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1. Introduction

Mass non-European immigration to the EU is a process that has shaped and continues to shape Europe’s demographic development as well as Europe’s societies. Started with little public debate it has become a part of Europeans everyday life. Some member-states have been a more preferred destination to others due to various reasons. These might be simply a historical consequence of previous experience with certain countries, ex-colonies for example, or simply economic, language, social and even cultural reasons. Although immigration occurred due to necessity after the end of World War II and immigrants helped to restore the “glory” of Europe, with time they have become an integral part of it and political as well as social debate has emerged as to whether this need for immigrant workforce did not trigger a process that can no longer be reversed. Recent surveys suggest the majority of Europeans consider that there are “too many immigrants”.

Immigration has been on EU agenda for some time now but some questions still remain unanswered: for instance has been done enough in order to ensure a positive outcome of the process for all parties involved in it? Europe is a magnet for immigrants and with growing differences between prospering EU countries and poor surrounding regions there is little belief that immigration flows will decrease. Furthermore it is an issue since each member-state decides its own immigrant scheme and it is up to the state to integrate the newcomers. What has been accomplished, what results did the policies implemented bring and what more can be achieved is what I will try to present in my thesis.

The aim of my academic work is to explain how mass non-European immigration affects economic, cultural, social and even political aspects of European societies and to show that if more coherent measures on EU as well as on national and local level are not undertaken these consequences might turn out to be mostly negative in the long run. After evaluating the devised policies and integration mechanisms by the selected EU member-states as well as the consequences of immigration to Europe I will present the areas that in my opinion need further elaboration and improvement. Apart from benefits immigration embraces certain negative elements that require deeper understanding, cooperation and ever more enhanced coordination of the policies among the ones involved in shaping them. More can and should be accomplished in order to maximize the benefits and reduce the undesired consequences. Be it
guest worker agreements, illegal immigration or asylum seekers and refugees, immigration is a fact of many Europeans everyday life. How is it affecting it is exactly what I will examine in the following chapters.

This thesis presents a solid theoretical framework required for the understanding of the development and evolution of mass non-European immigration into selected EU member-states and to analyze the effect it has had, it has and it might have on their societies and economic development.

The second chapter of my work basically introduces immigration as an aspect of global demographic development. I point out to the definition of immigration in the context of migration and provide the theoretical background which will serve me as basis in the following chapters.

The third chapter examines the emergence of mass non-European immigration as we know it today. I explain the role immigrants have played on the reconstruction of post-war Europe and try to show how illegal immigration and asylum seeking escalated during the 1980s and 1990s. Furthermore I use a demographic statistical analysis in order to point out precisely how immigration has been shaping demographic development of the selected EU member-states.

The fourth chapter practically examines the legal basis of EU’s Common Immigration Policy, its development, future and overall immigrant situation within EU borders. Secondly, in this chapter I provide case studies and I analyze the policies and procedures implemented by each of the following: Netherlands, Germany, France and Great Britain and present the current situation with regard to immigration in each of the above mentioned. Furthermore this chapter of my thesis provides a critical evaluation of the policies, methods and other sources of regulating immigration as well as integration of the newcomers into the EU.

Chapter five tackles the effects immigration has on the societies of the countries in question. I will pay attention to social, economic and cultural aspects which are influenced by the non-European masses that have been entering the EU through the years. In this chapter I will also examine the factors that lead to terrorism and try to correlate it to the immigrant flows.
2. Immigration as a global phenomenon

Immigration is an essential aspect of global demographic development. The movement of people through various national borders is distinctive for all stages of human evolution and particularly for the past two centuries when practically it became a daily phenomenon. Today, international migration processes are becoming an important element of international relations, especially after the end of the Cold War. In this context the relation between immigration and the development of states takes a central place in EU’s agenda, with new frameworks, new structures for interaction and cooperation between the Middle East, Africa and Europe, to curb migration processes. Despite the will of many Europeans, Europe cannot thrive without immigration. This inevitably and continuously is turning the Old continent into a cultural and religious mixture, and if current immigration tendencies continue it will become even more pluralistic. As of 2009 there were around 19 million immigrants from third countries in the EU. The number of illegal immigrants entering EU member-states annually accounts to 500,000 and strict measures and penalties against illegal trafficking of people seem not to be bringing required results. The EU begins to look like the Roman Empire, surrounded by poor nations whose nationals try to cross its frontiers in order to gain opportunities and benefits from its welfare system. Precisely this is the main motivation of immigrants, be it legal or illegal, coming to EU, seeking a better life for themselves and even their families. The widening gap between poor and rich regions is not helping in this regard. Apart from this reason, the EU proves to be a magnet for asylum seekers. Daily on its external borders transport vessels stuffed with immigrants are encountered. Despite all restrictions however, in the environment of globalization, large masses of people can be hardly stopped.

“Immigration in the EU is, and will remain a fact of life. Immigrants form part of the economic and cultural fabric of the European Union.” Immigration changes the state of the Union and new problematic situations occur. Decline in fertility rates, combined with increasing immigration rates are feared by many that might lead to a situation of collapse of the

European, traditionally national, states. The question arises, how to integrate the newcomers, and how to make immigration work for the benefit of all participants in the process? Until now this has proven to be quite a difficult task. In Germany for example until the end of 1990s\(^4\) citizenship was based on jus sanguinis, "nationality by blood", reformed in 1999, or in other words according to nationality, and not birthplace, which led to a situation in which German born Turks did not feel completely as a part of the country. It is no surprise that German Chancellor Angela Merkel has labeled German’s multicultural society as “utterly failed”\(^5\) despite insisting immigrants were still welcome in Germany. In France the political concept of citizenship is applied, jus soli or birthright citizenship, but at the same time negative attitudes against immigrants exist, especially against those from Africa. Ethnic segregation occurs in many EU member-states. Immigrant communities are founded with their own way of life, poorer and separated from the rest of society. Due to the above mentioned reasons, the negative attitude towards immigrants in EU member-states rises\(^6\). About 60% of Europeans consider that there are “too many” immigrants and an argument arises “not over how much immigration Europeans desire but over how much will they tolerate”\(^7\).

Europe is becoming more and more a “fault line conflict”\(^8\) area as Samuel Huntington points out in relation to the clash of civilizations on local level. People coming from Turkey, Africa, Middle East and Asia bring with themselves elements and aspects of their origin such as Turkish, Chinese, Indian and other, shops, products and even places of worship. At the heart of the European continent enclaves emerge with Arabic, Middle Eastern and Asian cultures, traditions and faith. The closeness of Europe to regions with high fertility rates, such as North Africa, the Middle East and even Turkey, means that the Old continent will have to absorb and manage even more immigrants in the future. For Europeans the main worry is derived from the fact that parallel societies have been formed and still form. All these combined together trigger


a political debate and when immigration takes place in a debate of such scale the result usually is establishment of national strategies and more effective measures in order to regulate immigration flows. Immigration raised as a racial or religious problem from far-right political parties however puts into question democracy itself and violates the established intergovernmental political cooperation. The humanitarian aspect of immigration is also significant. Mainly because the protection of human rights is one of the main characteristics of democracy, universal principles of international law and last but not least Europe.

Immigration can influence positively as well as negatively economic, social, cultural and even political life within a given state. In order not to upset social peace, immigration should be accompanied by successful integration into the hosting societies. They, on the other hand, should be tolerant enough to other ethnicities and the cultures and traditions they bring with them. Highly-skilled immigrant workers contribute to the development of specific branches of modern economy, while underpaid immigrant workers fill in sectors or do jobs that natives no longer wish to do. Both categories can be as well as assets, liabilities too to the labor market if not regulated properly. Unemployment for instance among immigrants has definitely a negative impact on Europe’s economy, triggers social problems and threatens the internal security. These are aspects which Europeans see as requiring improvement from their respective authorities since complete economic advantage is in the interest of all parties involved. The development of information and transport networks, the internet, and globalization also lead to reducing the boundaries and intensifying immigration processes. Europeans no longer speak only of controlling immigration, but also managing and diversifying it. The aim is to conduct an adequate and balanced policy, which will derive the social and economic plusses of immigration while at the same time assure a socio-economic environment and conditions in order to keep highly-skilled and capable young people.

Coordinating and managing such a phenomenon on EU level is not an easy task which is made even more difficult by the fact that the separate member-states determine how many and what type of immigrant workers are required to fulfill their needs and further integration into their societies is also left to the individual countries.

In the following chapters I will try to analyze in depth why and how mass non-European immigration after World War II accelerated. I will examine the methods implemented by selected EU member-states in order to respond to this phenomenon, what they do in order to integrate better the newcomers and study if immigrants want to follow the values
and principles of EU. I will also point out the effects immigration has had and might have on European societies, cultures and economies and give my personal thoughts on how we can make it work better and if that is possible at all.

### 2.1 Definition of immigration in the context of migration

In order to be able to define immigration and to understand the immigration policy theories, we firstly need to outline it in the broader context of migration. Although it is difficult to find a common and precise definition of these terms, since there exist numerous, I have decided to structure my understanding of immigration in accordance to the following definition: “Migration is defined broadly as a permanent or semi-permanent change of residence”\(^9\). Contemporary migration cannot be examined as an isolated topic though. We have to acknowledge the fact that it is a very complex and multi-layer process which can be controlled only through the implementation of a comprehensive method of approach. By achieving this, through proper management of migration processes and investment of sufficient resources illegal migration can be reduced while at the same time the necessary benefit of legal migration can be derived. It can be seen as transfer of people aiming to live in another place. It can be seasonal, practically when people reside for up to a few years in the hosting country and permanent for a long period of time or even for life. When the movement is within the borders of a given country, it is considered internal migration, which also applies to the EU and its internal market with its four freedoms of movement one of which is free movement of people. While when the movement of people is outside the boundaries of their native country it is considered as external migration.

External migration in relation to the forms might be: emigration or leaving once place of residence; immigration or arriving at a new place of residence; remigration or coming back after a certain period of emigration; refuge which occurs non-regulated and most often through escape; repatriation or enforced return of emigrants which is organized by the country from which they emigrate on the basis of an agreement with the country to which they immigrate and deportation or enforced return of immigrants.

---

There are factors of migration too. “The factors which enter into the decision to migrate and the process of migration may be summarized under four headings, as follows:

1. Factors associated with the area of origin;
2. Factors associated with the area of destination;
3. Intervening obstacles;
4. Personal factors.”

2.2 Theories of immigration policy

In order to prove and make a serious background for my further analysis and evaluation on non-European immigration and to enhance the understanding of this phenomenon I will use a mixture of particular theories of international immigration policy and try to implement it in my study. Using a blend of theories appeared to me necessary mainly because all of the outlined theories of immigration policy have its own faults. I consider this as a necessary step of my thesis since immigration policies practically tend to shape immigration trends which on its own shape demographic changes around the world. Furthermore immigration policies are responsible for certain cultural, economic and even political aspects of a given country and deep understanding is required in order for us to assess properly and competently the impact these policies have on European societies and immigration patterns. Although immigration policy theory lacks a precise and commonly accepted formulation or definition we can outline mainly six approaches: Marxist, liberalist, national identity approach, realist, partisan and/or interest group politics, commonly referred to only as domestic policies and last but not least, institutionalism approach. Firstly we should define what immigration policy implements in it. It practically can be a sort of immigration control policy, which deals with the methods used to control the selection procedures concerning immigrants or the social conditions offered to the immigrants by the host country. Generally in my thesis I tried to use a bit of every of the following: “The Marxist approach correctly predicts the short-term correlation between the

---

economic cycle and immigration policies. In particular, it sheds light upon policies regarding migrant workers and in some cases illegal immigrants. The "national identity" approach highlights historical experiences, cultural idioms and social conflicts that have shaped past and current immigration policies. The domestic politics approach points to important economic and social factors that shape immigration policies. It shows the influence of politics and is able to explain policies on immigration of dissimilar ethnic origin. The institutional approach sheds light on the intricacies of the process leading to immigration policy. It is especially revealing with regard to immigration policies on refugees and migrant workers. Realism contributes to our understanding of refugee policies, and neoliberal theories of supranational organizations and international regimes foster an understanding of immigration and refugee policies within the EU."^{12} As we can see each theory of immigration policy has a different approach. In my work I use to a certain extent a mixture between the Marxist theory, since it tackles the economic aspects in regard to immigration, the domestic politics approach, since I will be analyzing the social influence immigration has on selected EU member-states, and finally the neoliberal theories of supranational organizations such as the EU since a correlation between the member-states and the Union’s common immigration policy does exist

Having said this let us now take a look at mass non-European immigration into Europe as a process that although existent even before that is shaping European societies at present times. This is a necessary step since in order to fully understand this phenomenon and its consequences we need to examine it from its birth in its contemporary form.

---

3. Reconstruction of post-war Europe and the role of immigrants in the process

International immigration, in its modern sense as a global process in which base lie mainly economic motives and factors, is a rather new phenomenon. Its beginning can be traced back to the 19th century and since 1820 migration statistics have been kept. Immigration at that time corresponds to the mostly common accepted definition and boundaries of the process, practically masses of people from poorer regions move towards richer ones. This was a global process and it shaped the factors that defined the structure of global economy since not only capital migrated but also labour as a main element of production. The final decade of 19th century marked a new wave of immigration mainly in the less developed countries of East and South Europe, as well as in the colonial and semi-colonial possessions. These immigrants were characterized by relatively low qualification skills. During this era highly developed states exported capital but at the same time they attracted considerable amount of immigrant workers. During the period 1914 – 1950 international migration reduced. This was due to obvious reasons and as a consequence of two devastating World Wars. Post-war restoration however triggered an ever more dynamic immigration mainly into demolished Europe. This last immigration wave can be characterized by certain features:

- “Substantial increase in global migration;
- Sharp increase in illegal immigration;
- Complications in regard to the social composition of the migrants;
- Essential enlargement of the “geography” of international migration through the emergence of new immigrant cores;
- Development of a potentially new tendency: “internalization” of international labour immigration.”

Having said this in the next few lines I will discuss mainly what triggered this increase in immigration processes after World War II across Europe and show that although necessary

---

at that time, the long-term consequences were not considered properly by those responsible for the decisions taken in this regard.

Post-war immigration in Europe occurred with very little involvement of the public, or in other words it was decided by politicians and of course business elites. The foremost element that triggered the process was the restoration of Europe. Buildings, roads, railways, streets and factories were destroyed and someone had to help rebuild them. European countries needed man power for their heavy industries. Therefore they came up with programs for hiring third-country nationals in order to occupy the vacant jobs. Although initially this approach proved efficient, the question remains didn’t this openness towards third-country immigrants halt to a certain extent the rebuilding of Europe?

Apart from the need of immigrant workforce there are other factors too behind the hospitality towards them. We should not neglect the fact that European states, or at least France, UK and to some extent Netherlands, have been colonial powers and thus the new notion of feelings after Nazism and colonialism within Europe were solidarity and even shame. Countries like the above mentioned felt morally obliged to help and be friendly with their ex-colonies and thus became more open to them. In the case of Germany it was a different matter, Nazism with all its terrors played a significant role in the attitude of Germany towards immigrants in the aftermath of World War II, with its end, the end of racism was supposed to have come too. In other words, Germans felt morally obliged to be more open towards immigrants from any ethnicity, apart from the fact that they needed them since their economy was being restored with greater than imagined temps.

