Abstract

This thesis challenges the conventional theory of forced migration by expanding the narrow definition of violence that prevails, not only within international refugee legislation, but also within the academic field of migration. As such, this thesis argues that by limiting the scope of forced migration only to include victims of direct personal violence, manifested in physical harm, we are neglecting the victims of indirect structural violence, that is, the violence of oppression and inequality, where insights and resources are monopolized by a certain group or class within the society, making access unattainable for others. By analyzing personal narratives of six economic migrants from sub-Saharan Africa, that has fled their countries to escape structural violence, this thesis aims to shed light on the limitation within the conventional theory of forced migration.
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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFRC</td>
<td>Armed Forces Revolutionary Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AALCO</td>
<td>Asian-African Legal Consultative Organization (formerly Asian Legal Consultative Organization (ALCO))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APC</td>
<td>All People’s Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangkok Principles</td>
<td>Bangkok Principles on the Status and Treatment of Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAW</td>
<td>Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERD</td>
<td>Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>Convention on the Rights of the Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td>Human Development Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRW</td>
<td>Human Rights Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCPR</td>
<td>International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICESCR</td>
<td>International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDMC</td>
<td>Internal Displaced Monitoring System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Internally Displaced Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>International Organization for Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>United Nations Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRC</td>
<td>Norwegian Refugee Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAU</td>
<td>Organisation of African Unity (presently African Unity (AU))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIO</td>
<td>Peace Research Institute of Oslo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC</td>
<td>Protracted Social Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUF</td>
<td>Revolutionary United Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refugee Convention</strong></td>
<td>The 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees (<em>also known as the CRSR</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UCDP</strong></td>
<td>Uppsala Conflict Data Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UDHR</strong></td>
<td>Universal Declaration of Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UN</strong></td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UN DESA</strong></td>
<td>United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDP</strong></td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNHCR</strong></td>
<td>United Nations Refugee Agency (<em>formerly United Nations High Commissioner of Refugees</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNSTAT</strong></td>
<td>United Nations Statistics Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>US</strong></td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WWII</strong></td>
<td>Second World War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZANU-PF</strong></td>
<td>Zimbabwe African National Union Patriotic Front</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Introduction

When is a person eligible for the protection of another state? What atrocities or gross negligence have to have taken place before the international community becomes responsible for the citizens that thus choose to flee. According to the interpretation of the current refugee legislation, an act or a provable threat of direct personal violence (Galtung, 1969:169) has to have taken place before the person can be granted asylum (The 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees (Refugee Convention), Art. 1(a)). But what about those fleeing structural violence (Galtung, 1969:169), being the indirect violence inflicted on certain groups in society, that does not directly target an individual, and that, in most cases, cannot be traced back to a particular persecutor. Several academics as well as human rights advocacy groups have claim that the conventional understanding of who is, and maybe more importantly, who is not a refugee, is too narrow and does not adequately capture today’s migration challenges.

Refugees are forced to flee. Immigrants are supposed to have a degree of choice, but when their livelihood is so miserable, I don’t know what the level of choice is. It may be that they too should then be looked at as people forced to flee by poverty, but then it becomes very difficult. What kinds of freedom do you allow? What kinds of regulations do you put in place? (Sadako Ogata, quoted in Woods, 1994:607)

Although, this statement, by the former United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Sadako Ogata, was made over 20 years ago, these questions have yet to be answered. However, the importance of her deliberations seems more pressing than ever as migrants crossing borders between the global South and North continues to grow in numbers. But why do people embark on life-threatening journeys, such as the two teenage boys, Yaguine and Fodé, who tried to flee Guinea as stowaways (see appendix 4, table 2, for definition), in the engine gear of a plane heading to Belgium. The boys knew that the possibility of surviving the trip was slim yet they still decided to try, their reasoning was addressed in a letter to the members and officials of Europe.
“we have war, disease, malnutrition, etc. As for the rights of the child in Africa, and especially in
Guinea, we have too many schools but a great lack of education and training. Only in the private
schools can one have a good education and good training, but it takes a great sum of money. Now, our
parents are poor and it is necessary for them to feed us” (Yaguine Koita and Fodé Tounkara, quoted
in Ferguson, 2002:551-2).

While not all migration stories are as melodramatic, the ‘problems’ of economic instability,
political insecurity and lack of human rights fulfillment, such as education, persist as common
factors of migration while being greatly neglected both within the academic and legal realm,
according to which, the two Guinean boys would not be considered eligible as refugees, and
instead treated as illegal economic migrants, and, probably, be sent back to Guinea. By
analyzing migration stories, this thesis will argue that many such migrants are in fact victims of
violence and persecution, however, not in the more accepted direct form; they are victims of
structural violence and oppression.

1.1 Problem Field

In a world where the latest armed conflict is documented and debated at great length by
academics, politicians and the world media, with an international community legally bound to
provide protection for the victims that manages to escape it, very little attention and protection
seems to be provided for those that suffer the more quiet injustice, being that of structural
violence. The oppressed people, suppressed by the unequal distribution of resources, those who
are denied access to fundament human rights such as food, water and shelter, not directly, that
is, not by any given person, but indirectly, in the structures, that only give to those who can
afford, while the rest are left with no way of climbing the steep hierarchy of society (Galtung,
1969:171).

There is no help for the victims who chose to flee oppression, and according to international
legislation and conventional migration theory, such migrants are considered voluntary, and
legally defined as economic migrants or ‘bogus asylum seekers’ (Samers, 2010:14). They are
offered no form of international protection and the cost of escape is often so high that it is
unattainable for those who need it the most. While globalization has opened new doors and
possibilities for escape, the global North has, in turn, further protected itself, with restrictive
migration legislation and increased border control preventing ‘them’ from entering, if they ever made it so fare (Nathwani, 2003:2).

**1.2 Problem Formulation**

This thesis aims to problematize the field of migration by shedding light on those who are persecuted by structural violence, who chose to flee, but who, according to conventional migration theory and international legislation, are not eligible for the protection of the international community, as they are considered to be voluntary and not forced migrants. As such, this thesis aims to answer the question:

*How does the theory of structural violence help to problematize today’s challenges within the field of forced migration, that are not addressed by the conventional theory of forced migration and international refugee legislation?*

**1.3 Research Questions**

- *Why are those who chose to flee structural violence not considered victims of forced migration?*
- *How does structural violence affect modern-day migration?*

**1.4 Material**

This study uses both secondary and primary material. To frame the analysis, published material within the field of migration, human rights, history, anthropology, psychology as well as political science has been applied in order to broaden the analytical perspective. As the theory of structural violence is discussed throughout the entire thesis, material by peace scholar Johan Galtung and medical anthropologist Paul Farmer have played a significant role in this study.

A few websites have also been used, all from well-established organizations (such as the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) and the United National High Commissioner
for Refugees (UNHCR)) and while some of these organizations have been criticized by civil society for taking politicalized stands (see Mosher, 2002; Human Rights Watch (HRW), 2003; The New York Times, 2006), the material used in this thesis have mainly been numeric data, in which these organizations are the main provider.

The first-hand material, used in this study, is qualitative data collected through in-depth interviews that were recorded and later transcribed in order to be analyzed in a textual form. The information was supported by second-hand material in the form of prior research by academics, NGOs (such as the HRW) and large-scaled organizations, (such as UN, the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) and the Asian-African Legal Consultative Organization (AALCO)) in order to present well-rounded arguments.

1.5 Delimitation

Due to access and limited resources, the sample was confined only to include migrants currently residing in Denmark, more specifically, in the region of Copenhagen (see map 1, appendix 1) and while the interest of this thesis goes beyond those who are financially capable to migrate as economic migrants; those who are lucky enough to slide through the cracks of the current migration system; or those who are connected or educated to the level of which their migration has sponsored, this thesis are satisfied with the sample of this study, while urging research with on those who was unable to flee to investigate the consequences of the current migration scheme.

This thesis will not discuss the cause of structural violence, nor will it try to offer suggestions as to how it should be managed, it will, however, try shed light on the fact that it is present and that it is violence. It should also be made clear that while this study revolves around structural violence within the global South, the phenomenon is also present in the global North (see section 3.2).

While the effect of structural violence is most evident when one looks at the social (dis-)order of the world, especially that between the global North and South, and while this thesis acknowledges the huge impact it has on today’s migration patterns, here especially why the North seems to be the preferred choice for those trying to escape the structural violence
experienced in the South. The causes will not be discussed in this thesis, however, further research on this particular topic is welcomed.

This thesis will not provide any tangible recommendations as to how migration law should tackle the inclusion of migrants fleeing structural violence. Neither will it discuss the financial, logistical nor the political impact such inclusion will have on the international community, as the objective of this study is to shed light on fact that there is a the problem.

Migration is a topic that stretches over several fields within the social science world, such as international relations, human rights, history, psychology, economy, just to mention a few, and while I encourage research on challenges of migration fleeing structural violence in these areas, the interest of this thesis is, merely, to challenge the conventional migration discourse through the theory of structural violence.

1.6 Outline

The succeeding chapter (see chapter 2) will trace the development of the conventional categorization of forced and voluntary migration, the main influences as well as the criticism that has followed, in order to frame the field, it will further present the theory of structural violence on which this study is founded. The methodological chapter (see chapter 3) will explain the method that was applied both in the collection of data but also in the analysis, as it will reason why the chosen method will best answer the problem formulation (see section 1.2).

The background analysis (see chapter 4) will set the scene for the analysis and the discussion as it highlights the historical and political setting in which the current refugee legislation was created while also placing it within the context of peace and conflict studies. Next comes the analysis (see chapter 4), that highlight not only how structural violence affects people and the challenges they face, but also why they choose migration as a means of escaping it. The discussion (see chapter 5) will utilize the knowledge acquired from the analysis as it ties together theory and data while the concluding chapter (see chapter 6) will sum up the main arguments and statement that has been given during this thesis, and (see section 6.1) encourages further research on several areas that did not get the attention that it deserved within the scope of this study.
2 Lit Review

2.1 Forced Migration

The term ‘forced migration’ came into use around the period of the trans-Atlantic slave trade (Gannett, 1885), which, at the time, defined the forceful movement of slaves from Africa to the Americas. As such, in the 19th century there was already an understanding of the concepts of ‘voluntary migration’, where people themselves chose to migrate, and ‘forced migration’, where people did not want to migrate, but were forced to do so. A century later scholars continued limiting the concept of forced migration only to include cases where “men force men to migrate” (Dixon, 1950:230), scholars such as George Dixon stated that while “extreme drought, or a flood may force people to migrate” (Dixon, 1950:230) the term ‘forced migration’ is used only to describe “movements in which people are forced to move by other people” (Dixon, 1950:230), a perception that is still present to this day.

