ISS International Institute of Social Studies

Working Paper
No. 497

The Global Forum on Migration and Development:
"All Talk and No Action" or "A Chance to Frame the Issues in a Way that Allows you to Move Forward Together"?

Bernice Roldan and Des Gasper

March 2010

The Institute of Social Studies is Europe's longest-established centre of higher education and research in development studies. On 1 July 2009, it became a University Institute of the Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR). Post-graduate teaching programmes range from six-week diploma courses to the PhD programme. Research at ISS is fundamental in the sense of laying a scientific basis for the formulation of appropriate development policies. The academic work of ISS is disseminated in the form of books, journal articles, teaching texts, monographs and working papers. The Working Paper series provides a forum for work in progress which seeks to elicit comments and generate discussion. The series includes academic research by staff, PhD participants and visiting fellows, and award-winning research papers by graduate students.

Working Papers are available in electronic format at www.iss.nl

Please address comments and/or queries for information to:

Institute of Social Studies
P.O. Box 29776
2502 LT The Hague
The Netherlands

or

E-mail: wpapers@iss.nl

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abstract

The paper explores the proposed rationale of the Global Forum on Migration and Development that was launched by Kofi Annan in 2006 as UN Secretary General, as an informal inter-governmental discussion space. First, it identifies the series of claims in Annan's speech to the High-Level Dialogue that he convened in New York: that international migration must be managed; that to proceed from the present situation of entrenched disagreements and mistrust requires constructive structured communication; that the Global Forum can provide this and is a feasible way forward, unlike proposals for binding international conventions; and that through processes of growing mutual education and mutual acceptance the Forum can be fruitful. Implied are notions of building trust and community amongst the "migro-crats", the public policymakers in the global networks of migration. Second, the paper monitors how the hypotheses had fared by the time of the second Forum conference, in Manila in 2008, by discourse analysis of its concluding report. The Manila meeting's declaration of a "focus on the person" appeared in reality to a large extent mean a focus on the "migro-crats" and their interactive processes of mutual education and team-building that are intended to produce practical cooperation. To clarify this strategy and draw out its mindset and assumptions, the paper presents a series of tools for discourse analysis that may be more widely useful in migration studies and for participation in migration policy debate.

Keywords

The Global Forum on Migration and Development
"All Talk and No Action" or "A Chance to Frame the Issues in a Way that Allows you to Move Forward Together"?

1   Introduction

In 2006, the United Nations, for the first time in its history, held a high-level multilateral dialogue on international migration and development. With migration trends and issues increasingly common in international discussions—including on remittances, brain drain, feminisation of migration, irregular migration, and violations of migrants' human rights—sustained pressure had been exerted on the UN to convene a major forum. To some, the Dialogue was a way to address the lack of support by labour-receiving countries for the UN International Convention on the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families.[1] In Dauvergne's words, for those countries national migration law has been "transformed into the new last bastion of sovereignty" (Dauvergne 2004: 588). Various governments, of major labour-sending countries in particular, lobbied the UN for years to convene a keynote meeting. There were delays as the organisation gave priority to other issues and conferences (MFA 2007), but eventually a 2003 agreement of the General Assembly led to the Dialogue on 14-15 September 2006 at the UN headquarters in New York City. The objective was to address how to increase development benefits of international migration and reduce negative impacts.

Given adamant opposition by major immigration countries to any machinery for binding global regulation of migration, the preparations for the Dialogue led to design of a purely consultative and purely inter-governmental Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD). The Forum now exists outside of, although in cooperation with, the UN system, and has become a standing inter-governmental forum on international migration, how it relates to development, and the status of migrants' rights. It aims to build international cooperation on migration, in thinking, policy and practice, and

---

[1] <http://www.mfasia.org/mfaActivities/MWC-RatifyMonitor.html> accessed 4 January 2010. Opened for ratification in 1990, the Convention only achieved sufficient ratification to come into force in 2003. Only 40 State Parties have ratified it to date. Thus far, no major labour-receiving country has ratified the Convention. In contrast, the Convention against transnational organised crime achieved sufficient ratification within two years. That the two most common objections to the migrant rights Convention—concerning limits to state sovereignty and the provision for family reunification to regular migrant workers already residing in the labour-receiving country—do not hold upon a close look at the Convention's text, shows labour-receiving countries' degree of suspicion and domestic political dispute in this area. MacDonald and Cholewinski argue that the relevant Articles (44 and 79) have extremely qualified language, "leaving such a wide discretion open to states, it is difficult to see any obligation of any sort, let alone one that could present a serious obstacle to ratification" (2007: 12).

"to foster practical and action-oriented outcomes at the national, regional and global levels".[2]

For some civil society groups this outcome was a bitter disappointment. One issue surrounding the GFMD concerns its non-binding character, given the background history of non-ratification of the Convention on migrant workers. Another is that by taking the forum out of the auspices of the UN and making it a meeting of governments, many voices are excluded, including those of migrants, their families and communities, and civil society in general. Many in international civil society hold that issues of human rights and sustainable development are thereby downplayed. A different perspective comes from others such as the Washington-based think tank Migration Policy Institute, which wrote that while many circles had written off the 2006 UN Dialogue as "all talk and no action, it may yet be the beginning of a new era. Nearly all participating countries said they would like to continue a dialogue on migration and development but that such a forum should be state-led and should only promote cooperation, not produce binding agreements".[3]

Since 2006, while power relations between labour-sending and receiving countries inevitably remain in play, the Forum has evolved into a significant space for bilateral negotiations on international migration and how it relates to development, in particular concerning migrant labour (MFA 2009), as seen in its subsequent annual conferences in Brussels (2007), Manila (2008) and Athens (2009). Plans for subsequent annual meetings (in Mexico, Spain and Morocco, successively) are underway, before the Forum returns to the UN in 2013.

This chapter looks in detail at two speeches—the opening address to the 2006 High-Level Dialogue by then UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan, and the closing address of the 2008 Manila conference by the conference chairman— each in its entirety, using selected tools of discourse analysis. We aim to cast light on the intended rationale of the Forum, whose proponents see its non-binding, restricted character as a strength and not a weakness, given the starting points of fear and confusion in labour-receiving countries and profound international mistrust. We further aim to cast preliminary light on how the Forum's approach fares in practice, including whether and how it starts to build trust and reduce fear.

We especially aim to illustrate the usefulness of discourse analysis tools, in helping to reveal and test influential assumptions and frames and contrast them with other perspectives. Discourse analysis is particularly relevant in the field of international migration, given that the field abounds in fears and stereotypes, paradoxes and inconsistencies. The choices of categories and the creation or loss of trust are of central importance for the direction of discussion (cf. Griffin 2007). To reach a wide and relevant audience, we need tools of discourse analysis that are relatively accessible and yet take us beyond the level of insight of ordinary reading. In this chapter, we employ basic

---

[2] <http://government.gfmd2008.org/forum_info/objectives.html>, accessed 30 March 2009.

[3] <http://www.migrationinformation.org/Feature/display.cfm?id=544>, accessed 25 February 2009.

elements of rhetorical analysis, giving attention to each of logos, pathos and ethos (roughly speaking: appeals to logic and evidence, to feelings, and to the credibility of the author), and to the choices made in framing, especially through the choices of metaphor.

2 Visionary Pragmatism? - Address by Secretary-General Kofi Annan to the 2006 High-Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development

In just over 1,000 words, Kofi Annan's opening address[4] to the New York 2006 Dialogue presented a major message. It rewards careful attention. The core audience was from UN member states at the ministerial and highest civil servant levels. UN agencies and other inter-governmental bodies and organisations, such as the International Organization for Migration (IOM), were present as observers. While civil society and the private sector involved in issues of international migration were not present, everyone was aware that these actors were intensively monitoring the UN process. There had already been an interactive UN consultation with international civil society two months earlier.

In the analysis table below, we divide Annan's text into sections and comment on the choices of focus, language and structure. In doing so, we gain more insight into the layers of tacit meaning. To take us beyond the level of intuitive appreciation, such an analysis table forces the reader to examine a key text in a different way. It slows us down, ensures that we give attention to all elements and provides a more reliable route in looking for themes. We can then subsequently reconstruct the patterns of argumentation-cum-suggestion conveyed by the speech, more revealingly than through ordinary reading.

