

Migration in the European Union - a Cosmopolitan Future?

University of Twente

Public Governance across Borders

First Supervisor: Mariangela Veikou

Second Supervisor: Ariana Need

Marina Konrad

1857037

Date of delivery: 24.08.2018

Abstract

This research answers the following research question: *How does the European Commission include cosmopolitanism in their visions of Europe on migration from 2015 onward?* to capture a response of the European Union on the migration crisis.

A discourse analysis of official documents and policy papers of the European Commission will be conducted. Three themes within the cosmopolitan imaginations are selected to analyze the impact of cosmopolitanism on migration: Solidarity and Responsibility, Recognition of human rights and additional features of cosmopolitanism. This will ensure to capture how this crisis was handled as well as what future implications on migration are derived from this crisis. All three themes can be found in the documents of the European Commission, however there are often limited to legal migration and exclude irregular migration. For the European Union to host the term of a cosmopolitan society, much more implementation of the ideals are needed.

This research contributes to research concerning cosmopolitanism and its practical application and will help to understand the discourse on the recent migration crisis, as well as to future migration in the EU.

Introduction	2
Migration in Europe	4
Competences of the EU	5
Cosmopolitanism as a necessity for European Integration	5
Cosmopolitan Imaginations	7
Data and Methods	10
Analysis: Cosmopolitanism in the European Union	12
Solidarity and Responsibility	15
Recognition of human rights	17
Additional features of Cosmopolitanism	19
Conclusion and Discussion	20
References	22

Introduction

The refugee crisis in Europe in the 2010s has fueled a debate on migration throughout all media platforms as well as a discrepancy in policies on migration of different European states. These have been discussing a plethora of policies and solutions to approach this phenomenon: The reactions have been contradictory, ie. from Merkel's famous slogan "Wir schaffen das" ("We'll manage it") in the German federal press conference in August 2015 (Bannas, 2015) to the Hungarian Foreign Minister Szijjarto announcing the built-up of a fence along their border with Serbia (Dunai, 2015). The European Union is an organization connecting most of the states that have been affected by the crisis. Thus, the EU has been active in this debate likewise. The EU is trying to reunite the member states with finding a solution that suits all. Apart from this aim to generate unity concerning migration, the EU also has the ultimate goal of standardized political and economic regulations.

Originally the European Union was founded based on economic principles but over the last decades the european integration process has been successful in including social policies as well. In this case when talking about 'european integration' I refer to the process of further harmonization between the member states in the European Union. In contrast, 'integration' will refer to the integration process of migrants. Migration or rather a common immigration policy (Article 67(2) TFEU) is a shared competence of the EU and its members. The member states have also been working on the Common European Asylum System (CEAS) starting already in 1999. Additionally, the European Commission as the executive body has the ability to set out visions and ideals of new policies and can take initiative in proposing more measures on migration. However, for the European Union greater european integration and especially on the field of migration is a goal, yet to be achieved. To this day there is no consensus of scholars and member states on how european integration should proceed. However if european integration will continue to harmonize regulations for all member states in economic, social and cultural fields there can be a shift into a multinational society in Europe. This multinational society, of course then in inclusion of additional features, can be cosmopolitan.

The concept of cosmopolitanism is often introduced with the process of globalization. Globalization is categorized as organizations or countries operating on an international scale. In the past, globalization was referring to economic processes, however globalization has increased influences on social concerns, these include problems like climate change and terrorism. Ulrich Beck (2002) proposes as a solution to these problems with a change in the political economy from neoliberalism to cosmopolitanism.

The term cosmopolitanism was already introduced by Immanuel Kant described as the 'ius cosmopoliticum' in Perpetual Peace in 1795. And was defined as a form of world citizenship. These citizens

have a universal state of being in their external relationships. With this Kant included an idea of universal hospitality, which means that a stranger should not be treated as an enemy when he or she comes to another country (Kant, 1903). The EU can be seen as the closest organization to pursue a form of world citizenship, because its citizens have the liberty of free movement and employment within the member states. Migration in a world order of cosmopolitan citizenship, would not be categorized as a crisis, but rather a natural phenomenon. Changing your location and with that interacting with strangers is a logical habit for world citizens. Nonetheless cosmopolitanism is not an established world order, but remains a concept. And in a cosmopolitan society migration can and should be discussed. Of course, world citizenship is not the only feature of cosmopolitanism. Hence these features will be discussed later in this paper.

There has been a shift in recent research on the relationship of the EU and its member states. Before there has been some kind of competition between the parties. The increase of competences for the EU was implied to restrict the sovereignty of the member states. But in light of the principle of subsidiarity the European integration process can be identified as multi-level governance, with multiple interaction authorities. This would also imply a collaboration rather than a competition between the EU and its member states. Considering this cooperation the concept of a cosmopolitan Europe solidifies. Thus, the discussion on the possibility of a cosmopolitan European Union and on how cosmopolitanism can be part of the European Union is, I would argue, necessary to establish a sense of improved migration regime for the near future.

The reaction of the European Union on the migrant crisis needs to be identified to establish a sense on the future implications on migration. Migration and asylum are part of fundamental human rights, which the EU acknowledges with the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. However, I would argue that migration in the EU could be improved with the analysis of reactions to the recent migration crisis. These reactions are taken into consideration, because they reflect how the European Union tried to overcome this crisis. They also include ideas on the future of migration in the EU. The peak of the migration crisis, with most people migrating to Europe, was in 2015. Ergo the time frame of this research will be starting in 2015. As discussed above the positions on migration within the member states have been diverse. In the following the European Commission and its statements in response on the migration crisis will be discussed. The European Commission, while including a representative from all member states, is still following the general interest of the EU. Therefore it is the most appropriate body, as the executive body, to propose further measures on integration.