In 1951, the Refugee Convention (UNHCR, 2013d) was presented and accepted both by state leaders, but also by the academic world, that now merged the categories of forced migration with the legal definition of a refugee, which, thus, became the conventional definition. Thus, ‘voluntary migration’, at this point, consisted of those migrants that did not fall under the refugee umbrella.

However not all academics supported this approach. Just a few years later, William Petersen, in his criticism of what he considered to be an underdeveloped migration theory, tried to redefine the migration typology (Petersen, 1958:259). He divided the category of forced migration into 3 sub-categories: *primitive*, referring to migration that was pushed by natural forces, and *impelled* and *forced* migration referring to migration pushed by the state, or some functional equivalent social institution. Where *impelled* migration defined situations where the migrant had some level of choice, *forced* migration described situations where no choice was offered (Petersen, 1958:261). Nevertheless, this type of criticism remained limited, and the conventional categories of voluntary and forced migration continued, relatively untouched.
In 1966, Evertt Lee presented a new migration theory that explained the flow of migrants by push factors, being the factors that repel migrant to leave their country of habitual residence and the pull factor, being the features of another country that in turn attracts the migrants, thus the theory’s main focus is on the individuals and their reasons for migrating (Lee, 1966). While Lee's theory was innovative and quickly became popular, as it departed from the established cost-benefit analysis which calculate the perceived advantages and disadvantages, his push and pull framework has been criticized for not provide an adequate contrast between political and economic migrants.

However in the 70s, scholars such as Gunther Beijer contemplated that “[a]lthough migration ... [had] played a central role in the history of civilization and in the development of nations and continents” limited attention had been given to the “the social-psychological dynamics of the process of migration” (Beijer, 1970:93).

The criticism was followed by William Woods who, in the early 90s, claimed that the extend of forced migration was severely underestimated as the conventional definition of forced migration failed to account for the many migrants “uprooted by communal ethnic conflicts, life threatening environmental and economic conditions and mandatory repatriation” (Woods, 1994:608). Groups, which he also claimed to be victims of forced migration.

Supported by the ‘Kinetic Model of Refugee Movements’ (Kunz, 1973) where scholar, E. F. Kunz, attempts to create a sterile concept of the refugee, by introducing ‘kinetic models’ of flight and displacement, where he distinguishes between anticipatory refugees, those that are proactive by nature, and acute refugees, who, in turn, are considered reactive. Kunz identifies eleven different typologies of refugees based on their driving factors, emphasizing that the borderline between political refugees and those dissatisfied economically can be blurred.

An argument supported by Beijer, who had previously concluded that it, at times, were “difficult to determine whether an individual emigrates of his own free will or because of anxiety over anticipated persecution which may, or may not, materialize” maintaining that “[p]sychologically, a voluntary migrant may be as much a refugee as an involuntary migrant” (Beijer, 1970:93).
While the criticism today continues, little development has followed within the conventional division of voluntary and forced migration. Some scholars now refer to migrants that fall between the two categories as being part of a grey zone, that categorizes migrants as voluntary based on their method of migration, while their motive are forced (Colville, 2007:2).

Not all people in groups targeted for persecution leave a country. Not all economic migrants are without some coercion of the migrant’s decision making. [...] Voluntary-involuntary and refugee-economic distinctions attempt to make hard and fast categories that fail to capture the complexity of human motivation and decision making (Keely, 2000:50-1).

Charles Keely finds the void of a comprehensive migration theory, that accounts both for voluntary and forced migrants, to be particularly problematic, considering the magnitude of the matter, claiming that the labels, ‘voluntary’ and ‘forced’ are part of the reason why a concrete theory has yet to be established. He states, that by contrasting ‘voluntary’ to ‘forced migration’, one neglects to acknowledge that all migration includes elements of choice and pressure. (Keely, 2000)

Michael Samers, too, supports the view that the categories cannot be separated as he emphasizes that the reasons why people migrate exist on a continuum between forced and voluntary. Thus, determining precisely who is ‘forced’ and who is ‘voluntary’ is difficult. In short “those who are ‘forced’ by poverty are imagined by governments as ‘voluntary’ and so-named ‘economic migrants’” (Samers, 2010:13), often “imagined in relation to more deserving refugees” (Samers, 2010:13) and in some cases been labeled “‘bogus’ asylum-seekers” (Samers, 2010:14) by the public.

While Samers and other scholars acknowledge the need for legal definitions, in order to provide protection to those in need, they, at the same time, recognize the limitations, especially, when it comes to poverty-induced migrants. Foster challenges current legislation for being too narrow in its definition of forced migrants, as it only involves victims of political persecution (Foster, 2007). She, amongst others (i.e. Howard-Hassmann, 1983; Debono, 2008), conclude, that from a human rights perspective, the civil and political rights (referring to the International Convention of Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)) are held over the social, economic and cultural rights (referring to the International Convention of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR)), which she claims is a violation of the Universal Declaration of Human
Rights (UDHR) as well as the ICESCR (UNHCR, 1966b, Preamble) and ICCPR (UNHCR, 1966a, Preamble). Debono, following the arguments of Foster (Foster, 2007), concludes that “[a]n obligation of responsibility ought to be upheld in all cases where fundamental human rights are breached” (Debono, 2008:187).

While others claim that there is a clear distinction, between the moral force of the refugee’s claim and that of the economic migrant’s, rooted in the fact that the needs of a refugee is more urgent than those of a migrant attempting to escape poverty. The urgency is based on the assumption that if an economic migrant is refused entry, s/he is forced to return to a situation of poverty, whereas a refugee, that has been turned away, might risk his/her life (Gibney, 2004:12). Not considering the fact that poverty is a much greater killer than any conflict or war ever has been.

Nevertheless, it is important to understand the complexity of such real life cases, that, at times, does not fit neatly into one category or another, owing to the strong link between poverty and conflict (Findley, 2001:279). That is, refugees, claiming political asylum, could have become impoverished during a conflict and, conversely, there are circumstances where poverty and lack of resources have brought about conflict (Debono, 2008). The irony of the refugee regime is that asylum-seekers must deny the influence of economic conditions in order to satisfy most of the world’s refugee laws (Gordenkar, 1987).

Thus, today’s critics of the conventional theory of forced and voluntary migration can be placed under two headlines: those, who believe that the current discourse is limited, from a human rights perspective, by claiming civil and political rights over social, cultural and economic rights, and thereby excluding poverty-induced migrants from the category of ‘forced migration’; and those, who claim that the two categories does not capture the complexity behind the migration decision that often compromise both factors of force and choice.

### 2.2 Structural Violence

Conventional migration theory does as a norm separate voluntary and forced migrants by those who have decided to migrate to improve their standard of living (IOM, 2011a and those who are forced to migrate due to a threat of persecution, however, in practice the term persecution is
often interpreted as that of physical violence to the extent that a bruise and a scare, in many cases, are the best proof when applying for asylum (Fassin et al, 2005, Keith et al, 2009). As such our interpretation of violence is important when discussing who is and who is not eligible as a refugee.

In the Oxford Dictionary violence is defined as “behaviour involving physical force intended to hurt, damage, or kill someone or something” (Oxford Dictionaries, 2013). But can violence truly be restricted to only include damaging incidents of intended physical force? In 1969, Johan Galtung published an article that challenged, what he referred to as, “the narrow concept of violence” (Galtung, 1969:168). Galtung argued that if the statement “peace is the absence of violence” (Galtung, 1969:167) was to be valid then violence could not simply be confined to that of an intended physical character, as this would leave highly unacceptable social orders compatible with the concept of peace (Galtung, 1969:168).

Instead he argued for a broader definition where “violence is present when human beings are being influenced so that their actual somatic and mental realizations are below their potential realizations” (Galtung, 1969:168). As such violence is present in the ‘cause’ of the gap between what is ‘actual’ and what is ‘potential’. He later clarified this very abstract notion of violence by a simple example:

[If a person died from tuberculosis in the eighteenth century it would be hard to conceive of this as violence since it might have been quite unavoidable, but if he dies from it today, despite all the medical resources in the world, then violence is present according to our definition. (Galtung, 1969:168)]

To operationalize this very broad concept of violence, Galtung constructed a typology with two of the three categories being that of personal and structural violence. While his definition of personal violence followed the traditional perception of violence, being the direct visible violent action, known to have a very clear subject-actor-object relation (Galtung 1969:171), his definition of structural violence differed from the conventional discourse. As such, structural violence was defined as the indirect form of violence that often does not have any concrete actor/persecutor and does not always target one particular person. Instead structural violence has been known to be built into the structures of society, which, often, makes it very difficult to identify (Galtung 1969:171).
The theory of structural violence has mainly been applied to two fields, that of peace research and that of health. Within the latter field, anthropologist and physician Paul Farmer has written several articles and books emphasizing structural violence in the uneven access to medication and treatment, with most of his ethnographic work taking place in Haiti, where he worked as a physician at a free health clinic for an extended period of his life (Farmer, 1996).

The main theme of his studies has been ‘suffering’, especially the suffering of two diseases, being that of AIDS and Tuberculosis, which seems to prevail amongst the poor and the suppressed not only in Haiti, but globally (Farmer, 2004). What Farmer has concluded is that the suffering experienced by his subjects has not been “the result of accident or a force majeure; they are the consequence, direct or indirect, of human agency” (Farmer, 2004:40).

The human agency is often hidden in the structures of society, reproducing an uneven distribution of power, manifested in terms of economic and social inequalities. The inequalities, that both Farmer and Galtung are referring to, exist in terms of disproportionate life chances, directly caused by the uneven access to resources, with the underlying problem being that “the power to decide over the distribution of resources is unevenly distributed” (Galtung, 1969:171) and, typically, monopolized by a particular group or by the elite (Galtung, 1969:169). As such oppression and exploitation lies at the center of structural violence as “the topdogs, get much more (measured here in needs currency) out of the interaction in the structure than the other, the underdogs” (Galtung, 1990:293).

The theory has traveled to many different places and settings and helped researchers describe cases of violence that are not always easily identifiable. Nancy Scheper-Hughes, who has dedicated most of her research to exploring cases of structural violence in a range of different situations, (i.e. from mental illness among bachelor farmers in rural Ireland (Scheper-Hughes, 1979) to infant death in Brazil (Scheper-Hughes, 1993)), concludes that everything can be violence. A claim that supports the work of Pierre Bourdieu who found violence in the least likely places, in art, courtship, marriage and the exchange of gifts. (Bourdieu, 1977).

However, while the versatility of this theory might be one of its greatest strengths, revealing an unlimited amount of research settings to be explored, it can also be regarded as its greatest weakness, as it becomes difficult to operationalize, here especially when it comes to policy making and legislation (a problem that will be further explored in chapter 6). Structural violence
has, nevertheless, mainly been linked to one particular group of people, being those who occupy the bottom rungs of society (Gilligan, 1997): the poor (Farmer, 1996).