We identify five parts in the speech. First, an unusually bold and unapologetic opening, that describes international migration in language that brings legitimacy in dominant countries, not least the country where the speech was given: individual striving, opportunity and creative identification of possibilities for mutual benefit. Second, given the shared recognition now of the great potential for joint advantage between countries, the speech offers an emphatic endorsement of the timeliness of the initiative. The third and central aspect is a perspective for the ongoing management of this arena through a continuing forum for voluntary inter-state sharing of ideas. Fourth, reassurance that the Forum would not be an international mechanism to exert pressure on states to move in directions they do not wish, but could rely on support from the established UN system to make progress. Finally, as the send-off to his audience: Annan gives a gentle call for maturity by governments and a pointer to the benefits for all that it can bring. Later we will investigate the central, third, section of the speech in more detail.

---

[4] <http://www.un.org/migration/sg-speech.html>, accessed 16 February 2009.

TABLE 1
Analysis table for Kofi Annan's New York speech, 14 September 2006

U.N. SECRETARY-GENERAL KOFI ANNAN'S ADDRESS TO THE HIGH-LEVEL DIALOGUE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT NEW YORK, 14 SEPTEMBER 2006	COMMENTARY We have inserted in brackets five implied section headings. Italics in this column indicate a paraphrase or implication of a part of the speech.
Madam President, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen:	**[Governments start to see migration as an opportunity]**
Migration is a courageous expression of an individual's will to overcome adversity and live a better life. Over the past decade, globalization has increased the number of people with the desire and capacity to move to other places.	After the conventional formal greetings, a bold opening captures attention and legitimacy, by direct reference to individual humans and their aspirations and choices, and unapologetically praises migrants. In addition, Annan links migration to globalisation.
This new era of mobility has created opportunities for societies throughout the world, as well as new challenges. It has also underscored the strong linkages between international migration and development.	Opportunities are highlighted before challenges; opportunities for all.
Just a few years ago, many people did not think it possible to discuss migration at the United Nations. Governments, they said, would not dare to bring into the international arena a topic on which their citizens are so sensitive.	
Yet here you are, and I sense that the mood is changing.	*You [the assembled governments] have been daring.* Establishes a tone of confidence, openness; also makes the audience individually self-reflective by saying "you" are here, not here "we" are. "Mood" - emotions are involved; "excited" - the alternative mood.
More and more people are excited about the ways in which migrants can help transform their adopted and their native countries. More and more people understand that governments can cooperate to create triple wins—for migrants, for their countries of origin, and for the societies that receive them.	"More and more" repeated, to build a sense of a new majority. "Understand", not merely "feel" or "hope", acknowledges that cognition as well as emotion is involved. "Triple wins" - confidence-raising business jargon. "Their countries of origin", not "their countries" as if they did not belong also in the country of arrival.
No one can deny that international migration has negative aspects—trafficking, smuggling, social discontent—or that it often arises from poverty or political strife. But by being here today you show yourselves willing to tackle migration's challenges through dialogue and cooperation, rather than antagonism and isolation.	Again "you", not "we"; thus putting each of the audience in the spotlight rather than hidden in a crowd.
Your presence is also a tribute to the infectious energy and visionary pragmatism of my Special Representative, Peter Sutherland. His efforts have reassured and inspired everyone. I am deeply grateful to him.	Sutherland: the Irish former head of WTO – a Northern advocate of free trade, thus able to reassure rich nations "reassured": nervous worries have been overcome. Praise for one of the key organisers of the event implies praise too for those who participate in it.

As you begin your Dialogue, let me suggest three reasons why this is the right moment for it.	**[You have made the right choice, to participate in this event and process]**
First, to put it simply, we are all in this together. More countries are now significantly involved in, and affected by, international migration than at any time in history. And they are no longer so easily divided into "countries of origin" and "countries of destination". Many are now both. Countries that are very different in other respects face surprisingly similar migration challenges.	The first use of "we". Until this point the Secretary-General stressed the Dialogue as the product of the choices of individual governments (e.g., "your Dialogue"). Now, as the speech moves from the chosen entry of each government to the Dialogue, on to the substantive issues for the Dialogue, he stresses what all countries share.
Second, the evidence on migration's potential benefits is mounting. With their remittances reaching an estimated 167 billion dollars last year, the amount of money migrants from the developing world send back to their families exceeds the total of all international aid combined. And money is far from being the whole story. Migrants also use their skills and know-how to transfer technology, capital, and institutional knowledge. They inspire new ways of thinking about social and political issues. They form a dynamic human link between cultures, economies, and societies. As a result, we are better positioned than ever to confront the challenges of migration, and seize its opportunities.	*International migration is now central to economic, social and political development of poor countries, and in many vital global interlinkages.*

Again, use of the unifying "we", though for the last time (apart from one use of "us"). In the rest of the speech, the Secretary-General returns to using "you", to strengthen the feeling of Forum ownership by individual states. |
| *Third, Governments are now beginning to see international migration through the prism of opportunity, rather than of fear. You are focused on magnifying the positive, mutually beneficial aspects of migration: on sharing your experiences, developing practical ideas, building partnerships.* | Third use of "opportunity".
Having unified the audience by the terms adopted in his presentation, he reinforces this by praising their bold and constructive stance. The sentence 'You are focused…' is a garland of praise-terms: "positive", "mutual", "sharing", "practical", "building partnerships". |
| *For all these reasons—and also because people migrate not only between neighbouring countries or within regions, but from almost every corner of the world to every other—international migration today cries out for a global discussion.* | Again, implicitly: *we are all in this together*. |
| | **[The way forward: dialogue and voluntary cooperation, controlled by you]** |
| *Of course, it also stirs passionate debate. It can deprive countries of their best and brightest. It can divide families. It can generate social tensions. Sometimes criminals and terrorists exploit it. But the answers to many of these problems can be found through constructive engagement and debate.* | "Of course" makes an appeal to shared knowledge, shared experience, shared understanding and shared challenge.
"Best and brightest" – implies that the term does not apply only in rich Northern countries.
The three-fold repetition of "It can" gives emphasis.
"Constructive" figures as favourable counterpoint to the earlier "passionate". |
| *That's why I think the dialogue you are starting today should not end tomorrow. I am especially delighted that so many of you have embraced my proposal for a Global Forum on Migration and Development, and asked me to* | He takes upon himself responsibility for the initiative on this issue "so sensitive"' that others said Governments would not dare to discuss it together. Hence, no one can say it is |

help set it up. And I am particularly grateful to the Government of Belgium for offering to host the first meeting next year. *I believe such a Forum can foster practical, evidence-based cooperation among governments. It can give you a chance to frame the issues in a way that allows you to move forward together, to discover areas where you agree, and to find ways of improving cooperation.* *Clearly, there is no consensus on making international migration the subject of formal, norm-setting negotiations. There is little appetite for any norm-setting intergovernmental commission on migration. But, as I understand the thinking of the countries that back it, the Forum would be the opposite of that. It would be informal, voluntary, consultative. Above all, it would not make binding decisions.* *The Forum would allow us to build relationships of trust, and to bring together the best ideas that different countries have developed: facilitating remittances; engaging diasporas; exploring new ways to reduce poverty; building educational partnerships; and so on.* *Finally, it would show that Governments are now willing to address this complicated, volatile issue in a thoughtful, constructive fashion.*	only an initiative from Government X or Group Y. From here onwards, he conveys how the Forum he proposed is now owned by the governments, not by the UN: "you" frame, consult, and choose. The speech supplies a nourishing diet of praise-language: from "practical" and "evidence-based", through "move forward", to "cooperation". "Clearly" is added to help avoid spending time on a non-productive issue, and to instead sweep on towards more "visionary pragmatism". "Little appetite": a gentler phrase than "intense opposition", it eases the way towards cooperation. He now presents the thinking as being that of the Forum's backers, not his; ownership has been transferred. The Secretary General presents himself as a modest global facilitator, working with the grain. Another treasure-house of praise language: "build", "trust", "bring together", "facilitating", "engaging", "exploring", "building". The praise accompanies an elegant implied criticism—*that governments were previously unwilling to deal thoughtfully and constructively*—in order to again promote self-reflection.
The Forum must be led and overseen by States. But the United Nations System, and I personally, stand ready to support it. I have decided to extend the mandate of my Special Representative on Migration beyond this Dialogue. I trust that the Special Representative will form an essential link between the proposed Forum and the entire United Nations system. Also, I stand ready to create a voluntary Trust Fund to help support the Forum's work, should you find this useful. *The United Nations is rising to the challenges of international migration in other ways as well. Last spring, I established the Global Migration Group, which brings together UN offices, Funds, Programmes, and Agencies engaged in various aspects of international migration and development, as well as the International Organization for Migration. You are no doubt familiar with the important work done by the constituent members of the Group — from supporting labour migration to helping developing countries connect better with migrant communities abroad, from outstanding*	**[The UN will help you along this path]** Having calmed fears of an international process that would pressurise unwilling governments, Annan calms fears that the government-led process will lack technical and financial support or coordination with related work. He outlines a series of facilities, to reassure and encourage participants and to reinforce his own and the UN's standing. He relies heavily on his personal stature as a globally trusted global leader—using the authority and the freedom conveyed by being near the end of his ten years in post. The repeated "I" language conveys confidence and strength, to help energise the new Forum. By subsequently stressing the myriad relevant and coordinated activities of the UN system, he then transfers this personal authority to their work that will continue after him.

