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ABSTRACT

To escape political and economic challenges in the Middle East and Africa, many refugees and migrant are fleeing to seek asylum in Europe. Thus, Europe became overwhelmed with large influx of refugees in the last decades. The European Union (EU) member states have recently scrambled policy action to curb the increasing migrants entering Europe through the East, West, and Central Mediterranean Sea. The division in the European Union has led to the reemergence of nationalism which has weakened the foundation principle of the EU as a bloc.

In the effort to contribute to the scholarly literature on migration crisis in Europe, this thesis aims to discover the current divide and attitude on migrant between members of the EU and how it threatens the stability of the EU. A combination of secondary and primary data was used to gather information. Articles, journals, newspapers, books, and unstructured interviews were used respectively. Based on the findings of this study, there are challenges in differentiating between refugees and migrants. Secondly, there is absence of cohesiveness in EU migration policies, and restoration of national identity among the EU members which has led to anti-immigrant perception.

This study is of the idea that there is need to have common path to build strong EU policies. Additionally, the member states need to appreciate their differences and formulate mutual migration policies.
CHAPTER ONE: GENERAL INTRODUCTION.

1.0 Background of the problem

Europe is attractive to migrants because European countries are economically and politically stable. There is also an ingrained perception that Europe is wealthy and can grant migrants endless economic opportunities, safety, and increased access to social welfare programs. The United Nations High Commission for Refugees Reports 2011 shows that sixty million migrants and refugees entered Europe, which is higher than a decade ago. In fact, in 2015 alone, Europe received over one million migrants. This influx of migrants left the European Union confused and divided on how best to deal with the issue (United Nations High Commission for Refugees, 2011).

Most of the migrants are from Africa, Asia, and the Middle East. They flee from political, economic, and social violence. The top five countries from which people flee to EU include Syria, Afghanistan, Nigeria, Iraq, and Kosovo. The asylum-seekers make desperate journeys, inspired by the hope for a good life in Europe and to provide safety and well-being for their families. Many are forced to migrate due to conflict and wars in their countries that create power vacuums due to absence of government. The vacuum enables new factions and extremist groups to emerge. These include; Boko-haram in Nigeria, Al-Shabaab in Somalia and Islamic State in Syria and Iraq that make migration inevitable. With the creation and rise of extremist groups, European countries have raised concern about issues of national security (United Nations High Commission for Refugees, 2011).

Europe experienced high migration of refugees after World War II. Many East European nations migrated to the West. They also did it after the collapse of the Soviet bloc. The creation of Israel state and mass flow of the Palestine people which has created world refugee crisis. These migrants, however, were European. Europe faces dilemma in migration approach. This has exposed the European institutions such as the Common European Asylum System (CEAS) and the European Union Structure for failure of controlling the migration of people who are not European. The migration crisis has become a highly critical and political issue because European countries have not been able to generate a consensus on how to proceed with the reformation of
migration policies. Some countries are caught between alleviating and tackling humanitarian crisis and ensuring that their national security is not threatened (United Nations High Commission for Refugees, 2011).

The European Union was formed at the end of World War II to end wars in Europe and establish a climate of peace and stability. A few European countries began to unite economically and politically and after seeing how this unity was contributing to increased economic growth between members, more and more states decided to join. In 2013, the European Union consisted of twenty-eight countries with Croatia being the 28th member. Although the EU was able to form a consensus on issues affecting migrants from Eastern Europe migration and from outside Europe, this has left the EU member states disunited (UNHCR, 2011).

1.1 Statement of the Problem

The political and economic crisis in Africa, Middle East, and Asia raised the appetite for large influx of migrants to Europe. In 2015 more than a million migrants crossed into Europe leaving many European countries confused on how to deal with the emerging migration crisis. This created a division in the EU over how best to resettle people. Moreover, this division in Europe not only delayed the EU from forming a consensus on the migration crisis but also affected the stability of the European Union itself. The instability can greatly impact any future policy actions the EU plans to make in regards to resettling people.

The experience in Europe led the European Union to form the Common European Asylum System in 1999 to regulate and control migrants and to separate refugees and migrants. It adopted several policies to stop migrants which include a creation of safe countries, funding developing states, fining the vessels carrying people and imposing tough visa policies. These policies, however, have not succeeded in containing migrants. The reason for this failure, despite all the effort, needs examining.
1.2 Research Questions

1.2.1 What are the patterns of migration into Europe?
1.2.2 What are the current attitude and policy actions between different European countries towards the current migration crisis in Europe?
1.2.3 How is the divide in Europe affecting the stability of the European Union?

1.3 Research Objective

The objectives of this study are the following:
1.3.1 To explore the pattern of migration into the Europe.
1.3.2 To examine and explain the current attitude and policy actions between different European countries towards the current migration crisis in Europe.
1.3.3 To analyze whether or not this perplexed and inconvenient divide in Europe is imposing any threats on the stability of the European Union

1.4 Hypotheses

The hypotheses of this study include:
1.4.1 Governments are more likely to enact political reforms that are supportive of Asylum-seekers if public opinion is positive towards migrant.
1.4.2 Different reactions towards the influx of migrants reflect the dominant discourses of identities in these respective societies.

1.5 Literature Review

In his chapter, “The Introduction to Migration in World History”, Patrick Manning traces attempts made to define migration. He explains that migration is not a new concept or phenomenon to humans since as humans have been migrating from Africa to Asia and Europe. He recognizes the existence of the migration on those regions and tries to give the definition by saying migration is the process of movement of people, animals, and birds from one destination to another. He further examines human migration and defines it as the process of movement of people from one geographical area to another across a political border or boundary (Manning, 2005).
Dennis Conway in his book, *Migration in the Caribbean*, explores migration as a multidisciplinary topic. He further breaks down major demographic component of migration, which has direct correlation with other components such as population change, fertility, and mortality. The author further claims that the migration process is sociological because of its occurrence within the societal context. Also, it affects the society because it brings changes in the source of destination for the communities (Conway, 1986).

Aribidesi Usman and Toyin Falola, in *Migration in African History: An Introduction*, describes migration history as a human phenomenon in human societies and further states that the name migration is synonymous to the entire African life history where the continent has been characterized as the emergence of culture and civilization in general. They further examine the components of the migration and state that migration is multifaceted phenomenon and can be described with different components such as nature, character, and places. They also give and explore the emergence of migration from slavery, commerce, and regions and assert that internal migration was dominant in Africa (Falola and Usman, 2011).

Baker Jonathan and Aina tade Akin in their book, *The Migration Experience in Africa*, paint the historical context of African migration. They explain the different migration patterns in Africa as results of internal movement of persons. They try to capture different types of patterns, direction, and motivation within Africa and between the sub-regions. Baker and Aina points to lack of homogeneity in the migration in Africa and examine the pre-colonial period where warriors, pilgrims, and traders moved across Africa. In this period, international migration occurred over a wide area especially in warfare and trade (Baker and Aina, 1995).

Pieter Kok, in *Migration in South and South Africa: Dynamics and Determinants*, gives details on the flow of migrants from the Western, Middle Africa, and Eastern Africa towards South Africa. He provides the dynamics and the factors that drive migrants to South Africa and the different divergent views from citizens on the perception of migration from the rest of the continent. He also traces different routes, transit countries and means that the migrants use. He traces factors that influence migration behavior and their seasonal periods, which he claims that particular seasons favor the influx of the migrant (Pieter kok, 2006).
Stephen Castles in, *The Age of Migration: International Population Movement in the Modern World*, explores the emergence of global dynamics in international migration. The book focuses on the reaction of the receiving population and challenges faced by the receiving societies. He further explains that cultural diversity and values determine the acceptance of migrants. Also in the migration pattern, which brings a high point of migration to Europe from Latin America before the world wars, many scholars referred to this as the age of Mass Migrations. This period led thousands of migrants to move to better places in search of good jobs. During this period mobility was easier than before, because of the rise of globalization (Castles, 2014).

Macharia Munene in his chapter “Globalization and Foreign Relations in Eastern Africa”, asserts that, the endless refugee crisis in the world has a historical problem that can be traced from foreign relations among Eastern Africa states who are perceived to be major contributor of refugee crisis in the world. The failure and globalization effect to address the diversity of refugee issues within Eastern Africa countries has not been highlighted in their foreign policy agenda. The minimum engagement among the Eastern Africa states such as Kenya, Somalia, and Ethiopia to address factors that led the mass movement of people across border. Most of these countries in the Eastern Africa states has experienced the effect of globalization and many has failed to put measures to address the warring factors that hinders their collaboration among themselves in political and economical matters that affect them all (Munene, 2016).

Yuk Wah Chan and Heidi Fung, in *The Age of Asian Migration: continuity, Diversity, and Susceptibility*, explore the origin of the Asian migration from colonization and decolonization periods. Many Asian states inherited political instability and economic turbulence that led mass movements of people from India, China, Cambodia, and Vietnam. They further explain that though Asian migration was mainly to seek for jobs in the other part of the world, many unskilled workers migrated to Europe, North America, and Middle Eastern states to look for opportunities. They argue that most migrants were motivated by the high demand for labor in these regions (Chan, Haines and Lee, 2014).
Elizabeth Mavroudi and Caroline Nagel, in *Global migration: Patterns, Process, and Politics*, detail the event that shifted perception where several demonstrations were conducted in Tel Aviv, Israel, against public and government-owned institution. This was to oppose the presence of the large influx of the migrant into the country. This led to political leadership to deport and jail all Non-Israeli citizens. They considered the migrant to be a threat to the Jewish identity and thus moved towards the restoration of the Israeli culture and identity (Mavroudi and Nagel, 2016).

Nicola Foote and Michael Goebel, in *Immigration and National Identity in Latin America*, examines different ranges of responses and reaction from receiving countries such as Germany, Italy, and the long-lasting effects migrants impose on their socio-cultural and political institutions. They compare and contrast how different Latin American countries have handled diverse groups. They explore different race formation and the rise of nationalism that enrich the understanding not only of Latin America but also of the impact of immigration on the construction of the national identity throughout the world (Foote and Goebel, 2016).

Jacques Le Goff book, *Migration in European History*, tracks the migration history in Europe where migrants were moving in search of jobs in manufacturing industries. Therefore, making the internal migration dominant during that period. Colonialism led migrants from Europe to resettle in Africa and Asia. The collapse of the Berlin wall and the break of the Soviet Union caused an increase of migrants from Eastern to Western Europe nations creating pressure on local citizens. He argues that Europe has geographical advantages and disadvantages where it borders Africa, the Atlantic, and Asia. The European continent has become the receiving end for migrants from all regions, which has created instability to bordering States as they try to scramble in managing the migration crisis (Le Goff, 1996).

In Yasemin Soysal’s book, *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Post national Membership in Europe*, the author discusses how migrants in Europe are threatening what it means to be a citizen because rights that were once granted only to citizens are being extended to migrants. Nation-states are receiving intense pressure from international organizations to grant migrants citizenship rights, which is resulting in an increasingly blurred line between citizen and non-
citizen. In times when Europe is experiencing an influx of migrants, this book provides clarity on how migrants can or cannot threaten nationalist ideologies (Soysal, 2007).

Theodora Kostakopoulou’s book, Citizenship, Identity, and Immigration in the European Union, focuses on the theorization of the European identity. The author states that the European community is deeply diverse and consists of different countries with various norms and practices. Creating a collective European system brings many challenges to institutions that governs the EU. Each country will respond differently to immigrations based on individual practices. The same way norms are constructed, they can be reformed to provide a precise meaning of the European identity (Kostakopoulou, 2009).

Myron Weiner in his book, The Global Migration Crisis, argues that the increase of the international migration crisis to European nations in recent years poses a threat to the stability of the European Union as an institution. Other regions such as the Balkans, Middle East, and Africa are fragile. The presence and rise of xenophobic and nationalist politics in Europe can put the most advanced democratic state at risk of destabilization by the large influx of the migrant, refugees and asylum seekers (Weiner, 1995).