Even though structural and personal violence are illustrated as two separate categories in Galtung’s theory they are in practice often difficult to separate. This is probably illustrated best in the book ‘Violence in War and Peace’ (Scheper-Hughes et al, 2004), where Scheper-Hughes alongside fellow anthropologist, Philippe Bourgois, have combined anthologies of violence stretching from the violence found in the sexual relationship amongst male inmates in US prisons (Donaldson, 2004) to descriptions of the violence that took place during the mass murder of 1,800 Jews in Józefów, Poland, during the Holocaust (Browning, 2004). Their research illustrates the diversity of violence and how violence often breeds violence, in what they refer to as the violence continuum (Scheper-Hughes et al, 2004:1).

While structural violence have been discussed within the field of migration, i.e. Peteet who studied structural violence within Palestinian Refugee camps (Peteet, 2005), and Benson who explored cases of structural violence within employment conditions of Latin American and Mexican migrant workers in the USA (Benson, 2008), the link between the theory and field remains weak, even Galtung, the father of structural violence, have written about migration, yet never made the connection (Galtung, 1998:143).

However, this theory provides a tool that is crucial when the objective is to understand the complexity that characterizes the violence that compels migrants to leave their country of habitual residence. A violence that is often manifested in the high rates of diseases and deaths; unemployment, homelessness and lack of education; and in the violence of hunger and thirst.
3 Methodology

3.1 Research design

This study, that was approached inductively, was initiated by two pilot interviews that revealed great insights on the challenges of modern-day migration. The knowledge gained, from these interviewees, formulate the problem field, and helped locate the general theory of structural violence, on which this thesis has been founded. As such a qualitative research design was chosen, as this thesis aims to investigating the concept of structural violence from below, that is, by the people who experience the phenomenon and thus choose migration in order to escape it.

When migrants apply for asylum, they enter a system that, in large, base their ruling on the narrative of the asylum-seeker (Eastmond, 2007). The asylum-seekers will as such sit down for an in-depth interview, interested in understanding why they have fled their country of habitual residence and what reasons and conditions that shaped this decision. Likewise, this study will be based on the narratives of migrants who were not eligible for asylum, and instead had to find alternative ways of escape. Acknowledging that while it is the individuals’ experiences that are at the focus of this analysis, their stories speak up about general problems within their societies, of uneven power relations, hidden inequalities and struggles (Riessman, 2008:76).

3.2 The Sample

In order to conduct the interviews a sample had to be constructed. What was also learned from the pilot interviews was that the migrants, that experienced structural violence, often migrated individually or in small groups and frequently entered as economic migrants, legally defined as documented migrant, undocumented migrant, migrant worker, student migrant, or family reunified migrant (see appendix 4, table 2, for further definitions of each group).
Further, the pilot interviewees, who had migrated from Ghana and Nigeria, claimed that the phenomenon of structural violence was quiet common in sub-Saharan Africa, which was supported by statistics such as those offered by the Human Development Index (HDI), that beside measuring human development, also measures inequality, a factor that, according to Galtung and Farmer, are one of the most evident indicators of structural violence. It can, as such, be argued that the higher the level of inequality, the higher the possibility is of resources being reserved for a particular group within the society (Galtung, 1969:171). According to HDI estimates, sub-Saharan Africa has the highest level of inequality on the distribution of income, education and life-expectancy (UNDP, 2013).

Sub-Saharan Africa also has a political, economic and historical background that could serve as a breeding ground for structural violence, according to Farmer (Farmer, 2004). Dating all the way back to colonization, that left behind diseases such as favoritism and economic dependency. The period following indecency, was mark by a wave of civil wars and mass killings (Reno, 2011), peeking around the early 90s, and while there has been a decline in the frequency and intensity of large-scaled political violence (Peace Research Institute of Oslo (PRIO)/ Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP), 2012), there has been a slight increase in other forms of indirect, structural violence, such as election violence as well as access to livelihood resources (Straus, 2012).

Today, sub-Saharan Africa homes more than 10.4 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) (Internal Displacement Monitoring System (IDMC) and the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), 2013) and 19.3 million interregional migrants (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA), 2009), of which 2.2 million are considered to be refugees and thus fall under the protection of the United Nations (UN) (UNHCR, 2013a). Those that are not considered refugees often migrate to regions that are deemed more prosperous and stable (Debono, 2008). For a substantial number of people that place is Europe.

It should, however, not be assumed that nations outside sub-Saharan Africa does not suffer from structural violence, as statistics show that Yemen has the highest level of inequality in the distribution of education (UNDP, 2013), and countries such as Haiti (Farmer, 1996, 2004), Brazil (Schepers-Hughes, 1993), Ireland (Schepers-Hughes, 1979), Pakistan (Peteet, 2005) and the United States (US) (Benson, 2008, Bourgois, 2004) have all served as selected location of
researchers studying the phenomenon of structural violence. This thesis encourages further research of structural violence within other regions to provide a more encompassing and truthful world picture.

(See appendix 5, table 3, for a complete list and a brief description of each participant)

3.2.1 Selection Process

The participants were chosen through purposive sampling (Chambliss, 2010:112-3). This method was preferred as this study specifically targets a particular group of migrants, that is, those who have migrated as economic migrants (see section 3.2 for a complete list of legal term), and not as refugees, and only those who have experienced some sort of structural violence. Thus the sample is not intended to represent the characteristic of the entire migrant population but rather to represent a particular group of migrants within the population. As such, the sample that would best help to answer the research question was chosen (Creswell, 2009:178).

To ensure diversity of knowledge and experience the sampling was based around a sampling frame (Burns et al, 2007:103) consisting of three factors. First factor, was the Region from which the individual migrated, since sub-Saharan Africa is a continent with 51 independent states, participants from countries within its four regions (see appendix 3, table 1) were chosen. Second factor was Migration Method, that is, on which legal grounds the person migrated. At least one representative from each migration group (see full list of economic migrants in section 3.2) was chosen. Third factor was Gender, with the aim of reaching a sample with an equal distribution of gender. This sample frame was to some extend limited by access to participants of which, female migrants as well as migrant workers were the most difficult groups to trace.

Access to participants availed itself through a snowball technique (Chambliss, 2010:124), starting from my personal contacts (as in Frykman, 2012:56) who throughout this research acted as my gatekeepers.
3.3 Data Collection

As mentioned earlier (in section 3.1), the method chosen for this study is explorative in-depth interviews, with the objective being to collect personal accounts, rather than numbers, as it is within the individual’s story that the pain, the frustration and the suffering, that follows structural violence, lies, as such this thesis supports Farmer’s view, that structural violence cannot be properly understood without the voice of its victims, and cannot be felt, seen or heard in a number, regardless of size (as Farmer, 1996:262).

The interviews were constructed much like conversation which gave the participant the opportunity to discuss and elaborate on his/her story (O’Reilly 2005:116). The interviews were semi-structured with topics leading the conversations (see section 3.3.1). The participants were encouraged to speak freely and bring fourth issues they deemed relevant to the topics (see section 3.3.1). While the individual’s personal experiences were the main focus of the interview, general statements often appeared. Statements, such as ‘this is how it is for us’, was noted as general tendencies, and used for the development of themes for the analysis (see section 3.4.1) (inspired by Frykman, 2012:57).

Considering the degree of personal information that would be exchanged during the interviews, natural and private settings were chosen, to create a relaxed and comfortable atmosphere for the interviewee (Johnston, 2005:286; Creswell, 2009:174). The participants of this study were consulted on this matter and their preferred location was selected. The purpose was to make the participant feel ‘at home’ in the setting in order for him/her to be as open and undisturbed during the interview as possible. (See appendix 6 for further information about the methods used before, during and after the interview session).

The interviews were recorded on a phone and transcribed in a naturalistic form (see appendix 6 for a detailed description) not to exclude any important details (Oliver et al, 2007:1283).

3.3.1 Operationalizing the Interviews

As standardized questions and prepared text is known to reduce non-verbal behavior, emotions and contextualized speech, this was avoided. Instead, the questions have been spontaneous and individualized to fit the situation, as this approach is claimed to increase the narrative truth from
the interviewees, that is, how the world is seen through their eyes (Johnston, 2005:284). With this in mind topics were developed in order to guide the interviews:

- **Security issues**: such as economical and/or political instability, direct or structural violence
- **Milieu**: conditions/restrictions in his/her previous habitual place of residence
- **Motives**: the factors, people, ideas that influenced the decision to migrate
- **Method**: how the person found the needed information and how the person managed to escape

### 3.4 Data Analysis

After transcription, the interviews were finally going to be analyzed. As the story, that is, the experiences that led the person to migrate, was the main focus of this study, a narrative analysis was chosen to analyze the data that had been collected. This form of analysis goes deeper into the text (Johnston, 2005:277) as its primary focus is not on the choice of words or the audience (Riessman, 2008:73) but rather on *what* is told, in this case being: what is told about structural violence and how the victims are affected by the current migration scheme?

When analyzing the stories, different themes developed, that, to some extent, connected the individuals’ stories. The thematic analysis therefore seemed more appropriate as it highlights the experiences based on themes instead of a chronologic set of events, which, thus, allows the researcher the flexibility to choose what events that are more relevant in answering the research question and to theorize across cases (Riessman, 2008:74), which in this case meant highlighting the type of violence that the interviewees experienced and how it limited them and their surroundings. Their stories will further be supported by information acquired from prior research.

The analysis uses an extensive amount of quotes to support any claims that are made, and for this purpose the transcribed text was *‘cleaned up’*, as the primary focus is not on *how* the narrative is spoken, or on the structures of speech the narrator selects, but on the story, that is,
what is told (Riessman, 2008:54) (see appendix 6 for more details on the process of transcription).

