

Global Risk Society and the Cosmopolitan Argument in Favour of Open Border

¹Vitalis Jafla Pontianus

¹Department of Sociology Taraba State University Jalingo, Nigeria.

Abstract

The world in which we live in today is an advanced world in every sense of the word. This advancement has come with an ultimate price which has made the modern society a global risk society. Ranging from climate change and its ecological effects, armed conflict and the culture of global displacement, international terrorists' networks, financial crisis, compounded by economic recessions and joblessness and more recently the covid-19 global pandemic. These concerns have caused many nations to review their migration policies and legislations in which migrants are criminalized, rejected admission into other states with no cogent reasons and a deliberate lowering of standards when it comes to asylum seekers. The study through discursive analysis examines from a sociological point of view the cosmopolitan argument in favour of open borders. The findings of the study suggested that global risks are problems that are not limited to one nation alone. The study therefore recommends that there is the need for global cooperation in confronting a common enemy because if we fail to come together to confront a common enemy (Risk society) we will all die a death of a thousand extinction.

Keywords: Cosmopolitan argument, Global risk society, Migration, Nation/State, Refugees

Introduction

The world watched in horror in October 2013 when some 360 African migrants lost their lives within sight of land while attempting to reach the Italian island of Lampedusa. Untold hundreds have perished on the journey from Indonesia to Australia, or off the coast of Thailand. Migrants from Central America are raped, robbed, beaten and killed as they try to enter the USA from Mexico. African migrants' die of thirst in the vast desert reaches – their bones, the only testimony to their failed journey.” (IOM, 2013 p. 26)

Freedom of movement around the planet is a basic right of all human beings. The burden of proof falls on those who defend, suspending or restricting it. While the elimination of borders has long been encouraged by thinkers who have been dismissed as being utopian and of minor importance, the idea has recently been revived and advanced by respected promoters of neoliberal globalization who, equipped with an ultra-liberal or libertarian ideology, defend the free circulation not only of goods but also, consequently, of people in a world without barriers (Collier, 2013). Indeed, a wide-ranging, animated academic debate has arisen around the desirability and viability of a world with open borders (Velasco,

2016). The heart of the controversy lies not in the radical elimination of border policies, but rather in controlling borders for the passage of human beings, that is, in recognizing the free circulation of persons; though this has been the practice, the question remains to what extent and how fair and humane has it been to all peoples of all quarters?

We live at a time of unprecedented human mobility, with more people on the move than ever. For the poor and many migrants who are in dire need facing severe conditions, international borders are more often shut down on them with more stringent migration opportunities ebbing out of reach (Abizadeh, 2008). The dilemma here is that people this is happening at a time that the world seems to be liquified flowing to all parts (Urry, 2007). To speak about the right of persons to circulate freely in today's world is to take a walk through a minefield of paradoxes. To start with, it should be completely normal for the entire surface of the planet we inhabit to be accessible to anyone who is able to move around. After all, the whole planet is the common property of humanity (Maathai, 1996). A property that every generation receives as an undeserved inheritance. And if the Earth is a common good (and probably the most genuine one), the access to all its different parts must be universally guaranteed (Bartram, 2010). From the aforesaid, a way of conceiving one's relation with the territory can be inferred that obliges and constrains both visitors and hosts (Thiebaut, 2010). The possibility of deciding where to live is a fundamental aspect of human freedom (and in many cases it is also a condition of the possibility to enjoy other freedoms and opportunities). This assertion is completely evident when the person migrating is oneself. No one would deny this fundamental right to oneself. However, it does not always happen the same way when one tries to apply it to others. Then a thousand distinctions are made between theory and practice making it an abysmal endeavour. One has only to refer to the evidence seen in many nations and states to understand the complexity around this discourse. The free circulation of persons, as well as freedom of residence, as a basic human right, yet the specific way it is regulated suffers from a degree of asymmetry that borders on the absurd, a feature visible even in the most influential text about human rights. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR); Its Article 13 proclaims that:

- i. Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of every state.
- ii. Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his or her own, and to return freely to his or her country."