Adepoju Aderanti, in his article, “Illegals and Expulsion in Africa: The Nigerian Experience,” argues that Africa has been having a divergent view on migration because after gaining independence, most African states focused on building nation. African states had a different pace in terms of development. African states did not clearly focus on barriers and boundaries. African migration has been internal for a long period of time without realization, among African states, that internal migration led to international migration. Thus, the national borders give rise to undocumented migration. In most cases, it is difficult to know when a traveler actually crosses an international border (Adepoju, 1984).

Hein De Haas’s article, “The Myth of Invasion: The Inconvenient Realities of African Migration to Europe”, picks on the structural demand for cheap labor in the informal sector in Europe that fuel crisis. Restrictive measures failed to curb the migrants’ poverty in Africa
supports the large influx of the migrants to Europe. None of the African and European countries is willing to focus on stopping migrants because of perceived interest (de Haas, 2008).

Meghan Appel O'Meara, in his article, “The Migration Challenge: Europe's Crisis in Historical Perspective”, notes how the European nations drafted their own national policies toward each other and the national response towards the immigrants. Many elites conquered the migration crisis in Europe. He refers America as a nation of immigrants that adopted the level of tolerant on diversity and culture unlike the Europeans nations who lacked collaborative responses on migration and as a result, escalated the migration crisis in the rest of the world (O'Meara, Matuszak and Benson, 2003).

In Christina Boswell’s article, “Migration in Europe”, she discusses how European governments have been under intense pressure to pursue restrictive approaches towards migrants, even nation-states that pride themselves on being liberal. Governments have to take into account economic considerations as well as normative and constitutional commitments. Governments have an obligation to meet the needs of citizens before they can extend services to migrants. Sometimes public opinion can get in the way of EU policies and regulations. The article further examines how the increase in migration is giving residents/citizens a perceived risk that their cultures and jobs are being threatened (Boswell and Geddes, 2011).

Tomas Sobotka’s article, “Migration Continent Europe,” gives statistical analyses of migration trends throughout Europe. Although migration has been increasing, some countries are experiencing more migrants than others. Bringing light to this disproportional influx of migrants, the EU can establish policies that are geared towards specific member states. The article also continues to examine the role economics play in migration trends between old and new member states (Sobotka, 2010).

Russell King’s article, “Towards a New Map of European Migration,” gives an analysis of the history of migration patterns in Europe. The author explains that historically migration happened primarily for economic reasons; however, recently migration trends prove that migrants have non-economic objectives that are most likely involuntary. The reasons for
migration are becoming much more diverse and both countries and European institutions need to acknowledge these shifts so that they proceed with policy reforms that give interdisciplinary approaches (King, 2002).

Lauren McLaren’s article, “Anti-Immigrant Prejudice in Europe: Contact, Threat Perception, and Preferences for the Exclusion of Migrants,” states that perception plays a huge role in the exclusionary feeling towards migrants in Europe. If more Europeans interacted and formed friendships with migrants, it can reduce levels of unwillingness to accept migrants. The author further insinuates that a number of migrants in a country can greatly impact whether or not a country chooses to think of migrants as a threat (McLaren, 2003).

Rahsaan Maxwell’s articles, “Evaluating Migrant Integration: Political Attitudes Across Generations in Europe”, the author engages debates on the integration process of the migrant by analyzing the political trust and the satisfaction. He suggests that the first generation were positive on migrant because of the situations and challenges that they have experienced during the wars period hence the second generation have developed the phobia on the foreigner and migrant will have led to a rise of the nationalism and the fight to preserve their identity and culture (Maxwell, 2010).

In Hein Haas’s article, “Turning the Tide? Why Development Will not Stop Migration,” the author states that restrictive immigration policies in Europe do not necessarily result in a decrease in migration. In fact, the militarization of external border controls just makes migrants more likely to take alternative routes that are riskier and costly. The author further states that the best solution to curb migration is to address the underlying root causes of migration through increasing aid or liberalizing trade with origin countries. European countries need to focus on enacting policies that will support economic development opportunities in origin countries because by addressing development issues, Europe can keep migrants from flooding their countries (De Haas, 2007).

Channe Lindstrom’s article, “European Union Policy on Asylum and Immigration. Addressing the Root Causes of Forced Migration: A Justice and Home Affairs Policy of
Freedom, Security, and Justice?” analyses the European Union’s policy outlook on asylum and immigration. Union-wide policies have focused primarily on the containment of migration flows as a means to decrease threat to the European internal security regime. However, lately, EU members have been moving towards focusing on root causes of migration flows rather than conceptualizing asylum seekers as a security threat (Lindstrom, 2005).

Gwendolyn Sasse and Eiko Thielemann article, “A Research Agenda for the Study of Migrants and Minorities in Europe,” state that since migrant and minority policy issues have become more prevalent in Europe, countries and EU institutions have been moving towards providing more research and understanding surrounding the issue. Distinctly defining both terms can bring increased clarification on how both topics affect domestic and international policy making. Using the terms migrant and minority interchangeably can bring about confusion and misrepresentation (Sasse and Thielemann, 2005).

Jef Huysmans’ article, “The European Union and the Securitization of Migration”, deals with the politicization of how Western Europe developed the migration crisis into a security issue. Western Europe has a perceived fear that migrants will bring many challenges to the domestic integration and public order in which they are trying to achieve. Moreover, the author articulates that Europe’s plan to establish restrictive migration policies has less to do with security concerns and more to do with Europe’s constructivist ideology. Portraying migrants and asylum-seekers as criminals and terrorists is Western Europe’s way of protecting national identity and welfare provisions (Huysmans, 2000).

The principle of Non-refoulement in the refugee's laws has been an issue. Europe has been denying the fact of the principle applies to all who seek refuge in other states due to the fear of persecution the hypocrisy of this principle is that it only applied to the African states who were obliged to take refugees. Europe has been a key player in changing the status of refugees into economic migrants and security threat thus creating a room for bridging the social contract that every state should uphold to. The refugee law has not been clear in stating the period of accommodation of refugees and do not consider the ability a country to sustain refugees (UNHCR, 2012).
The European Union claim has been supported by the fact that refugees are people running from political, economic, and social persecution. Migrants moving from Africa, Asia, and the Middle East have largely been smuggled by paying huge money to enter Europe hence; Europe has the mandate to refuse the large refugees to enter their territory (IOM, 2011).

1.6 Significance of the Study

Although literature surrounding the issue of migration exists in general, the migration crisis in Europe has specifically attracted attention. Much of the existing writing focuses on the economic move, globalization, and effects of migration from outside Europe with little case studies from within. This study aims to contribute to the existing literature on the migration crisis in Europe. This study hopes to analyze each country specifically to develop a foundation in the understanding of the divergence of attitudes and factors that impede having a well-coordinated migration policy. Finally, this study will contribute information to relevant institutions and policy makers to understand the factor that hinders them from forming a consensus that would curb the migration crisis in Europe.

1.7 Theoretical Framework

Countries in Europe have decided to respond differently to this ever-growing migration crisis, despite the large influx of migrants into Europe within the past year. There are many times when migrants in desperate need of asylum from religious prosecution, warfare, and poverty, were denied entry, left stranded on the border. Countries such as Germany, Turkey, and Greece feel like other EU member states have failed to share the burden and take in more migrants. In an attempt to try and understand and explain the divergence of attitudes in Europe, this study will analyze three International Relations theories that correspond with how European nation states decide to respond to the migration crisis.

There are three theories related to the Migration Crisis that capture problem statement. These are:

a) Neorealism
b) Liberalism
c) Constructivism

1.7.1 The Neorealist approach

Christian and Bodin book, *The political Realism in International Relations*, argue that the unwillingness of the European Union to form consensus can be seen in the failure to transfer power and authority. They believe the state has supreme authority in making and implementing the laws and policies in each territory. They have given different views on dealing with the migration crisis and failure to recognize the difference in ideology. Migration issues continue to make the European integration process difficult which results to the instability of the European Union (Christian and Bodin, 2010).

From the Neorealist perspective, states are the central actors in international politics. This means that states will act within their own self-interest and will not make decisions that jeopardize their overall economic well-being and stability. This can be further noted as the incentives based approach where countries are more concerned with maximizing resources and economic prosperity. A hypothesis that can be formulated with this theory is that a country will be more accepting of migrants if the economic benefits prove to be higher than the cost. On the contrary, a country will oppose migrants if the cost will be perceived to be higher than the potential benefits (Powel, 1994).

Thus Germany, which has the most powerful economy in the EU, is more likely to take in migrants because it has both the financial and administrative capacities to do so. The same can be said of other countries such as Sweden, Italy, and France who have also been granting claims to migrants. The same cannot be said of Hungary, Croatia, and Bulgaria who have relatively weaker economies. An integration of migrants can be viewed as a threat to the jobs of the local population or may drain the already moderate public welfare resources. When migrants first arrive, they depend heavily on social welfare programs because. And if these migrants are refugees with entire families, governments will provide housing and healthcare. Although this crisis is a humanitarian issue, accommodating large amounts of migrants can greatly affect the local economy (European Council, 2014).
1.7.2 The Liberalist approach

Schuck, in his article, Migration Theory: Talking Across Disciplines, seeks to explain the difficulties of immigration control in the liberal democrat states. He emphasizes on the institutional roles on the rights and freedoms of the migrant as they enter the European Union states. He suggests that a failure of the migration policies may originate from the belief of the tenet of the liberal principles. He further argues that reaction of the attitudes depends on liberal principles rather than realist principles to cover up the profoundly ambiguous attitudes of the European Union public towards the migrant and refugees (Schuck, 2001).

Liberalism disagrees with realism on many aspects. Unlike realism where the state is the primary actor, liberalism sees non-state actors such as individuals and groups as important. Individuals have their own interests which often differ from that of government leaders. In fact, Individuals and groups are the primary political actors and domestic political institutions are only there to adhere to the needs of society. The Liberalist theory helps to examine how domestic politics shape state reactions towards the influx of migrants. Governments are likely to enact political reforms that are supportive of asylum-seekers if public opinion is overall positive towards migrant.

1.7.3 The Constructivist approach

According to Nicholas Onuf, in his book, Constructivism in World Politics, argues constructivism theory is the belief that reality is socially constructed which places a huge emphasis on norms and identity. Unlike Realism, which deals with objective facts, constructivism tries to understand and explain state behavior through a complex mix of history, ideas, norms, and beliefs. Constructivist argues that ability to make rational decisions is heavily influenced by identity and social norms. A change in foreign policy can raise questions about the discourses on identity. A hypothesis that can be generated from this theory is that different reactions towards the influx of migrants are a reflection on the dominant discourses of identities in these respective Europeans societies (Onuf, 2002a).
This theory can be applied to the European migration crisis because it implies that identity plays a huge role in the acceptance of migrants. Germany, which is more liberal, would be more tolerant of migrants versus conservative Hungary which prides itself in its Christian identity. Identity has a large influence on the way a country chooses to shape its policies. While some European countries perceived migrants as a threat to their norms and practices, others promote integrated policies that acknowledge migrants as part of the European identity (Onuf, 2002b).

1.8 Methodology

This study made use of primary data based on oral interviews from Italy, Milan and Eastleigh, Nairobi. Secondary data gathered from Journal articles, books, newspaper articles, and reports formed the larger volume of the material source. The books and journal articles provided the basic foundational argument relying on the theoretical framework to build a good understanding of the concepts encountered. The theories helped understand the applicability of the concept in the real world. The researched is based on qualitative as mean of data analysis.

In addition, the sourced materials gave insight into the relationship between members of European Union states in formulating migration policies. The materials provided a platform to understand how the policies may be approached to craft the appropriate migration policy measures to curb the influx of migration crisis. The newspaper articles provided the current situation on the ground and also gave insight of the reaction of the member’s states in dealing the crisis on hand.

Newspaper reports from different organizations such as International Organization for Migration (IOM), United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR), CNN and Al Jazeera comprised of an account on how the relevant institution on the European Union responds to actions taken by the individual states. The report gave a contextual framework that provided the public reaction in the wake of the Europe migration crisis; through the news media and interviews. The study collected the opinions from different states within the Union and the rest of the countries supplying the migrants to Europe. The study used both deductive and inductive approach for the analysis. The study concentrated on deductive approach because of the available theories. Lastly, opinion, media discussions, and case studies were used in inductive approach.
Field Research

Field research was conducted in Milan Italy for five days from June 28 to 2nd July 2016 and in Eastleigh Nairobi, Kenya from 18-20 September 2016. First-hand information was collected through interviews with an interview guide to aid during the process. Open-ended questions were used and notes taken to record data.

