THE SOCIO-POLITICAL NEXUS BETWEEN CITIZENSHIP AND MIGRATION

Emmanuel Chukwujekwu Ikenga

Abstract
This work is an attempt to provide a succinct account of the relationship between citizenship and migration. It does this by highlighting the variables and contending issues which confront states and organized societies in their quest to determine who qualifies to become a citizen and who does not, as well as challenges associated with the process of migration and rights of migrants. In this regard, this work recommends a middle ground approach which supports neither unregulated open door approach nor insensitive restriction of migrants with genuine needs. At the domestic level, this work also suggests the removal of "state of origin" provision in the official documentation of Nigerians as this would galvanize them to consider themselves primarily as Nigerians before any other parochial considerations. The work concludes by making some other recommendations towards ensuring that the challenges associated with citizenship and migration are either prevented or nipped in the bud. In carrying out this research the methodology is qualitative while employing theoretical analysis in the research. This is because this is a research in political philosophy which relies mainly on literature rather than data for information and proof.
Keywords: Citizenship, Migration, Politics.

Introduction

Recent events in different parts of the world urgently bring upon us the need to have a discussion on the issues of citizenship and migration. There have been an increasing number of humanitarian crises involving human migration across national boundaries, as a result of wars, economic devastations, terrorism, banditry, and violence in ethnic or religious conflicts. To resolve and contain these crises, there is need for immediate actions, mostly in the form of providing opportunities for resettlement for those who are displaced, either permanently or temporarily, on the part of those nations who are in a position to help alleviate the dire conditions of these refugees.

This paper therefore sets out to discuss the concept and the dynamics of citizenship and migration, general moral frameworks for addressing citizenship and immigration issues, arguments bordering on multiculturalism and inter-culturalism and their interplay with the challenges of citizenship and migration, the Nigerian experience of citizenship and migration discourse while considering ways of ensuring that the society is preserved from crisis in the process of applying the constitutional requirements of citizenship and (internal) migration.

What is Citizenship?

According to Johari (1989), "Citizenship is no longer a privilege available to the free, affluent and adult members of Athens or to the patricians of Rome or to the peers of England. It is a legal status available to all members of a political community regardless of their religion, race, caste, creed, language, wealth, etc". In a narrow sense, Johari states, citizenship implies possession and enjoyment of civil and political rights which enable a person to lead a 'good life' in society and to take part in the public affairs. But in a broad sense, it has a number of implications.

First, if citizenship confers rights, it also imposes a set of obligations on a person. Each right has a corresponding duty and the two constitute two sides of a coin. The second implication is that the citizens should necessarily have a broader range of loyalties. The loyalty of a citizen should not be confined to his community, he should have his loyalty towards all communities living there whether they are a minority or have a distinct racial and cultural identity of their own. This is, indeed, a necessary condition for attaining the ideal of national integration.

The third consideration is that citizenship should be packaged along with the idea of civic republicanism, meaning that the citizens should take active part in the public affairs. There should be no room for apathy, indifference or alienation of the citizens. Next is that if loyalty of a citizen towards the state is an essential element of the definition of citizenship, then it could be stretched to also apply in the cases of membership of trans-national state like the European Union. Note that one of the features of the Treaty of European Union is establishment of a common citizenship for people in all the member states (Treaty, 1992).

Some modern socio-political writers are of the strong opinion that in this age of globalization, the whole world has become like a village. And so, the geographical dimensions of citizenship should be discarded so as to take the whole global community in view. This, according to them, is essential if we want to live in a better and more equitable international political, economic and social order. We should note at this point that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 10th December 1948 "invested the idea of social citizenship with the authority of international law" (Heywood & Chin, 2023). So, according to Heywood, citizenship is a relationship between the individual and the state in which the two are bound together by reciprocal rights and duties. Citizens are not same as subjects and aliens because they are full members of their political community or state by virtue of the possession of their basic rights.

It is worthy of note that the contemporary analysis of citizenship has to be seen within the broader context of the study of social and human rights, because any inquiry into citizenship necessarily raises questions about the relationship between obligation and rights, or between responsibilities and entitlements. We may regard citizenship as a collection of rights and duties which define socio-political membership, the

consequence of which is to allocate collective benefits to social groups, households or individuals.

Citizenship is therefore defined as a bundle of entitlements and obligations, which constitute individuals as full-fledged members of a socio-political community, providing them with access to scarce resources (Ray, 2007). There are different forms of citizenship. In single citizenship a person becomes a citizen of one state by birth or by naturalization. Double or dual citizenship is what applies in some countries (such as the United States of America and United Kingdom) where there is a law of the soil (jus soli) which means that a person born in that Country becomes a citizen of that state by virtue of his or her birth there. Then some countries (such as France) have the law of blood (jus sanguinis) which means that a child has the citizenship of the country to which his/her parents belong regardless of the place of birth. For instance, the child of French citizens becomes the citizen of UK or USA if born in that country where the law of the soil prevails. Such a person has double citizenship for some time. On being adult, such a person has to lose one citizenship, as per his or her choice. In a federal system the case is quite different where a person is a citizen of his nation-state as well as of his province or canton.

