



**Jan Schneider**

**NECE Conference 2016 | Crossing Borders. Migration and Citizenship  
Education in Europe | 10-12 November 2016 | Zagreb, Croatia**

**— Some talking points for the Roundtable Discussion on  
'Strategies for migration management in Europe' —**

- 'Migration Management' at both the level of the European Union and the Member States is focused at (border) security, reducing irregular entries and cooperation with Third Countries to reduce migratory pressure (e.g. the EU-Turkey agreement of March 2016, migration partnerships planned or underway with Jordan, Mali, Nigeria, Niger, Senegal, Lebanon, Ethiopia). This is primarily a containment strategy with some lip-service on creating 'legal migration channels'. The main reasons for this strategy are the institutional and identity crisis of the EU as a whole, overburdening with high refugee inflow of 2015, populist pressure and a demand for securitization due to the perceived terrorist threat).
- However, this distracts attention from the urgent need to come up with new solutions for the Common European Asylum System (CEAS), as a situation of mass influx like the one witnessed 2015 through Greece and the Balkan route can reoccur anytime. This failure bears a number of **risks** that may further undermine the overall legitimacy of the European Union as a project of peace and prosperity:
  - Stealthy **farewell from the Schengen system** as we know it (e.g. restricting freedom of movement due to a continuation of 'temporary' border controls)
  - A **Re-Nationalisation of refugee protection** within Europe at times in which a new international refugee regime is promoted (United Nations are aiming for a Global Compact on Refugees until 2018 as one result of the UN Summit for Refugees and Migrants on 19 September, 2016)
  - This may mean continued or deteriorating sub-standard implementation of the CEAS ('**race to the bottom**'). The CEAS in principle has established both EU-wide mandatory standards for asylum procedures and the circumstances under which people have an entitlement to international protection.
  - **Misery behind fences** in the so-called frontline states; **breaches of the principle of non-refoulement** enshrined in the Geneva Refugee Convention, i.e. a fleeing person may not be returned or expelled to places where his/her life or freedom could be threatened
  - The **Mediterranean as a permanent mass grave**



- Europe needs a general remedy that could (re)instate trust among Member State governments and, more importantly, towards 'threatened majorities', and thus contain the populist threat. Alongside, the system of refugee protection might have to undergo some systemic changes, be interlinked with foreign policy and be supplemented by smart migration policies.
- In particular, several **paradigm shifts** that got stranded need to be carried on:
  - Dismantle the hush principle of 'NIMBY' (**Not In My Back-Yard**) on taking over responsibility for asylum crises and work towards both 'flexible' and mandatory (at all events: contractualized) **sharing of responsibilities**, burdens and costs
  - Move from the primacy of the territorial (in-situ) right to claim and be granted international protection towards a **primacy of humanitarian admission quotas** from neighbouring countries (Resettlement, Temporary Protection Directive) → these two forms of protection are indeed communicating vessels, but the latter avoids smugglers' business and the death toll
  - Create **viable solutions for legal migration**, particularly in African migrants' regions of origin, with a strong component of education and vocational training.
- Mid-term perspective: **Reconcile Dublin and the principle of 'free choice'** (proposal by the Expert Council of German Foundations on Integration and Migration – SVR). This proposal could be an expression of "flexible solidarity" as suggested by the Viségrad States: It suggests leaving border management, the initial reception of refugees, the processing of asylum claims and the repatriation of failed asylum seekers in the hands of the countries of first entry, endowed with sufficient financial and logistical assistance. As a further step 'in return', beneficiaries of international protection could get the right to freely select a place of residence and integration after asylum cases have been concluded, i.e. their 'destination of choice'.
- Long-term goal '**Full harmonization of the EU Asylum System**': Complete communitarisation of the CEAS by creating an EU asylum administration and law enforcement capacities. Current dilemma: Diverging responsibilities for law-making (EU = Council, COM, EP) and for enforcing/applying it (MS)
- Germany's role in shaping the development is crucial: avoid 'moral imperialism' (don't name, blame and shame scapegoats) but convince as a pro-active broker for pragmatic steps forward, bearing a strong responsibility and burden at any time (up until 2013, government representatives did not see alternatives to the Dublin system, but became quick change artists after resurgence of mass influxes in 2014/15).
- Boost enlightenment and civic education over current asylum and migration policy (which is much more restrictive than thought by the electorate in most Member States already)

JS, November 6<sup>th</sup>, 2016