Let us now focus on the colonial powers such as Great Britain, France and to a lesser extent the Netherlands. The end of World War II saw these states decolonize which led to many ex-colonial subjects being recruited by their ex-rulers. For example Jamaicans, former British colony, started coming to Britain as early as the beginning of 1950s. The ex-subjects started being referred to as Commonwealth citizens since they were citizens of the Commonwealth of Nations – former members of the British Empire. They were hired to do precisely those reconstruction jobs which I mentioned earlier, such as rebuilding railroads, demolished buildings etc. Another aspect that required more workers was the newly established Health Service. Although Britain was initially recruiting nationals from European states like Italy or Poland, they soon proved insufficient and Britain had to address its ex-subjects. Furthermore the Nationalities Act of 1948 assured ex-colonies easy access to Britain.
This Act basically states: “Every person who under this Act is a citizen of the United Kingdom and Colonies or who under any enactment for the time being in force in any country mentioned in subsection (3) of this section is a citizen of that country shall by virtue of that citizenship have the status of a British subject.” With the Act 800,000 ex-subjects were guaranteed entry but not only that, they could live and even work in Great Britain without any legislative restraints such as visa requirements. As a result Britain saw a great wave of immigrants in the aftermath of World War II, mainly coming from Pakistan and India. This was a consequent move since the former UK colonies spoke English which made their integration much easier and faster, meaning they could start working immediately. Also, they had already, or at least many of them, worked for British factories during and before World War II. Many even fought on the side of Britain during the War. Initially this step worked as intended but soon Britain did not need as many workers and British people were not yet used to living together with so many immigrants. As a consequence the Nationalities Act was revised and in 1962 the Commonwealth Immigrants Act was adopted. Its primary aim was to make immigration a bit more difficult in order to stop masses of non-Europeans from coming to Britain. This Act was passed by the Conservative ruling party and it intended to recruit immigrants only on the basis of government controlled needs, in other words the government was responsible for the amount of immigrants to be let in. According to this Act “citizens of Commonwealth countries, with certain exceptions, became subject to immigration control…” Opposition against immigrants in Britain was increasing and therefore this Act came as a natural consequence. It soon however needed a revision. In 1968 a new Commonwealth Immigrants Act was adopted which practically “widened the control to include persons who were citizens of the United Kingdom and Colonies either by birth in a colony or by registration in a Commonwealth country before it became independent”. This revision was required since opposition towards immigrants continued to grow despite the restriction adopted by the Act of 1962. Citizens and even political groups considered that there is too much immigration in Great Britain. As it became obvious, an even more complex and restricting Act were necessary. It was again up to the Conservatives to pass and implement it. Therefore in 1971 a new Immigration Act was adopted


once again. With it, new regulations were introduced such as the work permits which allowed residence to be only temporary. Immigration was indeed made more difficult with this piece of legislation. If a particular national from one of the former colonies wished to enter UK he/she needed to have a relative there, otherwise it was extremely difficult to get even a visitor’s visa. Furthermore for the first time the “right to abode” was introduced, meaning that “you are entirely free from United Kingdom Immigration Control. In other words, you do not need to get permission from an Immigration Officer to enter the UK and you can live and work in the UK without restriction.”

Similarly to UK, France was a colonial power that had to decolonize in accordance with the establishment of a new world order from which nationalism was supposed to be abolished. Another similarity that existed between these two states was the lack of man power. As Charles de Gaulle noted on 3rd of March, 1945, France’s lack of man power was “the main obstacle to our recovery”. Analysis had shown that France urgently required around one and half million people to fill in the shortages in various sectors, again like in Great Britain, mostly heavy industry and rebuilding of what had been destroyed during the War. Similarities with UK can again be drawn since France also sought workers firstly from European states, Italy, the Netherlands and Poland. The problem however occurred from the fact that these states were facing the same problem, lack of labor force. Another factor that triggered French openness to immigration was the low fertility rate the Republic was experiencing in the 1950s. The French governor of Algeria proposed to the French government the idea of recruiting immigrant workers from Algeria, an idea which was strongly rejected since “French politicians and planners had aimed at meeting France's need for labor by encouraging "culturally compatible" immigrants (i.e. European) to settle in preference to those from the Third World.”

The newly established National Office of Immigration aimed precisely at that. However, as time passed by, and other states grew economically stronger and the standard of living among them more or less became equal, Europeans preferred to stay in their native lands instead of going to France. This is when France had to change its stance on third-country immigrants. Obviously it directed its strength at attracting nationals from its ex-colonies, mainly in North Africa, or the Maghreb. Thus the previously rejected idea of recruiting

---

immigrants from Algeria became reality. Other countries from which France accepted immigrants were Morocco and Tunisia, Senegal and even French Guyana, however those coming from North Africa were the most numerous and from those Algerians were the most represented (for a period in 1962, they were arriving at the rate of 70 000 a week). Although the initial aim was for the immigrants to come on a short-term basis, soon it became obvious that the majority of them came to stay. Apart from the legal immigrants illegal immigration existed too. The French government analyzed that immigration has had a positive impact on the restoration of France so far and decided post de facto to legalize the illegally entered immigrants for further economic boost. At the beginning of the mass immigration process in France the development seemed favourable, factories were working at full potential, the restoration process was going steadily and the jobs that natives did not wish to occupy were taken by the arriving immigrants. The 1950s and 1960s were marked by massive waves of immigrants mainly from Algeria and as a consequence of the Algerian War. As time passed by, similarly to UK, France restored its economy, rebuilt its roads, railways and demolished buildings and immigrants seemed as no longer needed. They however were still arriving en masse. The French government had to enforce tighter rules on immigration. The global economic recession combined with the civil opinion, which was more and more against immigration, mainly derived from the rising unemployment rates, again as in Great Britain, forced the French government to halt non-European immigration. The implemented restrictions however did not prove sufficient enough and as a consequence illegal immigration accelerated drastically. As in UK the 1970s marked a decade in which the French tried “under the conservative presidency of Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, to reverse the flow of immigrants by refusing to renew their residency permits.”

Netherlands can be viewed as a slightly different case when compared to France, Germany and the UK. Although a colonial power it definitely was not of the same caliber as France or UK. Yet another difference that has shaped the immigration process in the Dutch lands is the relationship and status Netherlands established with its ex-subjects from Suriname and Dutch Antilles. 1955 marked an economic boom mainly derived from the rapidly growing industrialization. Netherlands adopted a business-like approach, not a political one towards its


former colonies. Postwar Netherlands welcomed around 300,000 immigrants from Indonesia but unlike France and UK these immigrants possessed the status of political refugees. Netherlands did not require as much workforce from abroad like Germany, UK and France did since it was experiencing high birth rate unseen elsewhere across Europe which had begun during the early 1900s. It did however implement a similar guest worker programme as the German “Gastarbeiter” to respond to its growing industrial needs. By 1970s there were less than 80,000 immigrants, excluding the above mentioned from Indonesia. The majority of them came from Morocco and Turkey.

As we can see there are similarities that exist between the situation, in relation to immigration, in France and the UK and to a lesser extent the Netherlands. These similarities derive mainly from the fact that these countries were colonial powers, thus making recruiting labour force a bit easier and at the same time integrating the newly arrivals better since their ex-subjects spoke their respective languages and had been more or less already in touch with their respective traditions and cultures. Germany’s case however differs. Since it did not posses colonial subjects it had to implement another method in order to recruit immigrants to restore its economy. Although it was Sweden that firstly introduced the so called guest worker bilateral agreements, it was the German guest worker programme, Gastarbeiter that became most famous for its wide sphere of activity. Mainly because of Sweden’s neutrality during World War II and the fact that it did not lose labour force. The German programme emerged in 1955 firstly as a bilateral agreement with Italy but later on, as it became obvious that Italians were insufficient for the booming German economy, same agreements were signed with Spain, Portugal, Yugoslavia, Greece and even Turkey. The aim of the Gastarbeiter programme was to recruit guest workers, mainly in the industrial sector, who had low qualifications, for a period of one or two years. Since it was directed at the needs of the industry, it was intended mostly for male immigrants. However, because the German economy was developing with lightening speed very soon other sectors required workforce too. This led to a spread of the programme and now bilateral agreements were signed with Morocco, Tunisia and even Vietnam (mainly East Germany). At the beginning of the Gastarbeiter programme Italians were the most numerous representatives of immigrant workers in Germany, until the early 1960s. The erection of the Berlin Wall however had a negative impact on the immigrant trends across Germany. Until then the East had been providing a significant amount of workforce. However

---

with the Wall this process came to an end since free movement of people was halted. West Germany simply had no other option but to turn its attention to foreign immigrants in order to fill in the vacant positions. Again as in the previous cases with UK and France, European economies were growing steadily, standards were more or less even which led to a situation in which Europeans preferred to stay in their homelands instead of going to work in and for Germany. Thus if until 1960s Italians were the most numerous immigrants in the country, late 1960s and beginning of 1970s saw a new source of mass immigration, Turkey. In 1973 Turks accounted to “23% of the foreigners within Germany.”23 The Turks were mostly men since they were occupying vacant positions mainly in the mines for a period of up to two years. After the end of their two-year stay they had to go back home. The problems started emerging when the understanding of natives and immigrants of the guest worker programme did no longer overlap. Immigrants could not earn as much at home as they could in Germany. Furthermore German corporations found it unreasonable to rotate workers every two or so years. Practically, it was more expensive since they had to conduct a new recruiting procedure and medical examinations every year. They also considered it as negative for their respective businesses since every two years they had to integrate and train newcomers, thus making the rotation principle wasting financial resources and time. According to corporate elites the Gastarbeiter programme needed restructuring. They influenced the German government to make the necessary amendments which basically included the following: the contracts of the Gastarbeiter workers could be renewed, their families could join them in Germany and those who did could stay. As for the 1970s we can draw parallels with the immigration trends in UK and France. Global recession was on the horizon going hand in hand with the Oil Crisis of 1973. The necessity for workforce drastically fell as a consequence of these crises and Germany was not an exception. Unemployment rates were rising not only in the host countries though, but in the source-countries of immigration too. Therefore they simply did not want to go back home. German authorities had no other option but to restrict further immigration. However, since the amendment of the Gastarbeiter programme in the 60s many of the guest workers had obtained residence permits and have established families in Germany. This was the main source of immigrants that shaped German migration trends in the 70s, family reunification. This phenomenon influenced the statistical data in relation to percentage of foreigners that live within the country. “The number of foreigners thus stayed more or less

constant throughout the 1980s at between 4 and 4.5 million. The labour force participation of immigrants, however, decreased”. This last quote is very important for my further analysis since it practically shows that the initial aim of immigration into Germany, and other European societies as a matter of fact, had shifted either from a guest worker programme, or colonial immigration, to an unprecedented irreversible process. Does this mean that “Europe solved temporary economic problems through permanent demographic change” and did “the disillusionment with immigration that has set in the older immigration countries comes from the disappearance of the tasks that immigrants were brought to do”? Well my aim in the following chapters is to examine and evaluate precisely these questions.

Illegal immigration and asylum seeking also play their part in shaping the face of European societies. Furthermore, with the establishment of the Internal Market and its free movement of people, illegal immigrants who have entered through another EC member-state can more easily reach one of the above discussed countries. Although the guest workers were supposed to go back home, many of them decided to remain in Europe. Family reunification is another aspect worth mentioning since the families of those who decided to remain joined them and currently most immigrant EU member-states are experiencing population growth because of family reunifications. Also, since these countries restricted guest worker immigration the amount of illegal immigrants increased. As a final step of this chapter I will use demographic statistical analysis to show how immigration has played a role in shaping Dutch, British, French and German societies in a certain way and this has happened relatively fast and yet has remained misunderstood and the policies made did not bring satisfactory results.

3.1 Illegal immigration and asylum seekers

As noted above what triggered an increase of illegal non-European immigration into Europe initially was the halt of the guest worker programmes but later other aspects influenced this process too. An illegal immigrant might be a person who has entered legally a particular country but has failed to leave it when legally bound. Also, an illegal immigrant is a person

who enters a country without the required authorization. As far as asylum seekers go it is important to know that the EU is obliged by international law, the legal basis is in the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, Article 18\(^\text{27}\), to protect them. Asylum is perceived as a branch or type of immigration and it can be noted that in this regard the member-states of EU have achieved more in relation to setting minimum standards on treating asylum seekers and have been able to more or less standardize procedures for processing applications for asylum. It is widely regarded that illegal immigration became “popular” more or less during the 1980s, although it had existed before. I will however not pay so much attention to asylum seekers in my work mainly because the number of asylum seekers entering the EU is rather small when compared to the numbers of illegal and legal immigrants. Furthermore over the past decade these numbers have been decreasing and if in 1999 there were 380 000 asylum applications, in 2008 the number has been reduced to 238 000.\(^\text{28}\) “Illegal or irregular migration is a phenomenon that has been politically and legally created over the course of time, in other words, illegal immigration is a social construct of our time, of the late 20\(^{\text{th}}\) century… First, irregular migration arises from an asymmetry between an increasingly integrated world, increasing mobility of information, capital and goods, increasing access to affordable and safe transportation on the one hand and increasing migration restrictions on the other.”\(^\text{29}\) Another factor that is regarded as a precondition for illegal immigration is the fact that many small-scale businesses, farms, restaurants etc. prefer to use cheaper labour and what better option than illegal immigrants for that purpose thus creating an environment in which it thrives. Another factor that has shaped the face of illegal immigration, although also applicable to economic immigration or legal immigration, is the establishment of immigrant communities, most of the time parallel communities within European societies. Although recent illegal immigration has been reduced\(^\text{30}\) it has played an important role on the demographic changes that have occurred throughout Europe. It is considered that the biggest number of residing illegal immigrants in the EU is from previously employed immigrants or “tourists” who simply overstayed. The reasons illegal immigrants come to various EU member-states are primarily the same as the ones legal immigrants chose EU for, higher economic benefit in comparison to


their country of origin. However there are other reasons too. Some of them are: rejoining with their respective families, better education or health systems, family problems at home, social difficulties or even adventure.

However, “Irregular migration is no separate flow which can be neatly distinguished from the flow of labor migration, asylum migration or family reunification, and even tourism.”

Defining illegal immigrants is left to the separate countries and gathering statistical data is also performed this way. While the numbers of illegal immigrants who were caught on one of EU’s external borders differ the Union has been trying to limit them to a minimum. This is well evident from recent agreements between Libya and EU worth 60 million euro in the form of aid for a period of 3 years. The cooperation and funding is in the form of a border management agreement. Furthermore actions to decrease illegal entry in the EU are considered on the Union’s eastern external border, the Greece-Turkey border. This measure is being considered since Turkey has a visa-free regime with countries like Yemen, Syria, Tunisia, Morocco, Libya and Iran which has led to an increase in numbers of illegal immigrants crossing that very same border in question. This is to be done by building a 206km wall along the border with Turkey in order to prevent illegal entry in Greece from where the movement of people within the EU becomes easier and less controlled. This type of restriction is already being used alongside the US-Mexico border. The fact that just recently the French Interior minister, Brice Hortefeux, proclaimed he is in favor of the building of such a wall speaks for itself.

3.2 Demographic analysis

Demography is a study that deals with human population. By using a demographic analysis I will show how the number of non-European immigrants has increased through time within selected EU member-states in contrast to an ageing and decreasing European
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population. The demographic processes are diverse in nature; they are complex in regard to their character, interrelated and have a strong relation to other processes of societal development. A fundamental element of global demographic evolution is precisely the mass non-European immigration into EU member-states.