Regarding freedom of circulation and residence, countries maintain that their regulation forms part of the *domain réservé* of their sovereignty. The Peace of Westphalia of 1648 is considered a great drive to this mentality which today is still considered a strong impetus to the building blocks of today's border control and immigration policies of most nations (Croxtton, 1999). This Westphalian treaty designed a state system on the twin-principle of

territoriality and sovereignty. Sovereignty accords the state unquestionable but legitimate control over the nation and polity, and it also gives the latitude to preserve and protect its territorial domain from both internal and external threats by any means at her disposal (Glanville, 2014). However, aside the fact that globalization and the internationalization of the globe have reduced the primacy of these dual principles, there have also been the problem of ideological and terrorist networks that have taken advantage of the instruments of globalization to emerge and threaten state sovereignty and its preservation. States today are caught in the web of legislating for freedom of movement and contending with national security from international terrorists' groups. Alongside these, is the growing reality of global migration which today has become a contemporary phenomenon of the world to the extent that the International Organization for Migration (2012) estimates that 405 million people will be leaving outside their native homes by 2050, this has made some scholars to label this age the 'age of migration' (Giddens & Philip, 2013).

Conceptual Clarification

The Global Risk Society

The expansion and transformation of the society have been necessitated by different factors, which has led to the globalization of almost every sector of the human life and society. These events together with the fall of the Berlin Wall, a great transformation in the world of communication, telecommunication gadgets, global economy, transportation, the fall of communism and a new dawn in an economy that is neoliberal in nature made this New World Order to have a sail in almost every corner of the earth. With these events, the world has continued in a free fall into the realm of globalization whose influence is seen everywhere and in almost everything. This new phenomenon comes with a range of problems, risks and danger. According to Giddens (2013) in the modern society, social practices are constantly examined and reformed in the light of incoming information about those practices which ultimately alter their character in the end. Everything is open to reflection in the modern world including reflection itself which leaves us in a state of uncertainty and risk (Giddens & Pierson, 2013). It is on the premise of such a fragile and unstable society that Beck (2002) expresses the same concern in which he calls our world 'global, risk society. According Beck, three aspects of conflict exist in the world risk society today. These aspects include *ecological* conflicts, which are by their very essence are global. The second is *global financial* crises, which in the first stage, can be individualized and nationalized, 2008 economic meltdown is still very much a fresh lesson. The third aspect which suddenly greeted the limelight through the Al Qaeda attack on the American soil on September 11th. This attack became a show of the global threats of transnational terror networks. These threats are global and transnational and are not limited either to regional or national borders.

Cosmopolitan Argument

Paul Crutzen in 2002 observed that we are now in the age of the Anthropocene an age in which human activities and initiatives have change and transform our ecosystem leading to loss of biodiversity (Lockie, 2015). Beck (2009) and Giddens (2013) agrees on this front that the modern society is a risk society, with the risks of global risk society. A global risk society that is perpetually experiencing different forms of new risks, dangers, security threats and uncertainties of living which cannot be controlled nationally or by a single state.

The cosmopolitan argument on the other hand is an approach from a moral and political philosophy. The word denotes a variety of different philosophical positions that encompass the moral, institutional, political and cultural spheres (Corvino, 2019). As the Greek 'kosmopolitês' ('citizen of the world') clearly suggests, the basic idea of any cosmopolitan view is that all human beings belong to a sort of worldly community that goes beyond geographical and political borders (Kleingeld & Brown, 2014).

Stoic philosophers were known for their views on cosmopolitanism based on their belief that human beings have a common capacity to reason and share a common spiritual element (Corvino, 2019). This was further amplified by Epicurean ethics that this capacity distinguishes human beings from other living species, represents the source of their moral value and makes them members of a global fraternal community. On the other hand, this invites all human beings into cosmopolitan commitment or brotherhood built on friendship. This was a common practice among the Epicureans who sought to create a community of friends that could protect its members from the experience of pain. Such a community was open to all human beings, regardless of their origins (Kleingeld *et al*, 2014).

Warf (2012) observed that the orthodox, liberal version of cosmopolitanism stands in sharp contrast to ideologies such as racism, religious fundamentalism, and nationalism, which emphasize and often exaggerate or oversimplify the differences among human beings at the expense of their common humanity. Liberal cosmopolitanism comprises an "imagined community" that extends everywhere. In this light, the moral community to which each person owes an obligation is worldwide, generating an obligation to "care at a distance," in which the concerns of distant strangers are held to be as important as those of people nearby (Warf, 2012).