There is also Multiple Citizenship which is a new development. Here, the Maastricht Treaty of 1992 has it that a person has the citizenship of all countries which are the members of the European Union. The Amsterdam Treaty of 1997 further says that the citizenship of the European Union complements and not supersedes the national citizenship of a person belonging to a state that is the member of the European Union. The two are inter-related. At the same time, it should be noted that such an arrangement does not take away the basic difference between the two.

Finally, there is Global Citizenship which implies that as human beings all people have rights of universal significance which must be recognized by all the states of the world so that they may lead 'good life'. One may say that such an idea is like a dream or a piece of imagination which cannot be realized until the world state is created. With the momentum being gathered by globalization, this could be achieved in the foreseeable future.

Dimensions of Citizenship
Citizenship can be viewed from different aspects and dimensions. According to Grincevičienė and Klimka (2017), the full concept of citizenship should be seen as containing legal, political and social dimensions. The concept can be viewed from all of these three angles. The first means that citizenship is connected with certain rights, like the right to vote or stand for election, the right to property and so on. In most societies, the law guarantees these rights to every citizen. Then there is also the social dimension, which can be said to be as important as the legal one: the recognition of equality and identities of others. Finally, there is the political dimension, meaning the importance of citizens' participation in the society, which is discussed in connection with the contemporary account of republicanism. All these issues are discussed from the point of view of groups demanding for group-specific rights and equal recognition.

In the view of T.H. Marshall, citizenship is essentially a matter of ensuring that everyone is treated as a full and equal member of the society. This sense of membership can be attained, he argues, by according people an increasing number of citizenship rights. He, therefore, offers a tripartite conception of citizenship – civil, political and social, emphasizing most on the social rights. Though formulated in the context of social and political development of Britain, Marshall's theory of citizenship is a powerful defense of the welfare state. His definition of citizenship requires 'full membership of the community' based on a tripartite conception of rights – civil, political and social. In his view, civil rights are necessary for individual freedom and include certain freedoms such as freedom of speech, assembly, movement, conscience, private property, equality before law, etc. It should be noted that such rights are exercised by the individuals within civil society and ensures autonomy of the individual with limited interference of state. Then, political rights such as the right to vote, to contest elections, and to hold public office enable the individual to participate in public affairs. It also requires the operation of a democratic system. Social rights, on the other hand, such as right to basic economic welfare, right to social security or right to lead a good life guarantee a minimum social status to the individual (Johari, 1989).

Some of the major criticisms suffered by Marshall's model, with emphasis on social rights which can only be provided by a welfare state, came from the 'new rightists' who advanced the idea of limited or curtailed welfare state. The feminists also found fault with the affirmations of Marshall on the ground that he did not include certain rights in the list of social rights that were essential for elevating the status of women in society like abolition of gender inequality and gender injustice. Above all, it ignored the case of universal citizenship that has now become popular in the age of globalization. Giddens and Dallmayr (1982) begins by disagreeing with most of Marshall's postulations. According to him, all civil rights, as mentioned by Marshall, are not of a homogenous category. Variations may be noted among them. Also, Giddens points out that the analysis of Marshall says nothing about 'economic rights' that were secured by workers by means of a series of struggles and which now constitute the case of 'industrial citizenship'. In summary, Giddens argues that class conflict has been and remains the modicum of the extension of citizenship rights and the basis of the creation of an insulated economy, polyarchy and the welfare state.

By way of summary, Giddens (1986), while rejecting Marshall's theory, states that the system of rights is a creation of the sovereign state. An increase in the number of rights of the citizens is a result of the extension of state sovereignty. A bigger state created a bigger identity of its people as political subjects or citizens. Naturally, the idea of citizenship came to have its link with the force of nationalism. The conditions involved in the creation of the modern state as a 'surveillance apparatus' are the same as those that help generate nationalism. Nationalism is clearly linked to the 'administrative unification of the state'. And citizenship mediates this process. The development of citizenship as pertaining to membership of an over-all political community, is intimately bound up with the novel (administrative) ordering of political power and the 'politicalization' of social relations and day-to-day activities which follows in its wake.

Migration

Migration is, simply put, the movement of a person or people from one country, locality or place of residence to settle in another in order to find work or better living condition. It is a normal human activity to migrate from the homes of our families or guardians into our own homes. People also migrate between regions, cities, towns and even countries. There is internal migration, which has to do with moving within a state or country; in contrast to external (international) migration, moving to a different country or continent. Migration also involves emigration, leaving one country to move to another; and immigration, moving into a new country. Some scholars also talk about return migration, which is moving back to where you came from, as well as seasonal migration, moving with each season or in response to labor or climate conditions.

Factors that drive human migration can be categorized into push factors and pull factors. Push factors are those conditions or situations that tend to influence individuals or groups to decide on leaving their place of abode. Those things going on in their place of residence that make people want to leave. Such push factors could be in the form of a problem, such as a food shortage, unemployment, insecurity, war, threat to life, or flood. Pull factors, on the other hand, are those conditions or situations which tend to attract people to a particular place. Such pull factors include nicer climate, more job opportunities, better food supply, better healthcare, gender equality or political stability.

Impacts of Migration on Social, Economic and Political Conditions

Migration does have consequences, impacts and effects on both the host community or country and the society or country of emigration. Let us consider some of the impacts, effects and consequences of migration.