3.4.1 Themes

The themes, that were developed both from the research question and from the accounts of the research participants (Burns et al, 2007:103), were influenced by Lee’s migration theory of push factors (as mentioned in section 2.1) (Lee, 1966). This approach was chose as the information that was collected when asked about the topics (here particularly: security issues, the milieu, and their motives for migration (see section 3.3.1 for a full list of topics)), were compatible with the theory of push factors, being factors that push migrants away from their country of habitual residence (Lee, 1966). (The information that was collected from the last topic, being method was not included in the themes but instead mentioned in the discussion (see chapter 6)). Hence, the themes are:

- **Escaping Poverty:** that discusses how education seems to be the only way for those trying to escape the viscous cycle of poverty (see section 5.1)
- **Structural Violence within the Society:** explains how people in the hopes of escaping poverty are forced to fight an unjust and uneven fight against an opponent that is better connected and/or financially superior (see section 5.2)
- **Direct Violence as a Consequence:** focuses on the increase of direct violence and criminalization that is often the effect of structural violence (see section 5.3)
- **The Anticipatory Refugee:** describes how people migrate deteriorating conditions within their habitual place of residence before the everyday violence escalates to conflict (see section 5.4)
- **Not a Real Refugee:** debates the structural violence that follows the migrant into the international refugee system, set up to protect victims of persecution (see section 5.5).
- **The Dilemma:** illustrates the frustration of those who want to take up the fight against structural violence and instead ends up being a victim of it (see section 5.6)
3.5 Establishing Credibility

The uniqueness of each interview prevents it from being replicated in another context. In narrative analysis the storyteller is seen as the expert. It is his/her story that is the truth. However, statements about the role of the researcher (see section 3.6) (Creswell, 2009:192) and the selection of participants (see section 2.2) enhances the reliability (Creswell, 2009:190).

To determine the credibility of the information provided by the participants of this study, several procedures have been followed. After having transcribed the interview, the participant was once again contacted to get feedback on the accuracy of the identified themes (Creswell, 2009:191). The study was also read through thoroughly by an outsider and reviewed (Creswell, 2009:192). Further the information collected during the interviews was triangulated as the stories were placed in a historical and political context by the use of secondary material relevant to the theme/country.

3.6 The Role of the Researcher

At a risk of a potential bias, and for the sake of transparency, the role of the research will briefly be discussed in the following section. For the past 9 years I have studied in international schools, and through my studies befriended many fellow students from other regions of the world. I have therefore heard parts and bits of their stories. I have witnessed their anxiety when bad news from back home has reached them, the worries regarding the family they have left behind as well as the frustration of not being there to help when help is needed. I have seen the, at times, desperate quest for ways to stay within the country, the nerves that involves going to the immigration office, and the constant search for jobs, scholarships, and any other means of income that can help them to stay within the country and to help their family.

However, I am not a migrant, I have lived all my life in Denmark and I have never experienced conflict or political insecurity, therefore my writing, while inspired by personal observations, are not based on personal experiences. Nevertheless, my personal relationships have provided me with a level of access needed in order to acquire the in-depth information this study requires.
3.7 Ethical Considerations

The main concern for this study is the protection of the research participants, some of which have entered Denmark on illegal grounds and, therefore, are afraid to be ‘found out’ and consequently deported. As such, all participants in this study are anonymous, any detailed information that possibly could link the story to the individual has been altered, changing names, locations or time, and when alterations have not been possible, such information has been excluded from the thesis (Chambliss, 2010:64).

Further, informed consent has been obtained from all participants of this research (Chambliss, 2010:55). An oral agreement, that included a summary of the research project, was made prior to the interview, and afterwards, the transcribed copy of the interview was approved by the interviewee before print (as mentioned in section 3.5).
4 Background Analysis

The following chapter will lay as a foundation for the narrative analysis, as it problematizes the legal definition of a forced migrant within a historical context but also within the context of peace and conflict theory, in order to later discuss the challenges faced by the narrators (see chapter 6).

4.1 The Refugee Convention

The Geneva Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees (Refugee Convention) (UNHCR, 2013d) is to this day the only international legal document in relations to refugee rights. It has been ratified by 145 states parties (UNHCR, 2013c) and its definition of a refugee has been adopted by all regional legislation regarding refugee rights (see the Bangkok Principles on the Status and Treatment of Refugees (Bangkok Principles) (AALCO, 1966, Art. 1), the Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa (OAU, 1969, Art. 1), Recommendations 773: on the Situation of de facto Refugees (Council of Europe, 1976), Harmonised application of the definition of the term "refugee" under the Refugee Convention (EU, 1996).

However, the great influence and status that the Refugee Convention has obtained was never intended. The treaty was created in 1951, to solve the refugee crisis that had followed the ending of the Second World War (WWII). Its main goal was to care for the European refugees and therefore it was limited only to events occurring before January 1, 1951. The convention was, as such, expected to expirer 3 years later, as it was assumed that the ‘refugee problem’ would be solved by then. However, this did not happen, and 8 years later the time restrains were lifted with the addition of the 1967 Protocol to the Convention. (UNHCR, 2001:2).
4.2 Victims of War

As such the Refugee Convention was created to protect victims of war. However, over half a century has past and the concept of war has gradually expanded to, not only include inter-state wars, but everything from minor conflicts to international intra-state wars. Further, theories, such as ‘new wars’ (as defined by Kaldor, 2012) and ‘protracted social conflicts’ (defined by Azar, 1990), have challenged previous assumptions about war and while these ‘new’ wars are fare from a new phenomenon - as there have always been rebellions, colonial wars or guerilla wars - they were, up until recently, not considered real wars and instead described as irregular warfare, or mere uprisings, insurgencies or, more recently, low-intensity conflicts (Kaldor, 2012:17).

Nevertheless, the concept of these wars can “be contrasted with earlier wars in terms of their goals, the methods of warfare and how they are financed” (Kaldor, 2012:7). What is interesting here, when it comes to migration studies, is especially the method of warfare. Kaldor argues, new wars borrows from guerrilla warfare as they tend to avoid battle and instead capture territory through political control of the population rather than through military advance, while, simultaneously, borrowing from counter-insurgency techniques, such as destabilization, by sowing fear and hatred within the population (Kaldor, 2012:9).

As such, a characteristic outcome of these new wars is a high level of refugees and displaced persons, as most violence is directed against civilians, and while new wars are notorious for extreme levels direct personal violence such as torture and mass killings, they are also known for their use of more indirect methods of intimidation such as forcible resettlement (i.e. Murambatsvina), as well as a range of political, psychological and economic techniques (Kaldor, 2012:9): the strategic use of structural violence, that is.

This is exemplified by the Ethiopian famine of 1983-1985, that most fiercely struck those parts of the country that harbored irredentist movements (Marcus, 2003:245). A statement made by the Ethiopian foreign minister revealed that “food [was] a major element in our strategy against the secessionists” (Tibebu Bekele quoted in de Waal, 1997).

In the theory of protracted social conflicts (PSCs) Azar claims that “there had been a tendency to focus on overt and violent conflict while ignoring covert, latent or nonviolent conflict” (Azar
1990:93) that is conflicts where warfare methods of indirect structural violence are used instead of that of direct personal violence.

Structural violence is also known as a common method of warfare in ‘dirty wars’, as described by Schepers-Hughes and Bourgois, where governments in fury, turn against their own citizens, suspected of harboring ‘seeds of subversion’ which, according to them, have been the most pervasive type of war in late modern history, although it often goes unnoticed (Schepers-Hughes et al, 2004:17).

However, one can claim that in a world that primarily view war and thus victims of war (refugees) in the image of Clausewitz (Clausewitz, 1991) and old wars (see Kaldor, 2012), refugees from these new wars, these protracted social conflicts are often left without a change of achieving refugee status according to the Refugee Convention.

4.3 Victims of Persecution

What Azar, amongst others, recognizes, is that covert conflicts are generally referred to as peace, within the political sphere, where the termination of physical violent acts is often equated with the state of peace (Azar, 1990:93). As such any person who,

owing to a well-founded fear of persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinions, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country (UNHCR, 2013d, Art. 1(A)(2)).

can, according to the Refugee Convention, apply for asylum, however, according to Foster, they are limited by the dichotomy between the ‘economic migrant’ and the ‘political refugee’. A distinction that has been particularly evident at the political and rhetorical level of state policy, and that has reinforced the rejection of entire classes of applicants on the basis that their claims are clearly those of economic migrants rather than refugees (Foster, 2007:2-3).

Foster provides the examples of the US policy of interdiction in respect of Haitian refugees in the early 1980s (Foster, 2007:3), justified by the fact that Haitians were labeled as economic and not political refugees (Villiers, 1994), and, more recently, by China that has relied on the
distinction as an explanation and justification for its decision to return thousands of North Koreans each year (Foster, 2007:3) under bilateral diplomatic agreements with North Korea (HRW, 2002).

This dichotomy has further been ingrained in the state practice as is indicated in the study of the refugee decision-making process in the Netherlands (Spijkerboer, 2000) which concludes that “the opposition between “economic” and “political” refugees is so strong and so total in the context of refugee law that anything related to the economic is assumed to be non-political” (Spijkerboer, 2000:76).

As such, the distinction between what type of persecution, what type of violence, that refugees can get protection from is limited to that of physical, direct personal violence, while persecution in terms of limited access to jobs, school and thus limited access to shelter and food, is not valid as basis for asylum applications.

4.4 The UN

On the UNHCR’s website is stated that

Global migration patterns have become increasingly complex in modern times, involving not just refugees, but also millions of economic migrants. But refugees and migrants, even if they often travel in the same way, are fundamentally different, and for that reason are treated very differently under modern international law. Migrants, especially economic migrants, choose to move in order to improve the future prospects of themselves and their families. Refugees have to move if they are to save their lives or preserve their freedom. They have no protection from their own state - indeed it is often their own government that is threatening to persecute them. If other countries do not let them in, and do not help them once they are in, then they may be condemning them to death - or to an intolerable life in the shadows, without sustenance and without rights. (UNHCR, 2013b)

However the problem with this line of argumentation is, as former UNHCR Commissioner Ogata stated two decades ago, that while “[r]efugees are forced to flee. Immigrants are supposed to have a degree of choice, but when their livelihood is so miserable, I don't know what the level of choice is.” (Sadako Ogata, quoted in Woods, 1994:607).
While this type of criticism has often been brushed off by the UNHCR, during the last couple of years, the UNHCR have begun to address the problem of migrants forced to leave their habitual residence due to cases of structural violence such as poverty. In 2008, UNHCR Commissioner Antonio Guterres gave the following respond to a proposal for a re-drafting of the Refugee Convention to included poverty-deprived migrants:

It is sometimes suggested that the 1951 Refugee Convention should be amended to deal with this problem. I am reluctant to consider this, for if we were to re-open a discussion about that Convention, I am not convinced it would go in the right direction. I often wonder what would happen if we were drafting the International Declaration of Human Rights today?

I would suggest we not touch the 1951 Convention, but consider instead that in addition to refugees, there are other people who need protection, assistance and solutions. I believe that we can find a way to do this using the existing framework of human rights law and international humanitarian law, coupled with more cooperation among governments, the United Nations, the Red Cross and Red Crescent movement, and non-governmental organizations. The possibility of a new international instrument for the protection of forcibly displaced people who are not refugees should also be considered.” (Guterres, 2008)

While no concrete line of action has taken place, the UN has to some extend acknowledged these grey zone migrants.
5 Themed Narrative Analysis

The narratives of six migrants will be presented in the following chapter and while each story is unique, they are representative of the challenges that are faced by these so-called economic migrants, fleeing structural violence, that, according to the conventional migration theory as well as international legislation, are not considered eligible as refugees.