Open Borders

It is an established fact that no institution in the world has been able to achieve what various states and nations have been able to do for its citizens. A nation has been described as a large body of people united by common descent, history, culture, or language inhabiting a particular state or territory and no state can exist without a territory (Hassan, 2006). The peace treaty of Westphalia of 1648 was made with territory or state boundaries being one of the major ingredients on which every sovereign state had the reserved right to defend

and protect her territory and those living there (Brunn, 1998). To protect this right, the state must legislate on how people come into this territory. This could be a stringent or relaxed policy (Wellman, 2011). This is because the state remains the primary custodian and protector of human rights (Cohen, Kennedy & Perrier, 2013). The nation/state entity has been argued by many that there is no longer any need to keep or sustain this reality in the context of denying people access into the state. This is because the wave of globalization continues to undermine national territories creating a world with little or irrelevant boundaries as exemplified by the Schengen EU agreement (Parkes, 2019), where regional union or cooperation becomes a basis on which territories are demarcated and managed. There also exist situations where visa free countries have made their border policies such that foreigners can access these territories without going through the long strenuous and often criminalizing process of visa application.

According to Brunn (1998) The political world is more than a two-dimensional (length versus breadth of land territory) world, rather politics have become concerned about volume (defining and defending water, air, and planetary spaces). This is further compounded by the reality that globalization has created linkages, networks, and webs of communication and interactions among states that goes beyond national boundaries. We cannot be living in a house here while our cooking utensils or groceries are in the next compound with stringent rules that we cannot enter the next compound. A recognition of our interdependence is a recognition of the need to relax our border regulations. It must be noted that advancement in transportation, information and communication technologies, diplomatic relations, international trade and exchange is affecting all states on the world map, including how they view themselves and others in the world, how they address their own and others' problems and issues, and the form and frequencies of information exchanges (Brunn, 1998). The COVID-19 should be a reminder to us about this reality.

The State and Its Right to Border Control

The prevalent notion of state sovereignty continues to hinge upon exclusive control of a specific territory and its borders, her legal authority also includes the regulation of foreign admission procedures. Consequently, the spontaneity of migratory flows remains conditioned by the constant, although rarely efficient, state endeavours that tend to plan them, orient them, and regulate them (Kristof, & Palme, 2006). Behind the persistence of territorial borders, one finds an implacable state machinery determined to mark the confines between those inside and those outside, to separate human beings into citizens and foreigners, an exclusive logic in addition to one that is profoundly inhospitable (Anderson, 1996). This is not a mere theoretical assertion but rather a verified daily practice. It must be noted that in principle, according to custom and international law, the act of migrating does not constitute a crime, especially in this age that has been tag the age of migration. As a result, if countries took this seriously, they should abstain from deploying any type of policy and legislation designed to criminalize immigration that is

not expressly authorized (Douglas, & Sáenz, 2013). However, they do just the opposite. This work therefore analytically examined the possibility of opening borders to migrants into other nations on the bases of the fact that we are all human beings sharing a common social orientation of a cosmopolitan humanity and a global economic system that supports us all. This will therefore be looked at as an impetus to open borders not only to economic goods and services as practiced today but much more to the global demand for human resources across nations. (Beck, 2005) This is more than ever predicated on the principle that we live in a world of global risk society where humanity everywhere in the world faces threats from armed conflicts, global terrorists networks, high level of unemployment and economic recession and finally climate change and its ecological effects especially to rural dwellers (Beck, 2009; Franklin, 1998; Gabe & Sandra, 2006).

It must be noted that given the three categories of migrants as outlined by Miller (2018) (a). A refugee is a person who faces threats to his or her human rights and possibly his or her life if he or she remains in the current state. (b). A particularity claimant on the other hand are migrants who assert that one state (usually a specific one) owes them admission based on what has happened to them or their nation in the past. (c). Of more importance to this work is the economic migrants, these are those who have an interest of moving from their home state into a new society either for education, job, or to pursue some personal interest. Since refugee status already have some legal rights and international duties binding on the receiving states; the Particularity migrant also have some legal backup to their claim. Most national policies on migrant tend to address more often economic migrants whose period of stay cannot be ascertain at the time of reception and whose case depend solely on the state (Miller, 2018).

