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2 Shifting migration flows and integration policies in Europe

An overview

Paweł Kaczmarczyk, Magdalena Lesińska & Marek Okólski

Introduction

Post-war Europe has faced the challenge of transforming from an emigration to an immigration region. This process has occurred at different times in different parts of the continent. Southern European countries have followed the northern ones, whereas the issue of when and how the transformation will be noticeable in Central and Eastern Europe remains an open question. This transformation has had a powerful impact on every domain of the social, political and economic realm of states receiving migrants and of Europe as a whole – on its demography, labour market, welfare, politics as well as social and ethnic relations.

The last two decades were a time of dynamic political change within continental Europe, symbolised by the fall of the Iron Curtain and the development of the EU. The EU’s development was a crucial factor in building a new European migration space, both as an institutional regime within the EU’s legal and regulatory system and as migration patterns to and within the EU. It must be noted that what can be regarded as the European migration regime is something absolutely unique and distinct, with no comparison in the contemporary world in terms of scale or legal and institutional framework.

The aim of this chapter is to look in a multidisciplinary way at contemporary Europe as a migration space. The first section briefly introduces the concept of the ‘European migration cycle’ and presents the change in migration patterns within the continent and its impact on particular countries. The logic of the free movement of labour was a fundamental pillar of EU development. Understanding the dynamics of migration in Europe is therefore crucial, as it has economic ramifications. The influence of new

---

1 An earlier version of this chapter, entitled ‘New Patterns of European Migration: A Broad View from a Multidisciplinary Perspective’, was published in the ANU Centre for European Studies Briefing Papers, August 2012, Volume 3, Number 10.
migration flows in contemporary labour markets and overall economic growth is examined in the second section of the chapter. In the final section, we examine the political dynamics of migration in Europe by looking at issues of integration and multiculturalism.

Old and new patterns of migration in Europe

It might be argued, from the long-term perspective using the European migration cycle (Okólski forthcoming), that a major feature of present migration in Europe is the shift that almost all countries seemed to undergo, namely from ‘old’ to ‘new’ relative stability of international movements of people. The transition from ‘old’ to ‘new’ involved two principal phenomena: 1) generally increased international mobility and 2) a reversal of the migration balance from negative to positive (from migrant-sending to migrant-receiving status). European-style modernisation and one of its integral aspects – demographic transition – were among the root causes of systematically growing population movements and ultimately the transformation of individual country ‘status’ from net emigration to net immigration. This transformation can be best understood in terms of a ‘migration transition’.

From the medium-term perspective, it seems clear that the migration transition did not occur in the same period in all European countries. Moreover, not all countries changed their migration status easily and under similar circumstances. The pioneering country was France, followed in the third quarter of the twentieth century by the majority of northwestern European countries. After approximately two decades, the migration status was transformed in four southern countries (Greece, Italy, Portugal and Spain) and among the northwestern latecomers (Finland, Iceland, Ireland). Finally, the beginning of the 21st century is witnessing a similar change in some central-eastern countries (the Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovenia). Cyprus is also now experiencing the change. According to their current experience with the inflow of foreign citizens, the three groups of European countries might be called, respectively, ‘mature’, ‘new’ and ‘future’ immigration countries.

In the short term, migration processes differ significantly across countries (both within each of the three groups and among the three

2 In this text, when we refer to Europe we have in mind the EU member states and those countries that are in some way formally associated with the EU.
groups) and are sensitive to shocks in the social milieu of an national and international nature and to country-specific policies. The effect of ongoing economic turbulence on migration flows can be used as an illustration. Some countries immediately encountered a deep decline in the inflow of migrants (e.g. Spain, the Czech Republic, Italy and Ireland); in some others, almost no reaction was noted (e.g. the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Sweden and Austria); while in other countries, inflows of migrants strongly increased (e.g. Portugal and Denmark).\textsuperscript{3} Notwithstanding these differences, the population of Europe has already acquired the major properties of a migrant population. Of all those in the world who are foreign-born, 34 per cent live in Europe (20 per cent in the EU). Of all residents of the EU, according to the 2008 Eurostat database, 19 per cent are either not EU citizens or were born abroad or had parents or grandparents born abroad, and an additional 11 per cent are EU citizens who were EU citizens who had emigrated and have returned, or are citizens with a foreign spouse.

In addition to this rather broad description of the present pattern of migration in Europe, six of its distinctive features might help in understanding its essence. First, current migration flows to and from nearly all countries are embedded in the centuries-long common history of Europe, in important events and landmarks such as major wars and famines, revolutions and technological breakthroughs, and, last but not least, overseas expansion. Secondly, a number of clusters of neighbouring countries display particularly strong intraregional interdependencies and, in fact, form migration mini-systems (e.g. Luxembourg and its three surrounding countries, Belgium, France and Germany; the British Isles; the Scandinavian countries; the Balkan countries; and pairs of countries, such as France and Italy or Germany and Poland). These mini-systems are characterised by lasting and intensive flows of people and their rich diversity.