Recruitment Strategy and sampling

Random sampling was used to select different respondents to interview questions. Interviews were conducted in Milan central station, Italy and Eastleigh in Nairobi, Kenya. The participants were two Somali refugees from the Ogadenia in Ethiopia and Mogadishu Somalia. The interviewed refugees were conversant with Somali language; hence, there was no language barrier.

Interview Strategy

Unstructured interviews were used due to the sensitivity and unpredictability nature when dealing with people who have experienced trauma from a violent situation. According to Bernard (2011), unstructured interview is an excellent way of learning the life experience of people and how their motives drives act in a certain way.

1.9 Thesis Outline

Chapter one consists of the background to the topic while contextualizing the present environment that the research occurs in. This chapter comprises of the statement of the research problem, research questions and objectives. A review of the existing literature pertaining to the research topic and the theoretical framework will also be evaluated. Finally, the significance of the study is established and the methodology that guides the research has been undertaken.

Chapter two explores the history, change of patterns of migration into Europe. The chapter also examines the dangerous routes and the dynamics involved in the current migration crisis.
Chapter three examines the attitude and policy actions between different European countries towards the migration crisis in Europe and the effect on the EU migration policies.

Chapter four reviews the interpretation of data whether or not this perplexed and inconvenient divide in Europe is imposing any threats on the stability of the European Union.

Chapter five concludes the thesis. It aims to piece together the findings of the prior chapters and provides recommendations that can help policy makers and researchers in the future.
CHAPTER TWO: THE HISTORY, CAUSE AND CHANGE OF PATTERNS OF MIGRATION INTO EUROPE

2.0 Introduction

The end of the Second World War made the Europeans to wish for unity to maximize their economic and political potential, and stop them from engaging in war against each other. In 1950, West French foreign affairs minister Robert Schuman propagated the idea of formation of the European Coal and Steel Community. European countries would not engage in war and the war concept will be unthinkable and materialistically will not be possible to engage. Afterwards Schuman’s idea became part of the Treaty of Paris where the aim was to unite Europe both politically and economically (Albassam, 2015).

The European Union comprises twenty-eight countries with the aim to prosper the political, security and economic cohesion of the member states. The European coal and Steel Community was founded with key principles laid on the Maastricht treaty that emphasizes on democracy, human rights, and European solidarity. The treaty laid the free movement of people and goods within the European Union, which led to the birth of the Euro as a single currency for European Union member states (Hurrelman, 2014).

The European Union has several supranational structures and institutions such as the European Commission, The Council, and Parliament that helps to protect their domestic and international interest. The European Union success is interlinked with governments, sacrificing sovereignty for the sake of the prosperity of the institution. The implication of giving up their national sovereign was to open borders and permit high influx of migrants entering Europe. Many European member-states have responded differently to the influx of migrants. The scramble they faced since 2015 has led many states to redefine European Union. Member states raised serious questions about the stability and future of the European Union and many states wondered whether Europe could handle the large influx of migrant from the Middle East, Africa, and Asia (Anon, 2011).
2.1 Definition of migration key terms

Definition of migration is highly contested. Migration can be defined over space and time where migration is defined as spatial and temporary movement that take place across boundaries of an area. In this definition, long distance movements are not counted, but the short movement is included. Migration therefore, refers to the movement of people (migrant) from one place to another across geographical boundaries or within state for certain period. It is a movement of people encompassing any kind of movement regardless of its length and composition (IOM, 2010).

Internal migration refers to the movement of people from one destination to another within a territorial boundary. International migration refers to the process of movement of people from one country to another across international boundaries. Immigration refers to the process of movement of non-nationals to another country for specific purpose of settlement (European Commission, 2011).

Emigration refers to the process of movement of national moving to another country for the purpose of the settlement. Circular migration refers to movement of people between states that are for a long or short time and that are beneficial to both parties involved. Mostly the migration is fueled by the labor demand and is sometime a voluntary movement (UNHCR, 2015).

Refugee is defined under the Refugee Convention of 1951. It states that a person owing to a well-founded fear of persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, or belonging to a certain social group or political opinion has the right to cross international boundary. Thus, are unwillingness to avail him for protection that he/she requires (IOM, 2015).

Irregular migration refers to the movement of people from one country to another that takes place outside the regulatory sending and receiving states. This means that individuals who stay or work in a country without the necessary documents required by immigration law are considered irregular migrants (European Council, 2015).
Migrant refers to movement of person from one state to another or any person who is moving or moved across geographical border or within a state away from his/her original destination and it can be voluntary or forced and also it has be short or long period of time (Anon, 2011).

2.2 The historical trends of international migration

Migration has been a common phenomenon in human history. The earliest man was hunter and gatherer who moved from one destination to another in search of nourishment and due to the long movement man has created residency overtime, which has allowed him to settle. Internal and intra-regional migration throughout history has been the cause of international migration in the world. International migration was a common phenomenon in human behavior as humans moved from one state to another voluntarily or forced. Therefore, migration has been in the course for the last few centuries. The national increase of international migration has been due to the geographical distribution and action of different states. Several conflicts have led to the movement of large number of people from their original destination (Oucho, 2007).

In the twentieth century labor was a limited commodity and many states encouraged the movement of people across borders to satisfy the high demand for labor. The international migration typical nature was a great concern because of the complex nature that is involved in dealing with it. In this period the migration has been encouraged by the outbreak of the First World War, which was characterized by the free migration in North America, Europe, and Africa where there were no restrictions. During this time, there was population increase in different regions in Africa, Europe, and Latin America (Anon, 2011).

2.3.1 Latin America

Historically Latin America has been a key player in international migration. Latin America migrants from Europe, Asia, and Africa. Migrants from Latin America have also moved to other parts of the world and have become the sender of huge migrants. Internal migration has been the most dominant in Latin American history. Migration patterns have been fueled by structural factors such as unequal economic and social development in several regions (Alvarado, 1999).
The transformation of Latin America as a sender of migrants is a recent trend. Although the United States continues to pull in large numbers of immigrants from the region, the turn of the century witnessed a new diversification of destinations. Europe began to emerge as a new and forceful pole of attraction for Latin American migrants. Within the region, Argentina, Chile, and Costa Rica became important destinations for those from neighboring countries (Martinez, 2005). The south-north migration and interregional patterns encouraged many migrants to move to global north in search of the better life and this has led to the migration crisis and divergent opinion in Europe and United States (Solimano, 2004).

2.3.2 Africa

Africa has a long history of contact with the rest of the world and migration process is not a new concept for the African continent. Before the colonial period, the African continent traded with the Americas, Europe, and the Middle East with different commodities including slaves and natural minerals. Due to these activities, migration patterns in Africa improved with the discovery of new ways to move from one place to another (Shimeles, 2010).

During the colonial period, Africa was restricted from any kind of movement. Colonial introduced different measures to control the migration process from the rural to urban. Due to the African internal migration pattern being destroyed, different demarcations on the continent brought the separation of different communities in African territories. After colonialism, most of the African states had introduced migration laws and policies to curb the movement of the people from the one boundary to another, which led to the expulsion of many Africans from Nigeria and South Africa (Adepoiu, 2005).

Migration process in Africa is dominantly internal but it breeds international migration. The continent’s migration patterns in Western Africa are changing due to the changing political and economic fortune of individual countries. To the South African states, migration has been a big issue due to the high influx of the migrant from neighboring poor states. This subcontinent has the transit point for migrant who make South Africa route to the rest of the world. Africa has been a migrant-sending continent to the rest of the world. African states face several challenges embodied in political and economic situations that drive migrants to Europe African migration.
trends depend on the season where Africans migrate depending on the pattern of the climate (Adepoju, 2011).

2.3.3 Europe

Migration patterns in Europe have been greatly affected by the demand of labor in 1960s, decolonization of the colonies, and collapse of the Soviet Union. International migration in Europe in the sixties has encouraged by the high demand of the labor force from European nations like Greece, Italy, Turkey, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia who had been exporting laborers to the rest of Europe. The impact of world wars has left Europe at a desperate situation because many states faced great economic and political challenges that required them to move to the rest of the world. Many migrated to United States. The mass influx of the political and economic migrant from Eastern Europe and fall of the Berlin wall in 1989 has been witnessed from decade within Europe. Western Europe became the center for the scramble by many migrants who were fleeing from conflicts in their region (Guardia, 2006).

Europe received all forms of migrants from different parts of the world such as, Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East. Former colonies faced challenges from the colonial impact and the conflict that had been inherited hence the colonial master have formed bond with former colonies in the Asia and Africa. This had encouraged asylum seekers and irregular migrant to European nations. The economic crisis and oil shock in 1970s made management to move to Europe (Guardia, 2006).

Since the formation of the European Union the migration pattern has changed from the change of individual state to the members’ role that played a key role in modeling the structure in place to prevent the influx of migrant to European Union. Still there was a failure in finding the trends of the migrant and there was also a challenge in dealing with the migration phenomenon generally (Tapia, 2002).
2.4 History of migration in Europe

In 1945 the two main reasons for migration to Europe were either colonial migration regimes or temporary guest-worker policies. In 1948 when the German economy started recovering from the currency reform, they looked to other regions of the continent to fulfill their domestic labor demands. Germany received guest workers from countries such as Greece, Spain, Turkey, Morocco, and Tunisia. After German trade unions became suspicious of guest-worker migration, the German government guaranteed that guest-workers would only remain in Germany if there were jobs available for them. Living up to its promise, many guest workers were returned home when Germany experienced its first recession in 1967. Guest workers were allowed to come back when the labor market picked up again. However, in the early 1970’s these guest worker policies began to impose unwavering consequences on European countries. After Germany began to experience a slowing economy the government decided to issue a migration stop in 1973. As a result, guest workers decided to stay because they did not have any guarantee of an easy return to Germany. After 1973 many countries such as Sweden, Austria, Denmark, France, and Netherlands decided to either end or sharply reduce labor migration (Hansen, 2003).

Countries that had a colonial history such as United Kingdom, France, Belgium, and the Netherlands could obtain unskilled labor to feed the postwar boom. After the United Kingdom realized that it was not a hotspot for migrants, it attempted to establish many pull factors that would lure guest-workers into the UK. In 1948 the British government granted all colonial British subjects citizenship of the UK, which gave them social, political, and economic rights. By 1962 over 500,000 non-white migrants (West Indians, Pakistanis, and Indians) had entered the UK to seek full employment. France also had similar experiences as the United Kingdom with French companies looking to Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia for workers (Hansen, 2003).

By the early 1970s all countries in Europe had ended the issue migration. However, granting migrants’ citizenship meant that they had a right to family reunification. With the admittance of migrant wives and children and migrants having high birth rates, Europe started to see the emergence of multicultural and multilingual societies. The first two decades of immigration in France and Germany were relatively uncontroversial. Both countries had strong economies that supported both indigenous and migrant workers. Furthermore, Indigenous did not
feel threatened by migrants because new arrivals took jobs that no French or German national wanted anyway. Despite the illusion that migrants and nationals were living peacefully together in France and Germany, new arrivals faced discrimination in housing and daily life (Bade, 2003).

The first country to really politicize immigration was the United Kingdom. Its favor of colonial migration was met with unwavering discrimination towards migrants. In 1958 a group of white Britons went on “nigger hunts”, attacking West Indians with knives and broken bottles. Although no one was killed, the race riots received so much attention that immigration and race became high politics. The public called for strong immigration control. The government, however, stayed divided on the issue. In the 1960s immigration became the source of national debate because the UK was experiencing an influx of migration following decolonization. The government stayed so divided on the issue, that certain politicians used racist commentary to send a political image. Conservatives used slogans such as “If you want a nigger for your neighbor, vote Liberal or Labor” to paint nightmare scenarios of an immigrant takeover of the UK and to gain support from voters (Bade, 2003).