Cosmopolitan Approach to Open Border

It was Aristotle an Athenian Philosopher who once said man [sic] is a political animal (Omeregbe, 1998). He never meant that everybody should be a politician he rather meant that human beings by natural disposition and orientation cannot live alone or refuse to associate with others. The simple questions could be, can this power to associate with others be limited by the created artificial national borders of nation/states? Does this intrinsic nature of humanity to associate with others, be limited within political nation/state boundaries alone? Do the economic burden immigrants' places on the receiving community, society and state enough reason to limit this freedom? Can this propensity to move into other lands and meet other people be terminated by mere national and state's legislations on the basic principle of freedom of choice? Can national security be guaranteed by closing borders to neighbours who share the same community with us? These are some of the questions whose philosophical and legal answers might not be realistic enough to satisfy the true yearnings of the human heart.

Beck (2011) observed that there is a drastic change to the social phenomenon of the modern age in which its dominant feature includes interconnectedness, which means dependency and interdependency of people across the globe. If this is the present circumstances and situation of the present world and society how do, we build up a network of dependency and interconnectedness when there is barrier across borders of nations and states. In most cases, the customary practice is to close borders to immigrants and the exception is conditional opening. To protect this conduct and serve as a perfect alibi, we are presented with the widespread obsession about security, which raised to supreme importance above all other considerations and most times dominates space and public discourse. The following comment by a former speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives is a significant expression of that national security rhetoric: “No serious nation in the age of terror can afford to have wide-open borders with millions of illegal aliens crossing at will” (Gingrich, 2005). To close borders to people, however, does not necessarily mean that we should present migrants as potential terrorists. That is only a conveniently timed excuse, as the physical barriers were erected long before the control of movement of migrants was bolstered.

The argument and counter arguments on migration shall always be issues of side taking especially when considerations are made between the outsider and the insider. It will always be quite plausible and easy to accept when issues of migration revolve around stopping others from coming but it's never the case when it involves the rights to come in. In a world of global crisis of insecurity, food shortages, job scarcity and environmental and natural problems that have continued to tear down our common social systems and widen the possible chances of global conflict and war. The need for global cooperation becomes not only an option but an imperative for all if we must save ourselves from the impending doom. This should not be a task confined within boundaries or constitutional legislations of states and nations. Beck (2011) is of the view that in a world of global crises and danger produced by modern day civilization, the old double world of internal and external, us and them, national and international must lose their validity and create a society in which we all come together to confront our common enemy for the survival of all. According to Young (2011), our common humanity obliges a common social and moral expectation on us to minimize suffering as much as we can for everyone irrespective of race, nationality or ethnicity. If this is the common expectation of every human being based on our common humanity, based on our social and moral orientation that gives us a universal or cosmopolitan character, we cannot therefore limit it within nation state boundaries. We need to extend a hand of welcome beyond our national confinements.

We today live in a world who's social and political values are at the verge of extinction through consistent crisis of states individualism as the recent Brexit plan of Britain, (Van Reenen, 2016) the American intent to build the Mexican wall (Gitlin, 2017) the Arab spree that led to the European migrants crisis, the recent covid-19 global pandemic that have not

only exposed human biological vulnerability but has also affected every facet of the human society, leaving helpless and confused. This is further compounded by other concerns of global nuclear threats from nations like North Korea, Iran and a host of other nations still clandestinely developing weapons of mass destructions without listening to the international community (Pilat, 2008). If these states are allowed to develop their nuclear ambitions for the protection and security of their people and territories, they might one day use them on other nations thereby triggering probably a global nuclear war that could have a devastating effect on the entire earth. On the other hand, however, assuming that migrants are allowed to travel through international borders and reside in nations of their choices freely, this could discourage many states from attacking other states, since they are aware that citizens from other nations and even theirs might be in those states. Beck (2011) is of the opinion that global crises and risks contradict methodological nationalism. This is because global social crisis or risks are not confined within national borders nor can their causal responsibility and effects be analysed through and within a national lens alone. Their effects are felt across sovereign national boundaries and they can also become subject to systems of governance and forms of civil societies that are transnational in scope. These global risks that could lead to state alienation through mechanized contemporary warfare and technological industrialization with its social and environmental hazards are the product of collective decisions of capitalist superpowers. Their consequences on the other hand are systematically shifted and shared by communities and nations that do not share in their benefits (Beck, 2011). If this assertion is true, developed nations who are principal beneficiaries of these global risk decisions must by way of compensation and moral imperative open their borders to migrants or assist in establishing the economy of other striving states. These cosmopolitan shared responsibilities will help in reducing economic migration, making migration to become an act of tourism and sightseeing.

