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ABSTRACT

The objective of this article is to analyze, from a geopolitical perspective, the extent to which African migratory movements can influence Brazil. Therefore, it is structured as follows: initially the evolution of migratory movements in Africa and the objective of this article are presented. Next, the taxonomy employed is defined, as well as the limits of this investigation. In the next section, are presented the theoretical assumptions that anchor the conceptual effort of this work, emphasizing the evolution of Brazilian geopolitical thinking and the strategic importance of the African continent for Brazil nowadays. Subsequently, the evolution of forced migratory movements in the twentieth century is presented, as well as the engagement of the International System and Brazil in this theme. In the last section, an analysis focused on the occurrence of this phenomenon in Africa and its reflexes on Brazil is carried out.
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INTRODUCTION

The first signs of human mobility date back to the origin of the planet. On the African continent, there are records that man’s first movements occurred in Early Stone Age (HUGOT; BRUGGMANN, 1976), around three million years before the Christian era (B.C.). During this period, migratory movements in Africa were predominantly caused by issues related to the security of local tribes and the search for food on land that would allow the practice of agriculture (ADEPOJU, 2009). Until the 13th century, this dynamic did not present major changes, marked only by the realization of detachments of small groups inside the African continent.

In the 13th century, this practice acquired a different form and became notable for the mobility caused, above all, by the beginning of the use of African population as slave labor by the European peoples. Registering small variations of numerical, geographic and temporal order, African migratory movements maintained this structure until the Berlin Conference, at the end of the 19th century, a political event that caused a new rearrangement of forces on the world strategy board and generated immediate reflexes in the African continent (MARQUES, 1989).

Considering the Russian Revolution, the 1st World War (WW) and the 2nd WW in the 20th century, events that generated harmful side effects for the population, we observe that society changed its position and became more effectively involved in issues related to forced migration movements. In summary, this transformation began with the Russian Revolution and with the 1st WW, because this events caused the forced displacement of almost 5 million people. Subsequently, this issue reached another level in the International System with the advent of the 2nd WW and the 40 million refugees resulted from this conflict (HOBSBAWN, 1995).

The period that followed after the 2nd WW was marked by the decline of European countries in the international context, in the same way as the protagonism of two other countries was witnessed: the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This period, known as the Cold War, is characterized by an unprecedented rivalry in history, when Americans and Soviets fought a duel in the most varied fields of power. In this reality and because of the Cold War, the African continent inaugurated a process characterized by the independence of many countries, which were previously considered European colonies and which, since the second half of the 20th century, began to be recognized.
as independent states by the International System (OLIVEIRA, 2009). However, what in the first instance could be a solution was only a failed attempt unfolding a significant degradation of the fragile institutions of the newly created African states. Under the most varied motivations, the independence process brought with it the emergence of numerous conflicts, producing new forced migratory movements on the continent and further destabilizing the structure of the already weakened African countries (AKOKPARI, 2016).

Nevertheless, the end of the Cold War revealed an even more unstable scenario in Africa and its effects could be seen in the forced human mobility that occurred in the continent during this period. The end of the state apparatus provided to African countries by the two superpowers of that time, the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, marginalized the continent in the process of globalization that was beginning and became one of the great responsible for the occurrence of new conflicts on the planet, concentrated predominantly on African territory (AYOOB, 1995). One of the most emblematic cases of this complexity is the genocide that took place in Rwanda in 1994, characterized by the massacre of Tutsis and Hutus moderated by Hutu extremists, generating a forced displacement of more than one million people in the country. As most of this population moved to the province of Kivu in the Democratic Republic of Congo, a new crisis broke out between the population of Rwanda and the Congolese population there, disestablishing the Democratic Republic of Congo in 1998. This weakened situation led to new forced migratory movements, involving more than two million people, who moved to neighboring countries, creating more instability for the entire region.

At the beginning of the 21st century, this panorama is still present on the African continent. In recent years, this issue has acquired more space and importance on the international agenda, reflecting a world of singular complexity. Currently, there is a large volume of reports and articles produced by the media addressing the cases of Syria, Iraq and Venezuela. However, it was in Africa that data about forced migration reached alarming levels in 2017. In order to have a more detailed idea of this phenomenon, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) reported that forced human mobility involved 65.6 million people around the world in 2017, 22 million of whom belonged to Africa (UN, 2018).
Given the seriousness of this problem, the growing engagement of the international community in this issue and considering that Africa is part of the Brazilian strategic environment (PND, 2016); the proposal of this research is to analyze, under the strategic lens, how African migratory movements can influence Brazil. In order to propose a systematization of the study, this article is structured as follows: initially we present the evolution of migratory movements that occurred in Africa and the objective of the research. Next, the taxonomy employed is defined, as well as the limits of this investigation. In the next section, we present the theoretical assumptions that anchor the conceptual effort of this work. Subsequently, we discuss the engagement of the International System and Brazil in the theme involving forced migration movements. In the last section, an analysis focused on the occurrence of this phenomenon in Africa and the reflections for Brazil is performed.

**METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

This research has qualitative intent, seeking the triangulation (DENZIN; LINCOLN, 2005) of sources, data and perspectives. In the scope of this article, the data is the set that records the forced migration occurred in Africa during 2017, with emphasis on the selection of countries with greater relevance in the relationship Brazil-Africa, elements analyzed based on Geopolitics. We believe that using this procedure it was possible to obtain a more comprehensive view about the theme, without losing sight of the need to reach more concrete and reliable results about the occurrence of this phenomenon in African continent (ZAPELLINI; FEUERSCHUTTE, 2015).

Regarding the data about forced migration, we used numbers related only to the place of origin of this population, disregarding the destination regions in the calculation. The information pertinent to forced migration was obtained from reports available at the UNHCR website. We selected 27 of the 54 African countries, countries that presented the highest numbers of forced migration in the year under review. With regard to the delimitation, this research carried out two types of delimitation: conceptual and temporal. In the conceptual part, this research focused on data related to all people who were subjected, in some way, to some type of forced migration. In the temporal delimitation, we extracted and analyzed the data exposed in this dynamic during 2017.
THE AFRICAN CONTINENT AND THE BRAZILIAN GEO-POLITICS

This section aims to present the theoretical assumptions that provide the conceptual lens for this research. In view of the common features that unite Brazilians and Africans (population, geography and process of historical evolution), geopolitics is proposed as the science that will help in the most appropriate interpretation about the occurrence of forced migratory movements occurred in Africa and its effects in Brazil. For this purpose, the discussion is structured in two subsections, namely: 1) Brazilian geopolitical thought; and 2) the role that Africa plays in Brazilian geopolitics.

BRAZILIAN GEOPOLITICAL THINKING

The essentially Brazilian geopolitics was born in the second half of the 19th century. Historical episodes such as the Proclamation of the Republic, Guerra de Canudos and the Federalist Revolution had an enormous influence on Brazilian geopolitical thought. In view of these events, the Brazilian geopolitics of that period was notable for formulating ideas that would help in the project of national integration. The contribution made by the Praia Vermelha School to national geopolitics should be highlighted. Playing an important role with the intellectual elites at the end of the 19th century, it became an important strategic vector and diffuser pole of the positivism propagated by Benjamin Constant, fundamental to sediment the necessary bases for the formulation of the great Brazilian strategy, triggered in the early 20th century (MATTOS, 2011).

During the first half of the 20th century, Brazil continued to be unstable, registering the occurrence of numerous internal revolts in its territory, such as the Guerra do Contestado, the Coluna Prestes and the Intentona Comunista. Again, Brazilian geopolitical thought was not immune to what was happening in the country and produced concepts aimed at achieving effective national integration, which was considered incipient in that moment. Willing to achieve concrete sovereignty in its territory, the Brazilian government relied on the ideas formulated by the Brazilian geopolitics of that time and implemented a series of strategic actions aimed at integrating the Brazilian space (MATTOS, 2011). An example of
this is the border policy unleashed during this period, which, included in the list of public policies of that time, made it possible to carry out various diplomatic actions with the purpose of demarcating and legitimizing the country’s borders within the International System. Another more daring example is the re-equipment of the Brazilian Navy at the beginning of the 20th century, a measure that was adopted in a broader strategic context, in which the main objective was to obtain regional leadership and exercise dominance over the South Atlantic (ALSINA JÚNIOR, 2015).

The 2nd WW and the consequent Brazilian participation in this conflict were determinant to constitute the basis of the Brazilian geopolitical thinking practiced from the second half of the 20th century. Nevertheless, Brazil continued its process of national integration, with several current actions, such as the creation of the city of Brasilia, the creation of the Zona Franca de Manaus and the adoption of a conciliatory foreign policy based on dialogue, an attitude that stabilized the region and did not reactivate old border problems with its neighbors in South America.