Additionally, in the United Kingdom, immigration remained a national issue until 1979; it became a problem again in the 1990s when asylum applications brought the issue back. Immigration did not become politicized in France and Germany until later. France and Germany initially thought that migrants were there temporarily, but when it became clear that migrants were there to stay, the issue was taken more seriously. This lead to increased debate about citizenship and identity in both countries. In 1993 a restrictive nationality law was passed in France that denied foreigners born in France automatic citizenship. In Germany, there was an unpopular divide between right and left wing politics. The right heavily opposed the integration of migrants except under strict terms. The left, however, believed it was important to integrate migrants under the National Socialist policy “forced Germanisation”. Not only did immigration become national politics, but citizenship and national identity moved to the forefront of debates on the inclusion of migrants. Countries became worried that migrants would threaten the meaning of national identity (Dragostinova, 2016).
With the influx of migrants as well as the permanent stay of guest-workers, there began to be increased debates about what it meant to be German. Before the Soviet Union collapsed 16 million East Germans were part of the USSR and there were many debates about German identity, but non-Germans were excluded from the debate. After the fall of the Iron Curtain in the early 1990s, East Germany reunited with West Germany and Western Europe began to experience an influx of asylum applications. Germany went through a series of immigration reforms to best deal with the overwhelming application requests. They took restrictive asylum measures as well as liberalizing German nationality as an attempt to increase Germany’s naturalization rate. Immigration became a national issue in Britain, France, and Germany when governments realized that migrants were there to stay permanently. The public however did not respond to this nicely (Hansen, 2003).

Public opinion towards the permanent stay of migrants became anti-immigrant across Europe. Europeans grow concerns that migrants would alter the culture of local communities. Politicians or political parties support the anti-immigration sentiment, which had violent consequences for the migrant communities especially in UK. This anti-immigration sentiment throughout Europe hindered European countries from making adequate integration policies. In 1965 the UK passed an anti-discrimination policy, but it did little to enforce the legislation. The Netherlands adopted its first integration policy in 1981 and in France and Germany integration policies were left to localities such as unions and churches. Because European countries failed to establish strong integration policies, permanent migrants were poorly represented in national politics and they faced high levels of unemployment and discrimination (Dragostinova, 2016).

2.5 Recent crisis in Europe

Images of migrants losing their lives at sea while trying to reach Europe have received a lot of attention all throughout Europe as politicians and policy makers try to come to a consensus on how to deal with the issue. In 2015, Europe had close to a million migrants come into the continent in search of security and stability. Many Europeans feel that migrants would impact the economy because of the extensive economic support the government would need to provide in order to accommodate asylum-seekers. Most migrants come from war torn countries, which have failed to provide the necessary resources for survival. Most Europeans are also concerned that
the influx of migrants would threaten the cultural makeup of Europe since majority of asylum-seekers come from Muslim countries (European Commission, 2015).

The top ten origins of people applying for asylum in the EU are Syria, Afghanistan, Iraq, Kosovo, Albania, Pakistan, Eritrea, Nigeria, Iran, and Ukraine. The conflict in Syria is the biggest driver of migration to Europe. Iraq and Afghanistan have been experiencing ongoing violence and force people to look for new lives elsewhere. Europe compared to other regions has been experiencing political and economic stability, which draws migrants to that area. Germany received the highest number of new asylum applications in 2015, with more than 476,000. Hungary came in second with over 177,130 applications in 2015. Other countries that received large migrant applications were Sweden, Austria, Norway, Finland, and Switzerland (European Commission, 2015).

Migrants mostly travel to Europe by sea with over 1,011,700 arriving by sea in 2015. This dangerous route has accounted for many deaths that has received large international attention. The boats that carry migrants are in harsh conditions, migrants are crammed beyond capacity. In 2015 more than 3,770 migrants reported, to have died trying to cross the Mediterranean. The summer months are usually the season where migrants try to reach Europe. This recent crisis has created tension within the EU because of the disproportionate burden faced by some countries. The countries where majority of migrants have been arriving are Greece, Italy, and Hungary. Since then the EU has formed a relocation scheme to alleviate the burden from some countries. The UK has been reluctant in receiving more refugees and only plans to accept 20,000 migrants from Syria over the next five years (BBC, 2016).

The boats used to carry migrants are often in bad shape. Their crews often abandon them and migrants are severely overcrowded. There are two main routes by which migrants find their way to Europe. These are the Eastern Mediterranean (from Turkey to Greece) and the Central Mediterranean (from North Africa to Italy and Malta). The Central Mediterranean is by far the most popular route and the one with the most deaths. Out of the total 3,279 migrants that died crossing the Mediterranean in 2014, 2,447 were killed on the central route making it the world’s deadliest path to protection. The Eastern Mediterranean became a popular route because Greece
can be reached from Turkey by boat. Greece however is not a final destination for migrants due to its unstable economy (UNHCR, 2011).

Although European countries have been receiving large amounts of asylum applications, the number of people being given asylum is far lower. In 2015 more than a million migrants applied for asylum, but only 292,540 migrants were granted asylum. The top five countries that were offered asylum were Syria, Eritrea, Iraq, Afghanistan, and Iran. The top European countries that were approving asylum applications were Germany, Sweden, Italy, France, and Netherlands (BBC, 2016).

2.6 Roots and causes of migration crisis

One of the main causes of the current migration crisis is the ongoing civil war in Syria over the past four years. This civil war has displaced many Syrians who fled the country in search of security and stability. Many Syrians fled to neighboring countries such as Jordan, Lebanon, and Turkey hoping that they could one day return home once the civil war has ended. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees registered more than 4.1 million Syrian refugees with more than a million residing in Lebanon and more than 2 million residing in Turkey. However, when the Syrian conflict got worse, many migrants began looking elsewhere for decent housing and permanent legal residence in Europe. Europe has been a hotspot for Migrants since the end of World War II. Bulgaria is the closest European entry point however; very few Syrians desire to settle there because it is the poorest EU member state. Bulgaria also does not have the economic resources to supply refugees with well-equipped refugee camps (Dragostinova, 2016).

Global trends in migration point out that the number of displaced people has been rising. The UNHCR recently reported that worldwide displacement was at the highest level ever recorded. Current conflicts in the Middle East reflect the devastating violence that has been escalating in the region. Bashar Al-Assad’s government has been violating human rights in its current civil using dangerous methods such as chemical weapons to attack civilians. The UN nations said that over 250,000 Syrians have been killed and that number is said to increase due to the escalation of violence throughout other major cities in Syria. The conflict is more than just a
battle between President Assad’s regime and rebel groups, Assad’s regime has been targeting civilians as a weapon of war (Upadhyay, 2016).

The conflict in Iraq has driven many migrants to Europe. After the invasion of Kuwait in 1990, the United Nations placed economic sanctions on Iraq which had severe implications for Iraq’s economy and society. Thousands of Iraqis left the country in search of obtaining a better life. After the death of Saddam Hussein, the nation-building process and growth in employment were moving at an incredibly slow rate. The country is currently witnessing deadly violence as the Islamic State continues to capture large parts of the country. The Islamic State captured Mosul which is the second largest city of Iraq. In 2015 the number of civilian casualties that were both killed and injured reached 22,370. People are desperately fighting for their lives as this vicious circle of violence continues. Insecurity, poverty, and lack of economic opportunities has also been causing migration from Afghanistan. Political instability in general has been the main driving force for migration to Europe. When governments fail to supply citizens with economic opportunities, people will be forced to look for opportunities elsewhere (Adam, 2015).

Poverty, human rights abuses, and increased insecurity encouraged migrants and refugees to escape from countries such as Eritrea, Pakistan, Morocco, Iran, and Somalia to obtain a better life in Europe. The number of asylum-seekers in Europe from Eritrea nearly tripled in 2014. Eritrean refugees initially sought asylum in Sudan and Ethiopia, but they became irritated and annoyed with the lack of humanitarian assistance in refugee camps. The violence in South Sudan and flooding in Ethiopia has made the situation worse. People are risking this awful journey because they are escaping a life of war, oppression, and civil disorder. African migrants are overwhelmingly traveling to Europe through Libya, Egypt, Algeria, Tunisia, and Morocco. The cost of travel ranges from a couple hundred dollars to a couple thousand dollars depending on the routes you take (Economist, 2015).

Before many refugees migrate to Europe they initially go to countries such as Turkey, Lebanon, and Jordan. However, many refugees are moving towards Europe due to the deplorable conditions in the camps. Migrants have complained that although they escaped the violent atmosphere from their home countries, they still were not able to obtain better social and
economic opportunities. Turkey does not grant Syrian refugees the legal right to work because the country is already experiencing an unemployment rate of almost 10 percent. There is increased tension between Syrian refugees and locals because Syrians are willing to work at lower wages. The Turkish government is considering implementing tight border control because of the political and social condition in the country due to the influx of migrants and refugees. Turkey, Lebanon, and Jordan are also afraid of being more susceptible to terrorism and insecurity (Daniel and Triling, 2015).

The conditions for refugees in Jordan and Lebanon are also disappointing and dissatisfying. Some of their experiences have gotten so bad that they even considered returning to their dangerous homelands rather than suffer from poverty, hunger, and an insecure future. The International Labor Organization reported that the migration crisis has significantly increased unemployment in both Jordan and Lebanon. The unemployment rate in Jordan has gone up from 14.5% to 22.1% between 2011 and 2014. In Lebanon unemployment, has doubled to around 20% and about 170,000 Lebanese had fallen into poverty. Due to the large economic burdens the migration crisis has had on Turkey, Jordan, and Lebanon, migrants and refugees are being pushed to move towards Europe in search of better economic opportunities (Upadhyay, 2016).

2.7 Effect of migration crisis in Europe

The migration crisis has had a huge effect on Europe. Due to the overwhelming influx of migrants to Europe many countries have implemented tight border controls to monitor and manage the number of migrants coming into the country. Migration issues have now become national politics as governments all throughout Europe try to form migration policies and reforms that will best address the issue. Historically migrants were guest-workers who only came to Europe to fulfill labor demands. However, since the 1990s Europe has been experiencing an inundation of asylum applications. Governments stay divided as they try to adhere to public opinion as well as EU institutions. Many European countries feel like the influx of migrants is now altering and threatening the European identity (Mackey and Robert, 2015).
Since many migrants are coming from Muslim countries, there is ongoing fear in Europe that the continued arrival of migrants will cause more terrorist. Large scale attacks in Paris and Brussels has made many countries reluctant to open their borders. The migration crisis has created a political divide in countries all throughout Europe. There has risen of right-wing political movements that have been promoting anti-immigration laws and left-wing movements that have been advocating for the integration of migrants within local communities (Frank, 2015).

2.8 Conclusion

The large influx in Europe has been a challenge to both the receiving members and the sending states. The interconnectedness of the world has led the movement of the people from one region to another more easy and flexible than before and also the historical and cause of the many migrant moves to Europe has been evident on ongoing crisis since 1995. The forced migrant and refugees has been the many of the causing the crisis in Europe and the for the state being free from migrant the European Union should focus on the divide among members that fuel the migrant to move to the promise land the “Europe.”
CHAPTER THREE: THE CURRENT ATTITUDE AND POLICY ACTIONS WITHIN EUROPEAN UNION TOWARDS MIGRATION CRISIS.

3.0 Introduction

The current migration crisis in Europe has brought a plethora of challenges to European Union (EU) member-states. The influx of migrants into Europe has sparked a humanitarian crisis in the region leaving the EU divided on how to deal with asylum-seekers. The United Nations has declared the situation as the worst migration crisis since WWII. Although the EU has tried effectively to deal with the issue, different EU countries have taken contrasting stances on the problem further delaying a well-coordinated consensus among all EU member-states (Al jazeera, 2015).

3.1 Individual country’s migration policies in European Union

The existing difference in historical patterns of migration, the differences in European labor markets and the existing migration flow, explicitly shows the current divergent policies approach in dealing with migration. This however does not come as a surprise to the rest of the countries within EU. The current dilemma in migration policies in EU has a historical dimension, where some countries have a longer history of immigration. These are historical ties with the former colonies such as United Kingdom, France, Belgium and Netherlands and other shorter programs (Austria, Germany, and Switzerland). This led to states adopting restrictive policies in dealing with high influx of migrants. The increase of the asylum seekers since 1995, ongoing family reunification and the increase of free movement of the migrant within the EU, has hindered the collective response to the migration crisis in EU (IOM, 2015).