demographic analysis to research on remittances, from efforts to secure the rights of migrants to combating trafficking in human beings. The Global Migration Group is working to ensure stronger coordination and greater coherence among its members.	
Ladies and gentlemen, *This High-level Dialogue will succeed to the extent that it ushers in an era of sustained, thoughtful consideration of international migration and development issues. For far too long, migration policy has been based on hunches, anecdotes, and political expediency. It is now time to turn to the evidence, and use it to build a common understanding of how international migration can bring benefits to all.* *Thank you very much.*	**[*Envoi:* It is time for serious work; let us put childish things behind us]** Implicitly: *In the past, we have not acted in migration policy like thoughtful, well-informed and mature judges.* *If we do so, then success—benefits to all— awaits us.*

Overall, from our initial reading, Kofi Annan's speech is well suited to its audience composed of senior government figures and representatives of inter-governmental and international agencies. The language is diplomatic, with judicious use of metaphor ("little appetite for", "prism of opportunity rather than fear", "move forward together"), juxtaposition (maximising opportunities, minimising risks; volatile problems, constructive solutions), a cast of characters suitable for motivating the audience (courageous individuals, visionary pragmatists, dangerous criminals and terrorists), and hints of pathos. Praise and criticism terms provide familiar signposts, and are often used in partnership. Having praised governments for their boldness in joining this new process— "you have been daring"—Annan underlines that the process represents their intelligent self-interest—for "we are all in this [intensively interconnected world] together" —and gently criticises the previous lack of intelligent, well-informed and constructive attention.

Our commentary in the right-hand column of Table 1 adheres to the three central categories of classical rhetoric: logos, the direct arguments provided, which are examined in detail below; pathos, the emotions appealed to, as in the opening and concluding sections where Annan extols the courage and enterprise of migrants, and then quietly calls for courage, enterprise and intelligence from governments; and ethos, the role adopted and authority acquired by the author in relation to the audience. Some key aspects in this construction of ethos are as follows. Annan shows that he understands the worries and concerns in rich countries, as well as those of migrants; he calls for evidence; he buttresses the credentials of the UN as a wise and helpful support of governments, not infringing their sovereignty but strengthening their rationality. He presents the United Nations system as deserving the standing that he individually had gained: as sufficiently broadly accepted and trusted, endowed with a global perspective and substantial relevant expertise.

We now look in more detail at the central section of the speech. Having already encouraged, praised and unified the audience, the Secretary-General

here moves to identify the required work that lies ahead and how it should be structured and conducted. As is usual in political speeches and in much other communication, many of the assumptions and suggestions remain tacit, only hinted at, for it could be clumsy, unnecessary or counterproductive to make them explicit. Table 2 employs a more refined, three-column, analysis format, that includes dedicated space for identifying his assumptions and conclusions, both stated and unstated, the definite and the only hinted at. This will give us a basis for specifying the logical structure of the core of the speech, as the system of propositions in Table 3. The main value-added from the more detailed analysis provided in Table 2 will be seen then in the synthesis of Annan's arguments that we arrive at in Table 3. (For exposition and fuller illustration of this linked pair of formats, and their rationale as introductory tools in argumentation analysis and discourse analysis more generally, see Gasper 2000, 2002, 2004.).

TABLE 2
More detailed analysis table for the key central passage of Annan's 2006 speech

Stated assumption = SA.   Stated conclusion = SC.
Unstated assumption = UA. Unstated conclusion = UC. Unstated suggestion = US.

Components of the text	Further comments/clarification of Meanings Italics in this column indicate a paraphrase or implication of a part of the speech.	Identified assumptions/ conclusions/suggestions
Of course, it [international migration] also stirs passionate debate.	***1. Challenges of migration*** Acknowledges the strong sentiments on migration in international debate	US: "I understand your worries".
It can deprive countries of their best and brightest. *It can divide families.* *It can generate social tensions.* *Sometimes criminals and terrorists exploit it.*	Pathos of labour-sending countries. "Generate social tensions": a vague description (and without clear causality) in contrast to "deprive" and "divide". Migration seems like an omnipresent force that can deprive and divide. But what are its underlying causes?	US: Labour-sending countries have a difficult situation. The UN understands that too. US: If we do not manage migration, criminal groups will manage it.
But the answers to many of these problems can be found through constructive engagement and debate.	***2. Proposed solution: the Forum*** "But": *pessimism is unjustified.* "Constructive engagement and debate" – neutral, diplomatic solutions to emotive problems.	UA: Controversial emotive problems require calm structured communication.
That's why I think the dialogue you are starting today should not end tomorrow.	"dialogue *you* are starting today"; having provided an optimistic perspective, he associates it with the work of those assembled	US: Member states have ownership of the dialogue, not the UN.
I am especially delighted	"delighted", "so many",	

13

that so many of you have embraced my proposal for a Global Forum on Migration and Development, and asked me to help set it up. And I am particularly grateful to the Government of Belgium for offering to host the first meeting next year.	"embraced", "particularly grateful" – *things are going great* "Asked me to help set it up" – *I am your agent.* A rich country takes the lead.	US: Governments are in control, while the UN will provide support. US: Other rich countries can feel secure.
I believe such a Forum can foster practical, evidence-based cooperation among governments. *It can give you a chance to frame the issues in a way that allows you to move forward together, to discover areas where you agree, and to find ways of improving cooperation.*	***3. Conditions for cooperation among member states*** Soothing, encouraging words. Uses panoply of praise terms, associated with: *You, you, you.* *The Forum offers so much that governments would wish for.*	UA: Member states start with different views, but SC: cooperative work will increase the areas of agreement, which will reinforce the cooperation.
Clearly, there is no consensus on making international migration the subject of formal, norm-setting negotiations. There is little appetite for any norm-setting intergovernmental commission on migration. *But, as I understand the thinking of the countries that back it, the Forum would be the opposite of that.* *It would be informal, voluntary, consultative.* *Above all, it would not make binding decisions.*	***4. Dialogue as voluntary, non-binding, consultative process*** "No consensus" – understatement, neutral term. Highlights role of the UN as outsider and supporter, and the countries as owners and leaders of the process. "Informal" might be vague, particularly for a high-level meeting, but "voluntary" and "consultative" are praise terms. Emphasis via "above all", to reassure the fearful.	UC: It is not feasible to implement binding resolutions and sanctions at present, as there is insufficient acceptance of an intergovernmental migration commission to lead this. SA: There is little demand to set up such a commission UC: An informal, voluntary, consultative and non-binding dialogue is more desired and feasible than a norm-setting intergovernmental commission on migration. UA: Non-binding character of the Forum is seen positively by most member states, and UC: is thus an accepted priority.
The Forum would allow us to build relationships of trust, and to bring together the best ideas that different countries have developed: facilitating remittances; engaging diasporas; exploring new ways to reduce poverty; building educational partnerships; and so on.	***5. Fostering trust and sharing good ideas*** Uses a series of praise terms, to encourage, persuade, reassure	SA: Trust is built when member states share good practices to minimise the risks and maximise the opportunities from migration, UC: it will reduce the need to create a formal, binding process.

	6. Addressing a sensitive issue fruitfully	
Finally, it would show that Governments are now willing to address this complicated, volatile issue in a thoughtful, constructive fashion.	Juxtaposition of problem/criticism terms—"complicated", "volatile"—with solution/praise terms: "thoughtful", "constructive".	US: Governments were previously not thoughtful and constructive.

Our closer study of this core passage confirms that the UN was well aware that in its first official meeting on international migration and development it was under scrutiny from various sides. The language is vivid when touching on the social costs of migration (families divided; countries deprived) and muted on causalities and broader societal problems. It made clear that the outcome after New York City would be a GFMD process where governments would take the lead and the UN would play a supporting role. The central passage ends with a subtle criticism of and warning to governments, while offering them the prize of better outcomes and a better image if they follow the path of constructive dialogue.