5.1 Escaping Poverty

Most of the participants of this study came from poverty-struck families, with parents, that at times, were struggling for basic subsistence. They explained that escaping the cycle of poverty became their main goal in life.

John was born and raised in, Mombasa, the second largest city in Kenya. He belongs to one of the smaller ethnic groups and came from a poor family of petty-traders. Being the second oldest son, he felt a lot of ‘pressure’ with 10 younger siblings and aging parents that he described as “worn out” (John). According to John, getting an education was his only way out. However,

when you want to study [in Kenya] then it means that you must have a sponsor, who wants to sponsor you [or] you have to pay that education, yourself, that is if you are capable. When I look at my family background, it would have been very difficult ... If I had to continue going to university or to college, positively, some of the younger children [siblings] they cannot go. They have to stop somewhere. (John)

So instead you work, that is, if you can find a job. Vanessa, who was born and raised in Zambia, managed to finish secondary school, with the financial help of extended family members, and while she wanted to further her education, she was told that she would have to find the means herself.

Because I didn’t have any money to go to university immediately, instead I went to work in the restaurant and I worked there for about three years and then the restaurant closed. But you know, when
I got the job, I said ohh I’ll be able to save money and do something you know to go to college but then I realized with the expenses, I would not be able. (Vanessa)

Vanessa explained that the job marked was not stable and therefore she spent several years unemployed, supported by her sister and other members of the family. Unless you know somebody you will not get, she said. John had a similar experience and he concludes that when we are talking about job opportunities after you have finished high school, most of those jobs are manual jobs, which of cause are not there, because we don’t have cleaning [as in Denmark] somebody would say, eh, today I will give you 10 kroner [to clean] (John)

10 Danish Kroner, equivalent to 1.7 US Dollars or 146.5 Kenyan Shilling, while above the 1.25 US Dollars a day, that, are set as the benchmark for extreme poverty, by the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDG) (UN, 2013), were, according to John, not enough to live in Mombasa. actually it cannot even sustain you because you see, when something is sustaining you, then you need to pay rent, you need to eat, you need to dress, then it can sustain you, but it cannot … that’s now where it is so frustrating because you may have today but tomorrow you will not have. (John)

According to the World Bank, an estimated 60.2 % of the population in Kenya, within the school appropriate age, attends secondary school (World Bank, 2009), a percentage that within the urban areas such as Mombasa are claimed to be a bit higher (Alwy et al, 2004:271). As a result, competition on the job market is very high, and while John says that some of his ‘more connected’ school mates got office jobs, he, being less connected, was not able to get.

While in Zambia the percentage is only 39.6 (World Bank, 2011), Vanessa claimed that unless somebody opens the door for you, you would not even be considered for a job. As both John and Vanessa are from the lower classes without the necessary network, neither of them had the chance of acquiring a more permanent employment.

5.2 Structural Violence within the Society

In Kenya there is unequal access to education, which is claimed to be caused by the patron-client relationship between the ethnic group of the ruling elite and the government that prevails
within the country. Political and economic power, and the wealth affiliated with it, is highly skewed to the ruling ethnic groups, the Kikuyu and the Luo. Their exclusionary practice has created marked inequalities in access to resources, here including educational resources. It has been argued that the ruling groups use the resources of the state for the special benefit of their own ethnic communities and allies, which is reflected in the educational development pattern. (Alwy et al, 2004:267)

out of the 32 tribes that we have in Kenya the civil service is being run by two to three communities [ethnic groups] and when you look at the trends of the way things are going, these communities, they are the communities that have been in power since independency so these are the communities which constitute like, 80 % of the civil service jobs, so when you see that then you see that there’s a correlations between the guys who have been in power and guys who run this composition … and that one is very common, and it is very normal, [laugh] which is, actually, it is very abnormal! (John)

According to Galtung the situation in Kenya exemplifies the configuration of structural violence as a whole (Galtung, 1969). That is, when the insight and resources of a country are monopolized by a group or class, then the actual level falls below the potential level, and violence thus becomes present in the system (Galtung, 1969:171). John notes,

… the structures they have been socially constructed that way and now they have been manifested and now we even see them as normal. But in the real sense, it is totally abnormal, because there are really some people which needs studies [education] but they cannot have that opportunity, the potential are not there for one to exploit, the potential in somebody, if you don’t get that person the opportunity (John)

Which, John notes, are the same when it comes to employment,

If I know somebody who is in power, you see, I feel contended, cause arhh, if I go there, he has a job he will give me. In general, when somebody is well connected, then that is the only way one is able to excel. You can be able to achieve (John)

John said that even though his family did not have the finances to pay his tuition at the University level, he was encouraged to apply for a scholarship, and so he sent in his application followed by his scores.

What they were looking for was subject combinations and in the whole district I was the leading, so I was contented now, whatever they gave people now, I’ll be given, but now when the results came out I did not get even a real grade, why because I was not well-connected […] I didn’t know anybody,
so it doesn’t matter how well you have performed, what matters is this how well you are connected both financially and, in terms of networking. (John)

There is no hope, that is, “the belief in the possibility of a minimum sense of agency” being “the perceived capacity to exercise some mastery over life” (Hage, 2003:24-5), only helplessness.

5.3 Direct Violence as a Consequence

Emeka’s story differs a bit, contrary to Vanessa and John, Emeka, who was born and raised in a small village in Nigeria, was well connected, in fact, he was related to the King of his village. Emeka’s education was financed up until university level, the purpose was for Emeka to get a good education so that he could bring business to the village, that was plagued with unemployment, poverty and looting. In 1999, Emeka was sent to Lagos with a 3-year budget to finalize his studies with a bachelor degree, however, at the time Nigeria was changing from a military regime to a democracy and as Emeka explains,

the military was now embezzling money cause they knew they couldn’t stay much longer, the concerns of the international world was now there, and we couldn’t fight any other war so embezzlement started, and it contributed to what happened to me. Schools weren’t getting funds, ministry of education was just run by some general, some major who didn’t know how to do it and just kept all the money for himself. […], support became limited and almost not happening anymore, so the strikes began and the corruption and the gangs, the violence, the falsification of results, everything contributed to the falling. teachers weren’t teaching anymore, what’s the point? (Emeka)

As such, the corruption of the school system resulted in several strikes that could last anywhere between one day to one year. Students like Emeka that had been given a three year budget soon realized that it would not be enough for them to finish their education

we just sat in school and waited and it was frustrating so some of us would have to get a job somewhere to do something especially to sustain. If you have a budget for 3 years and you end up having to do it for 7 years then I guess the budget becomes wrong, automatically, so you have to make amends, most students now indulge into other aspects and activities, we are talking about criminal aspects, yeah, where we have students become gang members and cult members and with names and signs and codes and code of conduct and everything what not, have a governance, have a hierarchy down to the soldier and with time this grew to be much of a worst case and the fear of most students who really don’t want to induce in it and really just want to study peacefully being recruited into these gangs became also an issue
in some point in time in the country. Guns, and machetes, acid, petrol, fire, and some of the killings were not just on the street it was done most times broad daylight in the class rooms, when you watch on TV and there are shootings in an American University it’s a big news ohh five people got shot, but in Africa you don’t hear about it cause its mostly common, it’s like everybody’s aware of it so you can either go to school and study or be a gang member and hope to live and tell about it (Emeka)

Political Scholar, Ukoha Ukiwo, that was conducting research in Nigeria at the time, concluded, that it reached a point in which conflict and violence became so frequent, that Nigerians, rather than being surprised at the outbreak of direct violence, adapted it to their reality (Ukiwo, 2003:116). While Emeka explained that “I’ll witnessed a lot of it, I’ve seen a lot of people die [nervous laugh] while I’m studying so, I’ve seen a lot of shooting” (Emeka), his fear was not death or physical injury, he feared that he one day would become like them. It was this fear that pushed him to migrate.

The last strike Emeka experienced before he left lasted one year, and the place he was living was a criminal haven where former students, who had now become more like mob-bosses, were living, and while he was trying not to get involved with any of the gangs, his money was running out.

Along with several other students, Emeka tried to apply for scholarships in different European countries. He hoped, that by going abroad to study, he would stand a better chance of finishing his education, but, more importantly, help his family financially as well as the community within his village, that had been severely affected by the political situation in the country to the extent that people were dying of hunger.

Derek too feared the criminal world that surrounded him. He said that while he never experienced any war or major conflict, direct violence was experienced daily in his neighborhood in Cameroon. He remembers that ever since he was a young boy, he and his homeboys had to “hustle”. Derek came from a broken home and most of the time he stayed with his father, a struggling petty-trader. Although he had great admiration for his dad, he did not want to end up like him, he did not want to be poor. As there were no real job opportunities he turned to criminal activities in order to accumulate an income.
I arrested foreigners for papers, fake cops, for papers, at the age of 18. Somebody put me into it and let’s do it, and I did it, one time, I was beating them, you have to give us some money, you know, you were acting like a cop, you know. It’s kinda some fucked up shit. (Derek)

Derek said that he decided that he had to change his ways after he got arrested and thrown in jail,

after that one time I got locked up in Cameroon, I was like shit! I knew a lot of home boys too who used to go to jail all the time too, and I was like, how can you go to jail all the time when it’s so bad like this, it was like you know, arr, because that was something I really thought was fucked up, you know, cause here [in Denmark] you only lose your freedom but there it’s not just your freedom they take away, you know [looks down] they take away everything, you know. (Derek)

Like Emeka, Derek feared for his future, he did not want to become like most of these homeboys, many of which have passed since he left. He says “When I’m there I’ll be like them you know, talk like them, but I always know we are not the same” (Derek). However, Derek did not feel that he had much of a choice due to the structures within his country, it was either following the footsteps of his dad, which meant a life in poverty, or, he could follow his homeboys, which led to money, ‘blood money’ as he referred to it.

According to anthropologist Nicolas Argenti, Cameroon has a history of structural violence that continues to divide and polarize communities on the basis of age and seniority (Argenti, 2007:5). His claim is that the younger generation, measured not only by their biological age, but also in the individual’s ability to financially take care of him-/herself, is suppressed by the older generation, the elite, that sits firm on the country’s political and economic resources, leaving the majority of the younger generation in a lifelong bachelorhood, penury and servitude (Argenti, 2007:7). However, not all settles for these conditions.