The third feature – the culmination of the recruitment of migrant workers – links much of the present with the 1950s and 1960s, when non-communist Europe was sharply divided into migrant-receiving and migrant-sending countries and many current strong immigrant communities and migrant networks were set up. At that time, the international movement of people was unequivocally perceived as beneficial and highly desirable. Many of the migratory directions, channels and routes established in those years continue today, even though the forms of flows might have changed.

\textsuperscript{3} This illustration draws from the Eurostat database on new immigrant registrations and refers to 2008 data relative to 2007. In the first group, the change was in the range -24\% to -43\%, in the second -5\% to +5\%, and in the third +34\% and +42\%.
Fourth, European migration plays a vital and indeed increasingly important role in offsetting the deficit in the natural increase of the population and in decelerating the ageing of the population. For decades now, the demographic sustainability of several countries, most notably Germany, has been upheld by strong immigration, with a highly positive migration balance.

A large majority of European migrants come from relatively well-off countries, and this fact constitutes the next feature. In 2008, around 73 per cent of the total inflow to the EU arrived from countries identified as ‘highly developed’ in the United Nations Development Programme’s classification based on its Human Development Index (as refined in 2008), countries whose share of the total world population was only 30 per cent. A little more than half of the migrants were citizens of other EU countries or returning citizens, and only 10 per cent originated from ‘less developed’ countries, whose populations comprise 22 per cent of the total world population.

Finally, typical for Europe is the relatively high propensity of its population to emigrate, usually irrespective of whether the migration balance of a given country is positive or negative. In 2008, approximately 2.3 million residents of EU countries were registered as emigrants, meaning that there were 60 emigrants per 100 migrants. In some new EU member states, such as Poland and Romania, the number of emigrants is sizable and far outnumbers the inflow of people. A high emigration volume (and rate) is also typical of renowned immigration countries such as the United Kingdom.

After the dismantling of the communist system in Europe and particularly after the most recent enlargements of the European Union in 2004 and 2007, sizable flows of labour and also of students, entrepreneurs and family members from Central and Eastern Europe to the ‘old’ countries of the European Community became a new and overwhelming tendency. Out of the 3.8 million migrants recorded in 2008, more than one million originated from the former European communist countries. Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) member states of the EU-27 accounted for around 60 per cent of intra-EU population movements (20 per cent of all inflows), while the share of non-EU post-communist countries (notably Albania, Ukraine, Russia and Moldova) in immigration to the EU was also significant (6–7 per cent).\(^4\) In addition, citizens of CEE countries were highly represented among other categories of migrants, such as short-term circular migrants.

\(^4\) In 2008, the top ten source countries of migrants to or within the EU were Romania, Poland, Morocco, China, India, Bulgaria, Germany, Albania, Ukraine and Italy.
In contrast to the period before 1974, when the inflow of temporary migrants (guest workers) predominated, and the years between 1974 and 1988, when settlement migration with the purpose of family reunion was prominent, new patterns of migration flows in Europe were characterised by irregular migration patterns involving a diversity of migrant activities and strategies. Two forms of population movement emerged: incomplete migration and liquid migration.

Incomplete migration refers to the trans-border circular mobility of citizens from CEE countries originally as a response to their limited freedom of international movement and, especially, their restricted access to the labour markets of the more developed countries in the West. The major form of international movement available to citizens of CEE countries was tourism (in fact, ‘false tourism’), and its main cause was the East-West differences in wage rates and prices of consumer goods. Since wages were much higher in Western countries and prices much lower in CEE countries, it became rational and highly profitable for travellers from the East to earn money in the West and spend as much of it as possible in their home countries. The ‘incompleteness’ on the one hand involved a lifestyle of commuting for work, but on the other hand embodied a syndrome of transnationality, social ambivalence and a split life (earning money in one country and having a household in another) for migrants.

In view of the above-mentioned restrictions, the intensity of incomplete migration flows is strongly related to the passport policies of individual CEE countries, whereas the duration of stay in receiving countries depended on tourist visa policies. Generally, incomplete migration involves a short stay and various irregular economic activities (e.g. petty trade, informal employment) in the host countries. The citizens of Poland pioneered this form of mobility in the 1980s when, compared to citizens of other communist countries at the time, they already enjoyed quite a high degree of freedom of movement as tourists. In the 1990s, when CEE population flows increased, incomplete migration came to be the main form of mobility in several countries of the region (e.g. Bulgaria, Poland, Romania, Ukraine). After 2004, this form of immigration ceased to be popular in these countries, especially Poland, since accession to the EU granted them free or more liberal access to the labour markets in the West.