It is a fact that Europeans do not have enough children. It is estimated that if a society is to keep its size a woman needs to have on average 2.1 children. If we look though at the statistical data provided by Eurostat we acknowledge the fact that all of the countries examined in this paper, UK, France, Germany and Netherlands, do not keep up with this numbers. “France has the highest fertility rate from the above mentioned with 2.0 for the year 2009, however with lower numbers for the preceding years. The other three states have fertility rates below 2.1.”\(^3\)\(^5\) If one pays more attention to the long term fertility rates of the countries in mind one finds out that this tendency for German, French, UK, and Dutch women to have less than 2.1 children is not a new phenomenon. Over the years these numbers might have varied but have remained below the so called “total fertility rate” required for the maintaining of a homogenous society. This gradually leads to a situation in which European population is shrinking. There is no one particular reason for this fertility shrinkage. Some consider it to be as a consequence of prosperity, others look at it as a result of decadence. Since statistics don’t lie if we focus on the age of European population we might find a disturbing truth. Again, looking at the data provided by Eurostat we acknowledge that Europeans are old. Over the years this tendency has been growing and is valid to Germany, the Netherlands and to a lesser extent to France and Great Britain.\(^3\)\(^6\) Looking at these numbers, one can assume that the total population of the countries examined in this paper or even at the EU as a whole would be decreasing. This is however not the case at all. EU population is increasing in fact. As estimated it has already surpassed 500 million people\(^3\)\(^7\). Just in comparison in 2000, a decade ago the population of EU-27 was almost by 20 million less\(^3\)\(^8\). So why is it so? If Europeans are not having enough children and their population is getting older and older, how come the
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overall European population increases? That is simple; it is due to the immigration. “Migration represents a much larger contribution to current population growth than the difference between births and deaths recorded on the territories of the EU-27 Member States.”\(^\text{39}\) Furthermore we should acknowledge the fact that non-European immigrants have higher fertility rate compared to Europeans. Therefore even if immigration flows are regulated in a manner that limits the immigration inflow, the already residing immigrants contribute to the population growth. For example, “foreign born women in France have 2.8 children. Tunisians, Turks, and Moroccans average between 3.3 and 3.4, more than their counterparts in their home countries.”\(^\text{40}\) These numbers are more or less valid for the other countries in question, UK, Germany and the Netherlands.

If we summarize the statistical data in a few sentences it will look like this: Europe’s fertility rate, and particularly of the states in mind, has been relatively low, under the commonly accepted rate of 2.1 children per woman. Furthermore, European citizens are old and the projections are that the average ratio will be increasing in this regard with years to come.\(^\text{41}\) On the other hand we have non-European immigrants with higher fertility rates when compared to the native Europeans. These facts combined with the ongoing legal or illegal immigration flows leads to a situation in which over time immigrant numbers are increasing in contrast to native population growth. Although immigration has reduced as of 2008 by 6%, most notably due to the economic recession which hit the examined states and the EU as a whole, it remains a statistical fact that there are about 29\% Asian immigrants, 24\% African and respectively American immigrants. The other 23\% are non-EU European immigrants and 2\% immigrants from Oceania.\(^\text{42}\)


4. EU’s Current situation and legal framework in the context of immigration

Nowadays we witness freedom of capital and movement of trade however at the same time the free movement of labour force is the most regulated aspect of economic performance. The difference between economic benefits between rich and poor countries is still very evident. Easier, more accessible and cheaper communication means and transport contribute to the immigration flows EU is currently experiencing. It is estimated that within the EU there are about 25 million third country nationals residing.\(^{43}\) In order to regulate immigration the EU has adopted and modified over the years policies and measures that are argued to be efficient enough. According to many this is so because when it comes to deciding immigration policies and regulation not enough attention is paid to the economic aspects of it but rather the political ones. Furthermore although a Common European Union Immigration Policy exists it is up to the individual member-states to set their own immigration policies and later integrate the newcomers. Individual member-states are responsible for the amount of immigrants they need, what type of workers are required and from where to recruit them. It is agreed though among EU leaders that host countries experience more or less similar challenges when it comes to immigration flows. This has led to enhancing of coordination and cooperation among member-states over the years of certain aspects of immigration regulation mechanisms. The problem however occurs when decisions for the common good need to be taken since opinions on immigration differ between the governments, the business elites and the nationals of the hosting member-states. This does not change the fact that from the total EU population it is estimated that around 4-5% are third-country nationals.

As noted in the previous chapter Europe’s population gets older meaning that the working class percentage gets smaller while at the same time the pension system gets “exhausted”. Immigrants are considered as the solution to this negative trend; however let us not forget that they are not a permanent solution to it, but rather addressing the issue of low fertility rates is. In order to understand however if EU legislation concerning immigration is
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working in accordance to EU immigrant needs we need to briefly examine the legislative framework of the Common European Union Immigration Policy.

The Home Affairs Directorate-General of the European Commission is responsible for proposals in regard to immigration regulations and policies. The competences in this domain are shared between the EU and the member-states (Area of Freedom, Security and Justice). Currently the immigration and asylum policy is exercised on the legal basis embraced in the Stockholm Programme\textsuperscript{44} of 2009, but not only since immigration is a complex issue which includes diverging aspects such as work, family reunification, integration and so on, that came after the Hague Programme of 2004 and the Tampere Programme of 1999. Furthermore “The EU Global Approach to Migration is the framework governing the external dimension of EU migration and asylum policy. “The Global Approach covers the management of legal migration, the effective prevention of and fight against irregular immigration and the strengthening of the relationship between migration and development. Implementation mechanisms include: i) mobility partnerships for enhanced migration management cooperation between the EU and individual third countries; and ii) migration profiles to enhance migration data management and promote evidence-based policymaking in EU partner countries.”\textsuperscript{45} Also, in 2008 under the French Presidency a Pact on Immigration and Asylum was adopted. Its primary aim was to better coordinate national and EU policies. EU leaders claim that with the Pact a step forward was made to reaching a harmonized European immigration and asylum policy. According to many human rights NGOs, politicians and others involved however, it is aimed at building a wall around Europe. Also since the Pact emphasizes that national policies and mechanisms are preferred option a question mark arises as to how will this be achieved if yet again member-states are the more powerful in the decision-making process. NGOs consider that the Pact pays more attention to security rather than to the protection of human rights and economic necessities. Since EU immigration policy is a shared competence questions also arise as to how will the intra-institutional competition reflect on the fast and balanced policy making? As far as the most recent legislative re-arrangements go we should not forget the Lisbon Treaty which is already into force. With it now all decisions regarding immigration are taken by Qualified Majority Voting by the EU Council and not unanimity which was the case


before. With it the EU was granted more competences in the context of immigration. The Treaty however makes it clear that it is still up to the individual member-states to determine the number of immigrants it wants to attract and it is up to them to integrate the newcomers. Also, since the Amsterdam Treaty, the co-decision procedure was extended meaning that the Parliament has now equal to EU Council legislative power within the immigration context. Over the years the EU has managed to pass binding directives, with some exceptions, in relation to family reunification and long-term residents. It has however failed to reach desired harmonization in regard to legal migration, or in other words labour migration, despite acknowledging the need of highly-skilled workers and the agreement that the Blue Card system, explained further below, will be applied by member-states as soon as 2011.

EU leaders seeing there are issues that need common addressing and understanding decided to coordinate certain aspects of legal immigration and integrating immigrants into the respective societies. Family reunification of legal immigrants is one element that is being coordinated. As far as illegal immigrants go, on EU level mechanisms to capture them and take them back to their respective countries of origin exist as well as collaboration activities with these countries in order to understand and manage immigration trends. According to EU law for example, after residing at least 5 years in an EU member-state, legal immigrants may seek working opportunities in another EU member-state. Another issue targeted by EU leaders is the easier recruitment of highly-skilled immigrants since EU is facing a shortage of precisely this type of labour force, such as IT specialist and doctors. Attention should be paid though on the level of qualification of the skilled immigrants as a situation might occur in which they do jobs that are less-skilled oriented than their qualifications require. This is important also because the status of immigrants plays a role in the attitude of native nationals towards them which we will see later in this chapter influences the policies EU and its member-states implement. The differences among the notion and ideas in regard to immigration are also derived from the fact that within the Union there are countries that have had different approach to immigration flows. For example, the colonial states and their policies correspond more or less to their link with their ex-colonial subjects. On the other hand there are member-states’ policies that have been shaped by the labour shortage they have faced and the bilateral guest-worker agreements they have signed with third-countries. Finally there are countries such as Italy, Greece and Spain who have been trying to limit the amount of illegal immigration since they constitute the outer border of the EU and are more vulnerable to this type of migration. What is obvious though is that EU member-states do need highly-skilled workers. Germany for instance as well
as France has introduced policies aimed at encouraging the recruitment of highly-skilled workers while at the same time limiting the amount of unskilled ones. Following this example the EU has proposed the establishment of a “Blue-Card” system in order to ease the recruitment procedures of highly-skilled specialists. “Comparable in theory to the US green card, which grants lawful permanent residence based on employment in addition to family relationships or refugee/asylee status, this legislation aims to make Europe a player on the emerging global labor market, enhancing its competitiveness and luring highly skilled workers to Europe — and away from countries like the United States and Australia.”

In a few words this new system is aimed at allowing holders of a Blue Card to seek work in any EU member-state. It will also allow faster family reunification and equal treating of native workers and Blue Card holders. A critique arises as to how the “Blue Card” system should operate since some member-states, Germany being one of them, think the idea is depriving them of their sovereignty in respect to determining the way they recruit immigrants. Others such as UK, Denmark and Ireland have opted out. Anyways, the issue of such a card is left to the member-states.

4.1 EU and immigration from a critical perspective

EU officials dealing with the shaping and implementation of immigration policies divide two types of factors that influence immigration policies. These are: push factors or in other words precisely what forces nationals to emigrate to EU; and pull factors or precisely what attract them. The EU has implemented over the years a so called “global approach to migration” in an effort to combine together these factors in order to achieve a more harmonized EU immigration policy. Since it is quite difficult to eliminate the pull factors, mainly because these include prospering economies, better paid jobs and working conditions etc., the global approach to migration should be focused more on the push factors since they are the ones that require better understanding and management.

Despite the fact that economists claim EU will be needing even more immigrants in future, surveys suggest that Europeans consider immigrants as a problem rather than as an

opportunity. EU leaders somewhat drifting among these two notions have been unable to conduct clear political aims. For the federalists the idea of a common migration policy is a must since it will mean further European integration bringing the EU closer to being a state. Although European elites have stressed the need of establishment of “circular migration and co-operation platforms” they fail to explain how will these be implemented and what in fact is their essence. Circular migration is aimed at diversification of immigration flows and at preventing of drain of highly-skilled workforce from poorer countries since this will lead to a situation in which economic development of these countries will lag behind in the long run. Therefore what is required is to recruit the needed labour force for a certain period of time, after that they would return home, with an option to go back to EU, well-provided and with more skills. A good example of such type of migration is the Locum contracts Ireland and Great Britain offer to doctors. This however cannot happen without flexible visa regimes. Again, the diverging understanding of “circular migration” from the various member-states presents an obstacle to achieving its full potential. Some of them want it to be applicable to highly-skilled immigrants only; others would prefer if it was implemented in a wider perspective embracing even seasonal workers working mainly in the agricultural and tourism sector. If EU were to create a coherent immigration policy it should shift its attention to the external factors shaping it, meaning that EU officials should work in closer cooperation with the governments of the immigrants’ origin. This is mainly necessary in order to understand why nationals are leaving the particular country and also to comprehend what can be done in order to improve the living and working conditions as well as improving employment possibilities. Looking at the root of the problems we acknowledge that EU should invest more in education and training instead of spending lucrative amounts of euro on border controls. Not only this is expected to prove more efficient in the long run but it is more productive from an economic point of view. Investing in farming and food production could also prove proper step since in Africa for example a high percentage of illegal immigration is triggered by food insufficiency. Another critique aimed at EU structures and officials is connected to Frontex, the EU border agency. Despite the fact that is possesses a significant amount of equipment it might come as a surprise that it does not have an operations center where probably it needs it the most, in Southern Europe, where the highest percentage of illegal immigrants try to cross EU borders. Furthermore the equipment it has at its disposal belongs to the member-states meaning the border agency depends on their consent.
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Another factor worth mentioning from a critical perspective is the Development Aid EU grants each year. Even though it is the biggest donor, mainly the money is given by UK, France and Germany; it is argued that Development Aid is not harmonized with EU’s immigration policy which practically leads to underachieving set goals in regard to immigration. Not only that but the so called remittances, or money immigrants send home, account to times the amount of the Development Aid distributed by the EU, as part of the official development aid (ODA), “The growing importance of remittances as a source of foreign exchange is reflected in the fact that remittance growth has outpaced private capital flows and official development aid (ODA) over the last decade.”\(^\text{49}\)

Integration is one of the most problematic issues of non-European immigration into the EU. It has to be noted that the member-states themselves are responsible for integrating the newcomers. Up till now however they do not seem to cope with the situation. Only last year German Chancellor Angela Merkel claimed German multicultural society as a failure. Unfortunately the same opinion was voiced by the UK Prime Minister David Cameron speaking at the Munich Security Conference on 5\(^{\text{th}}\) of February 2011 “Under the doctrine of state multiculturalism, we have encouraged different cultures to live separate lives, apart from each other and the mainstream. We have failed to provide a vision of society to which they feel they want to belong. We have even tolerated these segregated communities behaving in ways that run counter to our values.”\(^\text{50}\) This is important because if a certain immigrant minority group is mistreated in one EU member-states it might easily move to another one. It is considered that granting citizenship is the fastest way to integration, however there are member-states that completely block opportunities for citizenship for migrants and others require 10 years of residing in order to grant one.

As noted earlier I will now discuss how the continuous extension of co-decision procedure might influence the overall harmonization of EU’s Common Immigration Policy. Briefly this means the European Parliament, the only directly elected EU institution, has equal legislative authority, together with the EU Council, on variety of issues, immigration is one of them. Legislation, within the context of immigration in our case, is adopted respectively voted down on the basis of Simple Majority. The Parliament is formed by political groups which


members practically vote legislation. The question that comes up in mind is what interests they support when voting, is it inherited party lines, personal experience or perhaps economic interests? Left and right wing political parties differ in their approach towards immigration. On one hand left-wing politicians tend to be more in favour of more liberal immigration policies, while on the other, right-wing politicians are more in favour of more restricted policies. Strangely enough, the voters of these two respective political wings are reversely affected by their supporting political parties’ attitudes towards immigration. Unemployed and unskilled workers, in many European countries left-wing voters, are the ones exposed to the greatest economic risk of immigration. On the other hand, business elites and pensioners who support mostly right-wing political parties are less likely to be negatively affected by immigration.

Therefore how is immigration policy shaped? In Europe it is a complex of historical, political and last but not least cultural aspects, a good example are the colonial subjects some member-states used to have. These experiences have been transferred at European level through the MEPs which are selected by the respective ruling government and political parties, or coalition of such, making MEPs strongly dependent on national political parties. Currently the strongest political groups are the European People’s Party (EPP), center-right, and the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats, center-left. “Parliament has grown over time and competition between the groups is mainly structured along left-right rather than pro/anti-Europe lines…. This consequently suggests that when voting on migration and related issues, MEPs are more likely to act on their personal ideological opinions or the voting instructions of their national or European party leaders than the specific migration policy preferences of the citizens in their member state or the supporters of their national party.”  

According to a research of Simon Hix and Abdul Noury in which they examine variables and models that influence MEPs decisions and opinions, MEPs ideological background is their primarily source of opinion and not economic factors.

Immigration policies at EU level are still pretty much influenced by national politics since member-states are the most influential actor when decisions are taken. The problem is derived from the fact that they have to play a two level game. Let me explain. On domestic level national governments are influenced by voters’ opinion as well as by non-state actors,

---


NGOs being the best example. On European level national governments need to work and master their way through coalitions and bargain in order to promote policies, thus putting pressure on national governments on both levels: “[A]t the national level, domestic groups pursue their interests by pressuring the government to adopt favourable policies, and politicians seek power by constructing coalitions among those groups. At the international level, national governments seek to maximize their own ability to satisfy domestic pressures, while minimizing the adverse consequences of foreign developments.”53 Since this is the case my aim will be to analyze the current situation in regard to immigration in selected EU member-states, Great Britain, France, Netherlands and Germany. I will examine how these states manage immigration flows and how they integrate immigrants into their societies, since integration is the core of a successful immigration policy.

