similar challenges.

It is a known fact that South Africans are to a certain extent xenophobic in their relationship with the migrants. Peberdy (2013) gives the argument that South Africa provides a seemingly typical example of how the former apartheid enclave policies on migration have become interconnected with and embedded in political interests. In the parlance of migration discourse in South Africa migration has been domesticated thus making the policy makers to turn blind eyes to what South Africa (ns) can benefit from migration, diplomatically. For years, exclusionary policies against migrants majorly dominated most of its migration policies. In agreement, Moyo and Zanker (2020) believes that the increasingly restrictive environment for migrants in South Africa is instructively shaped by systemic xenophobia and securitization, of which both can serve as political capital for the ruling political class.

Further to this Moyo and Zanker (2020:2) argues that migration governance in South Africa is used as leverage in its domestic politics. While xenophobic violence against migrant has continued unabated and routinely, the exclusionary approach [which contradicts the visions of free movement and Pan-Africanism as well as the benefits of skilled migration] has continue to work particularly as a leeway for scapegoating the governments failures to address poverty, inequality, and job creation.

Johnson and Altbeker (2011) elaborates further that South Africa attracts large numbers of [both skilled and unskilled] migrants from its poorer SADC neighbours. A process that has heightened a number of social, economic, and political challenges, thus necessitating bold and new migration policies. Recently, South Africa resulted into some sort of diplomatic tensions with other African countries requesting their citizen to leave the country. For example, the Zimbabweans living in the country with a special dispensation permit were given a 12-month grace period to either apply for a mainstream visa or leave the country. Debatably, the long-term benefits of migration for migrants and their countries of destination are well established, managing the social, economic, and political stresses that arise from the process can create significant challenges. Masiyiwa (2022) writes that the move could have economic consequences for South Africa, given the role immigrants play in boosting its economy. According to Masiyiwa, the 2018 World Bank report that assessed the impact of immigration in South Africa between 1996 and 2011 found that each immigrant worker created roughly two jobs for South Africans. Arguably, the most common response to these challenges is for [South African] government to seek to welcome migrants with professional, technical, or business skills and discourage unskilled migrants. However, this

call for an open migration policy approach that will best serve the South African national interest given that the contribution of these unskilled migrants to South African society is greater than is usually recognized.

Migration in Southern Africa [and other poor regions of the world] is shaped by some factors. The most important of these is the movement of migrants from relatively poor to relatively rich societies. Given the growing global economic integration, migration flows may well increase in coming decades.

Martin, (2011:9) argues that there is no uniformity in the number of migrants in any society across the globe therefore migration is considered to be a process that governments learn to manage, it is not a problem that can be given a blanket solution since there is no single remedy to solving the problem of migration, that governments can apply before moving on to the next problem. Migration means change as well as an agent of change. By interpretation, as migrants change when they move; the host country or society changes when they arrive. This also applies to the sending country because it changes when they leave. The asymmetrical changes associated with migration are ongoing processes, which is why there is need for flexibility bureaucratic flexibility in the management of migration. Therefore, for South Africa to manage migrants that are economically motivated successfully, South African government must ensure that migration policies and rules are aligned with the economic incentives of the key actors. These actors include most private sectors that requires the require the expertise of these migrants.

As said earlier, one of the major drivers of migration is the degree of differences in economic opportunities. This principle of attraction applies wherever there are significant differences of economic performance among countries in a particular region. Interestingly, South Africa fall in the ambience of middle-income developing countries hence, in position comparable to rich countries managing migration from poorer neighbouring countries.

From observation, an average South African believes that there is no need allowing migrants in the country for reasons attached to unemployment and crime in particular. This is not a new position, but the question is how would South African government overcome the resistance of the rest of society to more migration? Carneson (2011) reiterates that migration policy in South Africa is guided by the importance safe and secure South Africa in which people are proud of and value their identity, hence the need to seek for strengthening the national security by implementing risk-based immigration controls which involves the use of a comprehensive strategy that includes technology, intelligence-sharing, well-trained personnel, and diplomatic efforts.