At about the same time a new form of mobility emerged – liquid migration – which had three major causes. One cause was the IT-based revolution in mass communication, coupled with the development of a cheap and...
effective transportation network. Another was the substantially increased mobility of people in CEE as a result of the far-reaching and comprehensive social change ignited by the transition to liberal democracy and the market economy. The last major cause was the high demand for labour in the rich economies of the EU, which instantly or gradually opened their labour markets to citizens of newly incorporated EU member states between 2004 and 2011. Consequently, this form of mobility is most typical of migrants originating from the eight CEE countries that joined the EU in 2004. Liquid migration is characterized by high volatility. It differs from earlier forms of large-scale migration in Europe with respect to six major aspects. First, it is by and large temporary and hence rarely leads to permanent settlement and full integration. Second, the predominant motive of migrants is economic – specifically gainful employment or improvement in their professional career. Third, migrants are as a rule fully documented throughout the migration process or at least possess a work permit. Fourth, migrants do not necessarily follow traditional routes or aim at traditional destinations, choosing new receiving regions and countries and moving between multiple destinations. Fifth, it represents a first-generation pattern of migration in which migrants are usually single and follow individualised strategies. And sixth, liquid migrants’ aspirations and behaviour are intentionally unpredictable as they prefer to keep various options open. In general, liquid migration involves a high degree of unpredictability, flexibility, temporariness and circularity. In addition, because of these characteristics, it often fails to meet the basic criteria for migration that are in official use, which makes liquid migration to a large extent invisible.

European migration: An economic perspective

Immigration to Europe and demography

After several decades of an almost continuous inflow of migrants, mostly driven by the demand for migrant workers in the 1950s and 1960s, the stocks of foreign-born people in Europe reached such high levels by European standards that a new wave of discussion on migration in Western European countries has emerged. In the late 1980s and 1990s, anti-immigrant rhetoric escalated, driven by a spectacular increase in the proportion of foreign-born in the total population. The response of most Western European governments was to attempt to apply stricter control over the inflow of newcomers, particularly asylum seekers. These phenomena can be easily summarised
by two concepts that have been continuously present in the public debate on migration since then: ‘zero immigration policy’ and ‘fortress Europe’ (Castles & Miller 1993).

Paradoxically, the 1990s brought a new, important issue into the immigration debate. Contrary to previous expectations, such as those represented by the activity of the Club of Rome, the dynamics of demographic change made it clear that the future of European societies would be dramatically shaped by the ageing of their populations. The projected increase in the share of the elderly (who are economically inactive) in the population and a decrease in related labour-market support ratios raised the question of potential political responses to these changes. One of the commonly discussed issues is so-called ‘replacement migration’, a potentially positive impact of immigration, which is persuasively supported in the UN report on migration’s impacts on demographic structures (UN 2001). On the basis of detailed forecasts, the report’s authors projected a severe decline in the population of most of the well-developed countries, accompanied by significant changes in the age structure and labour-market support ratios. Replacement migration was then analysed as one of the possible remedies. However, considering recent trends in migration and our knowledge of migrants’ behavior including expectations regarding migrants’ fertility, immigration does not emerge as a long-term solution to the demographic problems of the developed world. For example, extremely high and constant inflows of migrants would be needed to maintain the ratio of people of working age to those not of working age at a constant level. This is simply not acceptable either from a social or political point of view.

Nonetheless, even if replacement migration remains just a vague concept, an inflow of newcomers may serve as a source of demographic dynamism in the short or medium term, resulting in a serious impact on the labour market. According to OECD data, net migration constituted a significant portion of the total population change in most EU countries, especially in the new immigration magnets such as Italy, Spain, Portugal and Ireland (OECD 2011). Assuming zero net migration, most of the EU member countries, with the exceptions of France, Ireland and the United Kingdom, will experience a severe decline in working-age populations over the coming decades. As Fargues (2011) shows clearly, immigration is not the only solution. While an inflow of migrants will boost labour-market support ratios, in the longer term the ageing of the foreign-born will cause a further rise in the number of elderly. It is, nevertheless, one of the necessary components of the policy mix in addressing demographic change in Europe.
Foreigners and the EU labour market

As already pointed out, during the post-war decades, migrants became a structural component of most EU labour markets, accounting in many cases for at least 10-15 per cent of the total labour force. As a result, migrants’ participation in the labour market became one of the most important issues in the public debate.