4.2 Integration as a two-way process: EU perspective

Analytical research leads to a conclusion that EU member-states have not managed to shape up their integration policies sufficiently enough in order for the immigrant third-country nationals to integrate desirably into Europe. On EU level the need for integration has been acknowledged as necessary, and although arguably efficient enough, measures have been taken. EU member-states have been trying to develop a coherent integration policy since the Hague Programme and through the current Stockholm Programme. EU officials have also implemented the so called Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy on which policy measures, instruments and strategies in general are based. These are:

- “Integration is a dynamic, two-way process of mutual accommodation by all immigrants and residents of Member States;
- Integration implies respect for the basic values of the European Union;

• Employment is a key part of the integration process and is central to the participation of immigrants, to the contributions immigrants make to the host society, and to making such contributions visible;

• Basic knowledge of the host society's language, history, and institutions is indispensable to integration; enabling immigrants to acquire this basic knowledge is essential to successful integration;

• Efforts in education are critical to preparing immigrants, and particularly their descendants, to be more successful and more active participants in society;

• Access for immigrants to institutions, as well as to public and private goods and services, on a basis equal to national citizens and in a non-discriminatory way is a critical foundation for better integration;

• Frequent interaction between immigrants and Member State citizens is a fundamental mechanism for integration. Shared forums, inter-cultural dialogue, education about immigrants and immigrant cultures, and stimulating living conditions in urban environments enhance the interactions between immigrants and Member State citizens;

• The practice of diverse cultures and religions is guaranteed under the Charter of Fundamental Rights and must be safeguarded, unless practices conflict with other inviolable European rights or with national law;

• The participation of immigrants in the democratic process and in the formulation of integration policies and measures, especially at the local level, supports their integration;

• Mainstreaming integration policies and measures in all relevant policy portfolios and levels of government and public services is an important consideration in public-policy formation and implementation;
Developing clear goals, indicators and evaluation mechanisms are necessary to adjust policy, evaluate progress on integration and to make the exchange of information more effective.”

As a next step towards creating integration policy for the EU the Pact on Immigration and Asylum, was adopted under the French Presidency, which practically outlined EU’s third-country nationals’, both legal and illegal, integration basic principles. Even though it has been criticised we cannot neglect the fact that this policy document was the first to introduce a clear common European strategy in the immigration and asylum context. It was adopted as a response to the growing stances across EU member-states that they cannot deal with the number of immigrants crossing their borders simply because they do not possess the resources required to do that, despite the fact that the EU has previously established certain common instruments such as the border agency Frontex and the common visa policy as part of the Schengen Agreement. The Pact therefore focuses on five key issues: legal and illegal migration (in these two domains the Pact stresses the importance of further cooperation among member-states and the development of a comprehensive approach towards them and it encourages integration); asylum policies and border controls (attention is paid to the role of Frontex and the creation of a Common European Asylum System which was supposed to be adopted in 2010); and finally the Pact outlines the importance of cooperation with the countries of origin of the arriving immigrant nationals. As far as integration is concerned the Pact stresses the importance of good conduct of the host country language and access to the labour market.

Without any intention to disregard the importance of the Pact we should not forget though that according to it the conditions for granting entry of third-country nationals is left to the member-states which ideally means that the EU does not possess at its disposal instruments such as common immigrant admission criteria. Having in mind the ability of free movement of people within the Single Market of the EU, diverging policies in the immigration domain influence the whole of the EU, therefore commonly approved criteria is a must. The EU has taken a significant step towards establishing a coherent integration policy but it is just the start of a long process and currently it simply acts as an “assistant” to the member-states through means of evaluation, analysis and good practices. Since integration is vital for immigration to be beneficial for all parties involved the EU has outlined “integration into the labour market,


social inclusion and education as the core of its integration policies and instruments. Further, the EU aims to involve immigrants at local level of governance as well as to involve the hosts in the integration process themselves. It is evident that immigrant representation in the making of integration policies is still low and the EU encourages further improvement of this aspect. EU officials and policy-makers consider citizenship as primary tool which contributes to non-EU nationals’ feeling of belonging to a particular society. Integration is perceived as a process that requires dedication and effort from both the host society and the immigrants themselves. Therefore with the support of the Integration Fund, the EU undertook several campaigns which were aimed at raising the awareness of integration matters among society in general. The EU went even further by the introduction of a web-site on integration which acts as a source and forum for practitioners and policy-makers as well as immigrants, where they can share and find practices from all around the Union. It has also published three handbooks on integration, the last being published in 2010. This 3rd edition of the Handbook outlines the importance of the media in regard to integration, with special attention being paid to the role media can play when tackling immigrant discrimination as well as the involvement of media into targeting underrepresented minority groups. Another issue the 3rd edition of the Handbook examines is awareness-raising good practices on integration matters. The EU aims to inform as much as possible, and with quality data, both host societies and immigrants themselves by information campaigns which increase the knowledge of all nationals in the immigration and integration domain. At the same time, these campaigns should act as forum for interaction between natives and immigrants. Awareness-raising should be based on up-to-date facts in order for the policy-makers to be able to come up with relative and contemporary solutions and instruments. The establishment of dialogue platforms is considered as important since by means of communication and limiting of misunderstandings will integration be achieved. Interaction between host nationals and those from immigrant background at local level will enhance the trust among them. Immigrants should be prepared to put forward their problems, and the hosts should be open to an equal-to-equal conversation. In order for such dialogue platforms to exist, funding should be more accessible and funds distributed more target specifically. It is perceived that nationality, as defined in the European Convention on Nationality, is a major driving force behind integration, but immigrants should realize that besides the chances it presents, there are obligations that come with it too. These greater
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opportunities for the immigrants and employers are not the only praiseworthy derivatives from it though. Nationality is seen as a tool which brings together immigrants under the common umbrella of both EU and national legislation, making addressing immigrant issues more adequately and coherently. Removing difficulties in national legislation that make acquisition of citizenship difficult therefore should be addressed and where appropriate eliminated. It is also one of the main reasons why I pay attention to it when analyzing current situation in regard to immigration in the four selected EU member-states. What is evident from experience is that employers tend to prefer employees that are nationals of the member-state in question. This alone is a stimulus for immigrants to aim to acquire nationality. Education is perceived as vital element of integration of young immigrants, and language proficiency is the most important of the education process, therefore access to education is significant for further integration. In order for immigrant pupils to fit in properly in their new school system, before hand assessment of their schooling knowledge could be performed by the host school. The problem arises from the fact that many European schools are not equipped with such competences. At a working seminar in Tomelloso, Spain, in which I took part, on the Grundtivig project Towards a European Teacher Portfolio it was agreed that “The European teacher is not just a national teacher but one who teaches “beyond” the national curriculum. He/she would see himself/herself as someone with roots in one particular country, but at the same time belonging to a greater European community.” The idea is a mirror image of the ideal teacher who can contribute to the process of faster assimilation into new school environment. This combined with the introduction of orientation programmes will contribute to the adequate integration and transition into the new school system of the young immigrant pupils. The abilities of teachers to work in a multicultural environment should be previously assessed.

Europe should not forget that third country immigrants most often have to accept and respect customs, values and traditions that are different and even sometimes contradictory to their own. What becomes evident from EU’s continuous effort to standardise integration

57 For further information regarding the project please visit: http://towardsaneuropeanteacherportfolio.wordpress.com/.
instruments is the need for immigrants to know and respect liberal democracy principles despite the fact that most of the time they are not quite in consent with them. If s/he is able to obtain citizenship then it is even possible for her/him to attempt and change legally those very same principles in mind. Since however citizenship grants immigrants with certain benefits, such as equal rights and protection from the state, then they should play their part in the integration process and at least legally abide by the above mentioned principles. This does not apply only for principles of the host country, since French citizenship for instance, inevitably means European one as well. Therefore immigrants for the sake of assimilation should, again at least legally if not morally, respect common EU values and principles.60

Examining integration from an EU legal angle we note that EU legislation clearly distinguishes two diverging kinds of immigrant groups, those with citizenship from any other member-state, and those who are nationals of non-EU member-state. Precisely the second type is what is of interest to us since the first type of immigrants is no subject to any specific integration criteria. Non-EU nationals on the other hand are subject to integration conditions, included in the very first legislation concerning migration Directive 2003/86/EC61, and unlike EU nationals are underrepresented in the Community law. According to it, integration conditions, like civic and language introductory courses and exams, together with residence terms, might be included in the member-states’ national law. EU legislation tackling integration procedures of third-country nationals is undoubtedly not clear enough and this is mostly derived from the fact that member-states did not agree upon to deteriorate their national sovereignty by adopting all proposed legislation. For instance the extent and conditions for obtaining residence permits is left to the individual member-states and their respective national law. Interesting and strangely enough is the fact that when we speak of highly-skilled third-country immigrants EU legislation does not provide any specific criteria for integration. What is considered as sufficient enough, as requirements, are a job contract and health insurance. The highly-skilled immigrant family members who wish to reunite with her/him according to EU legislation is not clear whether they will be subject to integration procedures or not. An obvious question arises: why the highly-skilled worker does not need to go through integration courses while his family members have to? If we compare European and third-country

nationals we understand that the first automatically obtain permanent residence permits, while on the other hand the second could be subjected to integration requirements in order to obtain the same piece of document despite being legal residents for five years already. Furthermore if a third-country national decides to legally move to another EU member-state he/she might once again be subject to integration procedures, unlike EU nationals. This creates a discriminative, from legal point of view, environment for the non-EU immigrants since equal rights among them and EU migrants are not evident in EU immigration and integration legislation.

4.3 Great Britain: legal framework and current situation in regard to immigration

“Coming to Britain is not a right…..And even when people have come here, staying here carries with it a duty. That duty is to share and support the values that sustain the British way of life. Those that break that duty and try to incite hatred or engage in violence against our country and its people have no place here”

Great Britain’s approach to current immigration and its respective policies is influenced by the fact that it is directed mostly at ex co-nationals. From a legislative point of view British Parliament “has no constitutional limits to its law-making powers” thus creating a situation in which Parliament has to keep in mind the public opinion which has been hostile towards immigrants and even today considers that immigration should be reduced. One should ask why it should keep it in mind. Well first of all because it represents it and secondly because it is a voting weapon for future success. Going back to British attitudes towards immigrants let us focus on an interesting survey conducted and compiled in 2009 by Transatlantic Trends which shows: “66% of those polled felt that immigration was more of a problem than an opportunity, the highest of all countries…. British citizens estimated the percentage of immigrants living in

their country to be 27%, while in reality it is 10%......49% of those polled in the United Kingdom believe that the unwillingness of immigrants to integrate into society is the greatest barrier to integration, as opposed to 32% who believe that discrimination by society is the greatest barrier......54% of British citizens agreed that immigrants take away jobs from native-born workers. The United Kingdom is the only country where a majority agrees......48% of British citizens agreed that immigrants bring down wages, one of only two countries where a majority agrees." Britain’s case is interesting also from another perspective. According to many after the dissolution of the British Empire, Great Britain had failed to establish clear citizenship criteria for its ex-colonial subjects. Despite the attempt to do so with the Nationality Act of 1948 all nationals holding British passports were allowed to enter the country, these of course included nationals from the New Commonwealth simply because their passports were issued by the UK too. The legal background of UK’s immigration policy is the Immigration Act of 1971 and its subsequent modifications, which I examined earlier in my work. With it immigration became ever more restricted despite the fact that the right to abode was included in the Act. Furthermore what is important to remember is that UK is the member-state which most opposes the extension of immigration competences at EU level. Throughout its history British immigration policy has been characterized by attempting to limit specific groups of immigrants. Initially after the disintegration of the British Empire non-whites were not very warmly welcomed by the British population and precisely that is why UK government was forced to introduce and shape immigration policies in a more restrictive manner. Despite this attitude however Britain remains a magnet for immigrants from all over the world and according to the Office for National Statistics “immigration is expected to contribute 56 per cent to the increase in the UK population by 2029.” Let us focus on London, being the capital of Great Britain and being mostly affected by immigrants since it is the biggest cosmopolitan city across Europe. The best example there is if we are to understand how immigration influences certain aspects of British nationals’ everyday life; from social issues to economic ones is precisely London. It has been at the center of Great Britain’s population growth, accounting to 70% during the last decade mainly derived from high fertility rates among minority groups. Statistical data for this decade will be available later this year since the National census takes place in March 2011. Every third citizen in London is considered to be

an immigrant and half of them were actually born in Great Britain. Furthermore a quarter of London based pupils use languages other than English at their respective homes, the most commonly used being Bengali. London is now home for Cypriots, Pakistanis, Indians, and Bangladeshi, Turkish, Polish and more. However the largest immigrant proportion is from the New Commonwealth. Majority of them hold British passports. Immigrants are a vital element of London’s economy since they take part in activities such as catering, real-estate, restaurateur business and other economic sectors. All these jobs and businesses however are family owned and are small-scale, although exceptions do exist, and immigrants would prefer to grant a job to their own family members, most of the time hired illegally, thus maintaining an environment in which they prevail local employment patterns, within their own business that is, that do not change over time leading to the creation of, as Prodromos Panayiotopoulos mentioned in his book *Immigrant Enterprise in Europe and the USA*, “ethnic economy”67. This does not necessarily mean bad influence to the economy as argued by the author. Without immigrants it is difficult to predict but London’s economy and UK’s as such, would not be as powerful as it is. Again using statistical data provided by Prodemos Panayiotopoulos it is important to appreciate that 27% of the labour force in inner London constitutes from immigrants, however majority of these do low-paid jobs. We should not allow these figures confuse us simply because it is well known that unemployment among immigrants is higher as well as high percentage of child poverty is accumulated too to minority groups. 68 This does not change the fact that immigrant enterprise, mainly small-scale, flourishes in London. The economic effects of these will be discussed in the next chapter in more detail.

Immigration has been on the British political agenda for many years mainly because of strong opposition to it by the natives since terrorist attacks and other forms of extreme behavior are associated with immigrants. It has to be noted that Great Britain has opted out from the immigration and asylum provisions that came with the Amsterdam Treaty which entered into force in 1999. In fact not only Britain opted out, but they managed to negotiate selective participation at EU level. This interaction between EU and UK is important to outline certain features of British immigration policy. While at one hand Britain “signed up to all

---


seven EU measures on asylum agreed between May 1999 and May 2004 it has decided to decide upon economic migration on its own.

The UK Border Agency, within the framework of the UK Home Office, is the institution responsible for managing and controlling immigration within Great Britain. UK possesses one of the most well elaborated evaluation immigration policy systems, which is implemented by the UK Home Office. This is mainly achieved by the establishment of a well functioning statistical database which provides necessary to the Home Office data in order to monitor migration flows and demographic changes within the country. Furthermore an Inter-Departmental Task Force on Migration Statistics also plays its role when assessment or recommendation is required. Despite these statistical databases certain criticism exists. British government has adopted several means to better integrate immigrants, a good example is the “Britishness test”, and its legal basis lies in the Nationality Immigration and Asylum Act of 2002. Nationals who are able to pass this test are granted citizenship or settlement visa. This is done in order to identify who is eligible to live in the UK. Apart from that very good knowledge of English language is also set as a requirement. This method implemented by the British government has been under heavy criticism since the test consists of “questions not only about everyday life, but also about British history and law.” Despite constant arguments about who and how can obtain British citizenship and identity, politicians and others involved in the making of immigration policies agree that without immigrants British economy would not have prospered as it did, thus making immigrants a vital element of UK economy. This is the main reason why the government has been trying to recruit highly-skilled labour force, such as medical practitioners and IT specialists.

