THIRD-COUNTRY MIGRATION TO THE EU: BETWEEN NORMATIVE EUROPEAN FRAMEWORKS AND NON-EUROPEAN IMMIGRANTS' PERSONAL EFFORTS

Demir ABDULLAH *

Abstract

European leaders' rhetoric on third-country migration ranges from a discourse extolling the benefits of a United Europe, to one upholding Europe's repute as a bastion of fundamental human rights, to yet another one out of which the continent emerges as a repressive fortress. Third-country migration not only engages the EU's efforts, but also those exerted by non-EU immigrants towards integrating and becoming more open to their European host culture. This paper will be focusing both on the EU's commitment to honing its third-country migration policies, as well as on the non-EU immigrants' potential and limitations when it comes to their assimilation/integration into EU countries, in particular, Romania.

Methodologically this paper uses the content analysis of European leaders' discourses and also the qualitative analysis of data collected from 40 interviews carried out with non-EU immigrants into Romania. Another methodological tool will consist in an analysis of official EU documents. What will be pursued is the way in which the EU official documents reflect the shared interest proved by European leaders concerning the immigration processes. It will touch upon how the integration processes reclaims on the one hand permanent exchanges between the host European society and non European immigrant and on the other hand sustained efforts from these two parts in order to meet their needs and recognise their limits, in terms of economic, professional and social resources.

Keywords: third-country migration, non-EU immigrants, social and systemic integration, EU policies, European values.

1. Introduction

Cultural diversity represents an element based on which the EU defines itself. The unity within diversity that is specific to the EU now represents, despite the cultural differences, the unity between EU members, and it crystallizes due to the values that are shared at the collective level such as the respect for human rights and for fundamental liberties, for democracy and for the rule of law. These values generate in turn, through the processes of socialization, European attitudes and behaviours. On various occasions, European leaders remind people about the values that stand at the basis of the EU, but also about certain moments that have configured the union: freedom, solidarity and diversity; Magna Carta, The Bill of Rights, The French Revolution, the Berlin Wall.[1] In turn, in Article I-2 from the Treaty that was constructed to be a Constitution for Europe but which was taken over by the Treaty of Lisbon, it is mentioned that: "The Union is founded on the values of respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights. These values are common to the Member States..."

In the attempt to describe and explain heterogeneous human societies from a cultural point of view, a series of concepts have been put forward among which: pluralism and assimilation. *Pluralism* asserts that multicultural states have accommodation at their basis, in other words the practicing of interaction between people from different cultures[2]. On the other hand, *assimilation* develops based on a project that favours cultural homogeneity around a national culture and identity, cultural differences being annulled[3].

The processes of immigration of non-European citizens have determined important debates within the EU regarding its role but also its resources in articulating a coherent and adequate policy regarding the extra-Community immigration. The debates that have taken place especially within the context of the refugee crisis from the last few years (over 2,5 million asylum requests have been submitted in the 2015-2016 period)[4], also emphasize the shortcomings of the EU in offering both immediate and long-term answers regarding the waves of immigrants from third countries. On the other hand, the extra-Community immigrant is confronted with a double challenge: on the one hand the demands on the European job market and on the other the European cultural values, which most

often are fundamentally different from their fundamental baggage of traditions and values.

Social integration, in the broader sense, represents a social process that presupposes interactions between the side that is integrated and the side that is integrating, the final purpose being of establishing a functional relation between the two sides.[5] According to the specificity of the sides that are being integrated (individuals, groups, communities, social subsystems) the integration can be professional, urban, and societal. In a restricted sense, when one treats the relation between an individual and the medium where the integration is taking place (group/community/society), one should distinguish between systemic and social integration. Systemic integration presupposes the learning of the rules of the game whether it is about the new living context (*political and civic* integration) or about language, without which *economic* integration cannot take place. Social integration, on the other hand, presupposes from the individual who is being integrated that they be aware of the differences specific to other individuals who come from other cultures and that they establish interactions with the latter, interactions based on acceptance and permanent exchanges. These interactions between individuals belonging to different cultures specific to plural societies, represent the basis for the formation of new identities, different from the ones that the individuals had before being integrated in the new social structures. At an ideal level, for an individual to function in the new social structure where they decide to integrate, the two types of integration should complement each other: on the one hand respecting the rules from the host society and learning the language of communication (systemic integration) and on the other hand accepting the cultural differences and configuring a new identity based on the already existing one (social integration).

In the demonstration of this paper we will take into account the fact that the process of integration presupposes a permanent interaction between the society that integrates and the extra-Community immigrant who is integrating with the purpose of developing a functional relation between the two sides. In the first part we will analyse how the EU has treated extra-Community migration in its normative system. To this end, we will diachronically present the main documents (communiqués, reports, decisions, etc.), which translate the preoccupations of the European leaders regarding extra-Community migration but also the analysis of certain debates form 2015 on the topic of migration and asylum. The second part of the paper will concentrate on the content analysis of the data obtained as a result of conducting 40 structured interviews with non-EU immigrants from Romania, carried out during October 20017 – February 2018 in Bucharest with women and men between the ages of 18 and 65, of different professions and levels of education.

The content analysis focused on the human and professional resources that the non-EU immigrant is willing to invest in order to integrate but also on the professional and cultural limits that hinder their process of integration.