I don’t have respect for money, in this situation, in Africa, you are bound to, in a society where it’s like you have to give respect to people not because of the merits or the way they carry themselves or their activities, you have to have respect for them maybe because of their connections or their family background or whatever they have, how much money they have in their pocket, you know. (Derek)

Derek knew he had to leave the country if he wanted a “good life” (Derek). However, he did not have the same possibilities as Emeka, who with time, and the help of a Professor at Lagos University, got a scholarship to a Technical school in Budapest, Hungary. Derek’s first attempt
to leave Cameroon was as a stowaway, by paying off a worker at the shipyard that in turn provided food, water and a access on board a containership for him and a friend, however, they got caught. Second time around, he paid off some guy, known for providing fake passport stamps, that could take him to Tallinn, Estonia. This turned out to be his way out.

Emeka and Derek were both caught in situations that from the outside were filled by direct violence, but at a closer look, the violence and criminalization were end products of the structural violence that surrounded them, a violence continuum as described by Scheper-Hughes and Bourgois (Scheper-Hughes et al, 2004:1) where the structural violence was breeding personal violence.

What do you fear so much that you must really leave, no matter what, like it is the only option you have. Period! Violence and perhaps terrorization, oppression, could be one of the biggest reasons. The country yes is a democratic country now but it doesn’t mean that the ministry don’t run things or the police don’t run things or the government don’t do things the way they shouldn’t do it (Emeka)

What pushed Emeka to migrate was not the direct violence, as he to some extend saw it as normal, it was the fear of not being able to finish his education, help his family and community and being forced to enroll himself in criminal activity in order to achieve the former. Derek, too, came to the conclusion that if he wanted a ‘good life’ in Cameroon, he would be jeopardizing, not only his own life, but also the life of others.

5.4 The Anticipatory Refugee

When Iyatunde decided to leave Sierra Leone in 1997, the country was in the midst of, what would turn out to be, an eleven year long civil war, brought on by the Revolutionary United Front (RUF), a rebel group, infamous for the use of child soldiers and the cutting of arms and legs of the civilian population.

Before the war broke out, the All People’s Congress (APC) government had stayed in power for 20 years. Anthropologist Paul Richards described the beginning of the RUF of being a group of disgruntled intellectuals that wanted to change the structure of the political scene, where politics were preserved for the elite that only looked after themselves (Richards, 1996). As such the first coup in 1992 was welcomed by the population that were promised free education and
health care, and equitable sharing of diamond revenues, however, with time the purpose of the war took a turn as international investors/profiteers and rebel leaders got involved (Richards, 1996).

Iyatunde and her family had experienced the decreasing economy, the scarcity of jobs, food shortage as well as the increase in looting, rape and unlawful detention. While the 1996 democratic election brought with it hopes of change, rumors about another coup, and the prospects of further oppression of the population and economic hardship, forced Iyatunde to consider migration as a means of financially securing her family.

Iyatunde left Sierra Leone just two weeks before the coup by the Armed Forces Revolutionary Council (AFRC) who invited the RUF into the capital of Freetown where her family was residing, to create a joint junta that would control the country. With the financial help from relatives in England, she, along with her cousin and two younger kids, managed to buy seats on a truck that drove them to Guinea. “We were planning to go to Gambia, you know, we did not plan to stay in Guinea, [...] we had somebody there waiting for us [in Gambia], one of our aunties” (Iyatunde).

Iyatunde and her cousin are, what Kunz in his Kinetic Model of Refugee Movements refer to as, anticipatory migrants (Kunz, 1973:131) (see section 2.1), that is migrants who leave the deteriorating conditions in their home country before the military or political situation prevents it. Iyatunde recalls,

I didn’t see the, the badest of the war, no no, the bloodiest sight, no no, but the rumors said they were coming, at that time it was not the bloodiest, you know, I don’t know where they were at, but they were coming. (Iyatunde)

Vanessa, had after marrying Peace, moved to Zimbabwe where her husband’s family was living. However they only stayed there for 8 months, because

Zimbabwe was becoming economically unsound, and there was also a lot of violence, kidnapping, people were getting killed, so it was more that Zimbabwe was no longer stable and it wasn’t something he wanted to expose his family to. So because of that he just said, let me try to apply for a job within the [his field] but within a different country. (Vanessa)
Vanessa and her husband left Zimbabwe at the end of 2006 before the campaigning for the 2008 election really took off. At the time, the Zimbabwe African National Union Patriotic Front (ZANU-PF), led by President Mugabe, was running for re-election, however, when Mugabe was confronted with the risk of losing the upcoming election, as the 2005 parliamentarian election had confirmed that the ZANU-PF had lost political control of the urban areas, the government's security apparatus launched a massive ‘urban clean up’ campaign (Bratton, 2006:22), that targeted the poor and the poorly housed population (Bratton, 2006:24).

Vanessa and her husband were around to witness not only the launching of Operation Murambatsvina and its aftereffect, but also several other violent attacks on the opposition and its supporters (Bratton et al, 2008:50). The state repression was at its highest, according to Vanessa and while her and Peace had not been directly affected by the operation or the attacks, they feared the future of Zimbabwe and the power of the ZANU-PF. The lines between party and state had been blurred, and as a result, the military became politicized and politic became militarized (Bratton et al, 2008:41-2).

Much like Iyatunde, Vanessa and her husband are considered anticipatory refugees (Kunz, 1973:131), as they left

> when the turmoil was only beginning. We would hear this has happened, this has happened so we left before things got bad, that’s when we left, because after we left things got even worse, it was just when things starts boiling you know, that undercurrent where you say eh-hem [shakes head] something is brewing. (Vanessa)

### 5.5 Not a Real Refugee

While Vanessa and Peace, following the theory of Kunz (Kunz, 1973), were considered refugees, they were never seen as real refugees, according to the Refugee Convention. What they had experienced were the deterioration of a country before the real conflict started, it was the structural violence they witnessed and not the direct violence, and it was never directly targeted at them. Both Kunz and Woods discuss this problem regarding anticipatory refugees, that, by the legal system, often are mistaken for economic migrants (Woods, 1994) (see section 2.1).
Iyatunde never registered as a refugee with the UN,

They would not give refugee, let me not lie, they would not give. This refugee business, they are crooks, or how I can put it. They are not straight! This one of my cousins, the mother went to Gambia and registered as refugees, and that woman she was more affected during the war, she lost three fingers and a breast. A lot you know. So they went to register as refugee there, okay, and that woman they granted her this refugee status from America to go to America. The document, everything. And last minute, when they went to collect it, they sold her papers to another person. Her name, everything, somebody go with it, yeah, somebody went with it. [Raise voice] The people that are working there are making money they sell peoples papers to another family. The ones that were working there, the Gambians! They take bribes. (Iyatunde)

Knowing that she would not be considered a real refugee Iyatunde had to find a way of surviving in Gambia however it was difficult as Iyatunde recalls,

In Gambia it is the citizens first. They had a motto there, ‘Gambia is for Gambians’ there were no jobs for us the Sierra Leoneans, they would not give us. It doesn’t matter if you have the higher qualifications, it’s their citizens first (Iyatunde).

So Iyatunde and her cousin were relying on the support from their family in England. Nevertheless, Iyatunde wanted to go to Europe, she was afraid of Africa she said.

While her family in England was trying to find a way for her to get a visa, Iyatunde met Lars, a Danish guy, who wanted to help her. He applied for her to visit him in Denmark but was denied, “they knew if I came [to Denmark], I would not go back [laugh]” (Iyatunde), and so he decided to return to Gambia where they got married. In 1999, Iyatunde entered Denmark on the legal grounds of family reunification.

5.6 The Dilemma

Emmanuel was born into the Kingdom of Buganda. Since independence, the Kingdom and the state of Uganda had clashed on several occasions, leaving the relations between Uganda and the members of the Kingdom as strain. Emmanuel said, that “Uganda is not a collected nation, cause it was not constructed by Ugandans, you know it was constructed by the colonial
masters”, as such, he claims that the Ugandan people are not united, they do not share a love and pride of their nation, he says.

I belonged to a society in Uganda that was being persecuted. So most of my family were pushed out some of them were in England, others in USA, you had people of my nation, tribe, being killed because they belonged to that group. So people started to migrate, however, the people who migrated out of Africa had resources. They were not the very, very poor people. (Emmanuel)

Emmanuel was not poor, he belonged to the middle class, but the social unjust, between the elite and the poor as well as the difference between ethnic groups, concerned him, so even though his family advised him against it, he became politically active.

The group we are kinda really fighting mentally, they are supporting the status quo. We have a president that have been leading the country for nearly 30 years, and now, he’s grooming his cub to take over him, he’s killing, he has killed everything. We have a president leading a country where majority of the people live on 2 dollars, on 2 dollars, that is like 12 kroner, where you have a president that is spending nearly 2 million kroner a day, just running the presidency, you see the discourage all the hospitals are ruined, we don’t have medics, we don’t have structures, because most of the people are just shipping money away to invest it in the Caucasus, we have a Prime Minister now, he is very, very corrupt, instead of really developing the country, he went to China, and bought 7 centers, like Field’s [A 115.000 m² shopping center in Denmark] of them in China, he has 7 of them in China, cause now they are no longer investing in Europe, because when they find out they become scarred so they build in China where they feel secure. (Emmanuel)

The embezzlement and corruption described by Emmanuel became common knowledge as Britain, Denmark, Ireland and Norway in 2012 suspended aid to the office of the Ugandan Prime Minister, Amama Mbabazi, following claims that staff funneled 12.7 million US dollars from an aid program, set to treat victims of tuberculosis, AIDS and malaria, into private accounts. (Aljazeera, 2012, Copenhagen Post, 2012)

He explained, that while the situation within the country, were calm at the time, knowing that somebody was politically active, opposing the current political order, could have severe consequences for the individual. However, what tortured Emmanuel, was the fact that while he had an education that could provide him with a scholarship and an escape to Europe, many of his less privileged party members had no means to flee the country. He said,
The resources you need to migrate out of Africa are huge, you’ve never seen people being carried out of Africa to Europe, in most cases the people arrange the cash, the air ticket is not really cheap, especially for an African, so the majority cannot reach that bar, those are the people that would probably want to migrate more than those who come here [to Europe]. (Emmanuel)

The once that really needs to escape the poverty, the once that are extremely oppressed, they will never be able to escape through the current migration system. The once that needs it the most cannot get out.

Emmanuel never wanted to leave Uganda, his idea was to change it, however, as his voice started to grow, so did the threats he received, and in order to protect him, his family urged him to leave the country and travel to Europe. However, Emmanuel has continued supporting his party from abroad, thinking about those he claim the world does not see or hear, the once that have no choice or voice the poor and the oppressed.
6 Discussion

This chapter will join the theory of structural violence to the analyzed data as it problematizes the conventional migration theory and the international legislation on the field of forced migration.