Interestingly, in most cases the role and influence of foreign labour are presented in a highly stereotypical and controversial way. Commonly expressed beliefs include the belief that migrants compete with native workers in the domestic labour market and thereby reduce the number of jobs available for native workers, increase the risk that one will become unemployed, and create downward pressure on wages and workplace standards (so-called social dumping). Consequently, migrants are routinely blamed for any negative swings experienced by the EU economies. This set of beliefs is widespread in the media and is more often used by populist or right-wing parties, particularly since the global economic crisis began in 2008.

However, such a standpoint is clearly incoherent with both economic theory and empirical evidence. Regarding the first point, most economic models describing the situation and the adjustment mechanisms of the labour market question the negative impact of newcomers. In other words, only a very basic model (that assumes perfect elasticity and homogeneity of the labour-market) supply shock in the form of an additional inflow of foreign labour would project a decrease of wages. Based on these assumptions, there would be no unemployment and the total effect of immigration would be absorbed by a decline in the wage level. In more advanced approaches, the net outcome of immigration is strongly conditional on issues such as the structure of the labour market, particularly the existence of the so-called primary and secondary sectors (Piore 1979), market rigidities (e.g. a state intervention in the form of a minimum wage), and complementarity/substitution between the native and the foreign labour force (Bauer & Zimmermann 1999). Additionally, such effects as job creation driven by the migrants’ consumption or by the emergence of an ethnic economy should be taken into account.

A large number of empirical studies related to the US labour market (Borjas, Freeman & Katz 1996; Card 2004) show that the impact of migrants on the employment opportunities of native workers is moderate or negligible. The ‘Mariel flow’, a massive inflow of Cuban migrants to the Miami area recorded in 1989, is presented as one of the best examples. As clearly
shown by Card (1990), even such a massive supply shock, which amounted to around 7 per cent of the labour force, did not influence the local and the regional labour market in a negative way, apart from the effect on the Cubans who suffered due to increased competition. In most cases, however, clear adverse effects on vulnerable groups of native workers, such as the young or poorly educated, were noted, which makes the whole picture more complex.

European labour markets are usually described as far more rigid and less flexible than labour markets in the United States. Nevertheless, even in this case, most available studies provide similar results to those presented above. Two such studies are summarised here. Bauer and Zimmermann (1999) concluded on the basis of a simulation that, in the case of the German labour market, the inflow of foreign labour brings gains for the whole economy and that the sectoral effects strongly depend on the structure of the newcomers. Interestingly, the net gain for the German economy was positive whether the newcomers were low-skilled or highly skilled, but more positive in the case of low-skilled immigration. The effect is to be explained by the complementarities between relatively better-educated native (German) workers and poorer skilled foreigners entering mostly secondary sectors of the German economy. Boeri and Brücker (2000) proved that the elasticities of wages and (un)employment with respect to immigrant labour are relatively low and that the cumulative effects of the inflow of foreign workers are small and insignificant, with the exception of the already mentioned sectoral effects.

**Immigration and the welfare state**

Among the wide range of issues related to immigration and its economic effects, the impact of migrants on welfare systems is probably the most controversial and can, to some extent, be explained by the continuous crisis of European welfare models. Migrants are commonly blamed for relying on public welfare and social services and for being a burden on state budgets. Moreover, this kind of belief is commonly used by policymakers as they develop migration policies. Ireland and the United Kingdom, for example, seriously restrict or delay access to social benefits for the citizens of those countries that joined the EU in 2004, as noted in the next section of this essay.

Unfortunately, the empirical studies that are available provide mixed results for both the United States (UNDP 2009) and European countries, particularly Germany (Bonin 2002, 2006; Riphahn 2004; Castronova, Kayser, Frick & Wagner 2001). The Scandinavian countries and the United Kingdom
represent two opposite examples. In the first case, most of the available studies document a relatively larger scale of net welfare consumption by migrants than by natives (Storesletten 2003; Hansen & Lofstrom 2003, 2009; Nannestad 2004). Available data for the United Kingdom show rather positive and significant contributions of migrants to the treasury and net fiscal gains for the British economy, particularly in the post-accession period (Gott & Johnston 2002; Pollard, Latorre & Sriskandarajah 2008; Dustmann, Frattini & Halls 2010).

The general conclusion, however, is close to those presented in the previous section. According to available empirical evidence, the net fiscal impact of immigration is small or moderate, in most cases oscillating between -1 to 1 per cent of the receiving country’s GDP, and thus can hardly explain the blame being placed on migrants. What is more, a comparison of the fiscal effects of the migration inflow in countries such as the United Kingdom and the Scandinavian countries suggests that the net impact depends on a complex set of factors including the structure of immigration, the efficiency of integration into the labour market and, primarily, aspects of the welfare regime itself, such as the generosity of the system which may lead to welfare dependency. Paradoxically, in most cases, the blame for the problems is put squarely on migrants rather than on market failures or the inefficiency of the welfare system in receiving countries.