Fundamentally, states are to protect migrants and implement migration policies. The current ANC led South African government is facing an ever-serious economic fallout, not least linked to over one year Russian-Ukrainian war, which has further increased unemployment. In South Africa, times of economic downturns have often been met with an increase in anti-migrant sentiment, at worst spilling over into xenophobic violence.

Arguably, few governments have successfully developed policies that manage the entry and employment of migrants, particularly the low-skilled migrants. In South Africa, the presence of these migrants raises some pertinent questions vis-à-vis the management of migrants. Such question like how many [skilled and unskilled migrants] should be allowed into the country? What rights should they have while resident in the country? To remain permanently in the country, what rights should they have? This question raises another question whether to build diplomatic cum migration walls to prevent migrants from coming to South Africa or build diplomatic bridges that engenders cooperation and development.

Angbulu (2023) offers a convincing argument in reference to the above question while reflecting on Nigeria's migration policies. But to build walls? No, we don't build walls. We build bridges. Migration is an integral part of socioeconomic development in any society. What we do is to prevent bad people from coming into our country. Angbulu further echoed that migration is an agent of technology transfer,

as no nation is an island. It is inherent in humans to migrate. Countries in sub-Saharan Africa should see themselves as one big family. South Africa is a key player in the development of Africa, South African borders are contiguous to other countries in SAC. The country shares a common cultural heritage with the people on the other side. Therefore, to stop people from migrating will be a herculean task.

Concluding Remarks

To the economic theorists, there will always be movement of people from poorer places to richer ones. This account for the movement of people across borders which has long been a factor of contention in world affairs, demanding policy regulation and sometimes policy changes to meet with the new complexities that might arise while implementing the supposed old migration policies. Therefore, the possibility of the new intricacies in migration policies often makes the issue more prominent than before vis-à-vis the relations between states at bilateral, regional, and global levels. Hence, Rana (2008) contends that because of its multiple dimensions, the volatility of change, and the many different actors involved in migration, it may be difficult to advance a logical bilateral and multilateral agreements that could provide a regulatory framework for states, hence the importance of diplomacy in managing migration.

Unarguably, we live in a world in which the free movement of capital, goods, and technology has become a virtue. It thus means that the management and transformation of migration into a mutually beneficial process by the South African government calls for policies frameworks to make it a win-win for both the sending and the receiving country thus bringing gain to South Africa and the supposed poor countries within the SADC region and other African states. To a certain extent, this could also address the nitty gritty of brain drain and capacity building in South Africa.

Given that migration is a phenomenon with substantial domestic implications, the Department of Home Affairs needs robust and friendly relationship with foreign affairs offices of states in South Africa in conducting an international negotiation. This tends to project government approach in handling migration positively while ensuring policy coherence. South African government can also involve such a wide range of agencies, non-state actors, the NGOs, think-tanks, academia and all the others who have their own experience with migration - inward and outward.

Rana (2008) explains that migration demands regional cooperation. More often the sending and receiving countries belong to the same region which may likely be facing similar migration dilemmas. By interpretation, the location of South Africa within the SADC and by extension the continent of Africa requires a joint approach to managing migration, which may help mitigate the disproportionateness in bargaining power between the sending and the receiving states.