2. A Fortress Europe Versus a Responsible, Sympathetic Europe, True to the Values That It Is Founded On

After the crisis triggered by World War II, the markets were experiencing the need for workforce, so that this is the moment that also marks a process of territorial mobility for the citizens of a country onto the territory of another country. Thus, the immigrants who were coming from southern EU countries but also from countries outside the EU, were responding to the need for workforce at the regional and international level, and on the other hand they were responding to the personal need of improving one's own and/or their families' living conditions. The immigrants preferred countries where the living conditions were superior to the one from their country of origin. As a result, the immigrants from former European colonies received with open arms the new migratory policy and immigrated to Europe with their families. After the boom of the previous years, a series of changes intervene namely, the 70s bring the petrol crisis and imbalances on the workforce market, materialised in high unemployment rates. Western and Northern Europe impose new conditions for immigrants from the south and for those outside the continent. Not only does the number of immigrants decrease, but the policy regarding migration changes as well. The societies become more and more plural, and the workforce market becomes more flexible and specialised. Were immigrants ready for the new specialisations that appeared on the job market, for the new plural societies? Unlike in previous years, for an immigrant to integrate in the new society, work was no longer sufficient, moreover, not any type of work. Beside these aspects, the process of immigration also involves the immigrant's willingness to adapt to the new plural societies, in other words to socialise in accordance with the values of plural societies. With the arrival of the 80s, the economy becomes increasingly globalized, the job market increasingly specialized and societies increasingly plural. The Communist block from Eastern Europe, with countries encapsulated inside their borders, is disconnected from the circuit of migratory movements from within or from outside the EU. However, the end of the 80s marks a landmark given by the implosion of the Communist regime from Eastern Europe. After the terrorist attacks from 2001 but also after those that took place on the European continent, migratory processes become an independent variable of the security equation, determining states and

---

[5] Cătălin Zamfir & Lazăr Vlăsceanu (eds), *Dicționar de sociologie* (București: Ed. Babel, 1993), 555.

transnational structures to adapt their migratory policies to new challenges.

The cooperation within the EU regarding migration can be understood in relation to functionalist and intergovernmental theories that explain and describe the process of European integration. *Functionalists and neofunctionalists* [6]put forward the idea that the federation/confederation would be a coherent form of functioning for the EU, by creating inter-dependencies with the EU at the economic and political level, by having a close cooperation between the national and the supranational. According to this perspective, European cooperation in matters of migration is a must since the states have limited capacities to control immigration. *Inter-governmentalism*[7] explains the cooperation within the EU as a response to external stimuli but also to certain political constraints from within the states. The engine of cooperation from the intergovernmentalist perspective is represented by the freely consented agreements, the constant debates between the representatives of the states and the institutional forms are more permissive and more flexible than the transnational ones which are specific to the functionalists. Extra-Community migration represents in this intergovernmental optics both an external challenge for the EU and a problem that appeared as a result of the constraints at the level of internal politics.

The debates in the past few years from the European Parliament regarding migration and asylum are divided, in certain cases finding themselves at opposite ends.

On the one hand, what is being shaped is a union true to its own principles, a *sympathetic, responsible, moral Europe* that has political stands and policies that are adapted to the crises triggered by the humanitarian catastrophes from Syria and other countries that have been permanently marked by wars. This type of responsible, sympathetic, moral Europe fits more with the model proposed by the functionalist theories.

The commissioner for Migration and Home Affairs, Dimitris Avramopoulos considers that only a *responsible, unified, sympathetic Europe* can be the solution for the extra-Community migration phenomenon[8].

"The answer to these challenges is definitely not 'Fortress Europe'… When it comes to Migration and Home Affairs if we do not move together as a Union, we will not move at all…More solidarity is needed and this is possible only if Member States trust each other

and assume also their responsibilities…Being there, as a United Europe for people who face persecution and danger in our inflamed regional environment is not only a moral responsibility for Europe, but a real promise for Europe's position in the world."

Malin Björk considers in turn that articulated, community oriented and responsible actions are nothing more than a logical extension of a Union that is true to the values on which it was founded.[9]

"[T]he response to the catastrophes in the Mediterranean is about what kind of societies we are building for the future. Are we going to turn people against each other – as the PPE just did – or are we going to have politics, economics, social and human rights that actually bring us into the future together? That is the choice we have to make. That is why the Council conclusions, I would say to Mr Tusk, are nothing less than shameful because they do not focus on saving lives and opening this continent to people seeking refuge. Instead they focus on keeping people away. Therefore the response of this House is especially important."

Guy Verhofstadt emphasises in turn the importance of cooperation with the purpose of finding European solution, to "European problems".[10]

"The Commission has, in fact, taken a stance that is absolutely necessary because it promotes the interest of all, rather than focusing on single Member States, and that is what we have to do to tackle this problem. We cannot continue to say it is only the Italians who have to do their job; we cannot say it is the European Union which is at the source of this problem. What we need is a European solution to a European *problem*".

Cecilia Wikstrom reminds us about the moral responsibility that Europeans have towards people from other continents who are confronted with threats, violence and the lack of resources:[11]

"To give asylum to people who run from wars, conflicts and human rights violations, this is not about generosity. It is a duty that the 28 Member States have taken upon themselves to respect by means of international rights. The EU has succeeded in building a Monetary Union. We are now on the verge of building a Union of Energy. When are we to build a Humanitarian Union as well?"

On the other hand, another series of discourses contain messages that translate the hiatus between "them", extra-community citizens, and "the others", European citizens. These discourses propose as a solution a *fortress Europe* which "protects" Europeans

---

[6] Jeppe Tranholm-Mikkelsen, "Neo-Functionalism: Obstinate or Obsolete? A Reappraisal in the Light of the New Dynamism of the EC." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies,* 20 (1) (1991): 1-22.

[7] Garrett Geoffrey & George Tsebelis, "An Institutional Critique of Intergovernmentalism", *International Organization* 50(2) (996): 269-299.