This thesis has presented several stories of those who were lucky enough to slip through the cracks of the migration system. The question now becomes, whether their narratives are those of voluntary or forced migration? The political corruption and the criminalization that Derek and Emeka fell victim of, the deterioration of a country and the oppression that Iyatunde and Vanessa witnessed, the poverty, the inequality and the dream to change it, that John and Emmanuel, each in their own way, were fighting for. Were they victims of persecution, and, if so, should they be eligible as refugees?

According to conventional migration theory and international legislation, none of the interviewees were considered eligible, however, following Galtung’s theory, they were all persecuted by structural violence, as their possibilities, in one way or another, were limited by the structures within their countries (Galtung, 1969:169). They were, as such, unable to reach their full potential, that is, what would have been possible if they had been given equal access to the resources of their nation (Galtung, 1969:171). However, if all acts that limit us from reaching our full potential should be considered acts of violence and persecution, then everybody could, to some extent, be considered a victim and thus be considered eligible as a refugee.

Therefore the theory of structural violence has to be operationalized in order for it to be used in a legal setting, just as the concept of personal violence has been. Likewise, levels of structural violence has to be constructed and within them a boundary has to be identified, between what level of structural violence should make a person eligible as a refugee.

This has to some extend already taken place in the human rights regime, both within the general individual rights (such as those found in the ICESCR and the ICCPR) but also within the
collective rights found in the treaties protecting the so-called group rights (such as the Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities (UNHCR, 1992), Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) (UNHCR, 1979), Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) (UNHCR, 1989), Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNHCR, 2006), Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD) (UNHCR, 2000), Convention Related to the Status of Refugees (UNHCR. 1951)). The group rights, that were created to protect specific groups that, in one way or another, find themselves in a vulnerable, disadvantaged or marginalized position in society, and to ensure that they are protected from persecution, characterizes the victims of structural violence, when following Galtung’s description (see Galtung, 1969:169).

While crimes of structural violence, according to the treaties, listed above, are considered human rights violations, and while there are many on-going programmes of democratization, poverty reduction and conflict-transformation sponsored and supported by the international community (Debono, 2008:187) to minimize this type of violence, only migrants persecuted by direct personal violence are given the alternative to seek refuge within another state, while those persecuted by in-direct structural violence are forced to stay unless they, like the interviewees of this study, are lucky enough to find a sponsor.

As such, the narratives of this study should be viewed as stories of success. They are testimonies of people that, despite the structural violence that, in many ways, limited their human agency, and despite the complications found within the current legal framework of migration, managed to escape. They can therefore not be considered members of the lowest rung of society (Gilligan, 1997) or the poorest of the poor (Emmanuel) as they had connections to people that were, not only willing, but more importantly, capable of helping them. They, unlike many others, found a way out.

However, they all mentioned friends and relatives that unlike them never managed to escape and eventually gave up trying, only to return to, what at best can be described as, a miserable quality of quality (Debono, 2008:187). However, while access prevented their stories to be told in this study, it is on the basis of people like them that this thesis argues for a reflection of the conventional theory of migration as well as the current refugee legislation.
But who should then be offered protection by the UN and the international community. While many scholars, such as Foster (Foster, 2007) and Debono (Debono, 2008) argue for a solution that draws the line at the deprivation of the basic human needs, being food, water and shelter (also known as the physiological needs in Maslow's hierarchy of needs (Maslow, 1943), the theory of structural violence shows that there are indirect methods of limiting human agency to the extent that, indirectly, deprives them of access to their basic human needs. This is done by limiting their access to education and work. An example could be the victims of Murambatsvina, the ones that were not physically affected by the operation, the ones that merely lost their livelihood. Indirectly, many of them were deprived of access to the basic human needs, as many could no longer afford to buy food, water and shelter as their main source of income had been taken away (Potts, 2006).

This is why the theory of structural violence is so essential when discussing this matter. Our perception of violence and persecution needs to change in order for us to fully understand the challenges faced by those who are persecuted by structural violence. Iyatunde and Emmanuel, whose stories seemed most compatible with the current refugee legislation, never applied for asylum. While Iyatunde gave the explanation of a corrupt refugee system, the fact is, that none of them really considered themselves eligible. But why is that, why are none of the participants, of this study, refugees?

The answer is found in our perception of violence, as the general assumption, illustrated not only in the conventional theory of migration but also within the legislation, is, that in order to be forced out, there has to be a direct threat of violence. This becomes evident when listening to Iyatunde’s story. She, herself, did not feel as affected by the political situation, in Sierra Leone, as the woman who had lost three fingers and a breast, and thus experienced great physical harm (Iyatunde) and without denying the suffering connected to physical injury, this thesis will question whether physical harm, really, qualifies as a measuring stick for violence.

Galtung claims, that while “personal violence may more easily be noticed ... the ‘tranquil waters’ of structural violence contain more violence” (Galtung, 1969:173-4), an idea that is further elaborated on by Farmer. He says, that while almost all of us would agree that torture and rape constitute extreme suffering, most of us would also agree that insidious assaults on one’s dignity, such as institutionalized racism and sexism, too, can cause great and unjust injury.
(Farmer, 1996:261). Two questions then arise, because does ‘event’ assaults, such as rape, constitute more suffering than a lifetime of deep poverty, and is the death of a bullet (that is personal violence) worse, than that of hunger (structural violence)?

While the purpose of this study is not to compare direct and structural violence in order to identify which constitute the ultimate form of violence, it is important for the scope of this thesis to point out that structural violence is also a form of violence. Even though, it is not as easily recognized, it still constitutes violence, as this thesis has tried to capture.

Although this study has not presented any general recommendations on the basis of international legislation, it will argue, from an academic point of view, that the narrow definition of violence, that have resulted in an equally narrow category of forced migration, is inadequate in dealing with today’s migration challenges as the participants of this study are fare from unique, but representative of a much larger population, persecuted by structural violence and, to a great extent, neglected by the international community.
7 Conclusion

The conventional theory of migration was shaped around the mid-18th century and has, to some extent, remained unaltered, as forced migration are still limited only to include people that, by threats of physical violence, are forced to move by other people. Several attempts of broadening this definition has been made by critics, that claim that the category is too narrow and outdated, however, as the definition was legalized in the Refugee Convention of 1951, this line of criticism seems to have been pushed to the side, as changing this legal document has been deemed too problematic.

However, since the legalization of this definition took place in 1950s, our perception of war and, as such, of the victims of war, has drastically changed. The civil population are times and times again the main target of modern-day warfare and while many cases of gruesome physical attacks on civilians are covered by the world media and politicians, who stand in horror over the brutality of man, the quiet attacks of oppression, poverty, famine and inequality roams freely in the shadows, with the occasional exception (i.e. Murambatsvina and the Ethiopian Famine Crisis of 1983-5). Nature, culture and religion are often blamed for this unjust, as poverty reduction programs, government aid and democratization-strategies calm the conscience of the international community. However, the door remains closed for those who try to flee the persecution of structural violence.

The narratives, that were explored in this study, revealed how people, in their quest to escape the vicious cycle of poverty, find themselves unable to progress, without hope, as employment and education is reserved for those who are financially superior and better connected. Their experiences showed how access to resources are further limited in deteriorating societies, which often occurs when the government feels threatened and, thus, tightening its grip on the population. The participants spoke of corruption and violence in the government and how it affects all layers of the society, which, in some cases, become criminalized, and, how people, who do not wish to pursue a criminal path, are forced to do so, if they want to progress. Accounts
that exposed how the refugee system, at times, becomes equally corrupt and selective, and how those, who wish to change the hierarchy of society, are forced out.

This is violence. It is the indirect, structural violence, and while it might be less dramatic and, thus, less visible, it is still violence. What this thesis has tried to illustrate is, that by classifying those who flee structural violence as economic, voluntary migrants, is to deny the fact that some people are persecuted by oppression and inequality.

The stories and experiences presented in this thesis are testimonies of those who managed, despite the lack of help from the international community, to flee. The structural violence they faced, limited, not only their present, but also their future: How can a person, that is not given equal access to the insights and resources of society, ever reach their full potential? While some, that are given the chance, migrate, those who need to migrate the most, the poorest of the poor, the helpless, are not able, as the means, that it entails to migrate, are unreachable to them. Those, that try, nonetheless, those that disregards the odds, such as Yaguine and Fodé, often ends up sacrificing their lives. What we, the international society, need to ask ourselves is: What atrocities and gross negligence do these men and women face, that they choose to take the risk anyways?

### 7.1 Further Research

Due to the limited scope of this thesis several interesting topics were left untouched and, as such, this section will encourage further research on each of the following topics.

When asylum seekers come to Europe from sub-Saharan Africa they are met by a feminized image of what a refugee should be: *a victim*. However, this highly gendered and cultural image may clash with cultures, that raise men not to show emotions and not to be weak, and as emotions are serious indictors in asylum hearings (Eastmond, 2007:260) there is a danger of some refugees being ‘lost in translation’. This topic, of de-/construction of gender, deserves further research.

Another topic worthy of more research is that of the romanticized depiction of Europe that was presented throughout the interviews of this study. That is, how Europe was portrayed in sub-
Sahara Africa, and how the immigrants in Europe contribute to the up-keeping of such image as many lie about their lives here: the jobs they have had to take, the unpleasant experiences many have gone through, the feeling of exclusion, the structural violence, the ‘othering’ and their fear of being sent back.

The educational system seems to be a common method of escape amongst the well-educated migrants faced by personal and/or structural violence. However, the Danish system is very biased when taking in students from the global South, or the, so-called, developing world. The Danish legislation, revolving around foreign students, is highly uneven as free education is offered to those coming from the European Union (EU) while the developing world is charged, what in their currency, is obscure amounts, to participate in the same education. Further labor law limits the foreign students’ work hours to an amount that would not allow them to accumulate enough money to pay for their education within Denmark, which, thus, often force these non-European foreign students into criminalization, as they have to take on illegal ‘moonlight jobs’ in order to pay for their studies as well as their accommodations as their network, often, is not financially strong enough to support them.

What, from the outside seems almost ironic, is, that most of the economic migrants that try to enter Europe are faced with the same inequality, from which, they are trying to escape. As access is only given to those that fall under the right economic class, those that are capable of buying access, though; educational class, where they, through their accomplishments, are allowed access through the educational system; or social background, that is, those who have the right contacts and as such can be sponsored. If not, they are forced into criminalization, where they, if lucky enough, can find illegal loop-holes from which they can enter. Further research on the structural violence that these migrants meet upon arriving in Europe would be suggested.

As an extended amount of research has been conducted on the impact of remittance, that is, the capital that is send back to the country, from which the migrant/refugee has fled. However, research on remittance influence on poverty reduction (Gupta et al, 2009) and more especially on its effect on structural violence needs to be investigated.