Social Effects of Migration

(a) Culture and diversity

Culture is the common values, shared beliefs and traditions of a particular society or demographic. This includes their food, music, language, art and dressing. There are many different cultures globally, and these cultures are often shared and transmitted to new places through migration.

Migration can boost the cultural diversity of a host country, as an introduction of a new culture can bring a whole new market of products and services that were not available in the host country before to the arrival of migrants. Migration in this regard, can be considered to be of very positive impacts on the host nation or society. However there can be negative impacts for the migrants themselves, for example, there can be a significant loss of cultural norms, as they may be entering a host country that has a completely different way of societal living than their origin country.

Also, migrants may have entirely different cultural values or characteristics to those of a host nation. When there are differences between the host and the origin country, tensions may build up between them. This is often called a cultural conflict or cultural clash.

(b) Segregation and Unjust Discrimination

International migration may create opportunities for discrimination. Migrants may have different cultural characteristics, or religious practice from their host nation. There could also be language barriers, which can sometimes cause migrants to be discriminated against in every aspect of their lives, directly or indirectly.

During the course of international migration, migrants may face racial or ethnic discrimination or segregation, which may occur in different forms. In large urban areas, there often exists designated neighbourhoods for different ethnicities. For example, in South Eastern Nigeria there are areas regarded as 'Hausa Quarters' which harbours mostly people from the Northern part of the country. Also in some northern communities, there are areas designated as 'sabon gari' which means 'strangers' quarters', meant mostly for strangers. This can happen due to migrants being treated differently, affecting their access to certain types of housing, or if local populations make active choices to live away from migrant groups (Iceland, 2014). Segregation may also happen because it is attractive for migrants to live in spaces with people who have similar cultural characteristics.

Negative attitudes toward migrants, fueled by racism, tribalism and discriminatory beliefs, can also have a negative impact on policies in the host nation. A concrete example is found with the Brexit, negative attitudes towards migrants influenced many people to vote for leave, to reduce the number of migrants entering the UK.

(c) Smuggling and Human Trafficking

The process of international migration is often complicated, and immigration laws can be very strict. This can lead potential migrants to hire the services of illegal immigration officers, commonly known as smugglers. Due to the illegality of their services, there is no guarantee the migration process is safe.

Human trafficking is something different to smuggling. Human trafficking occurs when people are forced into undertaking unpaid forced labour, or sex work, for example, within or outside a country. Human trafficking may also occur as a result of smuggling if they are held captive or are forced to work to pay off the often expensive smuggling fees (UNHCR, 2023), but this isn't always the case.

Political Impacts of Migration

(a) International Borders and Asylum Seekers

International borders are not always well-defined. Some territories share border control authorities from different countries, and this can lead to conflict. When it comes to migration, it is often unclear who is responsible for the migrant movement and who takes responsibility in the cases of eventualities. Many illegal migrants have perished in the Mediterranean Sea while trying to enter Europe through North Africa, without any of the affected countries taking responsibility.

(b) Economic and Political Conditions

Migration obviously impacts economically and politically on both the host country and country of origin. First is Human Capital Flight. With international migration, origin countries often lose large proportions of the highly skilled human capital and workforce. Developing countries, such as Nigeria, suffer from the loss of this highly trained workforce, due to migration. This is called Brain Drain or Human Capital Flight, which negatively impacts economic growth. Brain Drain in country of origin automatically implies Brain Gain in country of immigration. This is more so when we consider that most immigrants come in as asylum seekers, temporary and permanent settlers, economic migrants, labor migrants, knowledge migrants, tourists who become permanent residents, social migrants, international students, etc; and most are in their productive ages, thereby boosting the workforce and human capital of the host country.

Migrants who enter their host countries and start earning income are likely to send part of their income back to their countries of origin. This is called diaspora remittance. Nigeria, for example, received around 19.8 billion US dollars in the year 2022 from remittances, which is about 5% of the country's total Gross Domestic Product (GDP). According to Page and Plaza (2006), there is ample evidence that remittances have raised internal consumption, increased local investment, and prolonged education attainment. Despite the fact that most of these workers will still send remittances back to their origin country, these remittances are not enough to deal with the economic impact of this human capital flight, which can impact the development levels of the origin country.

Another implication is Population and demographic changes. International migration can affect the population and demographics of both host and origin countries. Through migration, the population in the host country increases. This can increase pressure on public services and infrastructure, as more people are using or needing them (McGhee & Neiman, 2010). It is often the younger population that leaves to seek better opportunities elsewhere and this leaves behind an increasingly elderly population in the origin country, and with a growing younger population in the host country.

According to Gheasi and Nijkamp (2017), there are 244 million international migrants in the world as at 2018, roughly three percent of the world's population then. Eight percent are refugees, many of whom reside in countries near their countries of origin. Most international migrants have moved to countries with higher levels of development than their countries of origin. The United States is the top migrant destination in the world, with a migrant population of 47 million, 19% of the world's total. Germany and the Russian Federation hosted the second and third largest numbers worldwide (12 million each), followed by Saudi Arabia (10 million). The United Kingdom, United Arab Emirates, Canada, France, Australia, and Spain are also in the top ten. There is also the neoclassical macroeconomic framework which indicates that migration happens as a result of a process of economic development and wage differences. According to this theory, individuals try to maximize their income; therefore, they migrate to regions with higher wages. The country of origin also enjoys benefits: firstly, migrants reduce the ratio of labor to capital; and, secondly, migrants make up for their absence by sending remittances to their home country. In the long run, the decline in the labor-capital ratio would remove the incentives for migration.