Cosmopolitan Cooperation on Security Front

Many international communities have taken debates on global security as a collective responsibility and this has created wonderful security transnational bodies like the NATO, ECOMOG and many others across national borders of member states for security and safety. (Beck, 2005), This is a clear indicator that modern global challenges of insecurity cannot be left in the hands of individual states. States cooperation becomes necessary and inevitable if there is any chance and possibility of overcoming a common enemy. There is no better way to do this than to extend the confines of national borders with an intent of playing the role of a good neighbour to one another for the safety of all.

Debates against migration concentrate mostly on the burden migrants put on the receiving society, the need for a social and cultural homogeneity for a stable ground for democracy and good governance. The need for migrant's integration is said to be overrepresented in the social welfare system. This is said to be most true about low skilled migrants. High-skilled migrants, who have the skills and knowledge to generate exceptional value in

various markets, also have the chance to shop around the world and be ‘shopped for’ and are rarely seen as a problem. Those without special skills and knowledge are perceived in a mixed way, experiencing exclusion from many aspects of society (Castells, 2000). Only migrants that have something to offer, and thus the receiving society can gain from, are welcomed with enthusiasm. The reasoning is done from the point of view of the receiving society, only looking at what is best for their society and creating policies that maximize the optimum profit from migrants. In doing so, most foreign immigration policies and controls maintain a state of inequality between the haves and the have-nots (Isbister, 1996). Following Isbisters’ reasoning, the debate is about distributive justice as much as it is about the opening of borders. The concept of distributive justice is principally predicated on our cosmopolitan argument of our common humanity and oneness.

Following Carens’ (2003) line of reasoning on the need for open borders, political scientist Kukathas (2005) also rejects restrictions on migration. Closing borders are problematic for numerous reasons as is argued by Kukathas. Firstly, it can be a restriction to leave one’s own country and consequently escape failing and repressive regimes creating a risk for a person’s safety. Secondly, spatial relocation is often seen as the most logical method to escape poverty and denying people to settle elsewhere is denying them the chance to improve their economy and living conditions. Economically almost every sovereign state export one commodity or the other and these goods can traverse the international borders of almost every country with little or less control. How come that these goods are allowed access into other nations while the producers of the same goods are not allowed to access the nations the very goods they produced are consumed or used? Although Kukathas (2005) believes that the burden of proof to restrict migration lies with the accuser (i.e. the state), he keeps a realistic view and notes that “it should be admitted that the prospect of states opening their borders completely is a remote one”. The fact remains that the world has become a global village in which problems facing one section of the planet resonate in the other. The longer the shadow of global risk looms around us, the greater the incentives for the actors involved to cooperate and the greater the probability that the preferences of the actors, and ultimately of the state itself, will thereby undergo change. This is precisely the case in Europe. The European Union might become a model for climate change policies (Ghaleigh, 2013). For example, climate change as an aspect of Europeanization is not a discrete event and cannot be understood as a one-off act of cooperation that leaves the nation/states involved unaffected. To be effective, climate change policies must alter both the forms of state authority concerned and national sovereignty to their very core. Nation-states have become transnational states, which means that nation-states need to develop and practice reflexive self-limiting strategies in their own best interest. They refrain with good reason from exercising their remaining sovereignty: to maximize their national interests through Cosmopolitanism which is not the same thing as altruism or idealism but is realism built on the common social and humanitarian principles that we all have a

common problem and we must come together to solve; a responsibility across borders (Young, 2011). Actors are quite capable of learning and changing their preferences, especially under conditions of marked interdependence and intensive communication (Sandholtz & Sweet, 1998). This has far-reaching theoretical and practical implications because the preferences are no longer independent but dependent variables, related to experiences of global risks.

The tide of globalization has brought a drastic change to both the cultural and social communications of our world such that humanity tend to live and watch reality from a common stage making global mentality and perception more homogenized a very limited but valuable extent. According to Beck (2005) globalization' is a reflexive force rather than a linear process that takes the global and the local community together not as opposites but as combined and mutually implicit principles. These processes are historically dynamic (tied to their contexts) and multidimensional. Their application goes further than mere "interconnectedness", changing the relations between nation states and societies (Held, McGrew, Goldblatt & Perraton, 1999). One connectedness can no longer be limited to diplomatic ties alone it must go beyond paper corporations to a cosmopolitan cooperation in which national boundaries are mere symbols of our evolutionary development.