Table 3 organises the Secretary-General's points in this central passage into a logical system. The first row below the column headings shows how the overall proposal, that governments should proceed to cooperate within the new Global Forum, stems from a set of more factual claims (Data) and a series of posited principles or judgments (Warrants), largely those which we identified in the final column of Table 2. Each of those supporting elements rests in turn on some other background posited Data and Warrants, as we show in the other rows for most of the elements. The procedure helps us to draw out further the unstated assumptions and conclusions that we sought in the final column of Table 2, to show the interconnections, and to better assess what Annan said. Assessment is the task of Table 3's last column, where we present possible qualifiers and objections. It could be interesting, for example, to explore further Annan's judgment that it is not feasible to have binding resolutions and sanctions in the absence of a responsible and accepted intergovernmental migration commission.

Overall, the Secretary General argued that in the global system of nation states, a Global Forum for inter-state mutual familiarisation and cooperation is the best available option. The United Nations, itself an inter-state organisation, offers no route for fast-tracking migrants' rights. An attempt to take such a route raises fears and will be obstructed by labour-receiving countries. If Annan's problem analysis indicates fear and mutual ignorance as central constraints, including fear that global-wide principles are too standardised and unconditional, then his solution analysis points toward countering the fears and ignorance and promoting "sustained, thoughtful consideration". Let us move to look at the character of the Forum in practice.

TABLE 3
Synthesis table to show logical structure of key passage of Annan 2006 speech

I propose that (Claim)	Given that (Data)	And the principle that (Warrant)	Unless (Rebuttal / Qualifications/Queries)
Overall *Claim*: *You should go ahead to work in the Global Forum for Migration and Development*	*D1.* **Disagreements** *exist; and heritage of casual, non-thoughtful, non-constructive behaviour.* *D2. Alternatives are not feasible.* *D3. GFMD is feasible.*	*W1. We must manage migration.* *W2. Controversial emotive problems require calm, structured communication.* *W3. GFMD will be fruitful.*	*[See below, for possible objections and queries concerning the inputs to the proposition.]*
W1. We must manage migration	*There* are many associated problems and strong sentiments.	*Migration* yet offers great opportunities (see elsewhere in speech). US: Unless we manage migration, then criminal groups will.	*We* = who?
D2. Alternatives to GFMD are not feasible	*SA*: There is little demand to set up such an intergovernmental migration norm-setting commission	*UC*: It is not feasible to implement binding resolutions and sanctions at present, as there is insufficient acceptance.	Do binding general rules depend on having a norm-setting commission?
D3. GFMD is feasible	*US*: Member States have ownership of the dialogue, not the UN. US: Governments are in control, while UN will provide support. US: Rich countries will feel secure.		*Various* other stakeholders want an intergovernmental commission: migrant organisations, some labour-sending countries, some human rights groups.
W3. GFMD will be fruitful	*UA*: Non-binding character of the Forum is seen positively by most member states, and UC: is thus an accepted priority.	*SC*: Cooperative work will increase the areas of agreement, which will reinforce the cooperation. SA: Trust is built when states share good practices to minimise the risks and maximise the opportunities from migration. An informal process is more effective and can be sufficient, for it tackles the root problem of lack of trust.	*Provided* that civil society consultations take place and feed into the inter-governmental process Annan assumes that all governments will have strong participation at the Forum. Labour-sending and labour-receiving countries will in fact have different degrees of interest. In addition, the non-binding character could produce non-participation, lack of commitment and distrust among member states.

3   Frame and Metaphor Analysis of the Report of the 2008 Manila Global Forum on Migration and Development: "Continuing the Journey" and "Harvesting the Fruits"?

Our second text for analysis is the concluding report by Esteban Conejos, Jr., the Philippines Undersecretary for Migrant Workers Affairs, at the GFMD conference in Manila in October 2008. The speech appears as an appendix to this paper. The Undersecretary was the focal person from the Philippine government in the GFMD process and the Chair of GFMD Manila. He presented the report at the closing of the inter-governmental meeting, to more than 600 delegates (government leaders and representatives) from 164 countries.[5] More than 1,100 delegates participated in the meeting as a whole.

Migrant associations were kept out of the inter-governmental meeting but this provided a focus and inducement for an enormous wider forum. The event organisers provided for:

> a section dedicated to civil society participation: the Civil Society Day(s) held before the government meeting. While there had been only one day provided for migrants' representatives to meet in Brussels, this part was expanded to two days in Manila, including an 'interface' session with the representatives of government. Here, the topics of the Roundtable sessions mirrored the ones from the government meeting, thus Roundtable 2.2. dealt in both cases with 'Managing Migration and Minimizing the Negative Impacts of Irregular Migration' and so forth. Apart from the 'interface', a delegation of civil society representatives was given [30 minutes] during the government meeting to present its recommendations.… [In addition the] 2nd GFMD would see an especially wide scope of parallel events; in fact, the impressive level of activities taking place over nine days from October 22 until October 30 amounted to a more comprehensive, more inclusive and one might even say: more relevant event than the GFMD proper .(Rother 2009a: 101)

In an interview with the Philippines' leading news network, when asked what would be discussed at GFMD Manila, Mr. Conejos had replied, "We are going to shine the spotlight on the human face of migration. In the first meeting in Brussels, they were [very much] concerned with the economic side: what the economic benefits of remittances are, the transfer of skills, the diaspora contributions to the communities. But in Manila, we will not focus on the money. We will focus on the person itself" (sic).[6] Despite this, when compared to Kofi Annan's speech in terms of "visionary pragmatism", his closing report leans far towards the pragmatism side. As we will see, the "focus on the person" seems to concern as much the "migro-crats", those involved in inter-governmental and inter-organisational processes of mutual education and negotiation on migration, and their trust-building direct interaction.[7]

---

[5] <http://government.gfmd2008.org/news/press-releases/second-global-forum-on-migration-and-development-formally-opens.html>, 30 March 2009.

[6] <http://www.abs-cbnnews.com/features/10/14/08/ esteban-conejos-we-will-shine-spotlight-human-face-migration>, 30 March 2009.

[7] Strictly speaking, "migro-crats" could refer to migrant rulers, but we refer rather to those who administer the migrants.

3.1   Frames and framing

The Conejos report is three times as long as Annan's speech. We will not employ the same micro-textual analysis and argumentation analysis formats, for that would be arduous and might still require use of additional complementary tools to seek out general themes and principles guiding this larger text's construction. To illustrate this latter type of investigation, we will use frame analysis methodology to comment on aspects of inclusion, exclusion, prioritisation and patterning of choices in the speech. Following Rein and Schön's "frame-reflective policy analysis" approach (Rein and Schön 1977; Schön and Rein 1979, 1994), we trace how the report uses a series of framing devices to transform worries over a complex policy issue into an orderly problem formulation.

In policy development, problem setting is the stage of inquiry undertaken to arrive at a problem definition and diagnosis, as a stage in moving towards a prescription for action. It starts with a problematic situation, where our existing knowledge is not sufficient to cope with the problem, so that worries ensue, which we attempt to overcome through ordered formulation of the problem (John Dewey, in Rein and Schön 1977: 238). Conceptual frames guide us towards a problem definition and diagnosis. They focus our thoughts by highlighting and including certain things, while omitting and ignoring others. They link together certain features to create a pattern, thus suggesting relationships, creating order out of complexity and making sense for us out of problematic issues. Policy frames build a particular orientation towards action.

To make tacit frames implicit, we can look for what is the remedial action proposed, for that typically implies a perceived flaw that needs correcting, and the perception of flaw typically reflects a whole system of perceptions. In this case, some of the remedial actions to correct perceived flaws were mentioned in the themes of the Manila roundtable discussions (RTDs) – RTD 1: Migration, development and human rights (paragraph 14); RTD 2: Secure, regular migration can achieve stronger development impacts (paragraph 24); RTD 3: Policy and institutional coherence and partnerships (paragraph 31). The third title is of particular importance, for the master theme of the report appears to be communication: that a consultative process can gradually improve everything and bring advantages to everyone. Supporting this master theme are sub-themes, on particular aspects of the process, on necessary supportive structures, and on the expected fruits.