Finally, South Africa needs to create a receptive environment for skilled migrants who are willing to stay for a long period or take up a permanent residency of the country. South Africa must of a necessity help such migrants to overcome social obstacles, including racial prejudice that often come in the name of xenophobia. This can be made a national policy using its domestic outreach activities and public diplomacy. Taking a cue from Rana (2018), what kind of an integration model should the country of destination (Sout Africa) adopt? Should it be one of full assimilation, as the French have tended to pursue, or a "salad bowl" method akin to UK's celebration of cultural diversity? Practically, there are many variations, thus, each state naturally has power pursue its own migration policies. Nevertheless, South Africa must take the responsibility of educating public opinion on the need to promote and expand high-skilled immigration, while affirming a national preference for South Africa's national interests. implemented regulations and strategies to address

References

- Abreu, A. (2012) The New Economics of Labor Migration: Beware of Neoclassicals Bearing Gifts. *Forum for Social Economics*, 41(1): 46-67.
- Adamson, F & Tsourapas, G. (2019). Migration Diplomacy in World Politics. *International Studies Perspectives* 20: 113–28.
- Akçapar, Ş. K. (2017). International Migration and Diplomacy: Challenges and Opportunities in the 21st Century Perceptions. *Journal of International Affairs*. 22(3): 1-34.
- Angbulu, A. (2023). Why Nigeria can't build walls against Niger, other neighbours. *The Punch Newspaper* 3/09/2023. Retrieved from <https://punchng.com/why-nigeria-cant-build-walls-against-niger-other-neighbours-acting-cg-nis/>.
- Asare, P. (2012). Labour migration in Ghana. Retrieved from <https://library.fes.de/pdffiles/bueros/ghana/10511.pdf>.
- Brink, H. I. L. (1993). Validity and Reliability in Qualitative Research. *Curationis*, 16(2): 35–38.
- Carneson, J. (2011). South Africa's changing migration policies. In A. Bernstein (Eds) *South Africa's Migration Policies: A regional perspective* pp 12-13. Prepared for CDE Workshop no 8 February 2011. Centre for Development and Enterprise. Retrieved from www.cde.org.za.
- Castles, S., Korac, M., Vasta, E. & Vertovec, S. (2001). *Integration: Mapping the Field*. Report of a project carried out by the Centre for Migration and Policy Research and Refugee Studies Centre, University of Oxford.
- Crush, J. & McDonald, D. (2002). *Transnationalism and New African Immigration to South Africa*. Cape Town and Toronto: SAMP and CAAS.
- Crush, J., Williams, V. & Peberdy, S. (2005). *Migration in Southern Africa* paper prepared for the Policy Analysis and Research Programme of the Global Commission on International Migration. Commission on International Migration. Retrieved from www.gcim.org.
- Department of Home Affairs (2017) *White Paper on International Migration for South Africa*. Retrieved from <http://www.dha.gov.za/WhitePaperonInternationalMigration-20170602.pdf>.
- Dodson, B. (1998). *Women on the Move: Gender and Cross-Border Migration to South Africa*. Southern African Migration Project. Migration Policy Series No. 9. Retrieved from <https://scholars.wlu.ca/samp/124/>.
- Domholdt, E. (1993). *Physical Therapy Research: Principles and Applications*. W B Saunders, Philadelphia.
- Duru, I. U. (2021). Examination of the Causes and Consequences of International Migration in Nigeria. *Asian Development Policy Review*. 9(4): 180-193.
- ECRE (1999) *Position on the Integration of Refugees in Europe*. Retrieved from <http://www.ecre.org/positions/integ.shtml>.
- Greenhill, K M. (2010). *Weapons of Mass Migration: Forced Displacement, Coercion, and Foreign Policy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Greenhill, K. M. (2002). "Engineered Migration and the Use of Refugees as Political Weapons: A Case Study of the 1994 Cuban Balseros Crisis. *International Migration* (40): 39–74.