European Union states are not drafting new policies to curb the inflow of migrants into their territories collectively. However, separately they are revising and reforming migration policies to the current situation because some of the policies that were drafted had been outdated and cannot address the recent crisis. Some of the countries opted to reform the policies to their own experience in dealing with migrants and failed to focus on the collectivity of the policy response. For example, the United Kingdom has been a member of the EU until recently. Since
its exit from the EU, the country has undergone several changes in regards to its migration policies. It has reformed its economic migration policy by restricting labor movements. They have also instructed company owners to not employ migrants who have no documentation. They have raised the penalty on hiring undocumented migrants. Lastly, labor migration has been restricted to skill based and nation need only. Hence, this has affected member states because United Kingdom has acted on national survival without considering the EU policy implication. This action has threatened the collective response system within its members (European Council, 2014).

France has changed its legislation regarding the family reunification policy in 2003 followed by the change in the migration laws in 2006. The French government has claimed that there is an increase of migrants through the family reunification. This overwhelming increase in migrants has been a serious challenge in the country's economy and its survival in the global world, which led them to ignore the EU norms and laws on family reunification (Collett, 2010).

In 2008, in contrast to France and United Kingdom Sweden overhauled their whole migration system and authorized their state and private owned companies to recruit skilled laborers from Africa, Latin America and the Middle East countries. They wanted no interference from EU members because they focused on boosting the country's production, which was caused by the shortage of laborer’s. The current skilled labor force in Sweden failed to meet the labor demands by Swedish companies. Sweden acted in its own way to reform its policies to suit national interest and disregard common EU migration policies (Dragostinova, 2016).

Many countries in the EU saw the necessity of revising their migration policies and strategies because of the different experiences they got in dealing with immigration. Many of the states have recognized the problem and some attempted to reform the integration of immigrants. In 2006, Netherlands has undergone several structural changes to curb the immigrant flow. In 2006 the ministry had changed faces such as Ministry of Justice, Housing and to Environment. This was due to the divert attention of incoming migrants that they will not get the required necessity when they arrive in the Netherlands. The country did not shy away from forming free
movement policies to closed approach system that have allowed Netherlands to control migrants (Dragostinova, 2016).

The EU countries in Western Europe including the Ireland, Finland, Portugal, Spain and United Kingdom have been less restrictive on immigration particularly the labor migrant for their own self-interest. However, in some cases the countries differ in experience in handling the menace of the flow of migrants. Some countries lacked appropriate policies in controlling migrants. In dealing with the migration crisis, member countries opted creative approaches, which led to them gaining more experience in handling migrants (Dragostinova, 2016).

In 2006, Ireland opted to give work permits to the selected system and later moved to a sophisticated system. They created a Green Card kind of system that allowed only the company to transfer their excess employees to another company within the state. This policy caused serious implications to EU citizens and the rest of the migrants in the Ireland. Due to this, other states also adopted Ireland’s approach in controlling employees from Ireland. Hence, they violated the EU migration law and policies by controlling and restricting the order of attaining the working permit to non-nationals (Collett, 2010).

Spain has been a gateway to Europe and as they progress well into other countries. In the awake of the economic crisis, Spain reformed its migration policies such as family reunification and labor migration policies, which led to high unemployment. The policy makers overlooked the EU policies and acted on the current situation/crisis alone. It reduced social welfare benefits to discourage the high influx of migrants from particularly Africa and Middle East (Sobotka, 2010).

The recent admission of countries to the EU in 2004 and 2007 has exceeded the crisis because before the current migration flow, Europe was dominated by emigration from within the EU countries such as Baltic States, Poland, Bulgaria, and Romania. However, some states such as Hungary, Czech Republic, and Slovenia had soft power of attraction and migrant flow has been increasingly evident from Africa, Latin America, and Middle East. The members’ states
have a few comprehensive policies that are converging to control the dynamic in migration crisis in Europe (Collett, 2010).

The difference in the EU states is a challenge because some states such as Poland and Lithuania known for the emigration of their citizen to other EU states, opted several attractive policies that would encourage their citizens to return home such as increase of the employment, reduction of the income tax and welfare benefit, which still have not attracted most of their citizens to return home. On other hand, other member states such as Czech Republic has opted different policies and strategies to attract more skilled-labor to its country. Furthermore, many EU members failed to prioritize the implementation of the common regularization. Countries like Romania and Bulgaria failed to implement the EU policies on asylums, border control and visa policy. Instead they focused on their national demand and forgot the other member’s implications because no country can deal with the crisis alone when they are still part of the EU (Sobotka, 2010).

The immigration policies also vary in the strength of the economic difference in the EU members. The stronger economies have not only attracted migrants from within the EU, but have attracted migrants from all over the world. Outside states such as Spain, United Kingdom and Ireland were more encouraging for the inflow of migrants. States like Germany has accused certain member states for their restrictiveness with different policies. Migration has reduced the intra states movement, which curtails the free movement and also it undermines the Schengen area policy that has been effective for the EU citizen and the rest of the global citizen (Sobotka, 2010).

The geographical location of members’ state has led to different policy approaches in controlling and managing the border. Southern and Eastern Europe has been affected because of the long accessible border. Countries have become strict on border control to manage the inflow of migrants. They have pleaded for help from rest of the EU members to control the Mediterranean, which has not been effective. These countries include Spain, Italy, and Cyprus and this has resulted in threatening their alliance with other members. However, states in the east like Poland face the similar problem, but they didn't want to solve it because of their relation
with other neighboring states. Hence, there has been no similar national migration policy which has hindered a collective border control policy for all members’ states (Boswell and Geddes, 2011).

France has established the concept of selective immigration where migrants that are thought to be an economic contribution can be selected as opposed to the nondiscrimination policy of the EU in immigration. For most states, such as United Kingdom, selection is based on skilled labor and the creation of a conducive environment. An attractive condition such as immediate reunification, simplified procedure, and easy access of citizenship has encouraged migrants to move from the rest of the world to Europe (Boswell and Geddes, 2011).

The entry procedure has been different among states, for examples United Kingdom, Belgium, Netherlands and Ireland relied on admitting based off skilled labor and others such as Italy used procedural policies. Germany disregards all this and didn't use any policies in accepting migrants. Others used language as a prerequisite of being admitted in their countries. All members have signed and they are part of the EU policies and their response and acceptance is quite difference and therefore, the EU is developing as an institution against migrants (Falola and Usman, 2011).

The member states have reintroduced their own policies and others have undergone challenges in accessing the citizenship. Others made it easier for migrants to cross the border. However, all these responses have developed a sense of identity within member states and the individual states acted according to the understanding and the experience they got from the crisis. This has led to the divergent policies approach between EU members’ states (Collett, 2010).

3.2 Europe’s response to the migration crisis

Europe has been dealing with the current migration crisis in numerous ways. However, it’s important to acknowledge that not all European countries are enthusiastic about accepting migrants. Although the responses have been different throughout the continent, the common European agenda is to help migrants in need of international protection and return migrants who
have no right to stay on EU territory. Europe is only granting asylum to migrants who are fleeing from violent wars and conflict. Historically issues on migration only became national politics when governments started to realize that guest-workers were deciding to stay in Europe permanently. Currently the migration crisis has been receiving national attention due to the large influx of migrants that are trying to enter Europe. The international community has been putting pressure on Europe to take action due to the dangerous routes migrants have been taking, which caused many deaths (Falola and Usman, 2011).

Due to the unfair burden of migrants in countries such as Turkey, Lebanon, and Jordan, the EU interior Ministers have decided to distribute 120,000 migrants among the EU member states. Although majority of EU member have agreed to the relocation plan, Eastern European countries such as Slovakia, Romania, and Hungary have opposed the compulsory quota system. European countries have put an increased demand to improve the identification, registration, fingerprinting, and security to accurately account for all migrants coming into European borders. Although migrants wish to concentrate in a few European countries, the EU has decided that asylum seekers will not be allowed to choose the country where they would seek asylum. Europe has not been successful with its relocation plan because not all countries are being cooperative. The EU’s Migration and Home Affairs Commissioner, Dimitris stated that only 272 migrants have been relocated from Italy and Greece. Countries are so caught up on their domestic agendas that they are not making the migration crisis a priority (Upadhyay, 2016).

In response to the current migration crisis the European Commission has decided to replace EU’s Frontex with a European Border and Coast Guard. The Frontex is responsible for collaborating with national border agencies and ensuring security at the national boundaries. Currently the agency only employs 400 staff members, but is expected to expand to 1000 members. By 2020 the agency will receive 322 million Euros in funds therefore gaining more power with a strong reaction force. The new agency would also be in charge of turning away migrants who do not qualify for European asylum based on the agency’s criteria. Some countries have not been supportive of the European Commission’s new Frontex plan and have decided to maintain national sovereignty in external border control. The EU has also placed more emphasis on strengthening the role of EUROPOL (European Police Office) to dismantle criminal networks
and intends to launch Common Security and Defense Policy operations in the Mediterranean to capture and disassemble boats (Castles, 2014).

EU member states have taken increased measures to tighten control on their borders. The rising migration and security concerns have brought a lot of challenges to the passport free movement in the Schengen zone. Sweden, Hungary, Finland, and Austria have imposed temporary checks on the borders to control the inflow of migrants. Hungary put up razor wire fence and declared a state of emergency in border areas. Poland demanded greater national control over member states’ borders. Macedonia also put up a razor-wire fence after migrants built up at the Greece and Macedonia border. Macedonia’s Balkan neighbors also sent border guards to help police chase migrants’ away (Castles, 2014).

EU member states have responded differently towards the European migration crisis. The EU plans to give Greece emergency aid to tackle the crisis since migrants have been entering Greece through Turkey. After Macedonia put up its razor-wire fence, more than ten thousand migrants were camping in terrible conditions near the fence with little food or medical help. Migrants continue to try to enter Macedonia’s borders because they want to get to northern Europe, however EU’s Dublin Regulation requires a migrant’s asylum claim to be processed in the country where he/she first arrives. Hungary has also been criticized for its decision to build a razor-wire fence and prosecute migrants entering illegally. There were images of Hungarian riot police firing water cannon and tear gas at a big crowd of migrants at the border with Serbia (Upadhyay, 2016).

Around 1.1 million asylum-seekers arrived in Germany in 2015. It was a challenge for local authorities to accommodate a large number of migrants, but Germany was determined to fulfill its international humanitarian duty. This welcome however did not extend to economic migrants coming from countries like Kosovo, Albania, and Serbia. Not all Germans have been supportive of accepting migrants even those fleeing war and political prosecution. There have been many protests by right-wing movements that claim to be defending Germany from “Islamisation”. This led to an increased attack on migrants in Germany. Empty buildings reserved for new migrant arrivals were mysteriously gutted by fire. The Cologne attacks where
hundreds of women were sexually molested fueled anxiety towards migrants since victims and witnesses mostly blamed gangs of migrant men from North Africa (Upadhyay, 2016).

After the attack in Paris, political and security measures have been taken to address the security concerns in the European region. That led to the establishment of an EU-wide intelligence agency whose primary focus was to enhance border security and tighten border control. Germany is planning to establish a special anti-terror unit to respond to the terrorism challenges. The unit will comprise of five branches and around 50 personnel. Germany already a special force that responds to urgent security challenges and terrorist attacks, however the new terror unit will react in complex security challenges. To increase security, Germany has also decided to deport migrants who commit crime (Mavroudi and Nagel, 2016).

Europe has also taken measures to control external borders. They wanted to devise a plan on controlling migrants before entering the European borders. Europe has taken initiatives to control the smuggling of migrants, providing financial assistance to concerned countries, and working to contain the heavy inflow of migrants. The EU has partnered with countries of origin and transit to decrease migrant smuggling networks. Europe also plans to contain the heavy inflow of migrants through improving socio-economic conditions in origin places. The EU hopes that by stabilizing Middle Eastern economies and politics, they can avoid the large inflow of migrants coming to Europe. However, conflicts in Syria, Iraq, and Afghanistan have only gotten worse making it almost impossible for EU countries to stabilize conflicts in the Middle East. After the Paris attacks, European countries have agreed to enhance their political and military campaign against the Islamic State. Russia and France have agreed extend their defense cooperation to the fight against terrorism in Syria (Mavroudi and Nagel, 2016).