EU enlargement as a ‘natural experiment’?

The thoughts presented above suggest that the recent debate on immigration in Europe is hardly based on a solid theoretical background or empirical evidence. On the contrary, most available studies emphasise the potential positive impacts of migration inflow in terms of the labour market, the welfare state and demographic structures.

Against this background, the last two EU enlargement rounds (in 2004 and 2007) may serve as a perfect example of previously expressed ideas and as a kind of ‘natural experiment’. Importantly, they were unprecedented for several reasons. Firstly, the differences in income levels and living conditions were perceived as being much larger than was the case for previous accessions, particularly in the 1980s when Greece, Spain and Portugal joined the EU. Secondly, all the new member countries were still in the process of socioeconomic transition and some of them had faced serious barriers to mobility in the past and had not, therefore, experienced massive emigration prior to EU accession (Kahanec & Zimmermann 2009). Thirdly, the scale of change matters: the 2004 and 2007 enlargement rounds increased the
number of EU citizens by around 25 per cent, as compared to the 20 per cent increase in the 1980s.

Prior to 2004, all the above-mentioned factors led to a broad-based scientific and political debate on future migration from the region and, as a consequence, to a situation in which most of the EU-15 countries opted for the introduction of transitional periods (up to seven years as applied by Austria and Germany), which seriously restricted the access of citizens of the new EU member states to EU labour markets. As already mentioned, even in the cases of Ireland, Sweden and the United Kingdom, which opened their labour markets immediately, access to social welfare remained seriously restricted. Similar but much stricter solutions were applied when Bulgaria and Romania joined in 2007, when most EU-25 countries adopted transitional restrictions on the free movement of workers, even though most studies predicted the rather negative impact of transitional measures.

The years immediately following enlargement saw an unprecedented increase in the scale of emigration from the new member states. According to estimates based on European Labour Force Survey data, the number of foreign residents from the EU-8 countries (Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Poland, Slovenia and Slovakia) in the EU-15 rose from around 900,000 in 2003 to more than 1.9 million in 2007 (0.5 per cent of the receiving countries' population as compared to 0.2 per cent in 2003). This also means that there was a significant increase in the scale of annual flows (250,000 per year) as compared to the pre-accession period (averaging 62,000 per year from 2000 to 2003). The biggest outflows were from Slovakia, Lithuania, Poland and Romania (Brücker et al. 2009). According to estimates presented by Fic et al. (2011), the proportion of emigrants in a sending population in 2009 was as high as 1.8 per cent in the case of the EU-8 and 6.3 per cent in the case of the EU-2 (Bulgaria and Romania). The highest outflows were from Romania (7.3 per cent), Lithuania (4.2 per cent), Bulgaria (3.4 per cent), Latvia (2.5 per cent), Poland (2.4 per cent) and Estonia (2.3 per cent). In absolute terms, the largest stock of emigrants was from Poland and Romania.

However, the overall increase in migration after 2004, even if significant in absolute terms, remained moderate when compared to the population sizes of both the sending and receiving countries. The only exceptions were Ireland and the United Kingdom (4 per cent and 1.2 per cent of the receiving populations respectively), which absorbed migrants mostly from the EU-8 countries, and Spain and Italy (1.9 per cent and 1.5 per cent respectively), which became immigration magnets for the citizens of Bulgaria and Romania (Fic et al. 2011). Nevertheless, the whole process was exceptionally
dynamic and, particularly in the Anglophone countries, completely changed their immigration structures. Within only three or four years, migrants from the new member states became the most important immigrant group in the United Kingdom and Ireland. Significant changes were noted in many other countries, including Spain, Italy and the Netherlands. In contrast to the past, new migrant flows from the region tend to be male and strongly work-oriented, with labour migrants the vast majority of the total flow. They are also young and relatively well-educated (Kaczmarczyk & Okólski 2008).

As noted in the previous section, the recent flows from CEE can be categorised as ‘liquid migration’ (Black Engbersen, Okólski & Pantiru 2010), given its transitory, transnational and temporary character. The relatively large scale and particularly unprecedented dynamics of the post-accession flows raised questions about the effects of this phenomenon for both sending and receiving countries. In the context of this chapter, the impact on the receiving country is of particular importance. Most of the available studies document a relatively efficient matching process between temporary workers coming from labour-redundant transition countries and the labour markets in the ‘old’ EU member states, with their permanent demand for labour, especially for low-skilled migrants. The post-accession migrants staying in Western European countries, tend to have higher labour-market participation rates and lower unemployment rates, compared to the native labour force as well as the labour force in the sending countries. Because of their skill levels, the post-accession migrants are seriously overrepresented in occupations that require low and medium skill levels, filling critical gaps in the labour market (Kahanec & Zimmermann 2009; Dustmann, Frattini & Halls 2010).

