

Migration has been a historical phenomenon within Europe and in fact, is not a recent issue of concern. The flow of people, mostly from Southern to Northern Europe, summed up to a total of 10.5 million during the 1950s and 1960s until the oil shock of 1973 when the relatively rich nations brought restrictive policies because of rising concerns of unemployment (Bean et al, 1998). I argue that as long as the current disparities in income levels of individuals continue, so does the immigration.

Now that the nation-states have started to give up, at least part of, their sovereignty to supranational organizations such as EU, their state-centered approach against immigration has become weaker, especially because of the mentality underlying the concept of “union”; that is, the free movement of labor along with goods, services and capital. In order to realize the so-called economic integration, Favell and Hansen (2002) suggest that states “must give up the discretion that they once claimed to designate who is and is not a legitimate resident of their territory; and rather allow market forces to dictate supply and demand of migrant labor across economically interdependent territories.” So, stopping the mobility is virtually impossible and the cross-border economic integration is inevitable.

I think Europe’s economic and social security is not a self-destructing process. The paradox, if there is any, has been created most of the times by one-sided applications and unwelcoming positions of host countries’ governments. I argue that the host country of migrants can reshape its social programs and benefits to digest these people, who in turn, are needed to stabilize Europe’s social security system. In order to make the immigrants feel that they belong to the new society they are in, local or state governments should think of opening schools for immigrants, bringing teachers from their countries of origin and making every effort to make the following generations bilingual individuals so that they would not suffer of being excluded from their communities. Is every country following that path? Not really. Denmark decided to abolish Turkish teaching programs for Turkish immigrants in the name of a need for public financial savings, which was not very convincing at all. Keeping in mind that

the Dutch officials followed the same route very recently (but then rechanged their policy), the immigrants feel themselves isolated from the authorities producing anti-immigrant policies, such as keeping immigrants away from their cultures for the sake of getting them closer to the new environment.

The fear in terms of mass immigration even after the enlargement seems to be irrelevant and I believe that **the problem is not the migration in Europe; rather it is the integration of migrants.** Take the current incidents in France. While some may claim that the demonstrations are a result of tramps' exploiting an act of police, there is a truth of non-recognition of the non-integrated ones. A majority of these people, unlike the migrants in the US, do not feel that they belong to their current society. In order to speed up the integration of immigrants, there is a need for cooperation among the countries mainly on the following issues: Civic and language education, cultural adjustment, a free environment without any prejudices against self-expression, participation, and democratic representation of every segment of society.

After all, even the need for migration and the threat arising from migrants is a paradox; I argue that the trade-off between the need and the social costs still favors the preceding in terms of economic benefits and industrial development. Germany, accepting low-paid Turkish workers during the 1960s is a good example. Majority of the lowest-status and low-paid job opportunities have been filled by asylum-seekers in Denmark and Sweden, in service industries such as cleaning work. Many countries, indeed, are aware of the advantages of this trade-off, and it would not be an exaggeration to argue that some states even close their eyes for illegal migrants. Favell and Hansen (2002) claim that Germany's new capital Berlin "would not have been rebuilt without unskilled migrant labor, both legal and illegal." Martin (2002, cited in Favell and Hansen) estimates the latter from anywhere between 150,000 and 1.5 million.

The social aspect of immigration policies is that a hostile attitude today might have a significant impact in the years to come and there is a need for migrant-friendly approach. The

Economist (2002, August 22) calls it “the magnet effect.” The net number of immigrants anticipated for the years between 2000 and 2050 is about 77.6 million people for Europe and US with a serious asymmetry to the favor of America with 71.8%. The barriers to entry and the somewhat hostile psychological atmosphere in Europe, especially the locals and the extreme nationalists, are the major concerns of the newcomers. Kenneth Prewitt, the former head of US Census Bureau, (cited in the Economist, 2002) suggests that there will be a competition in the growing economies to find workers for the continuation of their growth; and the welcoming nations to immigrants will have an advantage.

Immigrants and internal security? If the whole thing is about security, one should think about the possible situation if Europeans fail to pull their weight in NATO because of the need to spend more on social programs arising from the aging population. Put differently; after the cold war, Europe decided to spend its public money for social costs of its population while the US invested heavily on military defense. According to the figures of the Economist, the total military spending of US in 2000 was \$295 billion compared to EU’s \$153 billion. Given that one of the rationales of EU’s establishment was to become a powerful political union, they need a strong military capacity in order to be a respected actor in international affairs. Now that the gap got wider, it is becoming too late for Europeans to narrow it now as the real time has come for their spending on social programs. After all, I do not think that Europe has the luxury of facing immigrants with vulnerability in the name of security and social belonging.

**References:**

Bean, C. et al. (1998). Social Europe: One for All? Center for Economic Policy Research, 79-92.

Favell, A., & Hansen, R. (2002). Markets Against Politics: Migration, EU Enlargement and the Idea of Europe. Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, October, 581-601.

“Half a Billion Americans?” The Economist. 2002, August 22.

© Yansı ERASLAN