3.3 Root causes of the current divergence of attitudes in Europe

If you take economic factors into perspective, you will realize that countries that are accepting asylum-seekers tend to have a higher GDP per capita. For example, Germany is the European country that has granted the most asylum claims to migrants. Germany is also one of the most developed countries in the EU. However, the EU member-states have proven time and time again that the divergence of attitudes in Europe has less to do with economics and more to
do with the rise of right-wing nationalist parties throughout Europe. European countries have invested large amounts of money towards internal and external border control. They have also granted large amounts of money to assist countries that are struggling to maintain a large migrant population. Xenophobia has become more prevalent in contemporary European politics and society. Many right wing nationalist parties are arguing that immigration threatens the continents national and cultural identity (Le Goff, 1996).

Some have associated this xenophobic ideology with Eastern Europe, but Western countries such as France, Netherlands, and Britain have proven to be xenophobic as well (Horn, 2015). Hungary has responded to migrants arriving at their borders with hostility and repressive tactics that go against EU values. The Hungarian Prime Minister Victor adopted an uncompromising anti-migrant position. Slovak leaders have stated that Muslims would not be welcome in their country and only accepted a small number of Christians. There are photographs of police in the Czech Republic writing numbers on refugees’ arms with permanent marker depicting images from the holocaust. Hungary and northern neighbor Slovakia have refused to be part of the EU relocation plan because they feel like Europe’s Christian heritage is under threat because most of the migrants are Muslim (Anon, 2016).

Although some countries are trying hard to live up to their promise to provide humanitarian assistance to migrants, the rise of right-wing political parties has been establishing anti-immigration policies across Europe. A median of 49 percent believe that the large number of migrants fleeing countries such as Iraq and Syria pose a threat to their country. An increased median of 59 percent believe that migrants will increase the likelihood of terrorism in their country. Another 43 percent have an unfavorable view of Muslims in their society. This negative feeling towards migrants is causing a more threatening political divide in Europe (Adepoju, 2011).

In France 32 percent of the population feel like migrants pose a general threat to society. Right wing politics in France see migrants as a major threat while only 29 percent of people on the left share that fear. Majority of people who share right wing views believe that migrants increased the likelihood of terrorism in their country. These sentiments have caused a large divide between right and left wing politics. The partisan divide is 30 points in UK, 29 points in
the Netherlands, and 28 points in Germany and Italy. The negative sentiments towards migrants are linked to attitudes towards Muslims, who make up a large share of the current migrant influx in Europe. A majority of Greeks and at least 40 percent of Italians, Hungarians, and Poles think that having an increasing number of people of many different races and ethnic groups will make their country a worse place to live. Those on the right are often more opposed to diversity than those on the left (Stokes, 2016).

For months’ tension, has been escalating between Greece and some of its EU partners because Greece continues to attract thousands of migrants daily. The Greek islands are near Turkey, which makes it easier for migrants to travel to Greece by boat. EU member states have accused Greece of deliberately waving through migrants who should be registered as soon as they enter the EU. Austria got so upset about the issue that they withdrew their ambassador from Vienna. Greece has argued that it cannot become Europe’s holding center for migrants and demands a fair burden-sharing among other EU member states. In January and February of this year 120,000 out of the 130,000 migrants who crossed the Mediterranean arrived in Greece. Improving cooperation with Turkey has also been a main priority for the EU. Turkey is however demanding a high price for its cooperation because it has already spent eight billion helping migrants from the Syrian war (Anon., 2016).

Europe’s rise in xenophobia shows that EU member states main priority is to preserve national identity. However, it’s been proven that Europe’s concern is more of a perceived risk rather than an actual one. If the EU granted asylum to all 4.5 million registered Syrian migrants around the world, they would make up less than .09% of the EU’s total population. Yet the EU is already in a sense of panic and they have only accepted a small proportion of migrants. The EU’s fear of minority groups stems from the majority’s anxiety of incompleteness. Eastern European governments have been criticized to their isolationist response to Europe’s migration crisis. They have been very hostile towards migrants fleeing from wars in Iraq, Syria, and Afghanistan (Albassam, 2015).

Up to 50 percent of the public in nine EU countries believe that Muslims are less likely to local customs and ways of life. Historically Germany has tried many times to incorporate
migrants through forced Germanization and currently there is a lot of fear that migrants will not want to assimilate into the German society. The increased fear of migrants, Muslims, and terrorism is a serious issue in Europe. It makes it almost impossible for leaders of countries that are becoming more diverse to promote the integration of migrants. Each terrorist incident continues to gain support for right-wing populism and native rhetoric (Stokes, 2016).

### 3.4 Differences in the European Union states

The EU failed to come up with good policies that are collective in dealing with the migrant crisis. The member states from the Eastern and Central Europe such as Romania, Slovakia, and Hungary has been a barrier in implementing the policies resettlement, integration and deportation policy. Others states such Germany has willingly accepted migrants and argued others to follow suit. This has brought a division between members. Hungary and Austria have led the campaign against migrants from other countries and they also incited their people not to accept migrants into their territories. The difference between Western and Eastern Europe is clear and continuing to be difficult for them to come to a consensus in matter of the migration crisis (Albassam, 2015).

Hungary and Slovakia have a few foreign nationals compared to other members’ states. This is due to the homogeneity in culture and religion. Poland has 0.3 percent of foreigners, Romania has 0.4 percent foreign nationals, and Lithuania has 0.7 percent. This shows the differences in EU members’ states in accepting migrant to their territory. There has been a rise of the far-right parties gaining popularity, which are advocating for anti-migrant policies. Most of the countries are predominantly Christian and conservatives compared to the Western Europe states who are open with having diverse populations (de Haas, 2008).

The anti-immigrant movement led by the political parties has fueled the nationalist tendencies to gain the public support. This generated the anti-immigrant feeling among citizens in EU nations some of the individual state leaders from Poland and Czech Republic have stated clearly that they will not allow migrants to their country and they will not accept the EU quota system in resettlement of migrants. They will make sure they will completely control their borders alone. Hungary’s president Viktor Orban has called the Europe migration crisis as “an
organized invasion of Europe” hence; they must close and protect their borders from non-nationals (Boswell and Geddes, 2011).

Germany and France anti-immigrant and anti-Islam parties have gained grounds and support of the public. This has shown the rise of identity preservation among European citizens. The far-right parties have spread throughout Europe and these parties have attracted many loyalties and conservatives in Europe. For example, Danish People's Party gained more vote in the recent election in Denmark and the country has also made changes in migration policies where the Danish government claimed that the migrants must support themselves while staying in their country. The government refuses to offer any assistance to migrants. Therefore, by adopting this policy, migrant will be more reluctant to come to Denmark (Boswell and Geddes, 2011).

Many countries within union have behaved differently in handling the migration within and outside Europe. The difference by the far-right and liberal democrats has provided migrants grounds to migrate more than before. The EU has faced serious threats from migrants and the member states have witnessed different type of crisis since 1995. After the adoption of the Schengen Area’s restrictive and conservative policies, Europe has been different in its implementation of migration policies at the national and regional level because of the different perceptions within the EU states. Thus, this has brought the existence of different types of the migrants who have been contributing to Europe’s economy and culture. Therefore, European Union members need to wake up and see the essence of unity and belonging to the institution that is failing because of the divergent interest among individual states (Upadhyay, 2016).

3.5 Conclusion

The increased inflow of migrants has posed challenges not only to European values and their international humanitarian obligations, but also to the European institutions that govern EU member states. Historically, Europe has made efforts in building human rights protection policies at the regional and global levels however; some countries have been opposed to taking in more migrants although the influx of migrants has been increasing at such a large magnitude. Anti-migrant protests and political parties have emerged throughout Europe. There has been a
growing security and social concerns due to incidents of terror and sexual attacks. Some central and Eastern European countries fear that migration may disturb their social homogeneity. Although some countries have formulated their own migration policies, the EU has failed to establish a well-coordinated migration policy. The EU needs to respond collectively, but currently their response has been weak further weakening the political tensions among EU member states. The next chapter will discuss how the migration crisis has been threatening the overall stability of the European Union.
CHAPTER FOUR: INTERPRETATION OF DATA

4.0 Introduction

The failure from the European Union structure and regulation as CEAS, Dublin regulation and Migration Declarations. These policies were formed to address the issue of the refugees and migrant within the EU has been overwhelmed by the mass influx of the refugees entering the Europe in the in the southern periphery that is Italy and refusal for refugees to proceed to the desired country in EU has also led to inequality in sharing the burden of the EU countries. Countries such as Italy and Greece became host of the crisis. According to Dublin regulation asylum seekers require to apply the arrival country and many migrant refuses to give their fingerprint and the end up in the street of the Italy and Greece i.e. Saeed and Ibrahim whom I interviewed are the case example of refugees who failed to give the fingerprint to the Italian Authorities.

In 2015 Germany and France who are main hegemony in the EU have declined to abide by the EU migration policies. Germany has failed to return the refugees that left Italy and Germany has been liberal to the issues of the migrant and states like France has failed to share the refugee’s database with the other countries such as Italy and Sweden. 28th June 2016 when I interviewed the Saeed and Ibrahim at Milan Central station cafe have explained to me their journey to Europe. Their experience has been similar though they are both Somalis but different regions Ethiopia and Somalia. They described the journey as hell (in Somali dialect “Nar”). They were able to raise the eight thousand dollars ($ 8000) from their families in abroad who had used the same route several years ago to enter into Europe.

They took off their journey from Mogadishu, Somalia where they have paid each two thousand dollars ($ 2000) to be smuggled across the red sea through Yemen. Upon arriving the Yeman the Somali smugglers has handed them to Yemenis smugglers whom they have paid them three thousand dollars ($ 3000) to be smuggled in all the way to Libya. They couldn't hold their tears mentioning Libya because they told me that it was their worst part in their journey that cannot be described by any word.
In Libya, they were imprisoned for four month in warehouse by the Libyan smugglers with no food and water. They said they were given expired food and many of their colleagues did not make it because they got diarrhea and became dehydrated. The smugglers own the ships and boats that they transport the migrant into the Mediterranean Sea. They must pay another three thousand dollars ($3000) to be transported into the offshore of the Malta from there. The Malta coastal guard has founded them and gave them shelter for a month and they were handed over to the Italian authorities.

Even in the best-case scenario where a search and rescue ship spots migrants mid-journey, the situation can turn deadly in a matter of seconds. “When people on boats in distress see that a rescue boat is approaching they start to panic, they move to one side of the boat, and the boat capsizes. It sinks very rapidly and those trapped in the hull lose their lives” explains UNHCR’S Federico Fossi (Interview with Federico Fossi, Milan, Italy, 01 July 2016). Tragically, even rescue operations may result in loss of life due to fear of apprehension by the authorities (Stake, 1995).

The failure and the divide in the EU policies have shown by evidence that the Saeed and Ibrahim upon arriving did not get the required process in gaining the Asylum at the arrival stage. The case of the two refugees are case example how the Common European Asylum System formation has not clearly anticipated the divide in the EU can affect it implementation of its policies to the members states therefore, influx of the refugees into the EU members led some to reconsider their membership because of EU formation has failed to put in consideration the difference and the divide the EU member had along and the shift of the focus on the economic integration rather they failed to place a lot of factors in place that is hindering their relation within and outside.

4.1 Economic Migrant or Refugee?

Despite the distinct legal categories into which new arrivals are slotted, individuals have complex and overlapping motivations for leaving their origin countries that defy simple categorization. Even for those fleeing conflict or oppressive regimes, it is often difficult to pinpoint one precipitating push factor, especially one that aligns with the legal grounds for
claiming asylum. The 1951 Geneva Convention offers a single definition of a refugee: someone fleeing a well-founded fear of persecution due to race, religion, nationality, membership in a social group, or political opinion. Ultimately, opportunity differentials continue to drive most movements, even for refugees. For many, reaching Europe means the chance to build or regain a normal life that has been disrupted by political or economic turmoil, conflict, or persecution. Thus, while international law draws a bright line between refugees and other migrants (requiring very different treatment for the former), this distinction is much more nuanced in practice.