Freedom of movement is defensible since it can be a condition for other forms of freedom (Carens, 1992). Secondly, freedom of movement is a necessary condition for equal opportunity since different places bring about different restrictions and advantages. In a few words, scholars that defend the closed borders argument state that the principle of free association is consistent with liberal egalitarian values and therefore are justifiable within the liberal moral theory. Focusing too much on the freedom of movement may leave the poorest of the poor worst-off. Considering the principle of free movement is a tool towards equal opportunity, it can have some negative side-effects if this principle is fully lived out without some partial or deliberate restrictions. Bader (2005) stresses that the world poorest do not have the means to migrate even if they wanted to and were not restricted.

From a practical view, defenders of open borders claim free migration is an effective way to level global inequalities and reduce world poverty. The arguments in favour of open borders is also built on the ethical moral principles of our common social humanity and the economic principles that we are meant to harness to save our common humanity from the impending global risk our world faces today. There is also a huge counter argument in favour of close borders. It becomes clear that the focus lies too much on which values is outweighed by which. Both principles are defensible from a liberal-egalitarian approach and therefore this approach fails to move the debate forward. Governments may argue 'we have a right, the sovereignty and the approval of our voters to control and limit those trying to enter our national territory'. In contrast, migrants may argue 'we should have a right to come and go as we please on the bases that we share common social and economic process that empowers every economy and state of the world. If a country's raw materials or goods

are valued, recognized and admitted into a community for their good and wellbeing; it become a moral and economic imperative too that citizens from that state should also enjoy the same economic honour and admittance into that same society or community. Today various wildlife conservation organizations go round the world rescuing endangered species without considerations to their national heritage. If this can be done to animals how much more are, we obligated to do for our fellow humans who share our cosmopolitan world?

Opening all borders and the subsequent migration from poorer countries may leave the people left behind worse-off. This risk of human capital flight (or brain drain) does not do justice to the people from the sending countries. Whichever value or principle one holds dear, defends or prefers, it will not do justice to every individual concerned with international migration (Ypi, 2008). The discussion about open borders should therefore be understood as arguing about social differences and how to deal with them. There seems to be an intuitive tension between protecting what is seen as one's own and more cosmopolitan feelings about social justice. The debate is about moral considerations and obligations we have or should have towards other people and where the borders of those obligations are laid down. The discourse on open borders or close borders are both part of human freedom and human security, so we should be careful when we do not place one above the other. However, it must be noted that, scholars who focus too much on the freedom of association pay too little attention to the moral arbitrariness of both grounds and the imbalances this might have on today's world. Defenders claim that the freedom of association subscribes the notion that one has the freedom to leave one's association, in this case the state, but it doesn't entail the right to enter anywhere else; this asymmetry would not be problematic if a person had the option not to be a member of any association. This option is not realistic since not having a passport and not being subject of any state is an abnormality and leaves the person without any rights. It is important to note that the freedom of movement is a tool for the principle of equal economic opportunity and therefore should have a pivotal place in any migration policy. This does not mean that a state does not have a right to have some form of admission policy, but that does not say anything about the considerations that are made about who is allowed to enter and who is not.

The Way Forward

The nation-state is, and will be for a long time, the primary institution for protecting order, facilitating commerce, protecting rights, and caring for the less fortunate of our world and society. As Walzer (1980) has noted elsewhere, one cannot simply proclaim a list of rights and then look around for armed men to enforce it. Careful attention must be paid on institutional structures and what is necessary to sustain them. Appropriately high value needs to be place on shaping other policies, specifically including immigration control policies, to foster, rather than undercut, the reassuring effectiveness of democratic

governance. But once this basic point is being accepted, there is still abundant work to do to contest the shape of those migration controls, to shrink or expand admissions, to experiment and modify. The arguments for moral legitimacy of controls are by no means a call for control at all costs; they frame a plea for properly valuing and strengthening the benefits of migration control while still serving other important public objectives. Trade-offs will remain important, but they must be trade-offs that do not consistently rank the need for adequate migration control at the bottom of the scale. An important moral guide in that process will be, as Walzer noted: “that states have a right to act in certain areas is not to say that anything they do in those areas is right”. One can argue about individual admission standards by appealing, for example, to the condition and character of the host country and to the shared understandings of those who are already members. Such arguments must be judged morally and politically and most importantly, factually.