[8] Hearing by the European Parliament - Introductory Statement Of Commissioner-designate Dimitris Avramopoulos (Migration and Home Affairs), 30 September 2014, available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K2ageBOTJmA, accessed December 2017.

[9] European Agenda on Migration (debate), available at http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/gsahighlight.html?query=farage&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.europarl.europa.eu%2Fsides%2FgetDoc.do%253Ftype%253DCRE%2526reference%253D20150520%2526secondRef%253DITEM-007%2526format%253DXML%2526language%253DEN, accessed February 2018.

[10] Idem.

[11] Idem.

against the wave of refugees and extra-Community immigrants and which considers that each Member State has the freedom to decide on the number of immigrants/refugees it can receive within its territory. The prevalence awarded to national states and not to supranational structures, positions this perspective of a fortress Europe closer to the intergovernmental theories. This type of discourse presents the EU as a community of citizens that has to be "defended", "protected", a community that does not have the necessary resources to be able to respond to the demands of the immigrants and refugees from its borders.

Kristina Winberg, for example, considers that each Member State should have the freedom to decide regarding the immigrants/refugees who enter its territory.

"I support the principle that each Member State should have the unconditional right of deciding who comes on its territory and who does not. We must first of all protect the population against terrorism and each country must be able to protect its democratic system, its system of social care." [12]

The prevalence of national states over transnational structures is reflected in the discourse the MEP *Udo Voight* as well:

"…the supranational principles should not be imposed on the rights of Member States. Refugees should not endanger the systems of national states." [13]

Jussi Halla-aho considers that economic resources are limited and that a better solution would be an approach that is more realistic and more concentrated on the needs of the EU Member States.

"The question is: can Europe indefinitely afford, economically or socially, a massive influx of people for whom the European labour market has very little to offer?" [14]

Nigel Farage[15] associates immigrants/refugees from third countries with disaster and considers that closing the borders can be a solution for European citizens to be safe.

"[I]f the message is that anybody that comes will be accepted, we are headed for disaster."

3. The European Normative Frame That Translates The Eu Interest Regarding Migration And Asylum

The EU has gone through several stages that translate its interest to respond to the challenges that have been generated by the processes of extra-Community immigration. A first stage was that which would last until 1986 when the policy regarding the extra-Community migration in the EU was mainly a responsibility of the national governments which, as a result of dialogue, decided upon the security measures at the EU borders, the movement of goods, capital and individuals. The year 1986 marks the second stage when one could notice a tighter communication between EU governments, this being evidenced by the constitution of the *Ad-hoc working group regarding immigration*. The year 1993 marks a third stage regarding the community efforts to treat immigration as a phenomenon that is of common interest for the EU states, as it can be observed from the Maastricht Treaty. Pillar III presupposes an intergovernmental communication with the purpose of offering European citizens protection in a space of security and freedom. Among the objectives included in Pillar III one also finds combating illegal immigration, border safety, and asylum policy. In order to achieve these desiderata, what was needed was cooperation between governments whose efforts were complemented by the activity of supranational structures such as the European Commission and the European Parliament, which were consulted regarding certain issues. The Treaty of Amsterdam marks the beginning of the fourth stage of the EU attempts to treat European problems such as immigration and asylum in a communitarian way. This is also the reason why the policy regarding migration and asylum is included in the communitarian pillar I. The EU Council decides that starting with 2005 decision-making regarding EU policies in relation to legal immigration will be done by means of voting with a qualified majority[16].

In Dublin, in 1990, the EU states signed the intergovernmental accord through which they decided that only one member state is responsible for the examination of an asylum request according to which the asylum-seeker receives or not the residence permit[17]. In the case where the asylum-seeker does not fulfil the criteria, the state's refusal is valid for the other states as well. There were seven years needed for this accord to become compulsory.

---

[12] European Agenda on Migration, Strasbourg, available at http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/gsahighlight.html ?query=farage &url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.europarl.europa.eu%2Fsides%2FgetDoc.do%253Ftype%253DCRE%2526reference%253D20150520%2526se condRef%253DITEM-007%2526format%253DXML%2526language%253DEN, accessed February 2018.

[13] European Agenda on Migration, available at http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/EN/vod.html? mode=chapter&vod Language= EN&startTime=20150520-09:03:29-960#, accessed February 2018.

[14] Idem.

[15] Idem.

[16] Petra Bendel, "Immigration Policy in the European Union: Still bringing up the walls for fortress Europe?", *Migration Letters*, 1(2005): 21-32.

[17] Agnès Hurwitz, "The 1990 Dublin Convention: A Comprehensive Assessment", *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 11 (4) (1999): 646–677.

In 1999, EU leaders participated at the Tampere Summit in Finland where they established lines of action for a *communitarian* response to the phenomena of non-EU citizen immigration. The necessity of a communitarian approach was needed since the immigration of non-EU citizen had increased in frequency and intensity, and it could not be treated in isolation or avoided. Among the lines of action a first step that was established was that of harmonising national legislations and of creating a common European system regarding immigration and asylum. To support these desiderata it was necessary to have partnerships with the immigrants' countries of origin and of transit but also to revise the EU policy regarding the rights and obligations of non-EU immigrants. The principle that they started from was that a coherent integration policy can only be created if third country immigrants who have a legal residence permit on the territory of Member States benefit from rights comparable to those enjoyed by European citizens[18].