Another criticism directed at the British government in the context of immigration is Britain’s lack of National Register and British dependence on various agencies to collect and elaborate required data, as mentioned in the previous paragraph. Relying on national census is regarded as not effective enough since it is being conducted on a ten-year basis, 2011 being a year of conducting one. Strangely enough, the last census, held in 2001 did not have citizenship question, but rather question identifying ones ethnicity. Migration in and out of

Britain is estimated by the International Passenger Survey, IPS. The survey is aimed at “in estimating the numbers and characteristics of migrants into and out of the UK”\(^{72}\) and the Home Office is one of the recipients and “user” of the data. This data is however considered inefficient since nationals are free to choose whether to take part in the survey or not. Also, asylum seekers do not take part in the survey and furthermore, people lie about their real intentions during the survey making it inaccurate.

We have to acknowledge the difficulty which British government faced, to abolish the blurring of British identity while at the same time to preserve the positive aspects of British multicultural model and to strike a balance between the traditions of the minorities and human rights. One of the steps for solving the identity problem was the introduction of the Nationality Immigration and Asylum Act of 2002, mentioned earlier, according to which a mandatory ceremony exist when acquiring British citizenship. This ceremony includes an oath of allegiance to the British crown and country as such.

UK, as many other developed countries, is currently experiencing one of the worst global recessions. As of 2010 the unemployment in Great Britain has risen to 2.5 million nationals making it reach rates unseen since 1997. This creates a situation and questions arise as to whether UK really needs immigrants if there are not enough jobs for the locals. In practice it is difficult to imagine sectors of UK industry performing without the help of immigrants. Englishmen almost do not participate in productions that require heavy physical labour and low qualification. It is very difficult to encounter a native British working as let’s say a janitor, a construction builder and other “unpleasant” professions. UK has been trying to focus its strength in recruiting highly-skilled immigrants. Apart from them being able to benefit from better payment, better working conditions, vast range of human rights, they are also expected to be accepted by the natives more openly and to adapt and integrate faster to their new surroundings. Furthermore, the economic benefits from such type of labour force are much greater compared to low-skilled immigrants.

The language barrier which many immigrants face, the need to work hard instead of to study and improve their personal qualifications and competences are the main reasons for the lower education amongst the majority of immigrant masses in UK and other developed countries. Research shows that poverty in major European cities, in our case London and other

big British cities is a consequence of immigrants, even more non-European immigrants. About 73% of those living in poverty in London are such type of immigrants. They had come from Pakistan, Bangladesh and Africa. It is only logical that under conditions of poverty the percentage of criminal behaviour among these immigrants is higher when compared to other members of society. This leads to manifestations of extremism, xenophobia and real treat to the internal security of Great Britain.

Since the 1970s British immigration policies have been directed at skill selection while at the same time low-skilled immigration has been restricted. Over time however Britain has become more open towards immigrants, especially if we consider family reunification which has been made easier. Although many may consider family reunification as not significant, this is quite the opposite since family members of already residing nationals are considered as one of the highest percentage of immigrants when it comes to mere statistics. Throughout the years Great Britain has remained a defender of its own national immigration policies despite the fact that it shares certain competences and aspects of immigration, most notably in the context of asylum and irregular immigration, with the EU. This leads us to the idea that Britain acknowledges the fact that despite strong national interest in immigration it faces its problematic aspects together with other EU member-states and that Europe as a whole needs a better functioning immigration strategy in order to reduce negative impacts and increase benefits of this phenomenon and it shows that British immigration policies have transformed from being post-imperial oriented towards more European oriented.\textsuperscript{73}

4.4 France: legal framework and current situation in regard to immigration

“If you want to belong, there are rules. If you don’t like them, you don’t have to join. If you want to play by different rules, find another club. That’s why, once again, the expression “France-love it or leave it” sounds fair to me. In a wide-open world, there’s no reason you

\textsuperscript{73} Geddes, Andrew. 2005. Getting the best of both Worlds? Britain, the EU and Migration Policy. International Affairs. p. 738-740.
can’t go elsewhere. Nobody is required to love his country or the values it proclaims. But if you choose a country, you have to accept it.”74

France currently is the home of some 5 million immigrants who represent roughly 8% of its total population. However these figures do not take in account immigrants born in France or those that already possess French citizenship. Figures show that about 60% of immigrants in France are of non-European background and to top it all France is the home for the largest Muslim population in an EU member-state.75

Unlike in Great Britain, since 2004 census on French population is recorded on an annual basis by the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies. According to the census “The stock of population can be distributed by citizenship, country of birth or by a combination of both in order to identify ‘immigrants’. The definition is as follows: an immigrant is a person born as a foreigner abroad and residing in the country. This means that a person who has acquired French nationality since arriving in France is still counted as an immigrant. Conversely, a person born a French national abroad is not an immigrant.”76 Furthermore in 2009 under the patronage of Yazid Sabeg, Sarkozy’s advisor on discrimination issues, France launched for the first time in its history a commission to measure up the ethnic composition in France. This idea faced strong opposition by many including the French population, except for the immigration population that is, claiming that this is unacceptable since it is discriminating to classify people by their race or ethnicity.77 These combined make up for a rather more user-friendly environment which presents adequate statistical layout for those involved in the policy-making of immigration issues.

Having said this, we should also acknowledge that in France a tradition of assimilation exists, a philosophically political approach that is, unlike Great Britain which over the years has adopted more of a multicultural approach to assimilation. However as the years have passed by France has moved closer to the British model which is based on race. Discrimination for example, in accordance with the EU directives and regulations of the year 2000, has been placed at the center of French integration policies and has even led to the creation of the High

Authority for the Struggle Against Discrimination and for Equality (HALDE) 78. “In principle, the French model recognizes the legitimacy of collective identities only outside the public sphere. This has come to mean that ethnic and religious groups are accorded no special privileges in public policy, nor are they granted special protection.” 79 As we will see below Nicolas Sarkozy’s laws of 2003 and 2007 respectively further contribute to the current face of French integration policy in the context of immigration and to the transition it has experienced in the last decade.

Nicolas Sarkozy voiced in the early 2000s for immigration choisi or in other words a more selective immigration. In order to assess if France follows this direction we should first of all not forget that French nationality is based on jus soli or right of soil meaning that nationals born in France, in the past were able to obtain citizenship straight away. However in 1993 with the Méhaignerie Act citizenship became obtainable only after reaching the age of 13. As of 2004 about 60% of those being granted French citizenship were from Africa and most notably from the Maghreb. According to French law French citizenship is granted also if one is married to a French national and after two years of marriage. Acquiring French citizenship by naturalization is also possible. One might apply for a citizenship if he/she has resided in France for at least 5 years and show that they have been earning enough to support themselves and their family if applicable. Those who are not from the EU or the EEA need to obtain a residence permit first. Residence permits, although easily to apply for, are restricted by requirements and regulations depending on one’s nationality. Since we are focusing on non-European immigrants I will briefly explain the procedure for obtaining such a permit by a third country national. Generally speaking one should obtain a long-stay visa in order to be eligible for a residence permit later on. Furthermore since 2006 those who wish to obtain a residence permit are obliged to sign the so called contrat d’accueil et l’intégration or in other words a type of contract between the resident seeker and the French Republic. Under this contract free language and civic lessons are provided but at the same time certain obligations are introduced such as respect for social norms and values. Under the French Presidency a European Pact on Immigration and Asylum was adopted which led to the establishment of three general factors for integration in Europe:

1. Knowledge of the language of the host country;

2. Having employment opportunity and;

3. Respecting and accepting the values of the host country.

As in the other member-states in question in my work, and unlike new immigration host countries like, Spain or Italy, France’s recent immigration flows were prompted by family reunification thus current French immigration policies are directed not so much at regulating and controlling the amount of coming immigrants but more at the characteristics of those coming.\(^{80}\) The law adopted in 2006 aimed at restructuring French immigration policy by giving rights to the government to stimulate highly skilled immigration, to fight illegal immigration and probably most importantly to limit family reunification. Despite the fact that this law came into practice at the beginning of 2007 in July 2006 some 13 000 people were deported because they did not possess the required documents. This actions triggered protests conducted by French nationals which probably shows that the transition to selective immigration will not be easily achieved. The aim of the new approach to immigration was based on two platforms. First of all the idea is to increase economic immigration at the expense of around 113 000 immigrants entering France annually in order to reunite with a family member, and secondly to conduct an iron campaign against illegal immigration. After years of political and social debates the main force behind the passing of selective immigration in France was the current President Nicolas Sarkozy. The above mentioned law gives the government the right to decide which foreigners might reside on its territory. French government faces critique from many NGOs protecting the human rights of immigrants, African leaders and many French nationals as well. The critique is primarily aimed at the restrictions for family reunification and the significant difficulty in regard to granting legal status to the already illegally residing nationals. Despite all efforts even many statesmen consider that French immigration policy has many flaws. The main arguments can be traced back to 1974 when immigration flows shifted from labour immigration to family reunification. “Today, family reunification accounts for nearly 65 percent of immigration to France — a major reason that the government wants to gain control over the numbers and types of migrants coming to the country.”\(^{81}\)

---


As the riots of 2005 in the Paris suburbs showed France did not manage in its attempts to integrate immigrants and their children, many of them French nationals by birth in fact. In response France implemented a new approach to integration which is based on 3 platforms:

- An elaborate integration plan;
- An initiative campaign against discrimination and
- A more open but still selective immigration policy.

Although a similar programme existed in the early 1990s the new version consists of better conditions for the immigrants. Despite the fact that participation in the programme is not compulsory those responsible for its conduct claim that incentives will be developed in order to encourage immigrants to participate in it. Such incentives according to many observers will place the pressure for integration on the immigrants’ shoulders rather than on the French government.

Currently the institution that is responsible for immigration in France is the French Ministry of Immigration, Integration, National Identity and Co-development. It has however received numerous criticisms mainly from opposition political parties. It however was backed up by some 72% of the French public. Speaking of percentages it is important to keep in mind the following facts: “43% of those polled felt that immigration was more of a problem than an opportunity and The French estimated the percentage of immigrants living in their country to be 26%, while in reality it is 9%.”

We can assume that the approach implemented by French officials in regard to immigration is a response to both public opinion and political competition.

During his work as an Interior minister Nicolas Sarkozy passed two legislations regarding immigration. The first one is the so called *Loi Sarkozy*, adopted in 2003, with which two dimensions of immigration were tackled. Firstly, illegal immigration had to be limited and some 25 000 people were deported from France. Secondly this law was aimed at limiting asylum seekers. So practically the new piece of law was in a sense restricting. It was however considered that this approach would contribute to better integrating those who remain in France. This change towards a more restrictive approach came as a consequence of political and public discussions. By implementing this path Sarkozy tried to address and win on his side the far-right electorate which has been supporting Le Pen’s Front National since he and his

---

political party targeted negative impacts immigration had on French culture, society and even economy. However at the same time Sarkozy had to be careful to balance his policies and ideas in order not to drive back the center-right electorate and the UMP in general. Although restrictive policies were adopted we cannot neglect the fact that he was in favour of the establishment of a French Muslim Council which had left many wondering what precisely is Sarkozy doing in regard to immigration and integration because on one hand he aimed at stricter immigration control yet on the other hand he was more open towards integration and assimilation as such. The second legislation, known too as Loi Sarkozy, came in 2006 and targeted better management of immigration in correspondence to the economic necessities of the French Republic. Furthermore with precisely this law the above mentioned contrat d'accueil et l'intégration came into practice. With the adoption of the law alien nationals were admitted in France only if they are able to financially sustain their family. Basically Sarkozy’s idea was to shift the numbers of immigrants from family reunification towards more selective labour immigration. Also, we can conclude that the immigration policy which the President has implemented proved successful when considering the electorate. Yet, the French public still sees immigrant integration as an issue that requires further attention.\(^{83}\)

Despite all, selective immigration is considered to produce better integration for immigrants in France. Political and public debate however still is concerned with the failure of integration which became evident with the 2005 nationwide violent protests. Also, many consider that the French educational system has failed to assimilate the newly arrived immigrants. Most notably however the public is worried that parallel societies emerge across France. The number of immigrants will most probably continue to grow. Economic necessities, labour shortages in certain sectors will undoubtedly contribute to further immigration.

4.5 Germany: legal framework and current situation in regard to immigration

In 2006 the German Federal Statistical Office announced that around 15.3 million people living in Germany have immigrant background, despite the fact that numbers of new

immigrants has been falling in recent years, and about half of them posses’ nationality other than German. As in France and to a certain extent Great Britain, recent immigration trends were mainly influenced by the family reunification criteria. Germany’s case differs since these trends occur as a consequence of the bilateral agreements and guest work programmes Germany signed in the aftermath of World War II till the early 1970s, consisting of two elements, temporality and rotational principle, which looking at today’s immigration statistics have both failed. Current flows are shaped also by the fact that the majority of immigrants marry to nationals from their native descent. For example, according to statistics provided by embassies more than half of the Turkish nationals living in Germany marry to another Turkish national which increase immigration numbers further. I mention Turkish nationals since they are the most numerous representatives of the immigrant society, about 2% of the total German population and around 26% of the foreign population residing in Germany as of most recent available data. These numbers combined with immigrants from many and diverse countries contribute to a significant percentage of the population whose integration has been labeled as a failure by German Chancellor Angela Merkel in a speech in Potsdam in 2010 “And of course, the approach [to build] a multicultural [society] and to live side-by-side and to enjoy each other... has failed, utterly failed.”84 The chairman of the Christian Social Union, Horst Seehofer, went even further by stating that “’We don't need more immigrants from alien cultures... The multi-cultural society is dead... It couldn't be more dead.”85 Motivated by political and ideological aspirations or not, examples show that both Mr. Seehofer and Mrs. Merkel are not far from the truth. The percentage of immigrants living on the welfare state and the percentage of unemployment among immigrants is definitely higher when compared to natives. Also, many of the immigrants don’t even speak German which increases segregation. Figures also can be looked at as proof of that: “60% of those polled in Germany believe that immigrants’ unwillingness to integrate is the greatest barrier to integration, as opposed to 27% who believe that discrimination by society is the greatest barrier. Germany has the largest majority of people who support the view that it is the immigrants’ fault.”86


from its nationals for the way it manages immigration\(^\text{87}\), the highest from the countries examined in this paper. This can be attributed to a certain extent to the amendments in German nationality legislation, establishing of statistical databases and integration mechanisms.

Unlike in France obtaining citizenship in Germany up to 2000 was based on \textit{jus sanguinis} meaning that you could become a German citizen only if you had German parents. Since that year however “children born in Germany of foreign parents will automatically become Germans at birth if one parent has been permanently and legally resident in Germany for at least eight years at the time of the birth, and has an entitlement to residence or has had for at least three years an unrestricted residence permit. These children will become German nationals at birth – with all accompanying rights and duties.”\(^\text{88}\) They also had to choose what citizenship to keep by the age of 23. Although \textit{jus sanguinis} is still the main citizenship principle, elements of \textit{jus soli} were attached to it. This practically means that Germany currently, like the majority of European states citizenship may be obtained on the principle of place of birth. It is largely considered that this shift would make integration and assimilation easier and faster. Also with this new piece of legislation, Nationality Act, adult foreigners can obtain citizenship only by naturalization which has to be applied for. In order for that to be possible like in France certain requirements must be met, such as: knowledge of the German language and history (600 hours language lessons and 60 hours history lessons), respecting the values and laws of democracy and Germany, and one should have resided at least 8 years in Germany (previously 15 years). The complexity of German administrative practices and regulation is evident from the mere fact that the different Federal States of Germany (Länder) implemented different criteria. Bavaria for instance required those applying for naturalization not only to speak but also to read and write fluently German.\(^\text{89}\) Also, since 2008 apart from knowing German, immigrants have to know important elements of German culture and even Constitution. All these adjustments to German Nationality Law might look at first sight as creating a friendlier environment for those who wish to acquire German citizenship but the fact is that it is still rather restrictive.