Even the motivations of those seen as primarily “economic migrants” may not be completely clear. Western Balkan nationals, for example, face extremely high unemployment and poverty rates, and have a clear economic incentive to seek entry to Europe. Roma or other minority ethnic groups that face severe and systemic discrimination in their home countries and could, in some cases, be considered grounds for refugee status represent a substantial share of those making the journey.

Motivations to move may also shift as conflicts wear on. While more than 4 million Syrians have found safety in neighboring countries, these countries have yet to provide the full legal status or rights entitled to refugees under the 1951 Refugee Convention including the all-important right to work. With few opportunities to resume a normal life or economic self-sufficiency in first-asylum countries, and little hope that conditions will improve in the future, many Syrians are choosing to search for their own solutions in Europe hence they face identity crisis.

The diversity of these flows both in terms of the nationalities of those arriving and the motivations of individuals themselves creates an added challenge for asylum authorities trying to determine who is a “genuine” refugee, who may qualify for another form of protection, and who does not have legal grounds to stay in the European Union. Each arrival must receive an individual assessment of his or her claim for protection, often a lengthy and resource-intensive process, and backlogs of claims awaiting adjudication have begun to grow in many Member States as authorities lack the means to keep up with the rising number of cases. But even those whose claims are denied stand a chance of remaining in the European Union, as return rates for failed asylum seekers remain low.
4.2 Shift in migration

In 2014, the central Mediterranean was the most popular path for immigrants into Europe. The greatest number of arrivals recorded was in January-July 2014 with 87,915 immigrants arriving in Italy. In 2015, the number increased to 93,542 which was an 8% increase from the preceding year. Despite this increase, Italy was still not the highest receiver of immigrants in these years. In Greece, the situation had worsened with 750% influxes of immigrants between January-July 2015 compared to 2014. In July 2015, the UNHCR conveyed that 50,242 Syrians arrived in Greece in comparison to 43,500 for the entire 2014. This sudden upsurge unquestionably made the eastern Mediterranean route the greatest frequently used compared to the central Mediterranean in 2014.

Additionally, 66% of immigrants who arrived in Greece from January to mid-August in 2015 were from Syria. In Italy, in 2015, the number of Syrian immigrants who arrived from January to July had reduced to 66% compared to the previous year. The director of IOM coordinating office for the Mediterranean in Rome in reference to the refugees arriving in Italy contended that “Flows are changing and some nationalities are intensifying compared to the previous year. This case also applies to Somalis (from 3,190 to 7,538), Sudanese (from 1,301 to 5,658) and Nigerians (from 4,702 to 11,899). O the other hand, Syrians are declining”. The Syrian war has undoubtedly produced the majority of new refugees in the past five years.

To efficiently understand the reason why most immigrants, choose the eastern Mediterranean path, two factors should be considered. First, Turkey’s closeness to Greece, and its intensifying Syrian immigrant’s populace. Moreover, Turkey is less than 1.7 km away from the Greek island of Samos. According to Samos, Michaelis Angelopoulos the island acquires a total of 800 immigrants a day. Kos, Greece, part of the Dodecanese island chain, is less than four kilometers from the coast of Bodrum, Turkey, and received 34,500 immigrants from January to July of 2015. Lesbos, Greece, an island less than 34km from Dikili, Turkey received an astounding 61,636 immigrants, the uppermost number all through that same time period.

Expectedly, two of the top Google searches in Syria are "sea separating Turkey and Greece" and "Greece map." Furthermore, Turkey holds 1.9 million Syrian immigrants more than
any other state in the universe. “It’s not very hard to comprehend why there has been an enormous movement of people arriving from Turkey to Greece” declares Flavio. “There are many people who are not willing to go to the refugee camps most of them just left Syria and want to go straight to Germany, Sweden, or Norway”.

Most people are giving up on the view of a future in their state, triggering numerous to head straight in the direction of Europe, either straight from Syria or its neighboring states. Syrians are enforced into a state where they must make a choice between two selections: forever live in disgraceful situations or endure their death-defying journey to Europe in hope of a better life. For a rising number of Syrians, the latter is 55 becoming a more striking choice. Approximately 40% of the half a million immigrants that arrived Europe from January-September 2015 are Syrian. In spite of these numbers, the massive majority of Syrians are still in their state or its neighbors denoting that this could be the start of the immigrant movement. All the fundamentals in place have shaped a perfect storm brewing in the eastern Mediterranean. A long-term phenomenon is now ongoing, in which a continuous movement of asymmetrical immigration comes from Turkey, overflowing into Europe with slight to no signs of decelerating soon.

4.3 Local and State Level Trends

At the state and local level, the utmost relevant trends connected to this topic rotate around the quality and organization of the reception centers along with the frequently undesirable replies by the local populace. Among these trends, the utmost grave signified within the case studies and legislative resources comprise of the humanitarian problems presently afflicting the reception locations for refugees. This was mainly obvious in the case studies for Greece and Hungary. It was evident that local actors, as well as government and non-government administrations, lacked the capitals or personnel to sufficiently fund the growing movements of individuals into their countries.

With numerous people arriving the state, the Greek reception centers have become so overwhelmed and congested that arriving refugees have been able to effortlessly move past
critical check points and move deeper into Europe via secondary movements. This last feature has turn out to be a growing point of pressure between EU Member States. It has resulted into not only to ruptures in ideology but also legal threats among nations. Hungary is at danger of humanitarian disasters along its boundaries as enormous numbers of people have been left waiting at the border for weeks, or months with restricted food, water, or funds.

Hungary’s limiting immigration rules, as well as the border barrier with Serbia and their outlawing tactic toward refugees, have not only harshly delayed the international protection of refugees’ rights but have evidently positioned extra pressures on other EU Member States. In all three case studies, it was found that cities have become flooded with refugees endeavoring to either migrate to the next host state or apply for refuge. In the meantime, they have lived in temporary camps or parks with restricted care, food, or other funds.

The absence of funds has resulted to one of two tactics by Member States that have had deep penalties in terms of the EU immigration rule. Some countries, like Germany, Greece, and Italy, have had to evade and neglect certain fundamentals of EU rule and procedure. Other countries, such as Hungary, Denmark, Sweden, Austria, Slovenia, Serbia, and Croatia, have either totally or partly closed their boundaries to refugees, additionally intensifying a possible human rights predicament (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

In addition to this resource predicament, the undesirable sentimentality amongst local inhabitants towards refugees was obvious all over all the case studies. From clusters like the Hooligans against Salafists, the substitute for Germany, and the Ultras in Germany to the robust anti immigrant parties evolving in Hungary and Greece, it is evident that these kinds of groups are acquiring both local backing and political authority as the calamity intensifies. This negative insight emerges from the idea that thousands of refugees are entering cities in an unrestrained and unmanaged way. In some instances, they are outstripping the citizens themselves. As these discernments upsurge, so does the impact that these local opinions have on state immigration rules. This is particularly obvious in two diverse instances in the Germany and Hungary case studies.
In Germany, national rule still directly brings into line with general EU legislative rule. As an outcome, a more exposed and welcoming tactic is taken. Local groups in Germany though have started to take stern goal at this. With regional countries, such as Bavaria and Baden-Wurttemberg start to execute additional limiting tactics to their management rules and as violence endures to arise from anti-immigration groups, German Chancellor Merkel may not be capable to endure Germany’s present path much longer. In Hungary, direct local backing for limiting rules is clear and has aided Prime Minister Urban endure to institute rules that counter EU legislative goals and objectives. This drift is not merely seen in these three nations. The literature indicates that comparable procedures are going on in Denmark, France, Austria, the UK, and many of the Balkan nations. Local inhabitants have become gradually anti-immigrant and more helpful of security and border regulatory tactics to addressing the catastrophe (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees).

4.4 European Union-Divide trends

The grave matter originating from the study is the EU’s clear absence of unity and harmony in addressing the present immigration predicament. This was obvious in the case studies of Germany and Hungary. Both validate nearly opposite philosophies and policies for handling unequal immigration and asylum-seekers. This discrepancy has separated the EU as a whole. As the catastrophe endures to reveal, the division has become even broader with more countries moving away from EU legislative rule and in the direction of more limiting actions. This absence of unity not only has formed a strong suspicion among EU countries themselves, but it has also had a direct effect on the efficiency of EU legislation. Looking at the immigration and relocation systems introduced by the EU, only 200 to 215 people of the projected 160,000 have been immigrated as of 2015 due to suspicion and antagonism to EU-wide immigration policy.

Additionally, the Dublin rule, a main piece of EU procedure in handing out refuge pursuers, has fundamentally been released by a number of Associate States, as well as Germany, the major supporter of EU policy. The EU has threatened its Associate countries with more than eighty-two distinct lawful actions, signifying the weakness of EU legislature.
This conflict between countries has fashioned a noticeable issue within the EU, designing an obvious alteration between EU rules and activities taken by Member States. This clear suspicion and philosophical disintegration has unswervingly resulted to costs for refugees. They have been stuck trying to understand the best sequence of action for moving through Europe, in spite of unique defilements of international defense and human rights against them.

Associated to this lack of harmony among states is the massively stimulating matter of EU execution of its irregular rules. With so many states inspiring the EU’s major rules and so little being done to counter their stance, the whole EU project has been put into danger. This has been most obvious in the case studies of Germany and Hungary. Their actions in creating restrictive obstacles have brought up potential violations of the Schengen Agreement, guaranteeing the freedom of movement between states. This principle is one of the hallmarks of the entire EU project, and it is under attack.

The examples set by Associate States could have terrible penalties even years after the immigration predicament ends. Even the European Council President, Donald Tusk, has been doubtful about the condition of Schengen. In January 2016, he asserted that “Schengen could fail” due to the present immigration disaster if advancement is not made instantly (Cendrowicz, 2016). With few implementation strategies to back up legislative policy, the entire EU could suffer outstanding penalties of this disaster, vividly jeopardizing the unified path of the EU. An absence of execution of EU law, pure conceptual variances between countries on migration problems, and a restricted sum of unity among members.

EU’s devastating tendency to deliver unreasonable and distrustful rules meant to produce short-term legislative solutions instead of long-term approaches. Due to this, many crashes have arisen. Whether internally or externally, grave gaps have advanced within the EU’s CEAS, predominantly in respects to the Dublin Conventions. Other gaps, precisely with respects to secondary activities of refugees, operative funding for states of entry and transportation along with external strategy gaps, have also arisen within EU legislation providing grave glitches for EU Member countries. The whole EU project seems to be in fluctuation as suspicion and main
philosophical variances over how to accomplish the migration catastrophe has endangered the formation of complete and amalgamated EU rule.

This disjointed posture, together with inconveniences of some EU legislative rules, have resulted to implementation issues of EU rule and have additionally alienated the EU countries while also hypothetically preserving a human rights crisis. Generally, the three case studies of Germany, Hungary, and Greece stresses the main drifts and glitches drawn in this study. They also enlarge on the predominant EU policy difficulties highlighted by authors in the literature assessment of this thesis. Finally, without addressing some of the main basics noted in this chapter, the EU will not only encounter increasing problems in handling the present catastrophe, but it will have problems in upholding the harmony of the entire EU.

4.5 Why This Crisis Is So Difficult to Tackle

The sheer scale of displacement worldwide has tested the limits of the international protection regime built around the 1951 Refugee Convention and revealed existing fault lines and failures in current humanitarian policies. As of 2014, UNHCR estimates that 59.5 million people have been forcibly displaced from their homes, of which 19.5 million are refugees outside their countries of origin. Three primary factors have limited the system’s capacity to respond.

First, existing approaches to protection have proven singularly unable to find solutions for long-term displaced populations. Almost half of refugees under UNHCR’s care in 2014 had been displaced for five years or more. For most, return to their origin country or resettlement in a third country remains a distant possibility; in 2014, approximately 105,000 refugees were resettled through UNHCR, representing less than 1 percent of all refugees displaced globally. Humanitarian responses in refugee situations have been criticized for focusing too heavily on the “care and maintenance” of refugee populations, leaving refugees essentially “warehoused” for years on end, their lives in limbo, with little focus on long-term, sustainable solutions.