The EU continues in the same direction of consolidating its policy so that, domains that regard asylum and migration are transferred to the *communitarian* pillar I (from the *intergovernmental* pillar III) along with the Treaty of Amsterdam. The Laeken Summit from December 2001 reaffirms the necessity of a common policy in terms of immigration, especially regarding data exchange, managing migratory fluxes, establishing common norms for receiving and reuniting a family, as well as programmes for fighting against discrimination and racism.[19] In 2003, the Council of the European Union publishes three directives in matters of immigration and asylum.[20] The first, entitled the *Directive regarding the minimum standards for reception*, emphasises the necessity to adjust the legislation for the creation of a common European system for asylum, in other words a legal system that would clarify the common minimum condition for the reception of asylum-seekers. The second directive has as a purpose to clearly establish the necessary steps for immigrants from third countries, who are legally settled in EU countries, to *reunite their families*. The third directive proposes a set of criteria based on which a non-EU immigrant can obtain the status of long-term resident within an EU state, but also

the residence conditions in other Member States (not the same as the ones that have awarded residence). The Dublin Regulation II[21] of 2003 returned to the decisions regarding the 1990 intergovernmental accord in order to clarify which Member State has the assignment to treat the asylum requests presented by a citizen of a third country. To avoid overlaps and abuses it was reaffirmed that only one Member State is responsible for the examination of an asylum request. Moreover, another Regulation entitled Dublin III was signed in 2013 in order to adjust the ambiguities which appeared as a result of the application of the provisions included in the previous regulations.[22] The year 2003 is a prolific one regarding common decisions in matters of migration and asylum, so that at Thessaloniki, in June, the leaders who gathered at the European Council reaffirmed the necessity of developing a common European policy regarding asylum and migration. It was reiterated that a European frame cannot be functional without the states assuming responsibility for the implementation of integration strategies for immigrants. Furthermore, it was established at Thessaloniki that each year the European Commission will present a report with the purpose of monitoring the progresses but also the shortcomings of the EU policy regarding extra-Community migration.[23] In 2004, the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at External Borders (FRONTEX)[24] was created. FRONTEX has aimed to secure the act of immigration but also the EU borders. Among the actions undertaken we have technical assistance and expertise given to states that have external borders and which are directly confronted with illegal immigration. For example, according to statistics, between 2015 and 2016 the Agency managed 2,3 million people who were trying to illegally cross EU borders. [25] Despite the Agency's intentions to secure the act of immigration in and of itself, illegal routes towards the EU are increasingly used and risky for immigrants,[26] with 2030 people losing their lives just at the beginning of 2017.[27]

The Hague Programme adopted by the European Council in November 2004 reaffirms the need of a higher coordination of Member States but also of the EU initiatives regarding the process of integrating non-

---

[18] *Tampere European Council, 15 and 16 October 1999 – Presidency Conclusions,* available at http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/tam_en.htm, accessed February 2018.

[19] Laeken Declaration on the future of the European Union (15 December 2001), available at https://www.cvce.eu/en/obj/laeken_declaration_on_the_future_of_the_european_union_15_december_2001-en-a76801d5-4bf0-4483-9000-e6df94b07a55.html, accessed January 2018.

[20] Directiva 2003/9/CE a Consiliului din 27 ianuarie 2003, available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/RO/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32003L0009&from=RO, accessed February 2018.

[21] Regulamentul Dublin II, available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legalcontent/RO/TXT/?uri=LEGISSUM%3Al33153, accessed January 2018.

[22] Regulation (Eu) No 604/2013 Of The European Parliament And Of The Council of 26 June 2013, available at http://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/20847/76279.pdf, accessed February 2018.

[23] Declaration, EU-Western Balkans Summit, Thessaloniki, 21 June 2003, available at http://www.consilium.europa.eu /ueDocs/cms_Data /docs/pressdata/en/misc/76291.pdf, accessed November 2017.

[24] FRONTEX, European Border and Coast Guard Agency, available at http://frontex.europa.eu, accessed February 2018.

[25] Migrația în Europa, available at http://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/ro/headlines/society/20170629STO78632/migratia-in-europa, accessed February 2018.

[26] Lutterbeck Derek "Coping with Europe's Boat People. Trends and Policy Dilemmas in Controlling the EU's Mediterranean Borders", *Mediterranean Politics*, 11(1) (2006): 59-82.

[27] Idem.

EU immigrants.[28] It is decided that clear action principles are needed since they are necessary both in future policies but also in evaluating the steps that the states and the EU will take in the efforts of integrating non-EU immigrants. Within the same programme, the Commission is also invited to present a plan regarding legal migration until the end of 2005. A first step to this end is the Commission's publication of the Green Charter regarding the manner in which economic migration was treated. The Commission emphasises the necessity of a direct proportionality between the admission procedures for immigrants and the measures taken by the EU and the Member States with the purpose of integrating them. The Council for Justice and Home Affairs adopted in 2004 the fundamental common principles regarding integration, principles that have as a central pillar the promotion of fundamental rights, of non-discrimination and of equal chances. Thus, the Council established a set of principles of action which ascertain that: integration is a dynamic, bi-directional process of reciprocal adaptation from behalf of all immigrants and residents of Member States; integration involves the respect for the fundamental values of the European Union; workforce occupation represents a key part of the integration process and is a central point for immigrant participation, for the contributions that immigrants bring to the host country and to make these contributions visible; fundamental knowledge regarding the language, history and the institutions of the host society is indispensable for integration; allowing immigrants to acquire this basic knowledge is essential for their good integration; efforts in the field of education are vital for training immigrants, and especially their descendants, to become active members of society; immigrants' access to institutions, as well as to private goods and services, in a manner equal to that of national citizens and non-discriminatory is a vital element for a better integration; the frequent interaction between immigrants and citizens of Member States is a fundamental mechanism for integration; forums for information exchange, inter-cultural dialogue, education regarding immigrants and their cultures and stimulating living conditions in urban areas intensify the interactions between immigrants and citizens of Member States; practicing different cultures and religious is guaranteed by the Charter of Fundamental Rights and has to be defended as long as these practices do not enter in conflict with other inviolable European rights or with national laws; the participation of immigrants in the democratic process and in formulating integration policies and actions,