The year 2000 is significant for understanding the German approach to immigration from another perspective. After acknowledging that Germany is in fact a country of immigration a new legislation, Green Card, was adopted allowing non-European nationals (third-country nationals) to participate in the German labour market. It was aimed at highly-skilled professionals to fill in the gaps were needed in specific sectors of German industry and economy in general. Green Card holders were entitled for up to 5 years residence permits in parallel to their work permits. Furthermore it “provided work permits for spouses after a one-year stay and was also available to foreign students of corresponding academic subjects, making it easier for them to stay in Germany immediately after ending their studies.”  

As of 2004 however the Green Card programme is not operational. It did however trigger a debate which led to the adoption of a new Immigration Act which basically simplifies already active immigrant regulations. For example, before the act was adopted there were five types of resident permits, currently there are only two: permanent and temporary ones. However after obtaining a temporary residence permit after a certain amount of time spent in Germany and after meeting certain criteria nationals are able to apply for a permanent one. What is more important though, both from a legislative and social point of view, is that with this Act for the first time in German immigration history regulations for integration and assimilation were introduced. What appeared as the most serious critique of the Act is the lack of introduction of efficient channels of access to the German labour market.

Up till 2005 Germany did not keep statistical data of nationals with immigrant background because ethnic Germans and naturalized ones were simply referred to as Germans. From 2005 onwards this is not the case since according to new regulations micro census is carried in order to identify nationals with immigrant background. The first one of its kind included two types of categories:

1. First, second and third generation foreign nationals and;
2. German nationals who have foreign background.

This is definitely a step forward from the German government in the context of managing immigration since it contributes to regulating integration, knowing the amount and type of immigrants helps authorities in the process of creating integration programmes. They can also

---

rely on the Central Register of Foreigners which provides data about Germany’s foreign nationals. Criticism however exist because many politicians and others involved in managing immigration in Germany consider this statistical background as insufficient and not relevant enough since it does not include duration of stay thus misguiding between long-term and short-term immigration. In many other countries this is taken into consideration since it is regarded as a significant element for defining migration patterns. This is important because it might be a useful asset for those responsible for managing integration programmes and courses. In Germany, similarly to France and unlike UK, the institution responsible for collecting statistical data for migration provides information about the citizenship, age, sex, current residence status and from 2006 purpose of stay. Certain proportion of the data provided and its update though relies on the immigrant’s readiness to co-operate with the authorities and many who decide to leave simply do not go and write their names off the Register’s lists and their names remain there. What can be distinguished as the most serious critique towards German authorities responsible for immigration is the lack of adequate census and their unavailability to those interested in them, despite the availability of other relevant data such as civil registrations.91 The last count of German population occurred in 1987 and one is planned for 2011 however it will not be a census in the typical form but rather a “register-based” one since the last census went hand in hand with civil protests and many claimed this method of collecting data is not democratic and at variance with human freedoms. “Register-based census” practically means that all relevant data from various authorities and institutions, such as the Federal Administration Office or the Federal Office for Migration and refugees, which have been collecting information, will be brought together and matched in order to reach one final statistical background. Statistical data does not clearly outline the purposes of immigration despite the attempts to improve this aspect and only further harmonization of immigration data can lead to sustainable results in managing it effectively.

Currently Germany is focusing on several key aspects of immigration that are considered as vital for the successful integration of immigrants into German society. “The integration of immigrants is one of the major political and societal challenges in Germany... Integration deficits carry with them the danger that living together becomes living near one another and, in the worst case, living against one another. Integration is a prerequisite to societal cohesion in a country open to the world in which people with the greatest possible

variety of ethnic backgrounds live together in peace, lawfulness, and mutual respect.” Not knowing German language, high unemployment rates among immigrant groups, lower education, not respecting German law and non acceptance of German rules and principles are the main obstacles for proper assimilation of third-country nationals. This combined with population projections according to which immigrant population in major German cities will increase over time in contrast to the ageing and low fertility of German population raises many questions. Therefore it seems as it is up to the German government to create better functioning mechanisms to help immigrants learn the native language, history and even traditions and to inform them and make them aware of German laws and rules. Family reunification is seen as the main force behind recent immigration trends and the German government has noted that integration mechanisms and policies should be directed at entire families mainly because they are the driving force behind assimilation. Germany has to keep in mind its own economic stability and performance, to which immigrants have contributed throughout the years, and therefore integration policies, should take into consideration the education of its immigrant groups in order to establish a society that can provide for itself. It should be acknowledged that successful integration participation from the immigrants themselves is required too as well as responsibility. They should realize that accepting and respecting German legal background and environment is of interest to both parties. If natives see that immigrants are willing to follow established German rules and participate in civil engagements they will be more open and tolerant towards immigrants. Practically both should realize that with certain rights, duties come too. The German government moved a step closer to achieving a better functioning integration policy by the creation of work groups tackling integration matters and by promoting an arena for discussion with immigrant representatives. In 2006 at an “Integration Summit” it also set key issues to be further addressed and developed. These include:

- Enhancement of the effectiveness of integration programmes;
- Promoting the German language at an earlier stage;
- Promoting women rights and creating better living and working conditions of females;
- Establishing a more coherent civil society and;
- Providing better education and career development to immigrants.

---

The results of the above mentioned approach towards integration of immigrants are of course yet to be seen, however to many it seems that Germany is on the right track, although others think it realised to be an immigrant country too late, until 2004 Germany considered itself as not a country of immigration, and the negative effects immigration has had are partially derived from this delay. Also criticism has arisen from Turkey as seen by recent comments made by Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, who although voiced Angela Merkel’s claims that immigrants should integrate, noted that assimilation was out of the questions since Turkish culture goes hand in hand with Turkish nationals and they should foremost learn Turkish and not German as requested by the German government.93

German policies nowadays are forced to strike a balance between the economic factors which favour labour immigration and the socio-political factors which on the contrary incline restrictive measures against further immigration.

4.6 The Netherlands: legal framework and current situation in regard to immigration

The Netherlands has a long history of being a country of immigration even though it is reluctant to admit it. Out of five nationals, one is of immigrant background and “a large part of the population-57 per cent according to a recent survey –believes that the acceptance of immigrants from Third World countries was Dutch post-war history’s biggest mistake... 56 per cent of the population regards ‘Islam’ as a significant threat to Dutch identity”94 According to statistics around 20% of the total Dutch population is of immigrant origin (first and second generation immigrants). When it comes to immigration statistics it should be noted that the Netherlands, when identifying immigrant background focuses on ethnicity in contrast to many other EU member-states which base their data on place of birth or even nationality. The Dutch government has gone even further with introducing categorization on several levels in order to identify its immigrant population. First of all two types of nationals exist according to the

Dutch government: *allochtonen*, those born outside the Netherlands or having one parent of foreign descent, and *autochtonen*, are practically the natives. Further classification is made between western (Europe, Japan, Oceania, Indonesia and North America) and non-western (Turkey, Latin America, Africa and parts of Asia) allochtonen. From these the Turkish and Moroccan immigrant minorities are the most disadvantaged since they have the lowest percentage of labour representation (as of 2006 15.1% of the Turkish immigrants were unemployed and 17.2% of the Moroccans\(^95\)) and high percentage of welfare dependency. From the immigrant groups “Moroccans and Antilleans in particular are seen as a source of problems in Dutch society. For example, police statistics show that over 10% of Antillean and Moroccan boys aged 12-17 have been suspected of a crime, compared to only 2% of autochtonen and 5.2% of Turkish boys. Of men aged 18-24, 17.8% of Moroccans and 13.0% of Antilleans have been a suspect in a crime, compared to 3.8% of the autochtoon Dutch population.”\(^96\) The Dutch government pays special attention to those of non-Western immigrant origin since they are the ones experiencing more trouble when integrating into Dutch society. This division although aiming to help policymakers in the integration context is seen as discriminative by some Dutch politicians. As of 2009 the majority of highly-skilled immigrants came from India, USA and to a much lesser extent from Japan. Other forms of labour immigration also occurred, mainly from China, the Philippines and North America. As a consequence of family reunification numbers of immigrants have also increased despite the stricter restrictions implemented by the Dutch government. Majority of family reunification immigrants originate from Morocco, Turkey and India. In 2009 alone some 118 850 temporary residence permits were issued and some 23 400 permanent ones.\(^97\)

As of 1998 a Law on the Civic Integration of Newcomers exists according to which every newly arriving immigrant needs to go through an integration programme. It consists of Dutch language courses and courses introducing the immigrant to the Dutch societal structure. With this Law new issues began being tackled by the Dutch government. These include: giving equal social and economic opportunities to immigrants, access to accommodation, education, work and integration schemes helping the newcomers integrate faster into Dutch society. As far as obtaining Dutch citizenship goes it must be noted that it is based on the principle of *jus sanguinis*, or in other words determining citizenship by having a parent or parents of Dutch


descent, meaning that a child born in the Netherlands to foreign parents does not acquire Dutch citizenship. 2003 is the year in which Dutch nationality law was amended and new regulations took place. Probably the most significant change occurred in regard to obtaining citizenship by naturalization. Prior to 2003 those applying for naturalization had to show that they did not have a criminal past and pass a rather easy Dutch language test. This simplicity was thought to contribute to easier and faster integration, however it proved to be non-satisfactory and this approach has been abolished. Similarly to the other aspects of immigration policy, obtaining Dutch citizenship became more difficult. For instance the test checking one’s language fluency became more difficult. Apart from just having to know basic Dutch language, since 2003 writing, reading and understanding the language became integral part of the tests. Cultural and societal aspects were too introduced with the new naturalization test system. Also, a national applying for citizenship needs to have legally resided in the Netherlands for at least 5 years prior to the application, if married to a Dutch national the period is 3 years. Since 2009 anyone who is to become a Dutch citizen is obliged to swear his/her acceptance and respect of Dutch values.

The Netherlands has adopted a policy directed at ethnic minorities and their integration. It pays special attention to the ethnicity, as noted earlier, and the promotion of social and economic cohesion and integration as well as removal of any sort of discrimination. The approach adopted focuses on the balance between integration and leaving enough space to the cultural and ethnic background of the immigrants. It must be noted that the Netherlands is one of the first countries in Europe to develop such a complex policy.

Institutionally speaking The Ministry of Interior Affairs and Kingdom Relations is responsible for the Dutch asylum and immigration policy. Currently the responsible minister is Mr. Gerd Leers. However the Dutch Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment is involved directly and responsible for labour migration. We can assume that current Dutch immigration policies are oriented towards the family values, labour needs and housing for immigrants. Most often immigration policies in the Netherlands are criticized for the lack of a clear cut structure, in contrast to the integration policies for example which is adopted on national level but implemented on regional. Integration policy has also been a target of criticism mainly because it is regarded that it should be much more complemented by the involvement of NGOs, trade/labour unions and even churches in the establishment of coherent integration programmes. From an institutional point of view another institution exists, Movement of
Persons, Migration and Aliens Affairs Department, which basically works in close cooperation with the countries of origin of immigrants and is responsible for the visa procedures. 98

Currently the Dutch immigration policy, as in the other member-states in question, is becoming more restrictive. This is primarily derived from the fact that the newly coming immigrants are from countries with different cultures and traditions in comparison to the Dutch and European in general which creates a situation in which cohesion and integration become more difficult. The Netherlands might be seen as the most vivid example of all EU member-states which has implemented a sort of limiting immigration policy over the last decade. This Dutch approach has been triggered by the will to preserve Dutch national identity and to protect the society from Islamic radicalism and criminal activities in general. For instance the killing of Dutch politician Pim Fortuyn in 2002 who was in favour of restricting as much as possible non-European immigration99 and the killing of Dutch film director, Theodoor van Gogh, by a national with Moroccan background100 triggered political tensions across the country and immigrants begun being seen as taking advantage of the Dutch tolerance towards them. Also we should not forget that when making policies in regard to immigration the Dutch government has to keep in mind the opinion of its public from which about half consider immigration to be more of a problem than an opportunity. Dutch policies responded by introducing certain requirements for the immigrants which are more or less similar to the ones introduced by Germany; tests determining ones knowledge of the Dutch language and culture. The interesting point of reference comes from the fact that the Netherlands was the first to introduce compulsory integration courses for to-become permanent residents before they actually arrive in the country, the so-called pre-integration course. Housing procedure also became much stricter, as well as labour hiring and marriage among Dutch and non-Dutch nationals. Furthermore, an example of Dutch anti-immigrant stances is the election of an anti-immigrant political party in 2009 to represent the Netherlands in the European Parliament.

Despite the above mentioned restrictive immigrant measures in a globalized world with its features such as knowledge based economy and highly-skilled labour shortages immigration will definitely remain a fact of Dutch society. Having in mind precisely these factors, the

Dutch government has set an objective to implement a new immigrant policy, the Modern Migration Policy, which should have come into effect in January 2011 but did not due to delayed introduction of an integral element of the policy, an ICT system called INDiGO. Generally speaking this policy is a remake of the Aliens Act of 2000 which concerns labour migration, family reunification and education migration. The policy’s primary aim would be to keep up with the ever-changing immigrant trends. With it, entering the Netherlands as an immigrant will become even more difficult since it will be up to the Dutch government and the institutions involved deciding who to allow into the country. The needs of the Dutch society and labour market are put in front. The Modern Migration Policy will also make obtaining residence permits simpler. This will be done by categorizing immigrant applicants into several key groups, such as: students, labour force and family reunification, highly qualified and even special residence. Furthermore within the specific groups differentiation is also made. For example concerning labour immigrants, they are divided into temporary workers and permanent ones.\(^\text{101}\) The new policy places the employer, or as it is also referred to the sponsor, at the centre of this domain. The employer is responsible for the submission of an application and since the aim of the policy is to simplify and accelerate the procedure he is not obliged to present other supporting documents, such as labour contract for instance, but simply a statement which notes that the requirements are met. In the application however the salary and the contract terms should be included. Certain obligations however need to be met for sponsors that require the admission of highly-skilled personnel. The sponsors need to be recognised as authorised by applying for such a status to the Immigration and Naturalisation Service. This obligation is valid also for educational institutions. Sponsors are also obliged to keep administrative record of every single employee for 5 years after the completion of the contract and has to keep the Dutch Immigration and Naturalisation Service with up-to-date information regarding the situation of every employee, be it merely the change of his/her working hours. Furthermore if the obligations posed by the INS are not met by the immigrants, they will be fined by the same institution. What arose as criticism towards the Modern Migration Policy is the compulsory need of a sponsor which is in contradiction with the EU Blue Card holders’

regulations, although not yet adopted, according to which no such requirement exists, thus creating a situation in which permission can be refused.\footnote{Kroes, Jelle. 2010. *A Modern Migration Policy for the Netherlands*. Volume 15. IBA Immigration and nationality law news. p. 1-3.}

The Netherlands has an image of an open country, with an open society and up till the year 2000 we can assume that its borders were open too. Since the beginning of the last decade however Dutch immigration policies have been aimed at closing down its borders as much as possible. This is mainly derived from the fact that Dutch society perceives immigration as a major issue deteriorating their culture and societal organization. Apart from the cultural and societal issues bothering the natives what is also seen as problematic is the fact that most immigrants are settled in the big cities thus creating a disproportionate distribution. This combined with the high unemployment rate of immigrants; their misconduct of Dutch language has been at the centre of current Dutch immigration policies. Critics of the new restrictive measures claim that the Netherlands is practically trying to keep poor Muslims out of the country, a statement which is obviously labeled as false by the Dutch government. Those same opponents of the Dutch immigration and integration policy are to some extent right if we consider the fact that Canadian or Australian nationals for example are not subject to the same procedures.
5. Consequences of non-European immigration to Europe

Examining the effects of immigration of third-country nationals to Europe is a relatively new research subject despite its importance for fully understanding and managing migration, and immigration as such. Both influence the economic performance positively and negatively, if not properly regulated; the cultural and social life and occasionally they are a prerogative for terrorist threats to the host societies as examples suggest. Europe is currently experiencing the outcome of the post-Second World War guest-work schemes and recruitment programmes, illegal immigration which resulted later as a consequence of the initial wave of post-war immigration and last but not least the impact of family reunification and other current migration patterns such as asylum seekers and refugees.