The macro-level studies available shed new light on the aforementioned debate concerning the developmental impacts of migration. Brücker et al. (2009) analysed the impact of EU-8 migration between 2004 and 2007 and concluded that the receiving countries gained significantly from the massive post-accession flows. However, it seems that the impact has been negative or neutral for sending countries. All in all, the impact on GDP, GDP per capita, unemployment and wages was rather moderate in the short term and negligible in the long term. The more recent study provided by Fic et al. (2011) – which covers the period 2004-2009 and therefore also the initial phase of the recession – shows that Ireland and the United Kingdom, which opened their labour markets to newcomers from Central and Eastern Europe, gained the most from post-accession migration. The gains for the EU-15 economy were moderate but also positive.

The ‘natural experiment’ of the EU enlargement may serve as evidence that mobile Europe is not just a hazy concept. Hundreds of thousands of
‘new Europeans’ departed on their migration journeys looking for better jobs and living conditions. The structure of the process shows that recent intra-European migration is mostly demand-driven. Migrants are filling gaps in highly segmented labour markets, and overall the receiving countries benefit more than the sending countries.

How have nation-states and the EU responded to the diversity of migration forms?

As stressed earlier in this chapter, as a migration space, Europe has faced remarkably diverse forms of migration flows in recent decades. Massive post-war migration constructed a new reality that the nation-states had to confront – one that was connected not only to demographic and social change but also to a fundamental transformation of the understanding of national culture, ethnicity and citizenship.

Immigration brings a variety of challenges – to demography, the labour market, ethnic composition, social structure, national politics. Whereas a population, an economy, a legal system and even politics are able over time to adapt to some extent and deal with immigration, its impact on the social and cultural life of a community is probably its most controversial aspect. It results in serious tensions, especially in the daily interactions between migrants and longer-term citizens of host societies.

Nation-states have responded to cultural pluralism with various strategies to manage diversity. A wide range of policies have been implemented over time, including assimilation and segregation at one end of the spectrum, and integration and multiculturalism at the other, with many other possibilities in between. For decades, a common policy was to exert pressure on minority groups – both settled ones and newcomers – to assimilate and become absorbed into the dominant national culture. Such a policy was justified by the superior interests of national unity and social stability. Post-war immigration, together with other global processes such as decolonisation, brought significant change in the area of ethnic relations. Since the 1970s, changes in the states’ approaches towards acceptance of cultural and ethnic diversity have been visible. The pioneering state in Europe was Sweden, where the government began implementing its own multicultural policy in 1975. Other countries needed more time to recognise the facts and officially accept the multicultural diversity of their own societies: the German government, for example, announced that it is a multicultural country in 2000.
As a policy, multiculturalism is based on the view that the diverse cultural traditions of ethnic and religious communities should not only be recognised but also actively facilitated by the government. The government should provide institutional structures to protect and develop the cultural diversity of migrant communities by supporting education in other languages, fostering awareness of cultural diversity through the media and the school curriculum, or supporting the translation of official documents into the languages of minority groups.

Most European countries developed their own ‘philosophies of integration’ based on differing traditions, concepts of community, citizenship and nationhood (Brubaker 1989; Favell 2001; Ireland 2004). As a result, a variety of integration policy models directed at migrants emerged. In very general terms, for instance, the French model of integration could be described as a ‘republican’ one. It sees integration as a process by which the ethnic differences would disappear as migrants are integrated into the community of French citizens via expansive naturalisation. The German model represents a ‘social’ model of integration where the labour market and welfare-state membership were recognised as the basis of integration. The model implemented in the United Kingdom seems to be the closest to a classic ‘multicultural’ model. Based on the concept of a ‘community of communities’ where cultural and ethnic diversity is recognised as a value, the UK’s policy stemmed from colonial traditions and the idea of a commonwealth. Understanding the logic of any individual country’s integration policy requires looking deeper into the history of particular countries, traditions and ideas of community, nationhood and citizenship and taking into account the unique national context in which immigration emerged.

The contemporary politics of migration and integration in Europe cannot be understood without accounting for the dynamics of both migration and mobility and the role the EU now plays in managing both. Immigration has always been a sensitive issue and some countries were reluctant to cede their authority in the management of human flows to a supranational level due to their strong, traditional approaches based on national sovereignty. Although there is evidence of policy convergence in the EU – shared objectives, common legal instruments and a highly developed decision-making process – this does not mean that there is a single common EU approach to managing migration. The harmonisation process is noticeable, particularly in domains such as external border protection, visa policy, the asylum regime and the response to irregular forms of migration.