This environment generated the ideal conditions for the country’s international projection. Thus, Brazilian geopolitical thought adopted at the end of the 20th century evolved and was guided by the formulation of ideas aimed at obtaining effective regional leadership and that were materialized by various actions perpetrated by the country on the globe, such as: 1) Brazil was the first country to recognize Angola’s independence. 2) Brazil’s participation in the Community of Portuguese-Speaking Countries (Comunidade dos Países de Língua Portuguesa - CPLP). 3) Brazil’s participation in the South Atlantic Peace and Cooperation Zone (ZOPACAS). 4) Greater participation of Brazil in peace operations under the aegis of the UN, with great incidence in African countries (ABDENUR; NETO, 2014).

Nowadays, Brazilian geopolitical thinking is guided by the formulation of concepts that seek to highlight the importance of Brazil in the international scenario. The public policies recently adopted by the country seek to achieve two clear objectives: 1) to consolidate Brazil’s position as a regional leader; 2) to raise the country’s status as a global power. Regarding regional leadership, this was materialized by the inclusion of Africa, the South Atlantic and South America in Brazil’s main defense documents: National Defense Policy (Política Nacional de Defesa - PND), National Defense Strategy (Estratégia Nacional de Defesa - END) and National Defense White Book (Livro Branco de Defesa Nacional - LBDN).
Considering as priority regions for the country, since they are part of the Brazilian strategic environment (ABDENUR; NETO, 2014). With regard to Brazil’s desire to become a global player, Flemes (2010) consider that the efforts made by the country from the beginning of the 21st century with a view to occupying a permanent seat on the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) and the prominent positions occupied by Brazil in the various international forums in recent years materialize the Brazilian ambition in this plea.

In summary, Brazilian geopolitical thinking is originated in the second half of the 19th century and, from that time, it was directly correlated with the conjuncture of the country in this trajectory. Brazilian geopolitical thinking has evolved based on two variables: 1) the internal scenario; and 2) challenges assumed by the country in the International System. The internal conflicts occurred in Brazilian history have initially shaped national geopolitical thinking. The combination of an unstable internal scenario and weak borders at the end of the 19th century made national integration a priority theme in Brazilian geopolitics, an aspect that resulted in the implementation of public policies aimed at integrating the national territory. Due to Brazil’s natural vocation to exercise leadership on the planet, the evolution of this thought occurred according to the challenges assumed by the country in the International System, starting with relevant participation in the continent until reaching regional consolidation and taking the first steps to obtain the status of global power, aspects contextualized by the country’s participation in the CPLP, ZOPACAS, BRICS, among other equally important initiatives.

THE ROLE OF AFRICA IN BRAZILIAN GEOPOLITICS

Currently, Brazilian geopolitical thinking has as one of its purposes to consolidate the regional leadership of Brazil. The African continent, as part of Brazil’s strategic environment, occupies a central place in this dynamic, contributing to the objective proposed by the national geopolitics. In addition to this aspect, Brazilians and Africans have characteristics in common, based predominantly on the cultural and historical ties that connect the two peoples, with emphasis on the following: 1) Brazilian history is practically confused with African history. 2) Brazilians and Africans have strong cultural and human traits in common. 3) The largest black population outside Africa lives in Brazil (PEREIRA; VISENTINI, 2016).
In addition to these similarities, Castro (1981) concludes that the most important aspect between Brazilians and Africans is the South Atlantic, because he understands that it is the main link between the two countries, as it establishes a direct link between Brazil and the west African coast, a characteristic that brings Brazilians and Africans together. This fact gives the South Atlantic a strategic position and a prominent role in Brazil-Africa relations.

Abdenur and Neto analyze the South Atlantic from another perspective, and demonstrate that since the end of the Cold War the strategic importance of the South Atlantic has increased in Brazilian geopolitics and justify this affirmation based on three main axes: 1) The global crisis that occurred during the first and most of the second decade of the 21st century has highlighted the need for Brazil to diversify its trade relations, increasing the importance of the role of Africa in this perspective. 2) The regional leadership of Brazil necessarily involves maintaining and increasing relations with the countries located on the west African coast. 3) The recent discovery of mineral resources in Brazil, and in some African countries located in the South Atlantic, raised the strategic importance of the South Atlantic, generating a direct impact on Brazil-Africa relations (ABDENUR; NETO, 2014).

Seeking a pragmatic understanding of the role played by the South Atlantic in Brazilian geopolitics, Mattos (2011) concludes that the country’s status as a regional power requires the consolidation and expansion of Brazil in the South Atlantic, focusing on the following aspects: 1) economic development of the countries belonging to the South Atlantic. 2) Security of the area covered by the South Atlantic. 3) Establishment of political relations among the countries of this region.