- Grigg, D. B. (1977). E. G. Ravenstein and the laws of migration. *Journal of Historical Geography*. 3 (1): 41-54.
- Harris, J. & Todaro, M. (1970). Migration, Unemployment and Development: A Two-Sector Analysis. *The American Economic Review* 60(1):126-142.
- Heath, A. F & Schneider, S. L (2021). Dimensions of Migrant Integration in Western Europe. *Frontiers in Sociology*. 6: 1-21.
- Hellgren, Z. (2015). Immigrant Integration as a Two-Way Process: Translating Theory into Practice. Interdisciplinary Research Group on Migration Working Paper Series List: Retrieved from www.upf.edu/gritim/distribució .
- Hollifield, J. F., Martin, P. & Orrenius, P. (2014). *Controlling Immigration: A Global Perspective*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hui, Weng-Tat. (1997). Regionalization, Economic Restructuring, and Labour Migration in Singapore. *International Migration* 35: 109–30.
- Johnson, S & Altbeker, A. (2011). South Africa's Migration Policies: A regional perspective. Prepared for CDE Workshop no 8 February 2011. Centre for Development and Enterprise Retrieved from www.cde.org.za.
- King, R & Collyer, M. (2016). Migration and Development Framework and Its Links to Integra. Review, arcés-Mascareñas, B & Penninx, R. (Eds) *Integration Processes and Policies in Europe: Contexts, Levels and Actors* (pp 167-188) Springer Open, London.
- Kishan S. R. (2008). Role of Diplomacy in Managing the Movement of People. *Indian Foreign Affairs Journal*. 3(1): pp. 68-82.
- Klotz, A. (2000). Migration after apartheid: Deracialising South African foreign policy. *Third World Quarterly*. 21(5): pp 831-847.
- Lee, E. (1966). A Theory of Migration. *Demography*. 3(1): 47–57.
- Lewis, W. A. (1954). Economic development with unlimited supplies of labour. *Manchester School* 28, 139–91.
- Mabogunje, A. L. (1970). Systems approach to a theory of rural-urban migration. *Geographical Analysis*, 2(1): 1–18.
- Martin, P. (2011). Global migration and lessons for South Africa. In A. Bernstein (Eds) *South Africa's Migration Policies: A regional perspective* pp 9-11. Prepared for CDE Workshop no 8 February 2011. Centre for Development and Enterprise. Retrieved from www.cde.org.za .
- Masiyiwa, G. (2022). Policy Threatens to Upend Lives of Immigrants in South Africa. *Global Press Journal* /<https://globalpressjournal.com/africa/zimbabwe/policy-threatens-upend-lives-immigrants-south-africa/>.
- Massey, D. S, Arango, J., Hugo, G., Kouaouci, G., Pellegrino, A & Taylor, J. E (1993). Theories of International Migration: A Review and Appraisal. *Population and Development Review*.19(3): pp. 431-466.
- Massey, D. S. (1990). Social structure, household strategies, and the cumulative causation of migration. *Population Index*. 56(1): 3–26.