There are several fundamental factors if we are to understand the effects of non-EU immigration to the examined member-states and Europe as a whole. These are based on a research study conducted by the European Migration Network. Foremost are the international, in our case EU, national and local legislation and regulations, or in other words the legal framework which deals with immigration and integration. This factor is of great importance since different legislation at the different levels has been shaped by certain political and historical traditions. That is why special attention is paid to it in the chapter *Current Situation and Legal Framework*, because the legal basis is considered as the foundation of how immigration and integration is managed and regulated which on its own is a prerequisite for the scope of effects it has on European societies. Another factor shaping the effects of immigration is the access of third-country nationals to Europe’s labour market and its correlation to the existing European and national legislation. Unequal distribution of the immigrants, they tend to prefer to settle in big cities as available data suggests, and the establishment of the so-called parallel communities undoubtedly is yet another factor that has relative effect on the impact immigrants present. What is considered by EU officials and national politicians as one of the most important aspects of successful integration and impact as such is the proficient conduct of the host language and education in general. Being able to freely communicate with the host society representatives is an advantage that enhances the
positive effects immigrants can have on Europe in general. A good example are the strict Dutch immigration laws according to which if a third-country national is to obtain legal residence or work permit s/he must be able to speak, read and write fluent Dutch or faces deportation.\textsuperscript{103} As mentioned in \textit{Integration as a two-way process: EU perspective} rights are a prerogative for successful integration too. What often triggers EU and national officials’ contradictory opinions is the sensitive issue of striking a balance between which and how much rights should be granted to third-country nationals. Despite the existence of these factors and effects it must be noted that comparative evaluation of some of the factors is difficult to collect and therefore further understanding and analysis of the topic should be conducted.

\section*{5.1 Economic effects}

From an economic perspective according to my academic research on the already existing literature, although empirical research is limited, immigration impacts the economy of the host member-state since it has direct effect on its labour market, pension system, unemployment rates, import as well as export and last but not least the margin of the consumption sector. Moreover we can assume as it is widely accepted that the economic sector is the one being mostly affected by immigration. Across Europe attention is paid to the effect on the welfare system of the host member-states and their respective pension systems (still a very debatable issue practically because many argue that immigrants age too and therefore their impact on this field is questionable). Analysis exists also in regard to the labour market but it is a domain largely debated as well as is the involvement of third-country nationals in the entrepreneurship sector and their consumer behaviour. The last being a sensitive topic mainly because immigrants represent a large number of consumers and their consumer activities should be more closely observed since their spending power and interests reflect a segment of the overall analysis on their contribution to the local economic performance as well as the need for diversification of the goods and services available. Not only that but once we possess relative data easier assumption can be made on the immigrants’ standard of living.

When integration and economic impact cross paths the labour market is perceived as the main aspect shaping integration related policy instruments.\textsuperscript{104}

Immigrant entrepreneurship has been one of the driving forces behind the economic prosperity mainly of the big European cities. Another positive impact is the productivity and spending capability of highly-skilled immigrants and their professional expertise in variety of economy sectors. Europe’s economy is viewed as knowledge-based and the sectors for which they are being recruited are vital for Europe’s economic prosperity. They practically fill a gap that has to be filled in if the machine is to continue functioning smoothly. These specialized professionals provide important and needed assistance and innovation in the health, IT and education sectors and many more. However while considering their positive impact many studies suggest that this recruitment method might be disruptive to the immigrants country of origin. A term known as brain drain is used to describe this phenomenon. It means that if a highly-skilled immigrant does not return home and apply the knowledge and experience acquired abroad it practically is a loss of capable professionals who could have contributed to their native countries’ economic performance. There is another side of the coin though which contradicts to a certain extent the idea that Europe should not acquire the services of highly-qualified third-country nationals for the sake of brain drain. Remittances, or the money which immigrants send back home, are seen as means that help fight poverty since many families rely on these funds. Therefore when creating migration-related policies both aspects should be taken into consideration and a balance struck.

In the member-states examined in my work the positive derivatives from immigration are closely related to the period for which the immigrant legally resides in the host country as well as to the welfare benefits s/he receives. Moreover, as noted in the sub-chapter Demographic analysis immigration contributes to the solution to the demographic “deficit”, or in other words to Europe’s ageing population, which from an economic perspective, if immigration consists of young working-capable third-country nationals that is, means that immigrants help contain the exhausted pension systems of the countries examined. Simply put, human capital is a prerogative for economic growth. This might be said for both high and low wage labour markets since the latter is a determinant in many occasions for attracting Foreign Direct Investment. Immigrant participation in the labour market contributes to an increase in

labour productivity thus affecting positively the per capita GDP of the state in which they reside.\textsuperscript{105} We should not forget though that this formula is applicable only when immigrants do participate in the labour market. In the Netherlands however, research points out to the fact that immigrants are more of a burden to the Dutch economy. This is a consequence of the fact that a very high percentage of them rely on welfare benefits and the unemployment rate among them is higher than the average among the native population. This is one of the main reasons why current Dutch migration policies are directed at allowing entry mostly to highly-skilled workers who as we saw earlier have a favourable impact.

One of the biggest fears among politicians and other officials is that immigration has a negative effect on wages. This though is not fully comprehensive and well-grounded. Examples and recent research studies suggest that positive features exist too especially in the long run, as seen in many EU member-states. Yes it is widely regarded that greater labour supply is considered to lower the average wage level simply because there will be more workers competing for a single available job, but in most cases immigrants and natives do not stand on each other’s way. Also, since the majority of current member-states’ migration instruments aim to attract mostly highly-skilled immigrants and close its borders to illegal and unskilled ones then this should not be the case in the long run. According to a study of Docquier, Çağlar and Peri the participation percentage of highly-skilled immigrants in the labour market of the examined member-states is greater than those of the low or unskilled ones. The factor of illegal immigration exists too but highly reliable data on this issue is difficult to organize because of the character of the type of migration.\textsuperscript{106} Roughly estimated and adjusted in a report conducted by Dita Vogel and Vesela Kovacheva, it is suggested that the percentage of illegal immigrants in the examined in this work member-states is relatively low compared to the overall immigrant population. For instance, in Germany as of 2008, undocumented immigrants estimate to 6% of the total foreign population in the country. For France the figures suggest 11%, for UK 16, and in the Netherlands 19%.\textsuperscript{107} These factors combined create reaction from scholars who consider that the issue is politicised on purpose. Finally there are also those immigrants who do the jobs Europeans no longer wish to do and


this is mostly applicable to the advanced economies, such as the economies of the countries described in the previous chapter. Here a contradiction might arise though and it is derived from two factors. The first one is the global economic crisis which inevitably affected Europe as well. Considering the high unemployment rates, although the Netherlands has rather low percentages when compared to all other EU member-states, we should assume that there should not be jobs Europeans do not wish to do. From this factor I derive the second one, being that Europeans do not want to do certain jobs at a certain wage.

As mentioned earlier in this chapter in relation to the impact third-country nationals have on the pension system there are disputes among officials and involved scholars. In order to be able to evaluate the effects we should first of all make it clear that the EU member-states discussed in this work use the money to pay pensions out of the currently collected taxes. In other words workers do not save for their own pensions but pay for others’. Considering the decreasing European population it is not an easy task for governments to keep the pension systems stable since the fewer workers in the labour market, the less money for pensions. That is precisely why many consider immigration as the solution to this ongoing problem and save European welfare system in general. Although to a certain extent this might be the case, we should not forget that immigrant’s age and retire too, meaning that over time governments will have to take care of them too. This obviously is if we assume that those immigrants would settle in Europe, but as history teaches us we cannot assume otherwise. What appears also as a concern is the fact that although the numbers of third-country nationals entering Europe increase constantly, the percentage of those being employed does not change drastically. For instance to support my statement I will use Christopher Caldwell’s evaluation of this aspect: “In 1994 in France, just 29 percent of all immigrants came for work purposes. (This does not mean the remaining 71 percent stayed unemployed, only that they were admitted for family reunification, an asylum application or some other noneconomic reason.) Those admitted for work included 70 percent of arrivals from other European countries, and 7 percent of those from North Africa. By 1997, only 12 percent of immigrants arriving in Britain from what used to be called the “New Commonwealth” (the nonwhite parts of the former British Empire) were coming for work.”\(^{108}\) That is yet another reason why Europe’s leaders are currently focused on economic needs of the respective EU member-states or differently put; the focus is on work-immigration.

Coming back to the labour market and correlating it to the demographic projections around European countries it comes as a certain surprise at first that those examined in this work have adopted relatively restrictive migration policies because if these projections are to be believed than Europe will need immigrants to fill in the labour shortages that are about to arise in the future. As far as the labour market is concerned and the impact of immigrants on it we can assume that they contribute to its growth thus giving more possibilities for employers and creating a competitive environment which acts as a stimulus among the competing workforce.

However, if we evaluate the advantages and disadvantages third-country nationals bring to the labour market from the perspective of level of productivity, since it determines the prices of goods and services which is factor shaping wages, we can argue that more competition will decrease the average wages. This means that immigration by causing saturation in some sectors of the labour market demand and surplus of final products/services availability has a negative impact on the welfare of the native population. Therefore the effects on the labour market and welfare to a certain extent depend on the elasticity of the labour market, or as Kolb and Egbert differentiated two labour markets: Competitive labour markets and rigid labour markets (where wages are determined by wage legislation for instance), meaning that for the various segments of the native population the effects are different. Those of them who are company owners will benefit from such circumstances. Therefore there are two sides of the coin which should be addressed by policy-makers and officials.

A problem however occurs when illegal or unskilled immigrants are hired by profit-seeking business elites who prefer to find cheap labour instead of to hire a native. Those third-country nationals not participating in the labour market are a tax weight on the natives. That is why labour market participation is one of the main targets of current EU immigration practices.

We can conclude that the economic effects of immigration on the host economy and society largely vary. When estimating the impacts one should pay attention to numerous variables such as immigrants education and skill competences, legal status, institutional framework concerning the labour market such as trade unions for instance, its flexibility, labour demand and supply, level of productivity, the dependency of both immigrants and natives on the welfare system and last but not least duration of stay of the third-country
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nationals. Research and evaluation on these matters is still contradictory and not commonly agreed upon and it is a vital domain that needs further attention and deeper evaluation by researchers and policy-makers within the migration context.

5.2 Cultural and social effects

“A country’s unity is both expressed in and sustained by its citizens’ shared sense of history; by their mutual recognition of national holidays, symbols, myths, and ceremonies; by their allegiance to a common set of values; and by their participation in a range of informal customs and tendencies covering virtually every aspect of life, including modes of dress, habits of thought, styles of music, humor, and entertainment, patterns of work and leisure, attitudes toward sex and sexuality, and tastes in food and drink.”

It is quite difficult to examine the cultural and societal impact of immigrants on Europe’s societies however a question whether immigrants influence the host societies from a cultural perspective should not arise since it is inevitable due to the fact that immigrants come from a different to European cultural background. However whether a country can embrace supplementing cultures is a question that still has to be answered and most of the time it is up to the individual country to manage the diversity brought in by third-country nationals. The question of cultural compatibility arises. Speaking of diversity it should be noted that according to some scholars Europe’s immigration patterns are not as diverse as one might think and are defined by similar religious and ethnic background. Europe, although currently the home of many third-country nationals, unlike the United States of America does not owe much of its evolution and creation of European principles and morals to immigration. Furthermore the European member-states examined in this work still do not fully acknowledge that they are countries of immigration and if they did so, it happened only in the past decade which inevitably influenced their approach towards managing immigration. Without any doubt however, Europe’s cultural landscape has been shaped to a certain extent, in some member-states more than in others, by the immigration waves that have occurred since the aftermath of World War II.

New clothing trends, new cuisine, arts and participation in sports activities (for instance the football national teams of France, Germany and the Netherlands are represented by numerous athletes from immigrant background) for example are the most vivid contribution to Europe’s cultural diversity. From a positive perspective, especially the sports and arts factor, this acts as a platform for smoother integration and assimilation. Cultural diversity is further perceived as a driving tool behind innovation and creativity in variety of spheres, such as arts for example. Also, being in touch with cultures different to ours makes our everyday lifestyle a bit more colourful and broadens our view of life.

Around Europe, and not only in the member-states examined in this work, magazines, newspapers and even television channels are broadcasted in a language different from the native one which can be perceived as further effort to correlate two diverging cultures and traditions and to create a multicultural environment. Just as an example “Over fifty non-German newspapers are produced in Germany; among the languages of former “guest workers” the majority of them being published are in Turkish.” This existence of media sources on the mother tongue of the third-country immigrants can be seen as a tool towards successful integration but on the other hand it can be seen also as deteriorating integration since non-natives tend to read, watch or listen only to media which relates to their own interests.

Ethnic and social segregation, or inequality, as well as the creation of the so-called parallel communities, many of them hostile to outsiders, are aspects with negative connotation which in many European countries, and according to many scholars, lead to uneven allocation of opportunities. Cultural and societal bonds and removal of all sorts of ethnic or religious discrimination are vital for social and cultural integration. Apart from occurring ethnic segregation on residence level in Europe such division is evident on the workplace as well. Discrimination against ethnic minorities, although we live in the 21st century, still exists in many parts around Europe. What is more striking is that not only ordinary citizens are advocates of such stances, but government officials too. Considering the demographic projections for the examined in my work member-states, nationals from ethnic background will contribute the most to the expected increase of population simply because of their high fertility

111 German National Contact Point. 2005. The Impact of Immigration on Germany’s Society. Federal Office for Migration and Refugees. p. 34.
rate and low fertility rate and high death rate of local nationals. This has to be noted since if segregation and other types of division among native and foreign nationals is not limited to a minimum, or even better completely eliminated, and considering the tendencies of third-country nationals to join already established immigrant communities, will lead to a situation in which bigger parallel societies will be established in the future which is not a desirable outcome. What is vastly considered as occurrence around Europe is that the more different the cultural background to Europe’s’, the more difficult it is for the newcomers to integrate in the society. This notion can be backed by the fact that many of the third-country immigrants come from countries where liberal democratic values and principles are not as important, if present at all, as they are in Europe. The emergence of parallel societies is seen as failure to integrate immigrants which has negative effects on both the host and guest communities. Also, the proclamations made by German Chancellor Angela Merkel, French President Nicolas Sarkozy and even the current Prime Minister of the United Kingdom David Cameron\(^\text{113}\) that Europe’s multicultural society has failed speak for themselves. Whether these positions of political leaders come as a response to the general public opinion which is in favour of more restricted migration policies is something we can only speculate about.