Second, the international community has failed to offer anything like meaningful burden-sharing to host countries in conflict regions, which care for the clear majority of the world’s refugees. Neither assistance funding nor resettlement places insufficient before the latest surge in
displacement have increased apace with the level of need. And the resources that are available are finite, and dwindle as time wears on. In Lebanon, for example, the World Food Program (WFP) announced in July it would have to reduce food vouchers given to Syrian refugees by half. The 2015 UN joint appeal for the region had received just 40 percent of requested funding as of September. Although all categories of the appeal are underfunded, support for livelihoods development and host-community resilience has been particularly low, adding to the prospect of long-term vulnerability in the affected countries. European leaders acknowledged the significance of the funding gap facing the Syria refugee response at an extraordinary EU summit on September 23, promising an additional 1 billion Euros to UNHCR and WFP to ease the deficit (half will come from EU funds and half from Member States). Prior to the latest announcement, European countries had provided more than one-third of the funding for the United Nations’ response, with the United States providing a further one-third of the financing. But outside Europe and the United States, financial support for the Syria region has been less than forthcoming. Other than Japan, no countries in Asia or Latin America have contributed, and while Kuwait has been the third largest financial contributor to the international response, other Gulf countries such as Saudi Arabia have come under criticism for not doing more.

Furthermore, UNHCR-reported resettlement departures have barely increased over 2009 levels. Countries not immediately affected by the crisis have been slow to offer resettlement places. Recent offers by traditional resettlement countries like Australia, Canada, and the United States to provide an additional 10,000-12,000 places each for Syrians are just a drop in the bucket in comparison with the 4 million refugees who have been displaced. And so far, offers from countries without established resettlement programs have been even less forthcoming.

4.6 Conclusion

Finally, the principles of protection enshrined in the Refugee Convention (in particular the requirement that refugees be located outside their country of origin) have resulted in territorially based national asylum systems refugees must gain access to a state’s territory in order to exercise their rights to claim asylum. At the same time, EU nations have undertaken a large-scale effort to secure and “push out” their borders. Visa restrictions and airline sanctions, for example, have
made it difficult if not impossible for most of those seeking protection to reach their destinations through common means of entry. Thus, refugees are forced to rely on increasingly risky and dangerous routes, often requiring the use of smugglers, to gain entry to asylum systems in Europe and rather the EU failed to tackle the lack of consensus among them.
CHAPTER FIVE: GENERAL CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

Over the last two decades the EU experienced a population growth of some 2 million per year and 80 percent of this growth was due to increased international migration. Germany has the largest foreign-born population. Germany’s immigration policies have been opened to accepting more migrants’ due to the recent crisis. Other countries also have a large foreign-born population such as France, United Kingdom, Spain, and Italy. The key gates of entry for people immigrating to Europe are temporary and long-term labor migration, family reunification, and inflow of asylum seekers (Carrera, 2006)

The increased inflow of migrants has posed challenges not only to European values and their international humanitarian obligations, but also to the European institutions that govern EU member states. Thus far, the EU has failed to come up with good policies that are collective in dealing with the current migrant crisis. The international community has been putting pressure on Europe to act due to the dangerous routes migrants have been taking, which caused many deaths. Although some countries are trying hard to live up to their promise to provide humanitarian assistance to migrants, the rise of right-wing political parties has been establishing anti-immigration policies across Europe. Due to increased wars and political prosecution, Europe continues to be a popular destination for asylum seekers. If the EU continues to stay divided on how best to handle the European migration crisis, this can impose instability to the institutions that govern the EU (Collett, 2009).

5.1 Recommendations

It comes as no surprise that European governments cannot come to an agreement on how best to deal with their migration policies. This divergence has several implications for both the EU and its member states. Historical patterns in Europe have had a large impact on current policies. Countries with a longer history of migration tend to focus more on placing conditions on migrants or restricting immigration flows. However, increased number of asylum claims,
ongoing family reunification, and increased mobility between EU member states are reminders that zero immigration policies are not a realistic goal (European Commission, 2008a).

Migration issues have been present in Europe for many decades. This is not the first-time European countries are developing migration policies. Countries have been reforming and revising their policies based on their own economic interest. Countries have also attempted to make policies based on the integration of migrants. For example, in the Netherlands, the ministry responsible for integration has changed several times over the last decade. Immigration flows and policy development are not new in Europe. These are issues that have been undergoing many changes in the EU. Moving forward countries need to realize that this is not an issue that will go away anytime soon. Third world countries are frequently bombarded with war, political persecution, famine and Europe continues to be a safe haven for asylum-seekers due to its political and economic stability (European Migration Network, 2007).

No one country can take on the burden of the migration crisis alone. This is an issue that requires Europe to come together and act as one. Europe needs to consider this task a new beginning and not allow the arduous task to divide the continent. EU members need to be able to learn from each other’s’ mistakes and have well thought out discussions on how to move forward to alleviate the crisis. For any policy to be effective, countries must come to an agreement that the migration policies will be collectively implemented by all member states. This will ensure consistency and stability throughout the EU (Eurostat, 2009a).

5.2 Ways to Forge a Common Path

Geography and the characteristics of bordering countries have played a strong role in determining European migration policies. Countries with long geographically accessible external borders have been more involved with border management than those with weak external borders. No two national immigration policies in Europe resemble one another. However, the European Pact on Immigration and Asylum has played a significant role in getting countries to adopt similar immigration policies. This proves that countries are more likely to adopt “selected” migration policies because migrants are deemed more likely to contribute economically. This
was seen in France where they not only selected economic migrants, but they also ensured that they assimilated into French society (IOM, 2010).

The European Pact on Immigration has played a major role in bringing EU countries together to tackle immigration. It can continue to be the institution or entity that brings countries together to address the current migration crisis. The EU has already established a common visa system and is on its way to completing an integrated Border Managements System with the development of a common border code. The relocation was initially seen as a step forward, however there have been concerns because four EU states voted against it (Münz, 2009).

5.3 Short term plans

The only way for Europe to effectively approach this crisis is to target the source. Although Europe cannot directly solve or prevent the push factors causing these refugees to flee, it can change the way these refugees are arriving. There are not enough safe and legal routes for those seeking international protection from outside of Europe to enter legally. Refugees should not have to rely on violent smugglers to risk their lives to make it to Europe. This has resulted in many deaths and if the EU simply developed a sensible approach that allowed refugees seeking asylum to enter Europe legally, the humanitarian disaster could be safer and more organized. The short-term policy actions will consist of the immediate action EU member states can take to ensure the safety of migrants and asylum seekers who have been risking their lives to flee political persecution, famine, and war. First and foremost, EU governments must ensure that the protection of all migrants, particularly women, children, and other vulnerable groups, regardless of their migrant status is the basis for their decision-making and action. EU nations have a moral responsibility to help people fleeing murderous regimes or organizations (OECD, 2009).

The Merkel Plan, which was developed by the European Stability Initiative, could make a great short-term plan. Its central idea is the resettlement of hundreds of thousands of refugees a year from Turkey to a group of EU member states. The EU must show that it is serious about supporting refugees in Turkey, and follow up on its promise of visa-free travel for Turkish citizens. This proposal will be hard to negotiate and implement, but at least it provides Europe with a practical way forward. This will allow leaders to restore a sense of control within the
continent. It would also allow migrants a chance to reach Europe without having to risk their lives (UNDESA, 2009).

Leaders must stop trying to find inefficient policies that are sure to fail the moment it leaves the press room. European governments should really try to understand the complexity of the migration crisis. Providing appropriate protection for migrants does not mean that governments should just allow all migrants to freely enter their borders. This means that EU governments should identify those who need international protection and granting them the necessary protection they need and to grant those who asylum claims have been rejected a safe return to their home country. EU member states should also ensure that they have rescue operations at sea in areas where migrants have been arriving through irregular channels. This will help reduce the number of deaths at sea. The UN High Commissioner for Refugees has stated that EU members should make it a priority to improve and harmonize legal channels of access to the EU for migrants. This includes significantly expanding current resettlement programs, increasing humanitarian visas, or granting temporary international protection for migrants in desperate need of safety. This would not only improve the management of the current migration surge, but it would reduce the need for refugees and other migrants to resort to dangerous irregular patterns lives (UNDESA, 2009).

5.4 Long term Plans

EU member states should make it a priority to form a credible joint border and visa management and a common European immigration policy. Having collective control of EU’s borders and coordination of Visa systems are essential for achieving a proper and functioning migration policy. Adopting a coherent long-term and comprehensive strategy that addresses both the causes and the consequences of the current influx will help maximize benefits and minimize the human and economic costs of global migration. They must try to invest in countries of origin, transit, or first destination outside the EU. They should also try to improve asylum systems and resettlement in destination countries within the EU. The concept of burden-sharing must also be at the heart of immigration policy reforms (UNHCR, 2009).
There needs to be a complete revision of the Common European Asylum System. One of the main issues is that member states that serve as the EU’s external border have a disproportionate amount of responsibility compared to northern states. The Dublin Regulation is currently not working because it mandates that migrants file for asylum in the first EU country they entered, leaving countries like Greece and Italy to deal with the influx on their own. Migrants are then forced to live in harsh overpopulated conditions. If more EU members took equal responsibility for migrants, asylum-seekers would not have to live in deplorable and inhuman conditions. The Dublin regulation makes it difficult for the rest of CEAS to work. Countries such as Germany have begun to suspend the Dublin regulation because of its failure to deal with the migration crisis accordingly (IOM, 2010).

For the Common European Asylum System to be efficient, member states must be willing to implement its policies. Currently there is an uneven implementation of the CEAS across the EU. Member states must try to ensure that all countries are compliant with the unified European asylum regime. Being lenient to countries that do not carry out asylum law accordingly will encourage other countries to not comply. Therefore, member states that fail to comply should be subject to penalty payments imposed by the European Court of Justice. Failure to ensure swift and fair relocation across the EU risks collapsing the asylum systems of even the wealthiest states (European Commission, 2008b).

When developing future policies, the EU should not view this as a crisis, but rather as an opportunity. The human capital of migrants has barely been accounted for in political and public discourse. Migrants bring skills and entrepreneurial expertise that may help address the labor markets and income gaps that many EU states face as their populations age and birth rates decline (European Commission, 2008b).

5.5 What Can the EU Do Outside its Borders

There is a lot the EU can do to help countries that are overwhelmed with the influx of migrants. EU members can institute multi-year funding and program cycles to ensure adequate support for the integration of migrants in their regions of origin. This will also illustrate that EU members are taking the necessary precautions to ensure an adequate international response to the
situation of migrants globally. Europe cannot continue to only be concerned with lobbying for more appropriate asylum policies in first generation or transit countries if it fails to demonstrate a commitment to international legal standards of protection. There should be a greater concern to increase political-diplomatic situations in countries of origin because such conflict is what’s generating large-scale forced migration. Furthermore, a more targeted aid approach may help address the instability, chronic poverty, and inequality that are understood to be key drivers of irregular migration (European Commission, 2007)

One of the main causes for the influx of refugees into Europe is due to the deteriorating conditions in formal and informal camps in host states across the Middle East and Africa. Migrants mainly rely on UN agencies, which had to cut back on services due to lack of funding. Since refugee migrants are prevented from becoming productive members of society, they have been forced into poverty and isolation. The EU should provide an increase in foreign aid for neighboring host-states that demonstrate their willingness to fully integrate migrants. Most asylum seekers would not have to depend on international aid if they had the opportunity to formally work and become self-sufficient (European Commission, 2007).

5.6 Conclusion

There is no doubt that the challenges faced by European governments because of the current influx in irregular migration are significant, but they need to establish a coherent solution now more than ever. Legally and morally, Europe must come together to institute a more humane and effective response. Migration is perceived as a problem rather than a solution across Europe. Not only does this limit the range of policies that can be adopted across Europe, but it also limits the scope of any EU cooperation with third world countries. Europe should make more of an effort to fund migrants and asylum seekers. They should also help countries shoulder the burden of migrants rather than making certain countries responsible for a disproportionate number of migrants. Forming short and long term policy plans will enable EU member states to develop a more organized and collective approach towards the migration crisis.
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