especially at the local level, supports their integration; the inclusion of policies and actions regarding integration in all policy portfolios and at all levels of government and relevant public services represents an important factors in forming and implementing public policies; the development of some clear objectives, indicators and mechanisms of evaluation is necessary to adjust policies, to evaluate the progress regarding integration and to exchange information more efficiently.[29] Member States are encouraged to integrate *The Basic Principles* in their integration policies, but each state had the freedom to manage their actions in accordance with their priorities. In 2008, the European Parliament voted the *Blue Card directive for immigrants with higher professional qualification*, with the purpose of proposing more flexible conditions for obtaining the paperwork for citizens from third countries who had a legal work contract in a EU country. This represented a step in the promotion of integration based on the immigrant's skills, on the capitalisation on his/her potential.[30] A year later, the EU proposed two more instruments namely the European Integration Forum and the European Website on Integration.[31] The Stockholm Programme[32], published at the end of 2009, replaces the Hague Programme and defines in its seven chapters the direction regarding immigration and asylum for the next five years. The emphasis is directed towards a Europe of citizens, secure, protective and responsible. The Council proposes policies regarding integration focused on immigrant participation, on respecting their rights but also policies for combating illegal immigration. In 2011, on the occasion of the presentation of the European agenda for the integration of immigrants from third countries, the Commission mentioned that the EU had fulfilled the actions provided by the Common agenda for integration from 2005. Furthermore, the EU considers that a new European policy is needed for the integration of immigrants from third countries, a policy that takes into consideration access to work places, a better cultural insertion, and more flexible procedures for awarding citizenship. The Commission thus proposes integration actions through participation, more actions at the local level but also the involvement of the immigrants' countries of origin. They also tried to bring out the professional and cultural resources of immigrants, to this end immigration being approached as a means of capitalising on the migration's potential both from an economic and cultural point of view.

The number of refugees and extra-Community immigrants has increased more and more as a result of

---

[28] *A Common Agenda for Integration Framework for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals in the European Union*, available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52005DC0389&from=EN, accessed February 2018.

[29] Justice and Home Affairs Council of 19 November 2004, available at http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_PRES-04-321_en.htm, accessed February 2018.

[30] Carte albastră pentru imigranţii cu înaltă calificare profesională, available at http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+IM-PRESS+20081107FCS41562+0+DOC+XML+V0//RO, accessed Mars, 2018.

[31] European Website on Integration, available at https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/home, accessed January 2018.

[32] *Programul de la Stockholm: către o Europă deschisă, mai sigură...*, available at http://www.ana.gov.ro/doc_strategice/ documente%20strategice%20europene/programul%20stockholm%20romana.pdf, accessed December 2017.

the war in Syria, of the Iraq conflict, and of the African humanitarian crises. After the tragic events from the Mediterranean Sea from 2015, the European Commission presented the *European Agenda on Migration*[33] where one can find immediate actions but also medium and long-term ones regarding migration and asylum. Among the immediate actions we can name: tripling the capacities of the Frontex, activating an emergency mechanism to help Member States that are confronted with an unexpected influx of immigrants, a European system for permanent relocation and military operations in the Mediterranean Sea with the purpose of combating human trafficking. In regards to medium and long-term structural changes, the EU has proposed: reducing economic stimulants for illegal immigrants, saving lives and securing external borders, a solid policy regarding asylum, and a new policy regarding the domain of legal migration.

In February 2016, the Commission presents a Report[34] regarding the actions that the EU undertook in accordance with the duties taken on within the Agenda, namely the re-establishment of order on the Eastern Mediterranean and Western Balkan route, the support offered to states for controlling unregulated migration, the actual access to asylum procedures for people who need international protection, decision regarding the access points and transfer points. The European Council from March of the same year concluded that there is a need to reform EU policies, in other words more attention needs to be given to humanitarian problems and efficiency needs to exist regarding asylum policies. The EU considers that its instruments are limited and decides to adequately equip itself especially in crisis situations in order to ensure an equitable treatment of immigrants from third countries. It is mentioned that it is important to look at the immigrants' potential, at their contribution to the economic and cultural development of the EU. The new instruments aim at a higher order, assuming solidarity and responsibility at the level of all Member States. The Commission's Report[35] from April proposes a set of actions meant to make the EU actions for migration and asylum to be more efficient, actions that have to be centred on the real causes of immigration and on the capacity of attracting talents and skills. It is emphasised that without ensuring participation and support for integration in the community where the immigrant

resides, the immigration and asylum policy remains void of content. Among these actions we can mention: a sustainable system and more clarity when deciding which Member State has the responsibility of examining asylum requests, a new regulation regarding common asylum procedures, combating unregulated movement, a new mandate for the EU Agency for Asylum, combating illegal immigration and ensuring the protection of the immigrant.

In September 2017, the Report was presented regarding the progresses recorded after the implementation of the actions decided starting with 2015[36]. Better results were recorded at the level of managing borders, at the level of reception points (hotspots) which allowed the registration and the taking of the digital fingerprints of all immigrants at arrival, the transfer mechanisms, more solidarity among EU states. One could be observe that efficiency in the area of migration and asylum policy is directly related to solidarity and to a better coordination between the actions of Member States. Also in 2017 there were a series of documents representative for the Commission that were presented such as "Migration on the Central European route", "A new approach regarding the collaboration with countries of origin and of transit regarding cooperation in matters of migration", "The renewed plan of action of the EU regarding the return policy", "The protection of migrant children". As it was presented in the discourse regarding the "State of the Union" as well, it is necessary for the efforts in the domain of migration to continue coherently and sympathetically, by maintaining the spirit of reason which has consecrated the foundation of democracies since, as state by Jean Claude Junker: "Europe is not and it must never become a fortress. Europe is and has to remain the continent of solidarity where people who are running away from persecution can find refuge"[37].