Europe is not a consolidated migration space; its rich diversity in terms of the migration profiles of particular countries has to be taken into account. It is
difficult, even impossible, to compare countries such as the United Kingdom, France and Germany, which have large populations of migrants and a history of immigration over several generations, with Poland and Hungary, where less than one per cent of the population are permanent migrants. Whereas the United Kingdom, France and Germany have long-standing traditions of immigration and engage in intensive debate about how to shape a multicultural community, Poland and Hungary are at the beginning of the transformation into emigration/immigration countries and have small migrant inflows, which means that immigration – let alone integration and multiculturalism – is rarely the subject of public or political debate. Moreover, diversity within a country may also be noticeable. There can be a gap, sometimes large, between policies implemented in one region or city and another, because the nature of the inflows and the social and economic profile of migrants may differ in peripheral regions from those in the capital city. In the more decentralised countries, such as Germany or Spain, local units are able to develop their own approach to implementing an integration policy.

In such a multilevel model of implementing migration policy, and given the territorial dispersal of migrants, the principle of subsidiarity emerges as a solution. This assumes that political decision-making should be as close as possible to the governed to ensure that the decisions are beyond dispute and respond well to their needs. The EU level of government provides the guidelines, a set of basic concepts and general rules to be implemented through their transposition by the member states into national and regional policies in an agreed manner (via the so-called open method of coordination). Below, we outline the main characteristics of EU migration and integration policies:

- The highly developed free-movement framework for EU citizens is the most visible example of what the European Union project has achieved. Free movement, initially introduced for workers, was provided in 1957 by the Treaty of Rome and was strictly related to the economic impetus underpinning European integration. In time, third-country nationals (TCNs) and refugees were included in the free-movement framework. That was the beginning of the development of the EU’s migration regime, institutionalised further in the Amsterdam, Nice and Lisbon Treaties.
- The EU’s migration and integration policy is firmly embedded in the single-market concept: in order to allow the member states’ economies and labour markets to become one single market, EU policy had to be extended to the area of migration and integration. This almost purely
economic orientation is also reflected in the debate at the EU level, where the cultural component is almost absent.

- The EU prioritises anti-discrimination legislation. The normative fundamentals are created by two directives introduced in 2000 – the Race Equality Directive and the Equal Treatment Directive, both aimed at combating discrimination on the grounds of race and ethnicity in employment, social protection and the provision of services – and the 2003 Directive on the rights of long-term residents, which are extended to legally resident TCNs after five years of legal residence. These documents play a crucial role. They are binding and must be implemented by all member states. Anti-discrimination legislation is well developed at both the EU and national levels. However, its translation into daily practice remains a great challenge.

- The EU formally defines the concept of integration as a dynamic two-way process of mutual accommodation by migrants and residents of the member states (European Commission 2005). Managing integration is thus the shared responsibility of both the migrant newcomers and members of the host society. As agreed by the EU Council in 2004, the Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy in the EU introduced a socioeconomic approach to integration and underlined the primary role of education, work, housing and health as the areas of successful integration.

- The EU itself does not deliver integration; it provides a rights-based framework that enables mobility and the portability of rights and entitlements within a single market area. EU legislation does not change the content of national integration policies, but provides an important context in which they are developed. This context is a common general legal and political framework, based on an obligatory *acquis* and a collection of recommendations and best practices which all EU countries should follow, through the open method of coordination mentioned above. In other words, EU directives provide relatively general pointers to encourage a degree of policy convergence.

Among the main challenges mentioned in EU documents concerning the integration of migrants, the most important include prevailing low employment levels of migrants (especially among migrant women), rising unemployment and high levels of ‘over-qualification’, increasing risks of social exclusion, gaps in educational achievement, and public concern about the lack of integration of migrants. Given these challenges, the EU has proposed that member states’ actions should focus on three main areas:
1) integration through participation (in the labour market or in education and training); 2) actions focused on the local level (addressed particularly to disadvantaged urban areas and aimed at improving multilevel cooperation between different levels of governance); and 3) the involvement of the countries of origin (to prepare migrants for integration before their departure, to support contacts between diaspora communities and their countries of origin, to promote circular migration, and to enable the migrants' temporary or definitive return process) (European Commission 2011a).