Another important aspect of challenge is on the social, cultural, economic and political security of the host country. Most often, immigrant receiving countries find preserving their languages, values, norms and customs challenging in the face of immigration. European security discourses, for example, regularly feature discussions about the threat to European culture coming from the influx of Muslim immigrants who are unwilling or incapable of integrating into the society. In response to this threat, countries are increasingly adopting stringent residency requirements that stipulate immigrants to study the local language, culture and history to be eligible for residency permit.

The security dilemma facing host nations becomes particularly strong when there is doubt about the long term consequences of immigrant activities and 'offensive' posturing could be attributed to the intention of immigrants. According to Alexseev and Hofstetter (2006), immigrants' actions will be considered as 'offensive' if they fail to return to their home country or bring over their families and friends to increase their stake on local resources and obtain greater political freedom. This is further compounded by doubt about the intention of the immigrant sending country, which may also be encouraging immigration to deliberately undermine the sovereignty of the receiving country. The immigration of ethnic Chinese to Russian Far East (RFE) over the past two decades, for instance, has been met with strong suspicion and apprehension that China's ulterior motive could be to reclaim lost Chinese territories.

The conflict and security dilemma that may result from immigration could upset the social order and lead to political instability, which is an important variable that has been widely shown to hamper economic growth. Instability engenders uncertainty about future policies thereby discouraging investment and leading to capital flight. It also adversely affects the quantity and quality of labor available for production as the most skilled and educated workers in the economy flee to avoid persecution (in the wake of political upheaval) or leave in search of better economic opportunities (Fosu, 2002).

Consequently, the level of output would decline and the economy would not be on an optimal growth trajectory. This underscores the importance of political stability and the

need to investigate the channels through which different factors may upset the political balance.

(c) Migration and Terrorism

Donald Trump, shortly after taking office as United States President early 2017, issued Executive Order 13769, which he termed 'Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States'. This order put in place a number of immigration restrictions, especially concerning immigration and travel from Muslim-majority countries to the United States. Here, Trump argued that these restrictions were necessary because so many foreign born persons have been convicted or implicated in terrorism-related crimes since September 11 2001. These include foreign nationals who entered the United States with visitor visas, student visas or employment visas, as well as those who entered through the United States refugee resettlement program. President Trump went on to insist that the purpose of these immigration restrictions was to protect the American people from terrorist attacks by foreign nationals who are admitted to the United States (Trump, 2017). This executive order is emblematic of how some politicians relate terrorism to immigration: migrants are regarded as a potential threat to domestic security given the chance they will engage in terrorist activity. In recent years, Muslim immigration in particular has been considered a security threat to Western societies. Furthermore, as exemplified by Trump's travel ban, the ostensible relationship between terrorism and migration has public policy consequences.

Interestingly, Helbling and Meierrieks (2022) carried out a detailed academic research on the connection or otherwise between migration and terrorism, and came out with the following findings: (1) There is little evidence that migration has an unconditional effect on terrorism that goes beyond a mere mechanical scale effect. (2) The evidence more strongly suggests that migrants are victimized by (right-wing) terrorism, for example serving as scapegoats for anti-immigration sentiment. (3) Even though the empirical connection between migration and terrorism is tenuous and by no means unconditional, such a link is still perceived to be valid in destination countries, which, in turn, has several consequences. (4) There is little evidence that stricter migration policies actually result in less terrorism. (5) The migration–terrorism nexus is transnational in nature. This not only refers to the cross-border flow of terrorist violence and people, but also to, for example, (a) the cross-border diffusion of fear and anti-immigrant resentment due to terrorism, (b) the adaption of stricter migration policies in response to terrorism in foreign countries and (c) feedback between terrorism and migration in sending and destination countries, for example, via diasporas and the cross-border flow of information and remittances.

Relationship between Migration, Citizenship, Multiculturalism and Inter-culturalism

We have earlier defined Migration as, simply put, the movement of a person or people from one country, locality or place of residence to settle in another in order to find work or better living condition. We have also defined citizenship as implying possession and enjoyment of civil and political rights which enable a person to lead a 'good life' in

society and to take part in the public affairs. Multiculturalism, on the other hand, is a new variety of liberalism that attaches particular significance to the rights and freedoms of the hitherto neglected, excluded and humiliated people and, at the same time, desires to maintain their distinct place in a pluralistic society and a democratic state (Johari, 1989). Finally, Interculturalism can be defined as a political movement which advocates for cross-cultural dialogue while challenging self-segregation tendencies within cultures. Interculturalism involves moving beyond mere passive acceptance of multiple cultures existing in a society and instead promotes dialogue and interaction between cultures (Wikipedia, 2023).