Race violence and emergence of anti-immigrant political parties is not something new to European societies as it can be traced back to 1970s when immigrants were blamed by the majority of Europeans for the economic recession, as literature suggest, which the old continent was going through. Immigrant prejudice around EU member-states nowadays is triggered apart from economic concerns also from purely cultural threats to native societies. This is a result of the diverging beliefs, lifestyle, morals and values between the two groups of nationals. These cultural differences are the core of immigrant prejudice. Practically natives are acting protective of their own cultural inheritance and traditions, which to a certain extent is understandable. This is however applicable to the foreign nationals too. As the Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan noted earlier this year while on a visit to Germany - “No-one should be able to rip us away from our culture. Our children must learn German but, first, they must learn Turkish.”\(^\text{114}\) This preservationism inevitably leads to tensions between different cultures but it is very difficult to abolish it since it is in human nature to cherish and be

\(^{113}\) BBC News UK Politics. 05.02.2011. *State Multiculturalism has failed, says David Cameron*. BBC. (http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-12371994).

protective of one’s ancestors’ traditions. The idea that all cultures are equal somehow has faded away and when cultural aspects are addressed not always neutrality is the driving tool. And if it is achieved it is not shared by the immigrants themselves. Natives on the other hand consider that their traditions and principles are opposed while the immigrants’ are being protected. Therefore the balance in order for both groups to be satisfied is quite difficult to establish. Speaking of cultural differences we have to mention that the majority of third-country nationals arriving in Europe have a different religion as well which lies at the core of the cultural incompatibility. This aspect however will be discussed further in the following sub-chapter. It however strongly correlates to the societal friction that occurs in European societies. This can be regarded so since religious affiliations are manifested by the lifestyle immigrants lead.\(^{115}\)

European culture can be enriched by the various cultures third-country immigrants bring with them. This however as mentioned earlier depends on the particular host country. It can be achieved only if prejudice and segregation are eliminated and higher level of integration attained, which as we saw in the previous chapters is precisely the aim of EU and the member-states in question. What is perceived by the public as the bigger threat is the economic consequence of immigration and not as much the cultural one. And from the latter the features that are seen as controversial are those that relate to religious differences.\(^{116}\) This is precisely why I will examine Islam and its role on Europe’s societies in the following sub-chapter.

### 5.3 Islam and the threat of terrorism

“Silently, squeamishly, the natives are disengaging, and the lines of ethnic mini-states are forming around us.”\(^{117}\) George Walden, ex-Conservative Member of UK Parliament

Public debates around the old continent more and more focus on the role Islam plays in shaping contemporary European societies, as it is the most predominant religion among third-country immigrants. They are a mixture of different groups who have different cultural

---


background and traditions. Europe witnesses the establishment of Muslim ghettos in which liberal democratic principles and Western secular values do not exist and it is these values and principles that define contemporary Europe, and not Christianity. Segregation and the existence of parallel communities are more than evident in many European cities. Let alone in France there are listed 751 Zones Urbaines Sensibles, or in other words, Sensitive Urban Areas. What officials and the public in general is interested is its impact on the integration of immigrants into the societies and its role on the European as well as global security. Scholars, such as Samuel Huntington for instance, question whether it can go hand in hand with European liberal democratic tradition or at some point contradictions will inevitably emerge. As history teaches, Islam has been Europe’s enemy in the past and to some it still is.

As of 2007 the EU is the home of around 16 million Muslims. France is the member-state with the largest Muslim population, 5-6 million, accounting to around 9% of total French population. The Muslim Council of Britain estimates that in London alone there is around one million Muslims residing. Not only is that but Muhammad is considered to be the second most popular boy’s name given to newly born in Britain. If population projections are to be believed by 2030 Europe’s Muslim population will increase by a third. Immigrants’ tendency to settle in big cities and in already established immigrant communities creates a situation in which important, from variety of perspectives, towns become or will become in the future the home for as many natives as third-country nationals. If they successfully obtain citizenship and integrate then they will possess certain voting rights. This voting power triggers questions as to what will be the outcome if local cultural/religious matters are to be decided by voting in the future. Recognition of religious minorities and institutions however, as literature suggests, contribute to the process of integration, but to what extent and at what price is not very clear. In France for instance one third of all mosque worship leaders are not able to speak any French, which as we saw from a European point of view is a vital prerogative for successful integration. Also, as I mentioned, the Muslim

---
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population of Europe is very diverse and therefore addressing problems even by Muslim organizations presents difficulties. What further diminish the attempts for integration are schools which only Muslim pupils can sign for.

Many Muslim groups although already residing in Europe for generations still live by their own traditional rules which clash with established European principles and democratic values. Violations of women’s rights for instance are related to purposeful alienation from local integration. Mutilation of women for example is by far contradictory to European liberal values and understanding. This is strongly related to the role young Muslim men play since they are the ones responsible for protecting the honour of their families and “...young men have a propensity to use Islamic symbols and metaphors justify their rebellious nature. Many associated with various groups such as Ahle-e-Hadith, Tablighi Jamat, Jamat-i-Islami or Hibzi-ut-Tahrir without showing signs of religiosity.” Furthermore the young Muslims are responsible for very high level of crime activities and unemployment rates which make them reliable on the welfare. Contrary to Muslims, Europeans have become less faithful to their religion and less loyal to their own cultures and traditions and even patriotism as a consequence of the devastating Wars and colonial exploitation. Many scholars consider this aspect to play an important role in Europe’s future if one has to defend his values and morals.

Arguably significant, Islam has an effect on European societies as examples show. In the UK for instance, in the town of Dudley, the local Council banned particular toys and images from its quarters since some of its Muslim employees found them offensive. Violence is yet another problematic aspect which is associated with Islam, although radical Islamist terrorist threats represent a small percentage of total terrorist attacks and arrests as the last Europol report concerning terrorism in Europe suggests. According to it from 249 terrorist attacks in 2010 within the EU, only 3 were associated with Islamist terrorist groups. Furthermore from 611 arrests related to terrorism in 2010 less than half were in relation to
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Islamist terrorism, 179 which is around 29% of the total.\textsuperscript{126} The level of crimes committed by immigrants however is higher when compared to crimes committed by natives. Statistics from French prisons for instance back this statement.\textsuperscript{127} Furthermore Europeans in the past witnessed several violent events. October 2005 marks one of the most violent riots in an EU member-state in recent decades. It happens to be that the riots, which took place in France, were started by nationals from North African origin who happen to be Muslims. Whether they were motivated by religious elements is very debatable but what is important is that in the eyes of the public, they were committed by immigrants who were Muslim. These acts however are not the only ones. Both the bombins on the train system in Madrid and on London’s public transport system are too attributed to Muslims. They represent a small minority of the total European Muslim population which inevitably though has an effect on the majority. This situation is created because of the lack of contextual research and reliance on media reports which the public has access to. The 9/11 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center in New York too influenced European public opinion on the threats Islam and radical Muslims present to liberal democratic societies. However, a few years later when the coalition war against Iraq erupted, millions of Europeans protested against it publically which to a certain extent might disregard commonly accepted notion that Europe is against the Muslim world in general. Although the above mentioned violent events raised serious questions, we should not forget that Europe has terrorism history, particularly associated with separatism in various EU member-states.\textsuperscript{128} UK for instance has experienced violent riots and attacks related to IRA, and in Spain similar events occurred only in 2009 which were conducted by the ETA.\textsuperscript{129} These forms of terrorist threat require different approach. If fighting IRA or the Basque separatists’ required national instruments to fighting terrorist threats, radical Islamist terrorism needs to be fought on regional, even international level. The new method was necessary for Europe since the establishment of the Single Market because free movement of people was in place, therefore the EU needed to strengthen its external borders. Easier access to transportation and the technological advances as a consequence of Globalization further increase the necessity for international collaboration in this domain.


As examples and academic literature suggest we can differentiate two approaches towards Islam and its role on Europe. Firstly there are those who look at it from Samuel Huntington’s perspective which views Islam as clashing with democracy and Western liberal values. The other notion is represented by those who consider the occasional violence organized by Muslims as disregarding the majority who peacefully reside in Europe. Despite evidence from certain violent attacks it is difficult to generalize and put all Muslim under the same indicative. Examples from literature show that moderate and willing to reform Islam people exist, such as Fadela Amara, French politician from Algerian descent living in one of the many poor banlieues across France, who wrote a book called “Breaking the silence” and who opposes to the women oppression and discrimination some Muslim groups exercise. Europeans need to be able to distinguish between those nationals who posses threat and those who simply seek to peacefully live in Europe because not all Muslims are violent. Working together with Muslim organization to fight radical Islamist terrorism is one way towards managing differentiation. In order for Muslims and Europeans to live together further work and collaboration in the integration domain is definitely necessary for Europe to be safe now as well as in the future. Accepting Islam unconditionally or being completely against it is not the way forward. Certain problems that arise when Islam and Europeanization cross paths should be addressed cross-culturally; however scholars, politicians and neutral observers should abstain from making generalizations. “It is acknowledged that religion and ethnicity are not the problem – but they are problematic... If the inclusion of these immigrants and of their offspring in society and polity continues to fail, then conflict lies ahead.”

6. Conclusion

Immigration is a process that inevitably triggers demographic, societal, economic, cultural and political changes in the host state. These are all evident in Europe because the Old continent has been a magnet for immigrants, intra-European and third-country, since the aftermath of the Second World War. Current immigration is not about individuals looking for a better way of life, it is about masses. The examined EU member-states are to a certain extent the most affected due to various reasons such as colonial past or the implementation of guest-worker schemes and later family reunification criteria, and to a lesser extent illegal immigration and refugee admission. They however differ in their approach towards managing immigration, integration and defining citizenship criteria and rights due to their national traditions and established relations with immigrants. What is certain is that immigration is a daily phenomenon that stirs up political and public debate, which cannot be ignored, about its efficiency and necessity as a process. The flow of immigrants from regions surrounding Europe, despite the restrictive measures adopted by many European countries, will continue, thus diversifying Europe’s cultural, economic, social and political environment even more. The gap between poor and rich regions is widening, globalization as a process shaping migration trends is thriving, regional conflicts in the many countries surrounding Europe rises, such as the Tunisian and Libyan revolutions for instance, and therefore immigration for the benefit of all parties involved is a necessity as acknowledged by officials and the public. Furthermore, demographic projections point out to the fact that Europe’s population is old and this tendency is to continue due to declining fertility rates. Immigrants are a part of the fabric of Europe that might help fight these negative projections by contributing to the workforce, particularly high-skilled immigrants, and demographic stability in general. The most important aspect concerning third-country immigrants to Europe remains their integration. It is an issue that surfaces on the political and social agenda more often than not since successful integration is perceived as the main prerogative for beneficial or positive immigration. Europe’s future, security and economic stability largely depend on the immigrants’ ability to settle in and the natives’ desire to accept them. France, the Netherlands, Germany and Great Britain have already acknowledged that and measures to manage this domain of migration better have taken place although one could argue that those occurred rather late since current European migration patterns are a consequence of several decades of immigration. The existence of already separately established parallel communities all around Europe is a fact and
multiculturalism has been labeled a failure by several European leaders. EU and national officials have been trying to strike a balance between public thoughts, labour market necessities and their own political party lines in order to create an environment in which immigration is an element of socio-economic prosperity rather than a sensitive problematic issue. Striking such a balance is an extremely difficult job mainly because there are many issues to be addressed. Focusing merely on Europe’s needs is unacceptable. Attention has to be paid also to the countries of origin of immigrant masses and closer co-operation established with them in order not to infringe with their economic stability. Obviously this is not an easy task despite ongoing efforts to harmonise immigration policies on EU level. “Within the European Union, each Member State sets its own national immigration policy. However, EU leaders have recognised that dealing with immigration is a common priority and that their countries face similar challenges. They have therefore decided to coordinate important aspects of immigration policy.”

This practically means that in the EU it is up to the individual member-states to shape up and control entry procedures, the number of immigrants needed and their integration. The outcome of successful immigration policies should be directed at the immigrants, the European societies and economies as well as the countries of origin of immigration.

After a deep analysis and evaluation on existing scholarly and research literature as well as statistical data we acknowledge that despite efforts on EU, national and even local level, immigration policies and instruments do not quite produce desirable outcomes in the examined EU member-states. There seems to be a gap in our understanding and knowledge of immigration related elements. The balance between demographic needs, labour market dynamics, social and economic participation and integration, security issues and the public opinion is not yet evident. One of the reasons behind this is that immigration aspects are addressed too generally, even though current immigration to Europe is about the masses and not the individual, and research data is not put together to create a clear picture. First of all the target of legal immigration policies and legislation varies from member-state to member-state despite efforts to coordinate them. A more coordinated, multi-level approach that would eliminate similar and repetitive problematic aspects of immigration in the different EU member-states should be achieved. Comparative research of both the countries of origin of immigration and their destination countries will enhance the creation of coherent immigration...

policies. Also, comparative research of the different minority groups residing in Europe in order to identify their concerns and problems more target specifically and effectively. This is necessary because the parallel societies which have been established in some European high-income receiving member-states are not integrated successfully to the extent that would be beneficial to all and many of them do not manage to live hand in hand with the European culture, democratic values and principles. In this regard more detailed surveys and more specifically oriented projects and programmes should be devised. Obtaining more accurate, transparent and more detailed information as to precisely what the employers’ needs are in order to create better functioning recruitment mechanisms is vital. In regard to the above mentioned recruitment mechanisms more accurate analysis should be made in order to identify precisely the origins of labour migration and to create legal, effective channels for acquiring the services of third-country immigrants. Expanding the already existing migrant worker programmes (MWPs) to new sectors that require workforce will further stabilize the European labour market. What is needed is “fundamental restructuring of MWPs so that they embrace truly market-based solutions. This new paradigm can provide native employers with more migrants, migrants with more freedom, and native workers with a chance to feel secure while sharing in the good fortune that migrants can bring.”

Supporting financially, providing expert opinion and working together with the poorer regions surrounding the EU should be a priority. Creating stable democratic societies and establishing the bases for economic prosperity is essential in order to limit undesired immigration from these regions and to concentrate on legal migration. Also, European leaders must understand that immigration is not the best answer to fight Europe’s population deficit in the long run. Addressing the issue of declining birth rates and creating instruments to eliminate these negative tendencies should be a priority.

In order to devise efficient immigration policies the process itself should be examined from variety of angles and expert findings from variety of academic disciplines should be gathered and evaluated mainly because immigration affects areas such as the welfare, labour markets and certain cultural and societal aspects. This is important in order to create a common European picture, since European officials agree that this domain requires collective efforts, build up by the respective individual experiences. In the integration domain what should be

addressed is how to engage the immigrant nationals to participate in local civil life. Also, target oriented school reforms in order to begin integration at an initial stage of one’s development as an individual and representative of a certain society is necessary. Undoubtedly commitment from both the host and the immigrant side must be achieved and both need to understand that working together towards eliminating frictions and segregation is the best way forward. Both parties need to be more open to each other and try to understand each other’s concerns. The sooner politicians outline, understand and tackle the main reasons behind segregation between local and foreign societies the better. In order for the movement of people to fulfill its full potential and to be accepted by the European majority, I am far from the thought that it can possibly please all interests; more resources should be granted to research initiatives, keeping the gathered information and using it when addressing particular areas of immigration.

Devising migration and immigration policies as such that correspond to today’s immigration reality is a must and a shift from purely national to international and local level of Policy-making is a prerogative for better management of immigration and integration.134 Mishandling immigration of third-country nationals to the EU is a risky experiment that inevitably will have a negative impact on European way of life. Xenophobia, the rise of anti-immigrant populist parties, extremism, segregation, discrimination and the existence of parallel communities are all aspects that need very subtle attention. Europe’s diversity whether we like it or not is a fact, embracing it and responding more adequately to it is of interest to all involved in the immigration process.
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