3.1.1   Master frame: Collegial consultative process will bring benefits for all

Staying close to the GFMD's character as a high-level forum that is "informal, voluntary, consultative", the report's overall style remains relatively informal and easy to grasp. Paragraph 3 sets the tone. It invokes "an ongoing process that is changing our thinking and actions on migration and development, but more importantly, that is changing the way we deal with each other on these two complex, but interrelated, issues", migration and development (emphasis added). Paragraph 9 elaborates, as follows: "The informal nature of the Forum has allowed new friendships and partnerships to blossom between migrant-

sending and -receiving countries" (emphasis in the original). Paragraphs 10, 13 and 40 continue the mood. Interaction unpressured by fear of imminent worldwide legal instruments provides the space for sharing information and for growth of mutual and joint understanding, leading to identification of mutually beneficial options, case-by-case. The final paragraph (47) restates the theme of a flexible discussion process, providing ongoing opportunity-oriented dialogue rather than attempting to specify a standard worldwide regime of rules.

3.1.2 Secondary theme 1: Win-win solutions, doing well by doing good

The theme of benefits for all is elaborated in paragraphs 14, 16 and 29. By a harmonising hand, the protection and empowerment of migrants will benefit not only them but also their countries of origin and destination (paragraph 14); the right thing to do is also the smart thing to do (paragraph 16); and new smarter policies such as planned circular migration and "market-based migration policies" (paragraph 29) will benefit all these groups, by precluding the activity of smugglers and traffickers, who constitute the real alternative if instead of orderly managed migration the governments of labour-receiving countries attempt instead to limit migration drastically.

3.1.3 Secondary themes 2, 3: Changing the perceptions of possibilities and of "we"

Finding benefits for all relies on patient joint work, which rests on and in turn promotes a mutual acceptance, the formation and strengthening of a feeling of "we", at least for these purposes. The theme recurs again and again, from paragraph 1 on "harvest[ing] the fruits of our labour together" and paragraph 3 on "changing our thinking and actions" by "changing the way we deal with each other", through paragraph 9 on "new friendships and partnerships" and paragraph 30 on "the theme of partnership and cooperation", to paragraph 38 on handing on "the GFMD torch" from low-income Philippines to high-income Greece. The cooperative "we" is described as engaged in a process that changes and generates ideas (paragraphs 2, 3, 13, 22) and moves towards much more shared understanding and concrete agreements.

3.1.4 Secondary theme 4: Jointly approved research and dissemination

The speech repeatedly states a need for research related to migration and development (paragraphs 21-23, 28, 32, 33 and 37), to provide evidence to guide policymakers; for instance in paragraph 21 on "disseminating information and the results of research on migration and development [to] inform governments about how to provide an enabling environment to empower migrants". Paragraph 32 echoes Kofi Annan on the previous fear-based reliance on "intuition and anecdote", which is the reason why the GFMD is needed.

Paragraph 21 is silent on whose research results and information will be disseminated and used. Will it be that of a labour-sending or labour-receiving country? Policy-oriented research is typically the subject of many criticisms, including that it is used merely to legitimate government action and discredit other courses of action, to support limited reforms that have already been formulated along preconceived lines, and to mobilise belief to back up such action (Rein and Schön 1977: 236-237). The GFMD appears in contrast to aspire to be a source or channel for more broadly acceptable research, including through commissioning or assembling studies on matters of widely shared interest, notably on "good practices".

Paragraph 28 says that both regular and irregular migration will be studied, to analyse their costs and benefits. However, a preconceived line of action is already embedded in RTD 2, whose title asserts, "secure, regular migration can achieve stronger development impacts". Although irregular migration also needs some "overdue research", paragraph 24 declares that "the best frameworks to protect and empower migrants for development are likely to be regular migration programs that are accessible, transparent, and non-discriminatory".

3.1.5   Secondary theme 5: A flexible approach to policy; "good practices" not "best practices"

Undersecretary Conejos twice uses the stereotypical jargon term "best practices" (paragraphs 12, 20), a notion that can transfer authority to global centres of research and research funding like the World Bank that claim to synthesise global experience and on that basis, declare what are best practices. However, his report largely shifts instead to a far more flexible, case-specific concept of "good practice" (paragraphs 20, 23, 26, 27), and explicitly opposes a "one size fits all" approach (paragraphs 26, 36).

3.1.6   Secondary theme 6: A light supportive structure

The report combines a predominant language of flow that stresses informal process, with a secondary language of solidity ("building on the substantive achievements…and consolidating the structures", paragraph 4). The open ongoing process requires some supportive structures (paragraphs 4, 38-39, 40-42), including ad hoc working groups and good working links with the UN system, but not a new, large and costly bureaucracy. Implicitly such an organisation can become financially beholden to rich countries, and would be largely staffed by rich country professionals and/or cut off from the urgency of action, lost in "the usual talk-fests of international conferences" (paragraph 40). The International Organization for Migration, with almost 7,000 staff, headquartered in Geneva, receives no mention in the report.

3.2   Generative metaphors

A metaphor is a device of seeing something abstract or unfamiliar in terms of something else that is familiar, creating in the process new insights. Metaphors are used not only to simplify and analyse complex issues, but also to construct

social realities. The metaphors we use day after day function as various sorts of "mirrors" (that may reflect the plain truth, lie, or take us beneath the surface), "magicians" (that transform realities), or "mutinies" (that expose and mobilise against forces considered to be oppressive) (Kornprobst 2008).

Metaphors typically play a central role in the frames and stories used in public policy for problem setting and for pointing towards solutions (Schön and Rein 1979). Frames usually "contain generative metaphors that enable us to reason from the familiar to the unfamiliar. Familiar concepts are brought to unfamiliar situations and in the process transform the unfamiliar, providing a way of organizing and understanding it, while they are themselves transformed" (Rein and Schön 1977: 240-241).

Some metaphors in the GFMD text are perhaps only decorative, like paragraph 9's "blossoming of friendships and partnerships". However, some are generative, in the sense described: notably, "harvesting the fruits of our labor" (paragraphs 1 and 11), "passing the torch" (paragraphs 38 and 45), and most pervasive and basic: "moving ahead". Each indicates a system of ideas and a course of action.

"Harvesting the fruits of our labor" likens the GFMD process to painstaking, productive work that is for the eventual benefit of all, building mutual understanding and trust (paragraph 3). Compared to Kofi Annan's address, the report is relatively silent on the labour of the migrants themselves. The focus is on governments, portrayed to be working with as much effort as the migrant workers, towards a goal that will benefit the migrants too.

The metaphor of "passing the torch", from Brussels to Manila and from Manila to Athens, conveys perseverance, victory and legacy. It mobilises the imagery of the Olympic Games: heroic endeavour within a community of international cooperation. The broader metaphor of a journey is central to the whole speech, from paragraph 1's "endings and beginnings", through to "the road ahead" (paragraph 41) and the very final paragraph (47). Whereas the penultimate paragraph (46) resorts to a hackneyed military metaphor ("We have gained much ground") to convey pride in GFMD effort and achievements, the final paragraph reverts to the primary theme, ongoing process: "The GFMD remains a 'work in progress' – to be completed… to be continued".

While "change" is repeatedly emphasised (paragraphs 2, 3 [twice], 29 and 40), we are secured along the journey by the partner emphasis on "continuity" in the process (paragraphs 2, 4, 11, 29). The terms provide more than decorative relief and reassuring conventional juxtapositions. A journey suggests exploration and advance, and hence praise. In paragraph 2, for example, we find a great cache of praise terms: achievements, continuing, advancing, consultation, collaboration, changing. Some of the praise may be intended for the Philippines host, for the Brussels meeting in 2007 had concentrated on other things and did not bring the process as far as Manila claims to have done: "changing the way the world looks at migration and development" and, "more importantly…changing the way we deal with each other on [migration and development]" (paragraph 3).

3.3   Silences

Identifying which topics are excluded or downgraded, and assessing this, is part of a frame analysis. Especially given the 3,000-word length and considerable repetitions in the GFMD Chair's report, we are entitled to remark that several major issues and actors received little attention.

First, while traffickers and smugglers are in the frame, other villains or challenges receive little or no mention: human rights violations against migrants; poverty, unemployment and underemployment in the home country that push migrants to resort to irregular migration; the global systems that contribute to these pressures; and the inability of national police forces, as well as lack of political will, to prosecute transnational human trafficking and smuggling.

Second, paragraph 25 presents "growing crimes of smuggling and trafficking" as a threat to the migrant worker's capacity to "earn and support families back home". Left out are other villains such as the extremely high charges that money transfer companies impose on clients who send remittances home. Another villain could be the lack of training for migrants and their families in financial literacy, management and sustainable entrepreneurship, to help them to manage their remittances to uplift their quality of life (Villalba 2002).

Third, the role of civil society including non-governmental organisations is only touched on. Paragraph 18 states that civil society and NGOs have an important role to play in the "shared responsibility" of protecting the rights of migrant workers, but no detail is given. Paragraph 42 adds that as governments, "We need to continue working on our relations with…Civil Society. We are still feeling our way in this process…".