At the end of this thesis one question still needs to be addressed, that is, the one asked in the beginning of this thesis by Sadako Ogata (see section 1) “What kinds of regulations do you [then] put in place?” The answer could be, from an academic perspective, to return to Petersen’s
typology (Petersen, 1958) with three types of forced migration, each with different levels of choice and force (see section 2.1), or, from a legal point of view, to follow Guterres proposal suggesting a new international instrument for the protection of forcibly displaced people who are not refugees (Guterres, 2008). However, as the answer to this question is not addressed in this thesis, further research focusing on a policy change, needs to be looked into.
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## Appendix 3: Countries and Regions within Sub-Saharan Africa

### Eastern Africa
- Burundi
- Comoros
- Djibouti
- Eritrea
- Ethiopia
- Kenya
- Madagascar
- Malawi
- Mauritius
- Mayotte
- Mozambique
- Réunion
- Rwanda
- Seychelles
- Somalia
- South Sudan
- Uganda
- United Republic of Tanzania
- Zambia
- Zimbabwe

### Southern Africa
- Botswana
- Lesotho
- Namibia
- South Africa
- Swaziland

### Middle Africa
- Angola
- Cameroon
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Congo
- Democratic Republic of the Congo
- Equatorial Guinea
- Gabon
- Sao Tome and Principe

### Western Africa
- Benin
- Burkina Faso
- Cape Verde
- Cote d'Ivoire
- Gambia
- Ghana
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
- Liberia
- Mali
- Mauritania
- Niger
- Nigeria
- Saint Helena
- Senegal
- Sierra Leone
- Togo

Appendix 4: Migration Definitions

The following table entails a list of migration terms and categories used throughout this thesis as well as their definition. The definitions mainly originates from the websites IOM as well as one reference to the legal definition set forth by the Refugee Convention and the OAU Convention. The IOM website was used as the main source as its definitions have been constructed not only from a legal perspective but also in collaboration with NGOs (IOM, 2011b) that are working with migration and as such provide a more updated, realistic and nuanced picture of the categories that in theory might be easily differentiated but in practice often overlap.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internally Displaced Person (IDP)</td>
<td>“Persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognized State border (Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, UN Doc E/CN.4/1998/53/Add.2.). See also de facto refugees, displaced person, externally displaced persons, uprooted people.” (IOM, 2011b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced migration</td>
<td>A migratory movement in which an element of coercion exists, including threats to life and livelihood, whether arising from natural or man-made causes (e.g. movements of refugees and internally displaced persons as well as people displaced by natural or environmental disasters, chemical or nuclear disasters, famine, or development projects). (IOM, 2011b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stowaway</td>
<td>The Convention on Facilitation of International Maritime Traffic, 1965, as amended, (The FAL Convention), define stowaway as &quot;A person who is secreted on a ship, or in cargo which is subsequently loaded on the ship, without the consent of the shipowner or the Master or any other responsible person and who is detected on board the ship after it has departed from a port, or in the cargo while unloading it in the port of arrival, and is reported as a stowaway by the master to the appropriate authorities&quot;. (IOM, 2013). However stowaways are also known to ‘use’ other means of transportation, anything from trucks to planes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continues on the following page...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>A person who, “owing to a well-founded fear of persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinions, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country.” (Art. 1(A)(2), Convention relating to the Status of Refugees).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In addition to the refugee definition in the 1951 Refugee Convention, Art. 1.2, 1969 Organization of African Unity (OAU) Convention defines a refugee as any person compelled to leave his or her country “owing to external aggression, occupation, foreign domination or events seriously disturbing public order in either part or the whole of his country or origin or nationality.” (OAU, 1969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Similarly, the 1984 Cartagena Declaration states that refugees also include persons who flee their country “because their lives, security or freedom have been threatened by generalised violence, foreign aggression, internal conflicts, massive violations of human rights or other circumstances which have seriously disturbed public order.” (IOM, 2011b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum seeker</td>
<td>“A person who seeks safety from persecution or serious harm in a country other than his or her own and awaits a decision on the application for refugee status under relevant international and national instruments. In case of a negative decision, the person must leave the country and may be expelled, as may any non-national in an irregular or unlawful situation, unless permission to stay is provided on humanitarian or other related grounds.” (IOM, 2011b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Migrant</td>
<td>A person leaving his or her habitual place of residence to settle outside his or her country of origin in order to improve his or her quality of life. This term is often loosely used to distinguish from refugees fleeing persecution, and is also similarly used to refer to persons attempting to enter a country without legal permission and/or by using asylum procedures without bona fide cause. It may equally be applied to persons leaving their country of origin for the purpose of employment (IOM, 2011b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undocumented Migrant</td>
<td>“A person who, owing to unauthorized entry, breach of a condition of entry, or the expiry of his or her visa, lacks legal status in a transit or host country. The definition covers inter alia those persons who have entered a transit or host country lawfully but have stayed for a longer period than authorized or subsequently taken up unauthorized employment (also called clandestine/undocumented migrant or migrant in an irregular situation). The term &quot;irregular&quot; is preferable to &quot;illegal&quot; because the latter carries a criminal connotation and is seen as denying migrants' humanity.” (IOM, 2011b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further categories can be found on the IOM website.
Appendix 5: Interview Participants

This table holds a brief description of the participants of this study. Due to anonymity, names, have been altered and detailed information has been omitted. It further describes the amount of interviews that has taken place as well as the length and method.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant*</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Student migrant, around 40, male, Kenyan, East Africa. John has been in Denmark for 4 years, he works a full-time newspaper job at night to pay for a university degree and to support his family back home. He is also paying back the loan he received from his “brother” (a friend from his ethnic group that lives in US) that borrowed him the money he needed to come here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa</td>
<td>Family reunification around 35, female, Zambian, Southern Africa. Vanessa was born in Zambia, however, after marrying her husband, Peace, they moved to his country of habitual residence, Zimbabwe. Due to turmoil within the country they migrated to Namibia before making their final move to Denmark, where they, along with their 3 kids, have lived for over 4 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeka</td>
<td>Student migrant, around 30, male, Nigerian, West Africa. Migrated from Nigeria to Hungary as a student migrant and after 2 years transferred to Denmark. Today he has a work permit based on family reunification with his son that was born in Denmark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iyatunde</td>
<td>around 35, female, Sierra Leonean, West Africa. Iyatunde left Sierra Leone in 1998 where she migrated though Guinea before arriving in Gambia. She lived in Gambia for over a year before she met, what is now, her ex-husband Lars. They married and moved to Denmark. Today she and her two kids live in Denmark, and she has now become a Danish citizen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel</td>
<td>around 35, male, Uganda, East Africa. He came 10 years ago as a student migrant but soon after married and is now living in Denmark on a permanent residence permit. He was born into the Kingship of Buganda, with several members of his family living in Europe and America as refugees. He himself was sponsored by a private European company based in Uganda.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continues on the follow page...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant*</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derek</td>
<td>Derek was born and raised in Cameroon, however at the young age he decided to leave his country and move to Europe. As Derek did not have the capital to travel through legal means he entered as an undocumented migrant. After having stayed in Europe for over 12 years he has eventually obtained a citizenship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Name of the participant; Legal definition of the participant’s migration category (upon arrival in Denmark), Age; Country of habitual residence before migrating; Region of habitual residence before migrating

Table is inspired by the presentation of participants by Suter (2012:58)
Appendix 6: Data Collection (Extended Version)

Interview Procedures

I would meet most of the interviews in the privacy of their own home, this was a conscious decision as I believe they would feel more comfortable and relaxed here. The first 10-20 minutes consisted of small talk, while I had met or seen most of the interviewees before, I felt a need to establish some sort of common grounds before the interview could start. It was the personal character of my questions that lead me to take this precautionary step. When I felt that a comfortable rapport was establish, I would start to discuss the thesis after which I would ask if I could turn on the tape recorder and then the interview would begin.

It quickly became clear that in order to get an open conversation going about their experiences in sub-Saharan Africa I had to give in order to get, that is, they needed me to address sub-Saharan Africa, some even asked me “what first comes to mind when you think about ‘Africa’?” The fear and incorporation that I initially was met with, was how was I going to portray Africa, and subsequently, them. I found myself having this discussion sooner or later with all participants. I tried my best to show that I was fully aware of the oversimplified image of Africa that is present in media coverage, politics and even scholarly literature and that it was not my intention to portray Africa as one entity (Ferguson, 2006). I was also met with the stigma revolving around the notion of refugees, all participants, here especially the men, made it clear that they did not perceive themselves as refugees, at all. They did not want to be perceived as being helpless, they felt that by leaving their countries they were active players and not helpless victims of a given situation, however as the interview proceeded most participants expressed situations where they felt powerless and vulnerable and some even concluded that they did need help.

As mentioned earlier (in section 3.3), the interviews were constructed much like conversations led by topics. As such I did not prepare any questions and instead kept to my topics (see section 3.3.1) and led the conversation flow in the direction that the interviewee’s story unfolded. This method did on several occasions take me out of the field of which I was studying, however, as the interviews were in-depth and as the interviewees had accepted an open time-span on the interview sessions, that in some cases were distributed over 3 days, I accepted a certain amount of ‘extra information’.

Sisse Nat-George
In my two pilot interviews I had discovered that there were a tendency of, right after having turned off the recorder, the interviewee would breathe out and after exchanging some more general words would say something profound about the topic of interest. This puzzled me and I was thinking of not offing the tape recorder after the interview-session in order to be able to record this brief discussion that would take place as I was afraid to miss any relevant information. However, I decided that by not offing the recorder, I would maybe miss the whole after-interview discussion, so instead, I decided to turn off the recorder, have the conversation and then after we had said our goodbyes, run to my car, turn on the recorder and repeat as much as I could from the conversation and also any relevant observations such as body language as well as other gestures that the recorder would miss.

**Transcription**

Deliberations were made when having to transcribe the interviews on whether to transcribe the interviews naturalistic and thus include all noise and tokens that occurred during the interview or whether to exclude all mispronunciations and dialects thus cleaning up the interviews. The decision fell somewhere in between, as involuntary noises such as coughing, laughing and crying were considered valuable as they revealed an emotional layer of insight about the personal experience that would, if not included, be lost (Oliver et al, 2007:1283). Further, response tokens, such as yeah, eh, mmm, were also included, as common ways of responding to a question in conversation-like settings (Oliver et al, 2007:1283).

As I was preparing the text for analysis I would label some points too delicate and detailed and therefore I removed such information from the text before analyzing it. I also edited names and other revealing information. In this connection I decided to rename use authentic names as I felt it provided their stories with more depth. The quotations that was chosen for the analysis was ‘cleaned up’, that is all unnecessary ‘noise’ was removed so that it would not take attention away from the story (as mentioned in section 3.4).