4. The Efforts Made By Turkish Immigrants To Integrate Themselves In The Romanian Society

Previously, we have succinctly emphasised the efforts made by the EU to manage the institutional, organisational and administrative shortcomings in its policy regarding extra-Community migration but also

---

[33] A European Agenda On Migration, Communication From The Commission To The European Parliament, The Council, The European Economic And Social Committee And The Committee Of The Regions, Brussels, 13.5.2015 COM(2015) 240 final, available at https://ec.europa.eu/antitrafficking/sites/antitrafficking/files/communication_on_the_european_agenda_on_migration_en.pdf, accessed February 2018.

[34] Communication From The Commission To The European Parliament And The Council On The State Of Play Of Implementation Of The Priority Actions Under The European Agenda On Migration, Brussels, 10.2.2016 COM(2016) 85 final, available at https://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/1/2016/EN/1-2016-85-EN-F1-1.PDF, accessed January 2018.

[35] Comunicare A Comisiei Către Parlamentul European ȘI Consiliu, Posibilit ăți de reformare a sistemului european comun de azil și de îmbunătățire a căilor legale de migrație, Bruxelles, 6.4.2016 COM(2016) 197 final, available at http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/1/2016/RO/1-2016-197-RO-F1-1.PDF, accessed March, 2018.

[36] Comunicare A Comisiei către Parlamentul European, Consiliu, Comitetul Economic și Social European și Comitetul Regiunilor cu privire la rezultatele Agendei Europene privind Migrația, Bruxelles, 27.9.2017, COM(2017) 558 final, available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/RO/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52017DC0558&from=EN, accessed January, 2018.

[37] Discursul Președintelui Jean-Claude Juncker privind starea Uniunii 2017, available at http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-17-3165_ro.htm, accessed February 2018.

the efforts made regarding the integration of extra-Community immigrants. This paper also focuses on the efforts made by immigrants in the process of their integration. The social and systemic processes of integration are not unidirectional. In order for a functional relation to exist between the side that is being integrated (the non-EU immigrant in the present case) and the side that is integrating (EU states), both sides suffer changes and make efforts. There are cases where the immigrant is not open or he/she resists the efforts made by the host societies in offering them the possibility to exercise social, cultural, economic, civic and political rights, according European and international treaties. Conversely, despite the openness proven by the immigrant towards learning, developing social relations with the citizens of the host society, the latter might treat the former as second-rate citizens even though they hold professional and social skills.

This part of the paper is dedicated to the attempt to point out the potential, skills, limits but also the efforts made by Turkish immigrants in Romania. I conducted fieldwork during November 2017-February 2018, during which I interviewed Turkish immigrants who reside in Bucharest, Romania. The interview guide followed: the reasons for which Turkish immigrants decided to choose Romania, the efforts made by Turkish immigrants to become integrated, the professional and cultural resources that they have, the representations that they have about democratic values, the relation between the efforts made and their desire to become Romanian/European citizens.

I have interviewed 43 people out of which 13 women and 30 men, with an average age of 38. Out of these, 24 have undergraduate studies, 8 have post-graduate studies, 8 have a high school education and 3 a middle-school education. Out of the 13 women, 7 have undergraduate and post-graduate, 4 have a high school education and 2 a middle-school education. In regards to professional mobility what can be noticed is an ascending vertical mobility for 15 of those interviewed who had a student status in Turkey and who became teachers, tourist agents, administrators of their own businesses in Romania. Maintenance of the professional status was found with 25 immigrants, maintenance of the status but a change in the professional role for a teacher who becomes a businessman and three situations descending vertical professional mobility for two female teachers and one female student who have change their status to homemakers.

The reasons for which Turkish immigrants decided to emigrate are as follows: for 50% of them the causes were related to work, the rest of them for studies and to reunite their families, with only one case for the accumulation of a cultural experience. 10 of the 13 women who were interviewed immigrated to be with their families while only two men had as a reason to reunite their families. Over 50% of the immigrants consider that they chose Romania because it is a "virgin" market, "better for making a lot of money",

"cheap", "with cheap workforce", "freer". Another four of them consider that they chose Romania because education here is "more qualitative" than in their country, "better" but also "cheaper". One of those interviewed considers that he wants to teach Romanian Turkish language and culture, while another one states that he chose Romania in order to learn Romanian language and culture. 3 of those interviewed consider that Romanian is a "safe" country where they feel secure, where "the society is freer" than the one in Turkey. Only five of the informants chose Romania because it is a European country and a member of the EU.

7 of the Turkish immigrants hold Romanian citizenship, 1 is a German citizen, 1 is a French citizen, 18 wish to obtain citizenship, while the rest do not have this in mind. A 44 year old man, the administrator of his own business, does not wish to have Romanian citizenship although he has been living in Romania for 24 years. Another case is that of a 44 year old man who, after living in Romania for 22 years with a residence permit, considers that he would like to apply for Romanian citizenship.

The analysis will concentrate on the efforts that the Turkish immigrants are making in order to become integrated. To this end, what I will examine is whether they did or did not attend Romanian classes, whether they use another language for communication beside Romanian and their mother tongue, whether they develop friendships with Romanian citizens, whether they get informed, whether they have reading and writing skills in Romania. I will also examined the representation that Turkish immigrants have about the EU but also about democracy given their intention of obtaining citizenship in a country that is a member of the EU. I will also analyse the relation between the efforts the immigrants consider that they are making and their level of integration.