Fourth, the importance of institutionalising human rights treaties for the protection of migrant workers is mentioned once, in paragraph 19, but only in the form of referring to "some recommendations", calls and "suggestions" from some of the delegates, without any explanation, emphasis or endorsement.

3.4   'Development'

We could extend the analysis in many ways, for example through exact examination of how the key terms are used and in what contexts. Let us illustrate with one central term: "development". It appears 34 times (besides the uses implied in the name GFMD). Half of these uses are in conjunction with "migration", as in "migration and development" (paragraphs 2, 3, 13, 21, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 42), "empower[ing] migrants for development" (paragraphs 7, 23, 24), "impacts of migration on development" (paragraph 28), and "development friendly migration" (paragraph 29). The other uses confirm the treatment of migration as instrumental to development (e.g., "development benefits they can bring" – paragraph 7; "contribution to [economic] development" – paragraphs 16, 21, 23 [twice]; "development impacts" – paragraph 24; "development needs" – paragraph 26). In particular the implied definition of development is that human development is only a "facet of development" (paragraph 7); human development is not the encompassing

UNDP concept, but the narrower concept used in development banks: "human beings who are healthy, educated, employed, and able to care for their families" (paragraph 16), which is contrasted to "economic development", towards which it is considered instrumental (paragraph 16). Thus, overall, migration is discussed in terms of instrumentality towards economic development.

4   Is "The Mood…Changing"?

The Manila Forum Chair's report maintains the perspective presented in the Secretary-General's New York speech, without much erosion or accretion. It lacks Annan's initiating flair and authority, and reflects a subsequent stage of routinisation. Amongst its intended audiences, the report may achieve its desired effect. "Development" is a potent idea; few would oppose the benefits of "development". The needs that are then articulated (for particular policies, better research, partnerships and so forth) are plausible, but limited and thus potentially misleading.

How much will be generated by the GFMD process in the longer-term remains to be seen. This would be no surprise to Kofi Annan and his advisers. His 2006 speech concluded: "This High-level Dialogue will succeed to the extent that it ushers in an era of sustained, thoughtful consideration of international migration and development issues." It did not guarantee such an era. However, as we have seen, the proposed logic of his position was to start from where we are, from conceptions of "development" that remain dominated by economic measures and from a system of nation-states that guard their sovereignty, and to establish improved channels of regular and constructive communication that have some potential to bring evolution. The GFMD is part of this. As Rother suggests (2009a: 95): "…it provides a perspective, albeit a vague one, for a possible way out of the gridlock between the sending and receiving states of migrants".

At one level, the new track of meetings between government delegates is expected to gradually create its own chemistry, generate expectations, proposals and alliances and, establish a more constructive dynamic. "…as Peter Sutherland phrased it, it can be seen as an advancement when sending, receiving and transit countries of migration sit around the same table 'instead of yelling at each other'. Indeed, the fact that e.g. the Saudi Arabian government showed willingness to speak about migrants' rights at all should be seen as an, albeit small, progress" (Rother 2009a: 104).

At a second level, the GFMD meetings become a catalyst and focal point for much more. Non-governmental organisations target the meetings, commission research, initiate campaigns and grab some of the attention. That different NGOs pull in different directions on this stage can be seen not as a problem but as part of the "cunning of history": it creates pressure for information and innovation, change and creativity; and it ensures that positions are tested hard. At the Manila Forum,

[S]ome associations were pursuing an 'inside-outside' strategy: while taking part in the GFMD process, they also founded the Peoples' Global Action on Migration, Development and Human Rights (PGA), which then organised

workshops – as well as public rallies for migrants' rights. Migrant associations are active in many countries. However, the movement is split. The International Migrants' Alliance (IMA), which was founded in Hong Kong in 2008, opposes the PGA because it considers the GFMD unacceptable. The IMA argues that the GFMD treats people as commodities and promotes neoliberal policies (Rother 2009b: 333).

Rother concludes: "It will be worth observing and researching which of the approaches –'inside-outside' or 'outsiders by choice' – will turn out to be the more effective strategy in the long term" (2009a: 106). Perhaps the real point is that these approaches are both necessary and are complementary, and that the presence of the Forum catalyses them.

5   Conclusion

This paper had two sets of objectives: at the immediate level, to explore the proposed rationale of the Global Forum on Migration and Development, and, at a deeper level, to show the relevance of some accessible tools of discourse analysis for better understanding of and better participation in migration policy. Discourse analysis may be particularly germane for migration policy, for as Griffin (2007) noted, stereotypes, inconsistencies and mistrust are so prevalent there.

We took first Kofi Annan's speech in which he launched the Global Forum. Through use of analysis tables for comprehensive precise attention (Tables 1 and 2), we identified the speech's resources and themes, both those stated and those unstated but implied. We saw Annan's skilful use of appeals to governments' self-image as intelligent and constructive, his confidence- and responsibility-building allocation of Forum ownership to the governments, and his reassuring lending of his own authority and commitment of support from the UN system. We then organised the elements from the central part of the speech as an explicit logical system, in a synthesis table (Table 3). Annan's advocacy of the Forum was seen to rest on a series of claims: that migration must be managed; that the present position is one of entrenched disagreements and mistrust; that to proceed will require constructive structured communication; that the Global Forum can provide this and is a feasible way forward; that alternatives to the Forum are at present less feasible; and that the Forum will be not merely feasible but fruitful, through processes of increased mutual education and mutual acceptance. Expression in this synthetic form helps us to clarify content, assess cogency and compare criticisms and alternatives. While not always feasible for longer texts, the approach is helpful for key passages; and such use strengthens one's awareness and skills when tackling longer texts in ways that are more selective. In the case of the Global Forum, drawing out this series of claims, and starting to reflect on the families of assumptions that appear required for the Forum to achieve its intended effects, makes clear its considerable degree of optimism.

While Annan's position could be expressed as a logical system, some of the component meanings are not openly or emphatically stated in the speech and we draw them out fully only through the unusual form of reading done for the analysis table. Further, much of the work of persuasion is seen to be done

not through bald logic but through a combination of suggested causal linkages with effective use of pathos—mobilisation of relevant values (including here: respect for migrants, respect for nations, respect for open communication, and appealing to the self-respect of governments, in calling for them to exercise)—and ethos, concerning the reasons for giving trust and credence to the speaker (including respect for not just his experience, post, and organisational resources but his range of sympathies and understanding, his combination of boldness and finesse). Central was Annan's subtle alternation between "you" and "we" in addressing the assembled government representatives.

How does Annan's case for the Forum fare in practice? Does it outlast Annan's presence in an important facilitating role? We looked for evidence from the second GFMD conference. While it is too early to identify success, it might be early enough to sense failure. There were no signs of that yet in the Manila concluding report, which gave an upbeat restatement and emphatic elaboration of the proposed rationale of the Forum: that from a starting position of major divergence and mistrust between national governments in a world polity of nation states, a non-coercive forum of open communication can help to identify mutually beneficial good practices and in the process strengthen mutual trust and solidarity. Discourse analysis helped us clarify both the imaginative and emotional content of the claims for the Forum, with their talk of moving forward, passing on torches, and reaping harvests, the central hypothesis of gradual growth of collegiality, and the silences, the issues neglected.

Evidently, in the world of the GFMD, governments of labour-sending and receiving countries are mandated to be the managers in migration and development, and are not necessarily attuned to perspectives promoting the human rights and well-being of migrants. The GFMD is a Forum for "migro-crats", representing nations who meet not in a Habermasian ideal discourse situation but with very unequal powers. Migrants and civil society are involved at best in consultations and lobbying, but the Forum provides a valuable focal point for their mobilisation and for wider public attention. No one format or line of action will suffice, but the GFMD adds a space for "migro-crats" too to "see the world" and enrich their understanding, as well as be subject to public pressures.

Much more can be done in trying to understand, monitor and assess the Global Forum. We can examine its other meetings, relate it to the preceding and parallel other fora and events in the international migration policy scene, and compare their respective impacts (cf. MacDonald and Cholewinski 2007). We can employ also much more complex forms of discourse analysis. In this chapter we hope though at least to have illuminated central aspects of the speeches and, especially, to have illustrated some widely accessible and yet helpful ways to probe key texts in migration policymaking. In doing so, we aim to facilitate involvement from all actors in a more informed and creative fashion in these realms of meaning-making and world-making.