- Maunganidze, O. A. (2021). Migration Policy in South Africa: Lessons from Africa's Migration Magnet for European Policymakers. (DGAP Report, 17). Berlin: Forschungsinstitut der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Auswärtige Politik e.V. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ss0ar-75770-1>.
- McDonald, D. (2000). On Borders: Perspectives on International Migration in Southern Africa (Cape Town and New York: SAMP and St Martin's Press.
- Mohajan, H. K. (2018). Qualitative research methodology in social sciences and related subjects Journal of Economic Development, Environment and People. 7 (1): 23-48.
- Moyo, K. & Zanker, F (2020). Political Contestations within South African Migration Governance Arnold Bergstraesser Institute pp 1-46.
- Nkamleu, G. B., & Fox, L. (2006). Taking stock of research on regional migration in Sub-Saharan Africa. Munich: Personal RePEc Archive.
- Nwosu, I. A., Eteng, M. J., Ekpechu, J., Nnam, M. U., Ukah, J. A., Eyisi, E., & Orakwe, E. C. (2022). Poverty and Youth Migration Out of Nigeria: Enthronement of Modern Slavery. SAGE Open 12(1): 1-13.
- Pasetti, F. (2014). Country Report: Integration Policies in Spain. INTERACT Research Report 2014/30.
- Peberdy, S. A. (2013). From the Past to the Present: Regulating Migration and Immigration in Post-Apartheid South Africa. Journal Für Entwicklungspolitik. 4: 67–93.
- Piore, M. J. (1979). Birds of passage: Migrant labour and industrial societies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rana, K. S. (2008). Role of Diplomacy in Managing the Movement of People. Indian Foreign Affairs Journal. 3 (1): pp. 68-82.
- Ranis, G. & Fei, J. (1961). A Theory of Economic Development. The American Economic Review 51(4): 533–565.
- Ravenstein, E.** (1885). The Laws of Migration. Journal of the Statistical Society of London 48(2): 167–235.
- Ravenstein, E.** (1889) “The Laws of Migration,” Journal of the Statistical Society of London 52(2): 241–305.
- Sjaastad, L. (1962). The Costs and Return of Human Migration,” The Journal of Political Economy 70(5): 80–93.
- Skeldon, R. (1990). Population mobility in developing countries: A reinterpretation. London: Belhaven Press.
- Stark, O. (1978). Economic–demographic interactions in agricultural development: The case of rural-to-urban migration. Rome: FAO.
- Stark, O. (1991). The migration of labour. Blackwell: Cambridge and Oxford.
- Sulaiman, S. (2020). Theoretical Background and Main Assumptions of Migration. Economics and Working Capital. <http://eworkcapital.com/theoretical-background-and-main-assumptions-of-migration/>.
- Tati, G. (2008). The immigration Issues in the Post-Apartheid South Africa: Discourses, Policies and Social Repercussions Open Edition Journals p. 423-440 <https://journals.openedition.org/eps/3496>.

- Thiollet, H. (2011). Migration as Diplomacy: Labour Migrants, Refugees and Arab Regional Politics in the Oil-Rich Countries. *International Labour and Working Class History*, 79 (1): pp. 103-121.
- Todaro, M. P. & Smith, S. (2006). *Economic development*. Boston: Addison Wesley.
- Todaro, M. P. (1969). A model of labor migration and urban unemployment in less developed countries. *The American Economic Review*, 59(1):138–148.
- Tolay, J. (2022) Interrogating and Broadening the Emerging Narrative on Migration Diplomacy: A Critical Assessment. *Millenium Journal of International Studies* 51(1): 354–375.
- Tsourapas, G. & Adamson, F. (2019). How countries use ‘migration diplomacy’ to pursue their own interests. *The Conversation*. Retrieved from <https://theconversation.com/how-countries-use-migration-diplomacy-to-pursue-their-own-interests-110533>.
- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2013) Estimates of international migrant stock worldwide. Retrieved from <http://esa.un.org/unmigration/wallchart2013.htm>.
- Waldinger, R & Fitzgerald, D. (2004). Transnationalism in Question. *American Journal of Sociology*. 109 (5):1177-1195.
- Wickramasekara, P. (2015). *Bilateral Agreements and Memoranda of Understanding on Migration of Low Skilled Workers: A Review*. Geneva: International Labor Organization. Retrieved from http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/—ed_protect/—protrav/—migrant/documents/publication/wcms_385582.pdf.
- Williams, B., Lurie, M., Gouws, E. & Crush, J. (2002). *Spaces of Vulnerability: Migration and HIV/AIDS in South Africa* (Southern African Migration Project, Migration Policy Series No. 24, 2002) and International Organization for Migration, *Mobile Populations and HIV/AIDS in the Southern African Region* (Pretoria: IOM and UNAIDS).
- World Economic Forum. (2017). *Migration and its impact on cities*. http://www3.weforum.org/docs/Migration_Impact_Cities_report_2017_low.pdf.
- Zelinsky, W. (1971). The hypothesis of the mobility transition. *Geographical Review*, 61(2): 219-249.
- Zolberg, A. R. (1992). Labor migration and international economic regimes: Bretton Woods and after. In M M Kritz, L L Lim & H. Zlotnik (Eds), *International Migration Systems: A Global Approach*, Oxford: Clarendon.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).