Regarding the number of those who did or did not attend Romanian classes, 21 attended such classes, 3 of them intend to do this while the other 19 did not attend any classes. Some of those who did not attend Romanian classes consider that they can manage to communicate in Romanian at a basic level since they learnt with the help of friends. 8 of those who wish to obtain citizenship did not take classes to learn Romanian, and one of them has citizenship without taking such classes. 5 of those who attended such classes consider that they were useful not just for speaking correctly in Romanian but also for understanding Romanian culture.

15 of those interviewed do not have friends in Romania, out of which 5 are men while 10 are women. Those who have friendships with Romanian citizens participate in different activities with them as follows: business, sport, eating together. Only two of the 43 state that they frequently visit with Romanian families and that they participate at various Romanian holidays at the invitation of their Romanian friends. The number of women who do not succeed in establishing social

relations outside of their family is higher than in the case of men, with only three of the 13 women having Romanian friends. It should be noticed that neither of the informants knows or has ever turned to the social networks that are offered by specialised institutions that deal with refugees and immigrants.

Although a significant number have higher education, 24 of the immigrants who were interviewed do not write in Romanian while 30 of them do have the habit of reading books, journals, or news websites. Of the 13 who state that reading is one of their preoccupations, 3 read specialised books, 3 read fiction, while 7 read the news in order to be informed. A particular case is that of a woman who holds a PhD and who declared that she does not read specialised books, fiction or media articles. 20 of them have English skills that allow them to communicate with other individuals.

Regarding the question "What does the EU represent?" the answers were extremely diverse. 2 of the informants do not know what EU means (both are students), for another 3 the EU does not represent "anything special". For one of them, the EU has a negative connotation since it is associated with "trickery" while for another it is associated with "social aids". For the majority, the EU is associated with democracy, freedom of movement, freedom, equality, safety. Two of the responders consider that the EU is a space of multiculturalism, while another two see it as a space of peace and security. Neither of the immigrants offered a clear definition of the EU, admitting that the information they have about the EU is from friends or from TV.

Democracy has some of the most diverse connotations for the Turkish immigrants. If a 23 year old woman considers that "democracy is everything", at the opposite end are five other informants for whom it does not represent "anything" since it "does not exist". 7 of those asked consider that democracy represents "rights" for citizens and "law", in the sense of a functional justice system. Democracy is associated with "morals" for one of the immigrants while for another it is associated with "the freedom to do anything". A 45 year old woman considers that in any democracy it is important for people to trust the institutions. For the other participants in the study, democracy is freedom, equality, brotherhood, an education superior to the one in their country, and "clean politics". It can be noticed that the majority of the immigrants have fragmented representations about what democracy is or about how a democratic system functions, with representations formed either as a result of informal conversations with friends, or after watching some TV shows. Neither of those interviewed offered a more complex description of what democracy means.

In regards to the question "Do you think that you are making enough efforts to integrate?" 30 answered no, 3 said that they were trying although they thought that it was not enough, while 10 appreciated that they are making/made efforts. 28 consider that they are in the process of integration, 10 are well integrated, while 4 have a lower level of integration.

According to the analysis above it can be concluded that:

The reasons why immigrants decided to settle in Romania determine the path of their integration. In other words, the majority of the immigrants decided that Romania is a country where they can develop businesses. To this end, they learnt Romanian in order to develop the skills for a basic verbal communication. English is often used as well complementing the gaps in their knowledge of Romanian. The immigrants learnt the rules of the game in order to support and consolidate their businesses and investments. They respected the rules imposed by the political decision-makers, they adjusted to the working norms of the institutions and to the economic mechanisms in Romania. All of these ensured a systemic integration for the Turkish immigrant.

Regarding the social integration, the following specifications can be made. For Turkish immigrants socialization takes place mainly within the immigrant group that shares the same values and customs. A 44 year old male informant considers, for instance, that religious traditions and values are being lost in Romania. A small part of those interviewed develop durable friendships with Romanian citizens outside the immigrant group. Conversely, it can be observed that despite the fact that they conserve they identity founded on traditional and religious values, they do not completely reject or resist developing relations with Romanian citizens or with citizens belonging to other ethnicities. Their social integration is not done with the same rhythm as the systemic one. This can be observed especially in the women who decided to immigrate in order to be with their husbands and who frequent Romanian socialization mediums to a lesser extent than the men.

Despite their wish to obtain citizenship and to enjoy the possibility of travelling and getting to know the EU, the immigrants do not make efforts to reach their objectives. The preparation of the citizenship test does not automatically constitute a step towards the social and systemic integration of the immigrant. One notices the need of a permanent socialization, of an availability to learn. The immigrants have not read books for general knowledge that would help them to better understand European and Romanian culture, they do not get informed lest in a small degree about political and civic culture, and about the democratic principles. This is disproportionate to their level of preparation with the majority, as aforementioned, having undergraduate and post-graduate studies.