Appendix (Conejos 2008)

Final Conclusions and Recommendations of the Chair, Esteban B. Conejos, Jr., Undersecretary of Foreign Affairs for Migrant Workers' Affairs and Special Envoy to GFMD, Republic of the Philippines

Manila, 30 October 2008

1. We have reached that exciting point in our Global Forum meeting, where we can harvest the fruits of our labor together over the past 18 months, and share some thoughts about the future of the Forum. This may well be the end of the Manila meeting, but it is also the beginning of the next phase of the GFMD.

2. I see the two overriding achievements of our meeting this year as being CONTINUITY and CHANGE. Continuing and advancing the process of consultation and collaboration begun in Brussels last year, and changing the way the world looks at migration and development.

3. What we have achieved in the past two days is to move forward by a few more decisive steps an ongoing process that is changing our thinking and actions on migration and development, but more importantly, that is changing the way we deal with each other on these two complex, but interrelated, issues.

4. We have done this by building on the substantive achievements of the first meeting in Brussels and consolidating the structures that will assure continuity in this process.

Turning to the substance or the themes of the Forum

5. The Brussels meeting focused on the first two priorities identified by governments in a survey undertaken at the outset of the GFMD process – labor mobility, and remittances and other diaspora resources. The Manila meeting took up the next two priorities, namely, rights and security.

6. These formed the basis of the RT 1 discussions on protecting and empowering migrants, and the RT 2 discussions about the policy frameworks that could foster such protection and empowerment by better balancing facilitation and control of migration. The third thematic area, policy and institutional coherence, has been continued from one meeting to the next as it provides the underpinnings of roundtables 1 and 2.

7. What is different about the Manila meeting is the spotlight on the human face of migration, and the human development facet of development. The Philippine Government chose the theme 'Protecting and Empowering Migrants for Development' to shift the debate away from the usual rational arguments about economic benefits of migration, and back to the migrants and their families. The greatest wealth of any country is its people, and the development benefits they can bring to their communities and countries are only possible when they are properly protected and supported.

8. As a major country of origin, managing huge outflows and diasporas for some 30 years now, the Philippines was well positioned to take up this cause, on behalf of our own migrants and their families, but also to share with other governments our hard-won good practices and lessons learned over this time.

9. The informal nature of the Forum has allowed new friendships and partnerships to blossom between migrant sending and receiving countries, which can lead to better deals for migrants in the future. It also helps the messages of the Manila Forum to reverberate more widely among countries around the world.

10. The informality of the process – the fact that we are not aiming for Declarations or binding agreements, but rather at efficiencies and effectiveness on the ground that serve everyone's interests, particularly the migrants – has also helped us achieve more than may be possible in formal international debates about principles, norms and doctrine.

Outcomes of the Roundtables

11. But, having assured the continuity of the GFMD process, what exactly have we achieved with the Roundtable discussions? What are the real FRUITS of the Manila Forum? And where do we take them from here?

12. Our GFMD rapporteurs have shared with us a number of concrete outcomes resulting from the Roundtable sessions – studies, pilot programs, compendia of best practices, working groups – and these projects are important for connecting this meeting with last year's in Brussels and with next year's in Athens. They should bring fresh evidence and information to the Athens roundtable discussions.

13. But these outcomes tell us something more about the GFMD process. They tell us that we are beginning to achieve a certain consensus of understanding about the important connections between migration and development, where the gaps of knowledge are and how to fill those gaps. They take us one step closer toward common solutions to our common challenges. They bring us closer to a consensus on action.

14. In Roundtable 1 on 'Migration, Development and Human Rights' we sought to highlight the condition of migrants and their families, and show how their protection and empowerment could result in development not only of their person, but also of their countries of origin and destination.

15. We wanted to see how principles and doctrines of protection and empowerment were working on the ground – a 'bottom up' approach to policies that protect migrants' rights. We also identified elements of an enabling environment for empowering migrants and diaspora to mobilize their resources more effectively for development.

16. There was consensus in RT 1 that migrants' rights must be protected, not only because they contribute to economic development, but because it is their basic human right. Protecting the rights of migrants is not only the right thing to do, but also the smart thing to do. People are our biggest national asset. Economic development cannot occur without

human development, that is, without human beings who are healthy, educated, employed, and able to care for their families.

17. In this regard, the need to protect the rights of women migrant workers, child migrants, and migrants in irregular situations was emphasized.

18. Protecting the rights of migrants is a shared responsibility of governments of origin and host countries. There is a need for political will at both origin and destination to translate the concept of 'shared responsibility' into tangible policies and programs on protecting migrants' rights. Non-government actors like the civil society and private sector also play an important role in this.

19. Many delegates called for ratification of the 1990 International Convention, ILO Conventions and other core international human rights treaties. There were some recommendations to review the provisions of the 1990 Convention or devise mechanisms that would improve rates of ratification and implementation. There were also suggestions to look at complementary approaches in applying the principles of international treaties in practical and concrete ways.

20. The GFMD plays an important role in facilitating an exchange of good programs and policies in this regard. These best practices include the Philippines' comprehensive lifecycle approach to migration management, and the Abu Dhabi pilot project in deepening dialogue and cooperation, which may be replicated with possible assistance from other agencies and countries.

21. The GFMD could also be useful in disseminating information and the results of research on migration and development, which can inform governments about how to provide an enabling environment to empower migrants. It could help governments and other relevant stakeholders identify effective elements that encourage migrants to better contribute to development, such as strong reliable domestic institutions in countries of origin, secure legal status for migrants, and incentives and tools in both countries of origin and destination. The GFMD could likewise promote partnership between source and destination countries in facilitating diaspora's financial, technological, and social contributions in both countries.

22. The GFMD could consider other suggestions made to empower migrants, such as ensuring greater exercise of political rights by migrants, establishing a common lexicon or dictionary of terms to promote commonality of understanding, and the feasibility of issuing diaspora bonds in order to harness diaspora assets beyond merely their income flows.

23. In view of the foregoing, I propose that the GFMD considers setting up an ad hoc Working Group on Protecting and Empowering Migrants for Development, which could conduct a study on the actual links between protections for migrants and their capacity to contribute to development. It could also catalogue good practices in joint arrangements to protect and support migrants and the diaspora for their contribution to development. I invite you to join the governments of the Philippines, the

UAE, Belgium, and El Salvador – Co-Chairs of RT Sessions 1.1 and 1.2 – in forming this small and informal consultative mechanism.

24. In Roundtable 2 on 'Secure, Regular Migration Can Achieve Stronger Development Impacts', we discussed how the best frameworks to protect and empower migrants for development are likely to be regular migration programs that are accessible, transparent and non-discriminatory. This is particularly so when legality is enforced through strong, effective measures to reduce exploitative and abusive practices such as migrant smuggling and trafficking in persons.

25. Migration programs that better match skills with real jobs, and are affordable and accessible to migrants, offer the best incentives to migrate by choice rather than by necessity. Enforcement alone has not prevented or solved the growing crimes of smuggling or trafficking, which can disempower migrants and reduce their capacity to earn and support families back home. We looked at more comprehensive approaches that combine enforcement with facilitation in a more balanced way.

26. While we all agreed there is no 'one size fits all' approach to migration, there are some emerging 'good practices' such as circular migration and bilateral labor migration arrangements that take account of the labor market and development needs of both the country of origin and host country. We saw that where labor mobility is managed flexibly between countries it can also help workers increase their skills abroad and contribute to sectoral development back home.

27. Governments are already able to benefit from the Compendium of good practices in labor migration established by the Moroccan and Spanish Governments as a follow-up to the GFMD meeting in Brussels last year. And we hope to expand and elaborate on that further before the next meeting in Athens.

28. Some pilot circular migration programs that have also resulted from the Brussels meeting will also be followed up and evaluated for the lessons they may yield in the coming year or so. We hope to continue the work begun last year on how to engage the private sector better in lowering the costs of migration for migrants; and to undertake some overdue research on the costs and benefits, and impacts, of regular and irregular migration on development.

29. Coming back to my observations about 'continuity and change', all of these outcomes are connected to the labor mobility theme of the Brussels Forum and the protection an empowerment theme of Roundtable 1 this year. They point to new and smarter policy approaches that could foster more development-friendly migration, such as circular migration and market-based migration policies that could compete with smuggling and trafficking businesses.

30. They also link with the theme of partnership and cooperation in Roundtable 3. Thailand's suggestion that a meeting be held next year for heads of regional consultative processes to share information on migration and development-related activities and achievements is a welcome effort to link the aims of Roundtables 2 and 3, and to reinforce coherence within the GFMD substantive frame.