In the context of migration, citizenship signifies a distinction between members and outsiders based on their different relations to particular states. Free movement within state territories and the right to readmission to this territory has become a hallmark of modern citizenship. Yet, in the international arena citizenship serves as a control device that strictly limits state obligations towards foreigners and permits governments to keep them out, or remove them, from their jurisdiction. A focus on migration highlights the boundaries of citizenship and political control over entry and exit as well as the fact that foreign residents remain in most countries deprived of the core rights of political participation. These exclusionary aspects of citizenship raise some difficult problems for the theory of democracy. Such questions are often ignored in discussions that start from the false assumption that liberal democracies have already achieved full political inclusion and equality and focus then only on questions of social equality, economic opportunities, political participation and cultural liberties among citizens.

Migration is a form of mobility of persons that involves crossing territorial borders and taking up residence in another locality, region, or country. In the contemporary world, most such geographic entities are organized as jurisdictions with precisely defined political borders. Some of these territorial borders are completely open for migration; some operate as funnels that permit a free flow in only one direction (entry or exit). The borders of municipalities and provinces are generally open within democratic states. Free movement within a country is today not merely conceived as a right of citizens but as a human right. Once they have been admitted into the country, immigrants have the same right as native citizens to move around in search for better opportunities. This is clearly a modern liberal norm that was absent in earlier regimes, and it is still not fully respected in some contemporary ones. All sovereign states, on the other hand, claim a right to control their borders. According to Dowty (1988) there is a human right of free exit, which is, again, not respected by most authoritarian regimes, but there is no corresponding right of migrants to enter the territory of another state.

In this respect, citizenship operates as a filtering device in two basic ways. First, states are obliged to (re)admit their own nationals to their territory. These include nationals born abroad who have inherited their parents' citizenship. Second, states may impose specific restrictions on certain nationals, such as through visa requirements, while opening their borders for others, such as European Union citizens migrating to other Member States.

Co-ethnic immigration preferences have been insufficiently studied. Several states (among others Israel, Italy, Japan, Germany, Greece, Spain and Portugal) have also

adopted preferences for foreign nationals whom they consider as part of a larger ethnic nation or as cultural and linguistic relatives who will more easily integrate in the destination country. These policies identify certain groups of non-citizens as potential citizens already before entering the territory. With some notable exceptions ethnic immigration preferences are a rather neglected topic in comparative migration research. This may partly be due to the fact that co-ethnic immigration does not fit well into dominant migration theories that focus on economic push and pull factors and on the sociology of migration networks. From these perspectives, it is not easy to understand why states would encourage the immigration of co-ethnics who crowd out other migrants with better skills and – in the German, Israeli and Japanese case – are sometimes not even familiar with the destination states' language. There is also a normative puzzle, which has not been fully explored, concerning the legitimacy of such distinctions. In the 1960s and 1970s, the exclusion of particular ethnic and racial groups from immigration was abandoned in the United States, Canada and Australia and is now also regarded as illegitimate in European immigration states. The question whether preferential admission on similar grounds, which is still widespread and potentially growing, also amounts to discrimination, is disputed and has not been fully addressed yet. Bauböck, Kraler, Martiniello, and Perchinig (2006) concludes by strongly suggesting that migration research must be combined with studies of nation-building and nationalism for explaining the persistence of such preferential treatment as well as for evaluating it.

Džankić and VINK (2022) have also opined that citizenship is a symbol of equality within states as much as a marker of inequality among states. It is, according to them, a defining feature of the international state system, which both reflects and reinforces inequalities of wealth and opportunity around the world, as well as a tool for social closure, through which states determine who belongs to the group that can share common entitlements and who, by contrast, are excluded from them. These two characteristics of citizenship are central to understanding the citizenship-migration nexus: whereas the promise of equality represents a strong driver for migrants to acquire citizenship in their destination states, the different opportunities attached to citizenship of different countries encourage migration of individuals from less privileged parts of the world and enable mobility for those with a citizenship status in the more advantageous countries.

Multiculturalism is essentially a move towards addressing the challenges existing in the citizenship vs migration discourse. But hardly had the dust settled when interculturalism surfaced, accusing the proponents of multiculturalism of employing an approach that is not result oriented considering the dynamics of modern society. There is, therefore, a critical debate between multicultural and intercultural approaches in both political theory and practice. Both interculturalism and multiculturalism address the question of how states should forge unity from ethnic, cultural, and religious diversity. But what are the dividing lines between interculturalism and multiculturalism? Interculturalists believe that an alternative to multiculturalism must be sought in order to understand and live with diversity. They share the view that multiculturalism is no longer a persuasive

intellectual or policy approach; but this assertion invites the question of how interculturalism differs from multiculturalism.

Meer and Modood (2016) weigh in and respond to the critiques of multiculturalism by questioning the notion that interculturalism is an alternative or a more advanced framework than multiculturalism and propose that interculturalism may represent, at best, a "critical friend" of multiculturalism. Modood defends multiculturalism as both a theory and a system of policies, while admitting the need to learn from some of the critiques posed by interculturalists such as, for example, the importance of intergroup contact and concepts such as "super-diversity". Furthermore, defenders of interculturalism rarely make clear how their policy recommendations differ from those defended by multiculturalists. As a result, Meer and Modood argue, the "good interculturalism versus bad multiculturalism" literature is essentially rhetorical rather than analytical.