5. Conclusions

The integration process of non-EU immigrants has raised questions regarding the European capacity, institutional resources and mechanisms for managing the extra-Community migration in general and the

migration crisis of the past few years in particular. The paper has presented the main stages that the EU went through in its attempt to manage extra-Community migration, which has been considered, since the Treaty of Amsterdam, as being a European problem which needs a communitarian response. The communications, the common decisions, the documents produced starting with the 90s translate the EU's interest for the extra-Community migration, but also the shortcomings that the Union is trying to overcome. On the other end of the spectrum, the extra-Community immigrant who aims at integration is confronted with economic, cultural, normative and social challenges. As it was mentioned in the first part of the paper, the social integration can complement the systemic integration for the purpose of a functional relation between the immigrant and the host society that is integrating him/her. The fieldwork that was done pointed out, as a result of the qualitative analyses of the data obtained,

that the Turkish immigrants in Romania are well integrated from a systemic point of view, by having language skills that ensure a basic communication, by respecting the economic rules and those of the institutions with which they enter in contact. Regarding social integration, which is more profound, what prevails is the base identity, which is founded on religious traditions and values. Even though there is no evident resistance from the Turkish immigrant towards Romanian and European values in general, they do not make efforts to become integrated in accordance with their desires.

The integration process represents a bi-directional relation which is wished to be functional. In the case where the efforts for change to not come from both sides, the relation will not be functional, and there will be imbalances between the part that is being integrated (the immigrant) and the part that is integrating (the European society)

References

- Bendel, Petra, "Immigration Policy in the European Union: Still bringing up the walls for fortress Europe?", *Migration Letters*, 1(2005): 21-32
- Castles, Stephen, "How nation-states respond to immigration and ethnic diversity", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 21(3) (2010): 293-398
- Derek, Lutterbeck "Coping with Europe's Boat People. Trends and Policy Dilemmas in Controlling the EU's Mediterranean Borders", *Mediterranean Politics*, 11(1) (2006): 59-82
- Geoffrey, Garrett & Tsebelis, George, "An Institutional Critique of Intergovernmentalism", *International Organization* 50(2) (1996): 269-299
- Hurwitz, Agnès, "The 1990 Dublin Convention: A Comprehensive Assessment", *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 11 (4) (1999): 646–677
- Tranholm-Mikkelsen, Jeppe "Neo-Functionalism: Obstinate or Obsolete? A Reappraisal in the Light of the New Dynamism of the EC." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies,* 20 (1) (1991): 1-22
- Zamfir, Cătălin & Vlăsceanu, Lazăr (eds), *Dicționar de sociologie* (București: Ed. Babel, 1993)
- Zhou, Min, "Segmented Assimilation: Issues, Controversies, and Recent Research on the New Second Generation", *The International Migration Review*, 31(4) (1997): 975-1008
- *A Common Agenda for Integration Framework for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals in the European Union*, available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX :52005DC0389&from=EN, accessed February 2018
- A European Agenda On Migration, Communication From The Commission To The European Parliament, The Council, The European Economic And Social Committee And The Committee Of The Regions, Brussels, 13.5.2015 COM(2015) 240 final, available at https://ec.europa.eu/antitrafficking /sites/antitrafficking/files/communication_on_the_european_agenda_on_migration_en.pdf, accessed February 2018
- Carte albastră pentru imigranții cu înaltă calificare profesională, available at http://www.europarl.europa.eu /sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+IM-PRESS+20081107FCS41562+0+DOC+XML+V0//RO, accessed Mars, 2018
- Communication From The Commission To The European Parliament And The Council On The State Of Play Of Implementation Of The Priority Actions Under The European Agenda On Migration, Brussels, 10.2.2016 COM(2016) 85 final, available at https://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/1/2016/EN/1-2016-85-EN-F1-1.PDF, accessed January 2018
- Comunicare A Comisiei Către Parlamentul European ȘI Consiliu, Posibilit ăți de reformare a sistemului european comun de azil și de îmbunătățire a căilor legale de migrație, Bruxelles, 6.4.2016 COM(2016) 197 final, available at http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/1/2016/RO/1-2016-197-RO-F1-1.PDF, accessed March, 2018
- Comunicare A Comisiei către Parlamentul European, Consiliu, Comitetul Economic și Social European și Comitetul Regiunilor cu privire la rezultatele Agendei Europene privind Migrația, Bruxelles, 27.9.2017, COM(2017) 558 final, available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/RO/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52017DC0558&from=EN, accessed January, 2018
- Declaration, EU-Western Balkans Summit, Thessaloniki, 21 June 2003, available at http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/misc/76291.pdf, accessed November 2017
- Directiva 2003/9/CE a Consiliului din 27 ianuarie 2003, available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/RO/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32003L0009&from=RO, accessed February 2018

- Discursul Președintelui Jean-Claude Juncker privind starea Uniunii 2017, available at http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-17-3165_ro.htm, accessed February 2018
- European Council Meeting in Laeken, SN 300/1/01 REV 1, available at http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/background/docs/laeken_concl_en.pdf, accessed February 2018
- European Website on Integration, available at https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/home, accessed January 2018
- FRONTEX, European Border and Coast Guard Agency, available at http://frontex.europa.eu, accessed February 2018
- Justice and Home Affairs Council of 19 November 2004, available at http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_PRES-04-321_en.htm, accessed February 2018
- Laeken Declaration on the future of the European Union (15 December 2001), available at https://www.cvce.eu/en/obj/laeken_declaration_on_the_future_of_the_european_union_15_december_2001-en-a76801d5-4bf0-4483-9000-e6df94b07a55.html, accessed January 2018
- *Programul de la Stockholm: către o Europă deschisă, mai sigură.*, available at http://www.ana.gov.ro/doc_strategice/documente%20strategice%20europene/programul%20stockholm%20romana.pdf, accessed December 2017
- Regulamentul Dublin II, available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legalcontent/RO/TXT/?uri=LEGISSUM%3Al33153, accessed January 2018
- Regulation (Eu) No 604/2013 Of The European Parliament And Of The Council of 26 June 2013, available at http://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/20847/76279.pdf, accessed February 2018
- *Tampere European Council, 15 and 16 October 1999 – Presidency Conclusions,* available at http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/tam_en.htm, accessed February 2018