Costa mentions, about the strategic importance of this region, that the aspect that provides the greatest geopolitical value to the South Atlantic lies on the edges of this ocean, particularly because of the existence of oil and gas deposits on the coast of countries such as Brazil, Angola and Nigeria and highlights this assertion inferring that this location is responsible for about 20% of world oil production. Added to this is the recent discovery of oil deposits in the pre-salt layer of the Brazilian coast at the beginning of the 21st century, increasing the strategic value of the region. These facts legitimize the concern and strategic actions taken by Brazilians and Africans in the South Atlantic (COSTA, 2014).

According to this importance, at the beginning of the 21st century,
the emergence of several non-state actors in the world with “status” of States and the growing importance of issues on the international agenda such as terrorism, the environment, drug trafficking, the economy, refugees, peace operations, population growth, among others, were considered. Because of this new structure, the insertion of the South Atlantic into the highest level of defense documents in the country was verified. As an example, the PND simply describes and infers that the priority area for Brazilian interests is Brazil’s strategic environment, composed of the South Atlantic, Antarctica and the countries of the West African coast (PND, 2016). The LBDN, on the other hand, provides more details about this importance and reports that, because Brazil is the country with the largest coastline in the Atlantic Ocean, it is required to devote special attention to promoting peace in the South Atlantic (LBDN, 2016).

Thus, the literature shows that there is no consensus about the geographical area comprising the South Atlantic. Therefore, this research will adopt the proposal defined by Meira Mattos, which defines this region as a space delimited to the north by a line that links Natal city, in Brazil, to Dakar city, in Senegal. To the east, it is bounded by the countries of the west African coast that are bathed by the Atlantic Ocean and are located in south of Dakar city. To the south, it is bounded by Atlantic Ocean and to the west, the limit is defined by the countries of South America that are bathed by the Atlantic Ocean and are located south of the city of Natal. Figure 1 shows what was previously described:

**Figure 1: Limits of South Atlantic**

![Limits of South Atlantic](image)

Source: Own elaboration based on Meira Mattos, 2011.
The figure above shows us that the equatorial line, which conceptually divides the planet into the northern and southern hemispheres, was not used to delimit the north of the South Atlantic. In fact, an imaginary line that connects Natal city to the Dakar city, more precisely at the point where the South Atlantic is strangled, defines the northern limit. In order to demonstrate the strategic importance of this space, the routes of passage from the South Atlantic to other oceans were also evidenced: 1) Route of the cable to the Indian Ocean; and 2) Route of the South Cone to the Pacific Ocean. Based on these aspects, we conclude that the African countries located in this region has strategic importance for Brazil, as they share with the Brazilians a “condominium” called South Atlantic, and should receive the highest priority in the Brazilian political agenda.

FORCED HUMAN MOBILITY

The 20th century inaugurated a period with a gradual change in society’s posture in relation to forced migratory movements. Trying to understand how this transformation occurred, this section revisits the way in which the International System and Brazil dealt with this theme during the 20th century. Therefore, it is structured in two subsections: 1) the International System and forced human mobility; and 2) Brazil and forced human mobility.

THE INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM AND FORCED HUMAN MOBILITY

The society, traumatized by the side effects generated by the 1st WW on the population, decided to change its stance regarding issues related to forced migration movements and began to adopt a more proactive attitude on this kind of issues, which resulted in the creation of the League of Nations in 1919 (PINHEIRO DA CUNHA; MIGON; VAZ, 2014). As a direct consequence of this transformation, in 1921 the situation of refuge began to be considered as an international legal system in the League of Nations (ANDRADE, 1997), giving more emphasis and importance to this issue within the International System. However, this institution did not achieve the expected success and failed to prevent the 2nd WW, which caused even more harmful effects than the previous one. This fact
generated more pressure from society for the creation of a supranational institution that was effectively capable of maintaining acceptable levels for the maintenance of peace throughout the world and had legitimacy to deliberate on this issue with the population affected by the 2nd WW.

Thus, in 1945, the League of Nations was replaced by the United Nations (UN), when the Charter of Nations was also signed (PINHEIRO DA CUNHA; MIGON; VAZ, 2014), a document that became the epistemological basis for several projects launched in the International System to address forced migration movements (SOARES, 2011). Therefore, in the second half of the 20th century there was a greater involvement of the scientific community in this theme, providing significant contributions to society, such as the broadening of the concept of security, with a focus on human life, the search and incessant surveillance of human rights and the protection of people in general (KENKEL, 2013).