Citizenship and Migration: Nigeria Experience

Oyeniyi (2013), in his study, states that internal migration in Nigeria presents a rather curious but complex trajectory, which involved rural-urban, rural-rural, urban-urban and urban-rural dynamics. As in other parts of Africa, internal migration in Nigeria is powered by a number of factors; the most notable being economic recession and economic growth, education, marriage, civil service transfer and national service. The study also found that two generations of internal migrants exist in Nigeria – first generation and their dependents and second generation migrants. These layers of internal migrants are not specific to Nigerians, but also apply to non-Nigerian migrants from neighbouring West African countries. It is his strongly held opinion that for the different generations of internal migrants, regional differences in education, socioeconomic and political developments play important roles in how internal migration impacts upon access to education, increases in life expectancy and living standards. He concludes that, contrary to the widely held view that internal migration is an economic and developmental problem, the study found that internal migration increases access to education, prolongs lives and contributes to improved living standards, not only for the internal migrants and their dependents and loved ones in regions of origin, but also of their host communities in destination areas.

Section 41 (1) of the 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria provides that every citizen of Nigeria is entitled to move freely throughout Nigeria and to reside in any part thereof, and no citizen of Nigeria shall be expelled from Nigeria or refused entry thereby or exit therefrom. It is important to note that this section specifically states that this freedom belongs to citizens of Nigeria. The scope of this right is also fortified by the provisions of section 15 (1,2, 3 & 4) which state:

15. (1) The motto of the Federal Republic of Nigeria shall be Unity and Faith, Peace and Progress.

(2) Accordingly, national integration shall be actively encouraged, whilst discrimination on the grounds of place of origin, sex, religion, status, ethnic or linguistic association or ties shall be prohibited.

(3) For the purpose of promoting national integration, it shall be the duty of the State to:

(a) provide adequate facilities for and encourage free mobility of people, goods and services throughout the Federation.

(b) secure full residence rights for every citizen in all parts of the Federation.

(c) encourage inter-marriage among persons from different places of origin, or of different

religious, ethnic or linguistic association or ties; and

(d) promote or encourage the formation of associations that cut across ethnic, linguistic,

religious and or other sectional barriers.

(4) The State shall foster a feeling of belonging and of involvement among the various people of the Federation, to the end that loyalty to the nation shall override sectional loyalties.

Have these provisions of the Country's constitution been upheld and complied with by the different states and geopolitical zones? It is my opinion that the answer is, to a large extent, no.

To understand the enormity of the challenges posed by migration (be it internal or external) across the different geopolitical zones of Nigeria, Innocent, Nwachukwu, Olise, and Nnamdi (2017) points us to the various challenges we are confronted with in the management of national borders, including the activities of transnational criminal organizations that traffic and smuggle persons, arms, and drugs; porous land borders, with several illegal crossing points that facilitate illegal activity; and the increasing activities of transnational terrorist groups like Boko Haram in Nigeria's north east and Al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM) (which operates in the Sahel region). In view of this, in recent public discussions there has been much talk of terrorists hiding in large numbers in refugee streams. This has made many people apprehensive about offering asylum seekers the assistance they are entitled to from countries which have signed and ratified the 1951 Convention and the 1967 United Nations Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees.

This unfortunate development has been compounded by ethnic profiling and labelling which exist, though in different proportions, across the six geopolitical zones of the country. Internal migrants are discriminated against, labelled (potential) terrorists and in some occasions lynched and physically assaulted. There have also been real cases of people from a particular part of the country carrying out criminal activities within their host communities, thus fueling such suspicions and ethnic profiling.

Murtala Adewale Kano reported in the Guardian Newspaper of 13th April 2021 that the terrorism and general insecurity in Nigeria has a strong international migration narrative to it. According to him, a large number of illegal immigrants, most of whom are undocumented, come into Nigeria mainly to eke a living for themselves; but the vast majority of their kith and kin are criminally minded and have helped in no small measure to fuel the insecurity in the country. Even the former president, Muhammadu Buhari, had lamented that migrants from Libya were responsible for the increasing insecurity in the country.

According to president Buhari during an interview with Arise TV in 2019, the stooges of former Libya leader, Muamar Gaddafi, constitute the terrorists perpetrating evil acts in Nigeria. He said the bandits, who escaped from Libya after the death of their leader in 2011, took to terrorism, the brunt of which Nigeria and some other African countries are currently bearing. Contrary to public belief that killings in some regions are the handiwork of Nigerian herders and terrorists, the president is convinced that the unsavoury legacy of Gaddafi is still haunting Nigeria and other countries. M.U. Kano reported in the Guardian Newspaper of 13th April, 2021 thus:

> The Nigerian cattle herder used to carry nothing more than a stick, but these are people with AK-47 and people refuse to reflect on the demise of Gaddafi. Gaddafi for 43 years in Libya, at some stage, decided to recruit people from Mali, Burkina Faso, Niger, Nigeria, Chad, from the Central African Republic and these young chaps are not taught to be bricklayers, electricians, plumbers, or any trade but to shoot and kill. So, when the opposition in Libya succeeded in killing him, they arrested some and they did what they did to them. The rest escaped with their orphans and we encounter some of them in the North-East and they are all over the place now organising attacks (Guardian Newspaper, 13/04/2021).