31. In Roundtable 3 on 'Policy and Institutional Coherence and Partnerships' we looked at the institutional and policy elements that need to be in place to achieve the aims of Roundtables 1 and 2 – the red thread of coherence runs through all other Migration and Development themes.

32. First, without a clear sense of those priority areas where strengthened data and research are required to assess the impacts of migration on development, and of development on migration, our arguments for policy and institutional coherence, joint approaches or partnerships are weak and will remain based on intuition and anecdote. We need more comparable data and must work towards common definitions and methodologies across countries. We need to improve our way of working, and promote new approaches to produce evidence-based information that can be of immediate use to policy makers in all regions.

33. The proposal arising from Roundtable 3.1 to set up an ad hoc Working Group on Data and Research on Migration and Development should thus be taken forward as part of our common effort to furnish this information. This working group can help us work towards more coherence and cooperation among key actors in these areas.

34. Second, the issue of policy, program and institutional coherence needs to be addressed both in terms of the concrete institutional and organizational arrangements governments are putting in place to achieve coherent policy making, and in the way these arrangements and resulting policies can subsequently be assessed and evaluated.

35. The second GFMD survey on policy coherence undertaken by Sweden, following the one undertaken for Brussels, has clearly demonstrated the political will and commitment by many governments to work towards such a coherent approach in addressing the migration and development nexus. The proposal of Roundtable session 3.2 to create an ad hoc Working Group on Policy and Institutional Coherence is well taken and should be pursued actively, including for the purpose of relying on the GFMD website to ensure on-going exchange among interested GFMD participating governments. This working group will also ensure that the critical issue of policy and institutional coherence remains on future GFMD agendas.

36. Third, we had a highly interesting debate on international cooperation, both within and across regions, including new initiatives for dialogue and cooperation at the inter-regional level. The effectiveness of regional and inter-regional consultations for development will be strengthened through an assessment of the impacts of such processes on country policies, and a pilot program will study the implementation of policy-relevant recommendations on migration and development. Governments also agreed to further strengthen the link between regional and inter-regional fora and our Global Forum in order to assure greater consistency and coherence of the positions they take in all these processes.

37. Our discussions in all Roundtables have confirmed again that coherence must stay on the agenda of the GFMD. The Global Forum can provide

the framework for periodic reviews of data, research, methodologies, evaluation techniques, pilot programs, how governments integrate migration into their national development strategies and so on.

Finally, to the structures and modalities of the GFMD

38.   Our work of the past 18 months, and your conclusions during the Future of the Forum meeting, have ensured that the right structures and modalities will be in place to take the GFMD process forward to the next meeting and beyond. As you know, we are honored to hand the GFMD torch onto Greece for 2009, and after that at least three other countries have indicated their interest in hosting the meeting.

How has Manila strengthened the structural foundations of the GFMD?

39.   We have continued to use the structural framework and the working methods set up in 2007 – the network of country focal points, the Roundtable teams of governments, the Chair's Taskforce, comprising national and international experts, the Friends of the Forum, a Steering Group; and to help 'govern' the process, the Troika of past, present and future Chairs.

40.   We have retained the practical and results-oriented roundtable approach, which in itself is a change from the usual talk-fests of international conferences on these issues. Countries at every point on the migration continuum – at origin, transit and destination – have cooperated in teams to prepare the roundtable discussions together, explore ideas and good and bad practices together, and agree on some new policy approaches and partnerships that can benefit everyone, not just one side of the emigration/immigration equation.

The road ahead

41.   Out of our Future of the Forum deliberations, most governments have agreed to add to the existing structural framework a light Support Unit to assist future Chairs-in-Office with the daily administrative management of this fast-growing process.

42.   We have also considered other governance and strategic questions deemed important for the future of our Forum, such as its linkages with the UN, its relationship with the Global Migration Group (or GMG) and with Civil Society generally, future funding sources and responsibility for follow-up activities. Most of us agree that the GFMD is now firmly established as an ongoing government-led, non donor-driven process with links to the UN, particularly through the Secretary General's Special Representative for Migration and Development. We need to continue working on our relations with the GMG and Civil Society. We are still feeling our way in this process, and new questions arise as the process grows, but also as global circumstances change.

43.   The current global financial crisis, for example, is a sober reminder to us of the importance of good planning and coordination within and

between governments at any time. But sound policies and institutional coherence are also the best buffers against the shocks of such a global crisis for the migrants, their families and home economies.

44. How we find the right answers to all the lingering and newly emerging questions in the future will determine the continuing relevance and usefulness of the process. It will be incumbent upon my successors to carry the suggestions you have made in respect of these crucial issues to a fruitful conclusion.

45. I can assure you that the Philippine government is prepared to fully play its future role as Troika member and to assist the in-coming Greek Chair whenever possible, notably in the follow-up to the conclusions reached here in Manila. The Government of the Philippines will hand the GFMD torch over to the Greek Government on 15 December 2008.

46. We have gained much ground in Manila, but there is still more to be d one.

47. The GFMD remains a 'work in progress' – to be completed … to be continued….

References

ABS-CBN News Network (2008) 'Esteban Conejos: We will shine the spotlight on the human face of migration'. <http://www.abs-cbnnews.com/features/10/14/08/ esteban-conejos-we-will-shine-spotlight-human-face-migration> [Accessed 30 March 2009]

Annan, Kofi (2006) 'UN Secretary-General's address to the UN high-level dialogue on migration and development, New York, 14 September 2006'. <http://www.un.org/migration/sg-speech.html> [Accessed 16 February 2009]

Conejos, Esteban (2008). 'Final Conclusions and Recommendations of the Chair', GFMD Manila, http://www.gfmd.org/en/gfmd-documents-library/cat_view/933-manila-gfmd-2008/984-report-of-the-proceedings.html. [Accessed 30 March 2009]

Gasper, Des (2004) 'Studying Aid: Some Methods', in J. Gould and H.S. Marcussen (eds.), *Ethnographies of Aid – Exploring development texts and encounters*, International Development Studies, Roskilde University, Denmark, 45-92.

Gasper, Des (2002) 'Fashion, Learning and Values in Public Management: Reflections on South African and international experience', *Africa Development*, 27 (3), 17-47.

Gasper, Des (2000) 'Structures and Meanings – A Way to Introduce Argumentation Analysis in Policy Studies Education', *Africanus*, 30 (1), 49-72.

GFMD, Global Forum on Migration and Development (2008a): <http://government.gfmd2008.org/forum_info/objectives.html> [Accessed 30 March 2009]

GFMD, Global Forum on Migration and Development (2008b) 'Second Global Forum on Migration and Development formally opens'. Press release. <http://government.gfmd2008.org/news/press-releases/second-global-forum-on-migration-and-development-formally-opens.html> [Accessed 30 March 2009]

Griffin, Gabriele (2007) 'The Uses of Discourse Analysis in the Study of Gender and Migration'.
<http://www.york.ac.uk/res/researchintegration/Integrative_Research_Methods/Griffin%20Discourse%20Analysis%20April%202007.pdf> [Accessed 6 November 2009]

Kornprobst, Markus (ed.) (2008) *Metaphors of Globalization: Mirrors, magicians and mutinies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

MFA, Migrant Forum in Asia (2009) *Mobilizing migrant community and civil society voices for the second Global Forum on Migration and Development: The MFA Experience*, Quezon City, Philippines: MFA.

MFA, Migrant Forum in Asia (2007) *UN High-Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development: A Report Prepared by Migrant Forum in Asia*, Quezon City, Philippines: MFA.

MPI, Migration Policy Institute (2006) 'Top 10 Migration Issues of 2006' [online], *Migration Information Source*.
<http://www.migrationinformation.org/Feature/display.cfm?id=544> [Accessed 25 February 2009].

Rein, Martin and Donald Schön (1977) 'Problem-Setting in Policy Research', in C. Weiss (ed.), *Using Social Research in Policy-Making*, Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 235-251.

Rother, Stefan (2009a) '"Inside-Outside" or "Outsiders by choice"? Civil society strategies towards the 2nd Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) in Manila'. *Asien Aktuell*, 111 (April 2009), 95-107.

Rother, Stefan (2009b) 'The allure of non-binding talks', *Development and Cooperation (D+C),* 36 (9), 331-3.

Schön, Donald (1993) 'Generative metaphor: A perspective on problem-setting in social policy', in A. Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schön, Donald and Martin Rein (1994) *Frame reflection: Toward the resolution of intractable policy controversies*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Villalba, Maria Angela (2002) Philippines: Good practices for the protection of Filipino women migrant workers in vulnerable jobs. Geneva: International Labor Office.