After these events, society has had an increasing participation in issues related to forced human mobility (CHRISTIE, 2018), causing the emergence of initiatives of all kinds, ranging from the development of legal instruments to the creation of organizations to take care, exclusively, of forced migration movements. Among the various projects executed, the following stand out: 1) The creation of the International Refugee Organization (IRO) in 1946. 2) The promulgation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948. 3) The Convention about the Status of Refugees in 1951. 4) The conception of the UNHCR in 1951. 6) The advent of the Protocol on the Statute of Refugees in 1967. 7) The Convention of the African Union Organization in 1969. 8) The Declaration of Cartagena about Refugees in 1984 (SOARES, 2011). In this list of initiatives, it is important to highlight the role of the UNHCR, a United Nations’ organization that has been in operation until the present time, deliberating on this issue, conferring legality and legitimacy on its actions (COSTA; SCWINN, 2016).

Although society understands forced migration movements in a general way, focusing its attention especially on refugees, the forced human mobility that occurs nowadays is a complex social phenomenon. It involves a wide variety of people, from refugees, asylum seekers, to thousands of individuals without international protection (SILVA; BÓGUS; SILVA, 2017). Considering this reality, the United Nations has defined as worrying population all persons involved in forced migration movements. As this universe comprises an extensive diversity of individuals, the UN has divided the worrying population into seven subgroups, defined as follows:
1) refugees; 2) asylum seekers; 3) internal displaced persons; 4) return of refugees; 5) return of internally displaced persons; 6) stateless persons; and 7) other people in similar situations (UN, 2018). Following, Table 1 presents the types of people involved in forced migration movements, from the perspective of UN:

**Table 1: The worrying population according to the UN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>População Preocupante</th>
<th>Subgrupos da População Preocupante</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) Refugiados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Requerentes de Asilo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Deslocados Internos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Retorno de Refugiados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5) Retorno de Deslocados Internos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6) Apátridas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7) Outras pessoas em situação semelhante</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own elaboration, based on UNHCR, 2018.

Trying to understand the typology listed in Table 1, UNHCR believes that refugees are nothing more than people who are outside their country of origin and who are under the 1951 Convention about Refugees and its 1967 protocol, having the right to receive state assistance in the places of destination. In the specific case of the African continent, the 1969 Convention of the Organization of the African Union is also added. In relation to asylum seekers, the UNHCR defines them as people who are outside their country of origin and who have asked for refuge in the host country, but do not yet have the status of refugee. With regard to internally displaced persons, UNHCR conceptualizes them as individuals who were forced to leave their homes and who are still in their countries of origin. Regarding returned refugees, UNHCR clarifies that they are those who were once considered refugees, but who have spontaneously returned to their countries of origin and who, in some way, are not yet fully integrated into the local community. Regarding to returning IDPs, UNHCR stresses that these individuals are among those who were considered internal displaced returning persons and who have already returned to their areas of origin but are not yet settled with the local community. The stateless
persons are defined by international law as persons who are not considered nationals by any of the States involved, they have no nationality. Moreover, the other individuals in a similar situation, UNHCR understands they are people who are part of a universe that does not necessarily fall into any of the above groups, but who, because they are in similar situations, receive assistance from the institution (UN, 2018).

From what has been exposed, since the 20th century, the society, using supranational institutions, demonstrated a growing engagement with this theme and that the forced human mobility that occurs today is a complex phenomenon, composed of a broad and multifaceted universe of people. Refugees are only part of the problem, because they represent only one of the seven categories of people who were subjected to the process of forced migration.

BRAZIL AND FORCED HUMAN MOBILITY

Brazil’s participation in issues related to forced migratory movements from the 20th century was directly related to the Brazilian geopolitical thinking in each time, which in turn was always based on two variables: 1) internal scenario; and 2) challenges assumed by the country in the International System.

Thus, the Brazilian government’s involvement in this issue began with the immigration policy unleashed by the Vargas government in the 1930s. Considering the rarefied territorial occupation of the country at the beginning of the 20th century, Getúlio Vargas felt the need to fill the immense demographic gaps existing in Brazil. Then, he adopted an immigration policy that attracted tens of thousands of European workers to the country, since it did not distinguish or discriminate between immigrants and refugees (KOIFMAN, 2012). Therefore, the treatment given by Brazil to refugees was similar to the treatment given to immigrants.

The scenario that emerged after the end of the 2nd WW generated the ideal conditions for Brazil to consolidate its regional leadership and take the first steps to become a global player. Thus, the country participated in several proposals elaborated by the international community to deal with the issue of forced migratory movements from this period, because the refuge was not only a humanitarian issue, but above all a political and economic instrument (ANDRADE, MARCOLINI; 2002). The following actions are examples of these participations: 1) in 1958, the country joined
the Executive Council of the UNHCR; 2) in 1960, the Brazilian government adhered to the dictates of the Convention held in 1951; and 3) in 1972, Brazil promulgated in its territory the Protocol drafted in 1967.