Ottuh and Idjakpo (2022), however, have strong evidence, supported with research, to disagree with President Buhari's narrative. According to them, most of the terrorist activities have a lot to do with what they termed 'fulanization'. The term "fulanization", which means "Fulani control", refers to the rapacious, exploitative, and oppressive use of the machinery of government and diplomacy (policies of cattle ranches) to seize territories, typically occupied by other ethnic groups to advance domination and opportunities for cow rearing. As a result, the government agencies compelled the region's original population into servitude and subjection. Fulanization goes along with Islamization. Specific arguments state that what is occurring in some regions of Nigeria now is the complete and ultimate takeover of all areas in accordance with Uthman Dan Fodio's long-standing ambitions as the father of Islam in Nigeria (Ottuh & Erhabor, 2022). Most Nigerians firmly feel that Muhammadu Buhari, the country's current president, has goals different than those of Nigerian nationalism. Through the deliberate eviction of indigenous groups that have lived in what is now Nigeria for a long time, there is a plan to open Nigeria's northern borders, covertly admit the nomadic Fulani of

West Africa, and permanently establish them in a new Nigerian homeland. Some have argued that the relocation of the Fulani could be partially attributed to global warming, which has made their pastoral way of life unsustainable. Under the pretense of herding, the Fulani have been spreading mayhem, destroying livelihoods, kidnapping, killing, raping women, and pillaging across the nation (Ottuh & Idjakpo, 2022).

The problem of "fulanization" and "Islamization" results from the influx of immigrants into Nigeria, which are Fulani from other African countries. Saminu, Yacoob, and Shukri claim that studies from all over the world, including those of the United Nations and the European Union, have paid intense attention to Fulani culture and all made various contributions to people's knowledge of Fulani and their cultural traditions (Saminu, Yacoob, & Shukri, 2022). It is safe to conclude that their socioeconomic activities are concentrated in and around the wooded reserves and rural grazing areas. Also, their main economic pursuits have been partially or entirely abandoned due to security and climate change challenges as they have moved farther south. For mutual co-existence, there is need for what some have described as state police in order to secure the lives and property of citizens and residents while maintaining law and order.

Philosophical Response

Social and Political Philosophy is a normative discourse which is interested in values related to groups of individuals, a community, society, nation or comity of nations. Some of the questions which this branch of philosophy tries to answer are; "What makes a good society?" and "What factors enhance the preservation of the human society?" Social and Political philosophers also advocate for such issues as fairness, justice, human rights, and the responsibilities of government. In considering all the issues connected with citizenship and migration, locally and internationally, the primary focus of this work is the enhancement of the society. How does the movement of persons from one society to another contribute to the betterment of both societies? How are migrants integrated into receiving societies without negatively altering the balance and peaceful co-existence already in place there? It has been established during the course of this work that, more often than not, migrants have contributed positively and enriched the culture, economy, politics and religious life of their host communities. Countries and communities that are open to receiving migrants, giving them opportunities to thrive, tend to be more progressive than those who are resistant to outsiders.

In order to take care of the challenges posed by the open border system as well as the conventional restrictive approach to migration, there is the collective self-determination argument for the state's right to control immigration which offers a middle ground in a highly polarized debate. On this view, we have both special obligations by virtue of membership in a political community and global obligations to all human beings. In contrast to restrictive nationalists who argue for closed borders, this moderate position acknowledges the obligation to take in refugees and to provide development assistance to poor countries. In contrast to proponents of open borders, the moderate position maintains that political membership is morally significant, even if its distribution is

arbitrary. Political membership establishes special rights and obligations that are more extensive than the obligations we have to all human beings. Although morality requires states to permit migration in an important range of cases, it does not demand open borders or uncontrolled freedom of movement. What is required is a policy of open doors that gives priority to those fleeing persecution and violence as well as those with family ties to current members. This moderate view also recognizes that insofar as immigration negatively impacts the wages and working conditions of domestic workers, including recently arrived immigrant workers, liberal democratic states may be justified in restricting the flow of migrants. Domestically, some scholars have strongly stated that for Nigeria to make progress towards greater unity the "state of origin" concept must be expunged from the 1999 Constitution. While this does not explicitly mention the phrase "state of origin", by vesting so much power in the Federal Character Commission and thereby tying citizens to the state of their ancestors the problem is entrenched in the governance system. Those who do not know their ancestry face considerable difficulties, both in terms of belonging and in accessing state resources.

For the Nigerian federation to work, Uzowulu and Umeogu (2021) insists, Nigerians should be able to move from the state of their ancestors to any other state and feel at home. Every Nigerian must also be able to aspire to the highest office in the state he chooses to call home. But if anyone wants to move from State A to State B, he must be willing to live according to the traditions of the majority population in State B. He adds that on this point, he sees no reason why a majority Muslim state cannot have sha'ria existing side-by-side with Nigerian federal law, provided that it is supplementary to the law of the nation. In turn, the people of State B must be willing to accept this 'migrant' as one of their own and give him the right to pursue a decent living. That way, the state and the individual can both profit. The findings of this work totally agrees with this recommendation which would guarantee the stability of state as well as the welfare and security of individuals there-in.