Conclusion

Global crisis and risk are vicious cycle whose reality seems eternal and there might never be a time humanity will have a region or sector of the earth that is immune from these risks. The earlier every state and nation realized this and answers the clarion call to unity not only for world peace but much more for economic and social support of our common shared humanity. From the findings of the study, global cooperation is an imperative demand that must be taken seriously if we must survive the impending doom that is looming on humanity from all sides. If we ignore this cosmopolitan corporation, we might be like a man caught in the 20th floor of a skyscraper and he looks through the window and sees fire in the 7th floor and thankfully says to his family ‘relax the fire will not get to us’. We all live in a global risk world and so it is either we come together open our national boundaries, harness our political, social, moral and economic resources to save our world or we stay apart and die a death of a thousand extinction.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are made to achieve a mutual economic benefit to the migrants and citizens of any state and for the good of future policies.

- i. A constructive debate about labour migration or economic migrants as the case might be should be promoted among nations on the concerns and benefits of migration to national economies and societies. This is the only way to move beyond short-term interests and think about future proof arrangements.
- ii. More attention should be given to identifying shifts in educational levels and occupational growth. In this way migration policies can aim at responding on changes in the availability of national labour skills and look at international compensation.

- iii. Every nation should pay attention to improving the protection of economic migrants. This is best done by providing honest, reliable information about the job they are going to do and the conditions they will be working in. Additionally, it could be thought of to cooperate with the private sector to not only attract migrants, but also provide additional training, housing and language courses. This entails decentralizing and maybe even privatizing aspects of current migration policies. Although there are ideas and literature available about possible scenarios that may work and improve migration outcomes for all actors, little evidence is available. The most important recommendation therefore is to create experiments on a small scale when it comes to new migration policies. In this way an evident based opinion can be made about alternatives way of dealing with migration and the practical implementation of different approaches.

References

- Abizadeh, A. (2008). Democratic Theory and Border Coercion: No Right to Unilaterally Control Your Own Borders. *Political theory*, 36(1): 37-65
- Anderson, M. (1996), *Frontiers Territory and State Formation in the Modern World*, Malden, Polity Press.
- Bader, V. (2005). The Ethics of Immigration. *Constellations*, 12(3), 331-361. doi: 10.1111/j.1351-0487.2005.00420.x
- Bartram, D. (2010). International Migration, Open Borders Debates, and Happiness. *International Studies Review*, 12(3), 339-361. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ucc.idm.oclc.org/stable/40931112>
- Beck, U. (2005). The Cosmopolitan State: Redefining Power in the Global Age. *International*
- Beck, U. (2009), *World at Risk*, Malden, Polity Press.
- Beck, U. (2011). Cosmopolitanism as Imagined Communities of Global Risk. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 55(10), 1346-1361. doi: 10.1177/0002764211409739
- Carens, J. (1987). "Aliens and citizens: the case for open borders", *Review of Politics* 49: 251-73.
- Carens, J. (1992) 'Migration and morality: a liberal egalitarian perspective', in Brian Barry and Robert E. Goodin (eds), *Free movement: ethical issues in the transnational migration of people and of money*, London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, pp. 25-47.
- Carens, J. (2003). "Who Should Get In? The Ethics of Immigration Decisions," *Ethics and International Affairs*, 17; 95-110.