During the 1980s, the way that Brazil dealt with forced migratory movements mandatorily is related to a fact that occurred outside the Brazilian border limits. This is the Cartagena Declaration, signed in 1984, which generated reflections in the country. Not by coincidence, the Brazilian government carried out actions that aimed to regulate the life of the foreign population that lived illegally in the country in this period (BARRETO, 2010). An example of these actions is Resolution No. 17/1987 that, among the various points listed, had one of them considering foreigners who were in an irregular situation in the country as “temporary foreigners”, not defining them as refugees. Another example is the elaboration of the Federal Constitution of 1988, establishing important themes in its content, such as the prevalence of human rights and the granting of political asylum as guiding the Brazilian foreign policy (MOREIRA, 2017).

This theme raised another level in the country because of the end of the Cold War, which enabled the UN to play a leading role on the international scene (RODRIGUES, MIGON; 2017), which also generated consequences on Brazilian territory, as it found a country willing to take more robust steps to become a global player. Not coincidentally, Brazilian government wrote with UNHCR the Law No. 9.474/1997, considered an international reference for this kind of issue and that is in force in the country (MOREIRA, 2017).

According to what has been demonstrated, the beginning of Brazil’s engagement in issues related to forced migration movements occurred in the 1930s and was initially motivated by internal factors, particularly by the existence of demographic gaps in the country at that time. Over the years, the participation of the Brazilian government in this issue has been growing motivated either by internal issues or by external issues. It is important to highlight the fact that the central aspect that guided the actions perpetrated by the country since 1930 was of a geopolitical character, since it reconciled the internal Brazilian reality with the strategic interests of the country.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents data about forced migration movements in
Africa in 2017 and seeks to analyze them in light of Brazilian geopolitics. As the purpose of this work is to obtain a panorama that shows more broadly the reality of this occurrence, this research will analyze the data related to the worrying population, for understanding that this category encompasses the group of people who were forced to migrate.

Thus, it is confirmed that about twenty-two million people were subjected to forced migration all over Africa in 2017. This research analyzed the data related to the twenty-seven countries that presented the highest numbers of forced migration movements in Africa in that same year, a sample of 50% of African countries, considering the number of States recognized by the UN in the African continent. Next, the chart 2 presents the ranking of the 27 African countries that presented the largest data relative to the origin of the warring population in 2017:

Table 2: Ranking of the worrying population in Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>4,080,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>1,911,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>3,039,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>2,781,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>2,640,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>Republic of Central Africa</td>
<td>1,170,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>771,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>342,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>315,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>306,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>Republic of the Comoros</td>
<td>249,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>235,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>192,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>168,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>161,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>150,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th</td>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>94,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th</td>
<td>Costa do Marfil</td>
<td>67,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>61,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th</td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>41,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>40,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>42,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>31,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th</td>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>34,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th</td>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>33,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26th</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>28,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27th</td>
<td>Cote d’Ivoire</td>
<td>27,492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own elaboration with UNHCR data

Table 2 shows that the number of individuals who were subjected to forced mobility in these States was 21,841,031 (twenty-one million, eight
hundred and forty-one thousand and thirty-one) in 2017. In other words, these countries were responsible for about one third (1/3) of all people who were involved in the forced migration movements that occurred in the world in 2017, concentrating around 99% of the worrying African population. With these numbers, is possible to infer that these countries represent a faithful portrait of the occurrence of this event in Africa:

Figure 2: Spatial distribution of the Worrying Population in Africa

The proposal of this work is to make a strategic analysis. Therefore, it is necessary to verify this occurrence from a geopolitical perspective. Since Brazilian geopolitics proposes that among all African countries, those located in the South Atlantic deserve more attention, it is necessary to verify this phenomenon under a strategic lens. The Figure 3 shows the map of the African continent with the countries located in the South Atlantic and which are included in the group of 27 countries presenting the highest numbers of worrying population in 2017:
Figure 3: Worrying Population versus Strategic Countries for Brazil

The Figure 3 shows that, among the African countries with the highest numbers of worrying population in 2017, 10 are located in the South Atlantic, 37% of these States are located in a region considered a priority for Brazil, an aspect that directly reflects the issues related to the country’s security and defense. Next, the table below details these data:

Table 3: Worrying Population versus Strategic Countries for Brazil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Posição</th>
<th>Nome do País</th>
<th>População Preocupante</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1°</td>
<td>República Democrática do Congo</td>
<td>4.680.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2°</td>
<td>Nigéria</td>
<td>2.784.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3°</td>
<td>República dos Camarões</td>
<td>249.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4°</td>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>98.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5°</td>
<td>Costa do Marfim</td>
<td>67.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6°</td>
<td>Guiné</td>
<td>45.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7°</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>42.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8°</td>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>34.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9°</td>
<td>Guímbia</td>
<td>33.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10°</td>
<td>Gana</td>
<td>28.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.070.624</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own elaboration, with data from UNHCR, 2018.
The table above shows us that the worrying population of these States exceeded eight million people in 2017. These numbers show that these countries were responsible for about 37% of the population involved in forced migration movements in Africa, representing around 12.5% of the world’s worrying population. In addition, table 3 reveals the existence of other subgroups, showing that there are countries that presented data related to the worrying population reaching millions. There are also states that obtained numbers relative to the worrying population of hundreds of thousands; in addition, there is also a significant group of countries that recorded numbers of tens of thousands of worrying population.

The group of States presented in Table 3 is composed of three sub-groups. The first sub-group is composed of countries that presented numbers of worrying population in 2017 in millions: the Democratic Republic of Congo and Nigeria. Together, the two countries had a worrying population exceeding the mark of 07 million people in 2017, being responsible for 92.6% of the people subjected to forced migration in African countries located in the South Atlantic. Considering these facts, we observe this phenomenon from a geopolitical perspective:

**Figure 4: Worrying population of the first subgroup of countries**

Source: Own elaboration, with data from UNHCR, 2018.
These numbers indicate that the two States should receive more attention from Brazil and should be priority to the country in issues related to security and defense in the African continent and in the South Atlantic. The possibility of part of this worrying population going to Brazil, or even part of this contingent using the South Atlantic as a route to its destination is high, which will bring immediate consequences for the security of the region and, in particular, for Brazil.

The Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) raises a paradoxical question. While the DRC registered a worrying population around 4 million in 2017 and has latitudes closer to those recorded in Brazil, on the other hand its narrow coastline does not present geographical characteristics capable of attracting the flow of the worrying population, which indicates that most of this contingent should be directed to neighboring countries. For this reason, these aspects do not emphatically accredit the DRC as being a higher priority than Nigeria.

Nigeria is situated further north, has a population of 190 million and a high birth rate, which indicates strong potential for population growth in the coming years. The existence of large oil fields on the Nigerian coast associated with the existence of several Islamic extremist groups in its territory, such as Boko Haram, place the Nigerian case in a geopolitical equation of difficult resolution. In other words, Nigeria has political and economic indicators that suggest a high priority for Brazil in issues related to security and defense in the region, such as a robust population with strong growth potential, the large amount of mineral resources in its territory and the enormous instability registered in its domains. However, it has geographical characteristics that suggest reduced priority for Brazil with regard to security and defense in the South Atlantic and the African continent, such as the greater distance from Brazil, when compared to the DRC and its proximity to the European continent, a characteristic that naturally directs the flow of forced human mobility from Nigeria to Europe. Given these aspects, this research suggests that Brazil should not choose a single country as a priority, but rather that the two African countries should be prioritized from a geopolitical perspective.

The second sub-group of countries is composed of countries that presented numbers relating to the worrying population of hundreds of thousands: the Republic of Cameroon and Congo. Unlike the 1st subgroup, which has a significant percentage in relation to forced migration movements in African countries located in the South Atlantic,
the 2nd subgroup is responsible for only 4.3% of the worrying population in this region. Extracting a strategic perception of the occurrence of this phenomenon in these states and the reflexes generated for Brazil. The figure 5 presents the spatial distribution of the worrying population referring to the 2nd subgroup of countries:

**Figure 5: Worrying Population of the 2nd Subgroup of Countries**

![Figure 5: Worrying Population of the 2nd Subgroup of Countries](image)

Source: Own elaboration, with data from UNHCR, 2018.

The figure 5 shows that the Republic of Cameroon and Congo have a common border, driving the effects of this phenomenon in Africa. Thus, under a strategic lens, these two states formed a single contiguous transnational region, responsible for the forced displacement of 347,433 people in 2017. The main aspect that distinguishes the 2nd subgroup of the 1st subgroup is the numbers related to the worrying population. While the previous group presented numbers of millions, this subgroup of countries (Republic of Cameroon and Congo) presented much more modest data, registering values of hundreds of thousands. In view of this, it is suggested that these states should be located in the country’s second priority in matters related to security and defense on the African continent and in the South Atlantic. In the same way as mentioned in the 1st subgroup of countries, there is also a possibility that part of this worrying population may go to Brazil.