Conclusion
To wrap up this paper, we have to state strongly that citizenship and migration are so intimately related   that it   seems strange they could ever have been   treated separately. Citizenship constitutes and shapes migration, while migration has brought about transformations in peoples' entitlements to citizenship. Since the discourse on citizenship and migration is of global concern, political theorists should give greater attention to issues of migration beyond North America, Europe, and Oceania. Political scholars tend to focus on these places because that is where many political theorists live. But it is imperative that we should examine immigration to a broader range of countries, such as Russia and Saudi Arabia, which receive the third and fourth largest numbers of migrants in the world, respectively, as well as countries in Asia and Africa. Most of the world's unauthorized migration is to developing countries governed by weak and erratic bureaucracies, such as India and Malaysia. How do understandings of borders and citizenship differ in such contexts? Conversation around emigration also raises a host of important normative issues, including whether states are ever justified in preventing

citizens from exiting, the role of remittances in the pursuit of global distributive justice, and whether the term "brain drain" accurately captures what happens when skilled citizens depart a country. Enlarging our focus in this way would mean adopting a more global perspective that considers the impact of migration on sending as well as receiving countries.

National citizenship remains important for immigrants, not only for their political, but also some social and civil rights. As destination states continue to grapple with the integration of immigrants and sending states seek to engage with their emigrants, the question of how to adapt citizenship to an age of migration will continue to engage social and political scholars.

Emmanuel Chukwujekwu Ikenga is a doctoral student of Department of Philosophy, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.

References

Alexseev, M. A., & Hofstetter, C. R. (2006). Russia, China, and the Immigration Security Dilemma. *Political science quarterly, 121*(1), 1-32.

Bauböck, R., Kraler, A., Martiniello, M., & Perchinig, B. (2006). Migrants' citizenship: legal status, rights and political participation. *The dynamics of international migration and settlement in Europe, 65*.

Dowty, A. (1988). The assault on freedom of emigration. *World Affs., 151*, 85.

Džankić, J., & VINK, M. P. (2022). Citizenship & migration.

Fosu, A. K. (2002). Political instability and economic growth: Implications of coup events in Sub-Saharan Africa. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology, 61*(1), 329-348.

Gheasi, M., & Nijkamp, P. (2017). A brief overview of international migration motives and impacts, with specific reference to FDI. *Economies, 5*(3), 31.

Giddens, A. (1986). The nation-state and violence. *Capital & Class, 10*(2), 216-220.

Giddens, A., & Dallmayr, F. R. (1982). *Profiles and critiques in social theory*: Univ of California Press.

Grincevičienė, V., & Klimka, L. (2017). Dimensions of citizenship and nationality in the area of comprehensive education: experience of the Republic of Lithuania. *Multicultural Studies*(1), 141-153.

Helbling, M., & Meierrieks, D. (2022). Terrorism and migration: An overview. *British Journal of Political Science, 52*(2), 977-996.

Heywood, A., & Chin, C. (2023). *Political theory: An introduction*: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Iceland, J. (2014). Residential segRegation. *A Transatlantic Analysis. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute*.

Innocent, E. O., Nwachukwu, T. S., Olise, C. N., & Nnamdi, C. (2017). Security threats in Nigeria: A thematic Exposition. *International Journal of Philosophy and Social Psychological Sciences, 3*(1), 21-39.

Johari, J. C. (1989). *Principles of modern political science*: Sterling Publishers.

McGhee, E. M., & Neiman, M. (2010). Concern over immigration and support for public services. *California Journal of Politics and Policy, 2*(1).

Meer, N., & Modood, T. Multiculturalism, interculturalism and citizenship. *Multiculturalism and interculturalism. Debating the dividing lines*.

Meer, N., & Modood, T. (2016). Interculturalism, multiculturalism and citizenship. *Multiculturalism and interculturalism. Debating the dividing lines*, 27-52.

Ottuh, P. O., & Erhabor, F. O. (2022). Radical Islamism: Trajectories of human rights violations and abuses in Africa. *Journal of Liberty and International Affairs, 8*(1), 243-264.

Ottuh, P. O., & Idjakpo, O. G. (2022). MIGRATION AND RELIGIOUS SOCIALIZATION IN NIGERIA: THE FULANIZATION DILEMMA. *Journal of Liberty & International Affairs, 8*(3).

Oyeniyi, B. A. (2013). Internal migration in Nigeria: A positive contribution to human development. *ACP Observatory on Migration International Organization for Migration*.

Page, J., & Plaza, S. (2006). Migration remittances and development: A review of global evidence. *Journal of African Economies, 15*(suppl_2), 245-336.

Ray, B. (2007). *Citizenship in a globalising world*: Kaveri Books.

Saminu, I., Yacoob, C. M. A., & Shukri, S. B. (2022). IDENTITY AND 'FULANIZATION'OF BANDITRY IN NIGERIA: THE FULANI AS A 'CRIMINAL TRIBE'. *Zamfara Journal of Politics and Development, 3*(1), 9-9.

Treaty, M. (1992). Maastricht Treaty. *Nice Treaty*.

Trump, D. J. (2017). Presidential executive order on assessing and strengthening the manufacturing and defense industrial base and supply chain resiliency of the United States.

Uzowulu, O. E., & Umeogu, B. (2021). INDIGENESHIP, CITIZENSHIPAND THE NIGERIAN STATE: A PHILOSOPHICALAPPRAISAL. *NNAMDI AZIKIWE JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY, 12*(2), 78-94.