- Castells, M. (2000). *The rise of the network society*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Cavallero, E. (2006). An immigration-pressure model of global distributive justice. *Politics, Philosophy & Economics*, 5(1); 97-127.
- Cohen, R., Kennedy, P. & Perrier, M. (2013). *Global sociology*. New York: New York University Press.
- Collier, P. (2013). *Exodus*. Oxford University Press. Complex. *Daedalus*, 142(3); 199-227. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ucc.idm.oclc.org/stable/43297260>
- Corvino, F. (2019). Kant on Human Progress and Global Inequality. *Revista Portuguesa De Filosofia*, 75(1), 477-512. Retrieved October 8, 2020, from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26625477>
- Croxtan, D. (1999). *The Peace of Westphalia of 1648 and the Origins of Sovereignty*.
- Douglas, K., & Sáenz, R. (2013). *The Criminalization of Immigrants & the Immigration-Industrial Exclude*, Oxford, University Press.
- Franklin, J. (1998), *The Politics of Risk Society*. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Gabe, M. & Sandra, W. (2006). *Beyond the Risk Society: Critical Reflections on Risk and Human Society*, New York, Open University Press.
- Ghaleigh, N. (2013). Two Stories about EU Climate Change Law and Policy. In Ruppel O., Roschmann C., & Ruppel-Schlichting K. (Eds.), *Climate Change: International Law and Global Governance: Volume I: Legal Responses and Global Responsibility* (pp. 419-462). Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ucc.idm.oclc.org/stable/j.ctv941w8s.19>
- Giddens, A. & Philip, S. (2013). *Sociology, 7th Edition*, New Delhi, Wiley Press
- Giddens, A. & Pierson, C. (2013). *Conversations with Anthony Giddens - Making Sense of Modernity*. Wiley.
- Gingrich, Newt (2005). *Winning the Future: A 21st Century Contract with America*, Washington D. C., Regnery.
- Gitlin, M. (2017). *The Border Wall with Mexico*, New York, GreenHaven Publishing.
- Glanville, L. (2014). *Sovereignty and Responsibility to Protect: A New History*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Hassan, D. (2006). *Rise of Territorial state and the Treaty of Westphalia*, Yearbook of New Zealand Jurisprudence, Waikato University, School of Law.

- Held, D., McGrew, A. G., Goldblatt, D. & Perraton, J. (1999). Global transformations: Politics, economics and culture. Cambridge: Polity. *International History Review*, 21(3); 569-591. doi: 10.1080/07075332.1999.
- International Organisation for Migration (IOM) 2012.
- International Organisation for Migration (IOM) 2013.
- Isbister, J. (1996). "The immigration debate: remaking America", West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press. *Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, 18(3/4); 143-159.
- Kleingeld, P. & Brown, E. (2014). *Cosmopolitanism*, in The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, ed. Edward N. Zalta.
- Kristof, T. & Palme, J. (2006). *Globalizing Migration Regimes: New Challenges to Transnational cooperation*, London, Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Kukathas, C. (2005). "The Case for Open Immigration" in: Cohen, Andrew I. and Christopher Heath Wellman (ed.), *Contemporary Debates in Applied Ethics* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.), Pp. 207-220.
- Lockie, S. (2015). Why environmental sociology? *Environmental Sociology*, 1(1); 1-3. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23251042.2015.1022983>
- Maathai, W. (1996). The Planet Earth Is Our Common Home: Excerpts, Statement by The Commission on Global Governance, 11 September 1995. *Women's Studies Quarterly*, 24(1/2); 102-104. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ucc.idm.oclc.org/stable/40004519>
- Miller, D. (2018). *Strangers in our Midst*. [S.l.]: Harvard Univ Press.
- Omeregbe J. (1998). *Introduction to Ancient and Medieval philosophy*, Ibadan, Joja Press.
- Sweet, A. & Sandholtz, W. (1998). European integration and supranational governance. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 4(3); 297-317. doi: 10.1080/13501769780000011
- Thiebaut, Carlos, 2010, "Tolerancia y hospitalidad. Una reflexión moral ante la inmigración," *Arbor*, 744; 543-554.
- Urry, J. (2007). *Mobilities*, Malden, Polity Press.
- Van Reenen, J. (2016). Brexit's Long-Run Effects on the U.K. Economy. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 367-383. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ucc.idm.oclc.org/stable/90000441>

- Velasco, J.C. (2016). Open Border Immigration Policy: A Step toward Global Justice. *Journal of Migraciones Internacionales*, 8(4); Pp.42.
- Walzer, M. (1980). *The Moral Standing of States*, 9 *Phil. & Pub. Aff.* 209, 226.
- Warf, B. (2012). *National Cosmopolitanism and Geographical Imaginations*, Wiley Press.
- Wellman, C.H. (2011) *Debating the Ethics of Immigration; Is There a Right to Exclude?* Oxford, University Press.
- Young, I. (2011). *Responsibility for justice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ypi, L. (2008). Justice in Migration: A Closed Borders Utopia? *Journal of political philosophy*, 16(4); 391-418.