As these states have similar latitudes and non-expressive
coastlines (in strategic terms), both the Republic of Cameroon and the Congo have similar geopolitical characteristics, which is not a determining factor for choose one country over another one in security and defense matters in the South Atlantic and the African continent. Therefore, this research suggests that between the two countries, the one with the highest numbers of worrying people in 2017 should be considered a priority for Brazil in issues related to security and defense in the region. Thus, the Republic of Cameroon should be a higher priority than the Congo in the context of Brazilian strategic interests.

The third sub-group of countries is composed of States that have presented numbers of worrying population of tens of thousands. Unlike the 1st and 2nd sub-group, which had only two countries, the 3rd sub-group is composed of six countries: Senegal, Gambia, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Ghana and Angola. Considering these differences, it is noticed that the 3rd subgroup resembles the 2nd subgroup, because it was responsible for about 3.1% of the forced migratory movements carried out in the African states located in the South Atlantic, a percentage very close to that recorded by the 2nd subgroup, which was 4.3%. Seeking to obtain a strategic view of the occurrence of this phenomenon, figure 6 presents the spatial distribution referring to the worrying population of the 3rd subgroup of countries:

**Figure 6: Worrying Population of the 3rd Subgroup of Countries**

![Figure 6: População Preocupante do 3º Subgrupo de Países](source: Own elaboration, with data from UNHCR, 2018.)
The Figure 6 shows an innovative aspect that should be highlighted. Analyzing this subgroup in a geopolitical lens, we can see the existence of two geographical regions. The first is located further north and is composed of five countries: Senegal, Gambia, Guinea, Ivory Coast and Ghana. All of these countries border each other and form a single transnational contiguous region, which was responsible for the forced migration of 217,477 people in 2017. The second region is further south and is represented exclusively by Angola, which recorded a worrying population of 34,441 individuals in the same year. As previously reported, there is also the possibility that part of this worrying population may go to Brazil or use the South Atlantic as a way to this displacement. Thus, this research suggests that these states should be the country’s third priority in matters related to security and defense in the South Atlantic and the African continent.

This subgroup also presents a geopolitical equation of difficult solution, as two regions are confronted, one with five countries and the other composed only by Angola. If on the one hand, the region further north has political and social indicators that suggest a high priority in matters related to security and defense in the South Atlantic and the African continent, such as the high number of countries (five) and the numbers registered in 2017 relative to the worrying population (almost six times higher than the numbers verified in Angola in the same year). On the other hand, this region has geographic characteristics that indicate the opposite, such as the reduced coastline existing in each country, the greater distance from Brazil when compared to Angola, as well as the proximity of the countries of this region to the European continent, an aspect that naturally directs the flow of forced human mobility occurred in these countries to Europe. Thus, these aspects do not ensure, in a pragmatic way, that this region should be prioritized to the detriment of the region further south.

Angola has relevant geographical, political and social aspects that should be considered in this analysis. Regarding the geographical aspects, it has a considerable coastline and latitudes similar to Brazilian ones, characteristics that prioritize this region to the detriment of the region located further north. The political and social aspects, the colonial history that Brazil and Angola have in common, their participation in forums of a political and economic character, such as the CPLP and the use of the same language in the two countries, are facts that are decisive for a choice. Thus,
this research indicates that Brazil should give to Angola higher priority than the region situated further north in matters related to security and defense in the South Atlantic and the African continent.

In view of what was presented, this research understands that Brazil can contribute to the reduction of the numbers related to the worrying population located in the African countries located in the South Atlantic. This help can be provided by the following actions:

1) Humanitarian peace operations, with two main objectives: to assist the population involved in forced migration movements; and to achieve and maintain adequate levels of security and peace for the region;

2) Support in the transfer of technology and knowledge related to issues in which the country has renowned expertise and worldwide reputation. This help can be offered by the Brazilian Agricultural Research Company (Empresa Brasileira de Pesquisa Agropecuária - EMBRAPA). The purpose of such assistance is to generate the appropriate conditions for the African population to settle in a region to produce and be responsible for their livelihoods; and

3) Cooperation in the area of health, particularly through the Oswaldo Cruz Foundation (Fiocruz), a nationally and internationally renowned institution. This measure aims to improve the health indicators of the population in these countries, which historically have low rates issued by the World Health Organization (WHO).

Finally, this study concluded that Brazil’s best option in this type of issue is to assist African countries in their own continent. In other words, the resolution of this phenomenon should focus on the origin, not the destination. Under a strategic lens, we suggest that Brazil follow the priorities listed in this study, considering that they were obtained based on theoretical assumptions established by Brazilian geopolitics and on data collected at the UN.
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