European migration and integration policies seem to develop in a kind of sinusoidal way. In times of economic growth and social stability, governments are more willing to implement liberal legislation and societies are more willing to accept newcomers. This is not the case in times of economic downturn and insecurity, as is currently the case in Europe and the rest of the world, when voices critical of immigration and multiculturalism become more prominent. Within a few months of the end of 2010 and beginning of 2011, leading politicians such as German Chancellor Angela Merkel, French President Nicholas Sarkozy and British Prime Minister David Cameron added fuel to the debate against multiculturalism in Europe by making very forward and strong statements. There are two main themes shaping the debate on immigration and integration in the European media and in political and public spheres. The first is that immigration is a threat to public security, and the second is that multiculturalism is contradictory to social cohesion.

The tone of the debate on the integration of new migrants has changed significantly in the last few years. The belief that multiculturalism brings positive effects to the social integrity of host communities has diminished. The prevalent fear of an external threat or a threat from already present migrants, sustained by the media and some of the political elites, has had a powerful impact on the shift towards anti-immigration and anti-multiculturalism debate. The association between immigration and security has been increasingly highlighted in the public rhetoric.

The debate on the failure of policy to secure the integration of new migrants now tends to be the main public policy concern and, moreover, is focused particularly on Muslim communities. Muslims are accused of self-segregation: they shut themselves in closed neighbourhoods and live in parallel communities in inner cities. Some commentators openly doubt that their integration is possible because the cultural differences are regarded as too pronounced. In the context of the common concerns about the erosion of social capital and the lack of social cohesion in European and other societies, it seems rather ironic that Muslims are accused of having too much
bonding capital. Strong religious identity, a lower level of integration, the role of the traditional *sharia* law (as being above state law), a common fear of radicalisation, alienation and violence among Muslims, especially young Muslims, have meant that the debate around immigration and integration has become focused on the security-terrorism-Islam triad.

Recent anti-immigrant sentiment and a backlash against multiculturalism within European societies stem from frustration and concern over demographic change and increasing cultural diversity brought about by migration inflows on the one hand and the economic crisis on the other. They challenge national governments and EU bodies alike to find ways to balance the declining support of host societies for multicultural policies and the growing need to implement more effective policies that facilitate the sociopolitical and cultural integration of migrants.

**Conclusion**

In the last few decades, most EU countries have undergone a significant transformation from net sending areas to net receiving areas. This process, described above as the migration cycle, was deeply rooted in a broad socioeconomic context that included such phenomena as demographic transition and modernisation. As shown in the first section of this chapter, the dynamics of these processes have had a serious impact on the migration status of particular European countries and are still, to a large extent, responsible for the diverse migration profiles of EU countries.

As a consequence, Europe became a continent of immigration and the destination for more than one-third of the worldwide population of foreign-born. Nowadays, migrants constitute a significant proportion of most EU countries’ total populations and labour forces. In structural terms, most of immigration can now be classified as permanent, in contrast to the migration in the period between the 1950s and the 1970s which was dominated by the short-term movement of people. Nonetheless, due to loopholes in migration policies, developments in the IT sector, new transportation opportunities and changes in the cost/benefit ratios for would-be migrants, new forms of migration appeared. The best example is so-called liquid migration, described above as being temporary, circular and highly flexible.

Because of the increased presence of new migrants in European societies, immigration has become one of the most important topics in the public debate. One of the main aims of this chapter was to juxtapose common beliefs and stereotypical knowledge with the impact of migration based
on available empirical evidence. The studies that were cited show that an inflow of migrants does not offer an ultimate solution to demographic ageing but may help to overcome short- and medium-term shortages in the labour market. Contrary to commonly expressed and widely shared opinions, immigration to EU countries has not had negative effects on either their labour markets or their state welfare provisions. As an example of this thesis, the ‘natural experiment’ of the EU enlargement rounds in 2004 and 2007 was presented. This process – massive in terms of population change as well as migration flows – has turned out to be highly beneficial, particularly for those EU countries that implemented immigration-friendly policies.

Nevertheless, as clearly stated in the last section of the chapter, the inflow of new migrants confronts EU societies with a variety of challenges, including ethnic composition, social cohesion and social structures, and national politics. The effects of immigration on the social and cultural daily life of receiving communities continue to be highly controversial. This chapter looked at diverse forms and modes of migrants’ incorporation into EU societies and documented in particular the rise and fall of the European version of multiculturalism, if one can be identified as such. One of the theses proposed was that EU immigration and integration policies are strongly related to swings in the European economy and thus seem to develop in a sinusoidal way. Additionally, well-developed EU countries seem to be facing a clear ‘liberal paradox’ (Hollifield, Hunt & Tichenor 2008). In order to remain competitive in an increasingly globalised world, they need to open their economies to newcomers, mostly to meet labour-market needs, but at the same time for reasons of security and internal political forces, they are pushed towards stricter control of access.