Cosmopolitanism as a theoretical concept recognizes fundamental rights. It introduces, on a very basic level, a guide on how people of different nationalities, gender, religions and cultures can live among each other peacefully. Therefore this concept can help to identify the visions on future migration and

possibly improve it. In this research I will attempt to analyze the European Commission's future vision on migration with regards their openness vis a vis the concept of cosmopolitanism. The following research question arises: *How did the European Commission include cosmopolitanism in their visions of Europe on migration from 2015 onward?* To answer this question, of course it has to be established if cosmopolitanism is found in the visions of migration at all. And if so, how do such ideals resonate as a response to the current migrant crisis.

Next the scientific contribution of this research will be identified. The high occurrence of people migrating to Europe in the last years, has been named as the refugee or migrant 'crisis'. Nevertheless many scholars do not categorize this as a crisis per se. The responses of the media in certain European states on the crisis have been analyzed in various research, notably the research of Rheindorf and Wodak (2017) as well as Holmes and Castaneda (2016). However, the European Union's reaction or response has not been studied intensively thus far. The future ideals of migration in the EU have not been analyzed in detail, though they could contribute to the improvement of migration. Especially the connection of cosmopolitanism, rather than multiculturalism, with regards to migration in the European Union has not been touched upon. Cosmopolitanism itself has been discussed upon more as a theoretical concept in research. Consequently, this research will also aim to add to our knowledge on cosmopolitanism in practice, since the European Union as a supranational organization, unique in the international sphere, could be seen as the closest entity to a cosmopolitan society.

Migration in Europe

The European Union is in contrast to its original foundations, not only an organization that secures peace, but also an organization which introduces more and more social policies that unite the member states. With this, a shift from only economic goals and unity within the member states has started. Of course, even economic standards have not been completely harmonized among the member states and the necessity for this harmonization for the future of Europe is not fixed. Many scholars have dealt with the European integration process and theorized the future prospect of the European Union and what that entails. However, these ideas can be very contradictory. One example of an idea of the future European Union is of Ulrike Guérot (2016) framing an idea of Europe as a Republic. However her book title suggests this to be a political utopia. Another strong contradiction of future of Europe can be seen within political debates and opinions of political leaders in the member states. On the one hand, France proposes further integration of the European Union and on the other hand, the United Kingdom is in the midst of leaving the European Union. In the following the competences, meaning which capabilities the EU has to act and set out policies, of

Migration and will be discussed. Additionally the idea of cosmopolitanism as a necessity for the future of European integration will be outlined.

Competences of the EU

The European Union is neither a nation state nor a multinational institution. It is often referred to as an institution *sui generis*, meaning there is no other institution that is alike the European Union. With this singularity a comparison to another entity, such as another international organization or sovereign state, cannot be drawn as easily. However the importance of the system of the EU is, that the member states have the ability to assign competences to the European Union, which then sets guidelines and policies which apply to all member states.

With the Treaty of Lisbon the member states shifted their competence on immigration to the European Union. This is formulated in articles 79 and 80 of the Treaty of the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). This means the European Union is the legal entity which can set guidelines in the migration process within the EU. Based on this legal obligation, article 80 TFEU especially states to implement the principle of solidarity. Thus migration in the EU is explicitly stated to be guided by solidarity, which can be found in cosmopolitan ideas as well. The European Union has formed multiple policies on migration since then. In response to the migration crisis, The European Agenda on Migration was published on May 2015 to set guidelines and propose immediate measures on how to handle immigration more effectively in the future (Raffaelli, 2018).

Following this way of assigning competences, future European integration either would entail more action from the European Union with their current competences or a shift of competences from the member states to the EU.

Cosmopolitanism as a necessity for European Integration

How could future European Integration be designed? With the ideal of equality of the citizens within the European Union independently from their nationality one concept especially comes to mind: Cosmopolitanism. Jean Marc-Ferry (2011), also conceptualized possible prospects for the European Union in regarding European integration as cosmopolitan in the future. Cosmopolitanism as the chosen concept, when achieved would not only benefit citizens of the member states but also third country nationals. Cosmopolitanism, in a general frame, recognizes basic human rights and principles of acceptance and solidarity among each other with the inclusion of people from different nationalities, cultures and ethnicities. To answer the question how the European Union can be or become cosmopolitan is easy, the structures of the EU are already to some extent cosmopolitan. The power structures between the EU and

the member states are in a more horizontal form which entails coordination, cooperation and joint decision making (Ferry, 2001). With this as a basis for open cooperation on an equal level and encouragement to dialogue and discourse, a cosmopolitan foundation in decision making is set. However, one conflict that is often portrayed is categorizing the EU as a supranational power. With this shift of power it is assumed that the member states lose their sovereignty when shifting competences. But when looking at the structure of the EU the principle of subsidiarity is striking. The EU will only act on behalf of the member states if they are not able to pursue the task on their own. Thus an impeachment of the sovereignty of the member states is far fetched. This can be described as a multi-level governance process where the EU and the member states are multiple authorities which can interact. Ferry connects the idea of a joint sovereignty between the EU and the member states with the idea of Kant's cosmopolitanism in *Perpetual Peace* (1903). Three different types of laws are distinguished to achieve a cosmopolitan society: civil law, law of nations and cosmopolitan law. These three types are already present within the European Union. The civil law, as national law of the member states, law of nations as international law, and cosmopolitan law, with human rights as well with other rights introduced by the European Union that introduce a concept of union of people instead of union of States, i.e. the freedom of settlement of persons (Ferry, 2011). Cosmopolitanism, or a cosmopolitan society does naturally follow the European integration process when social, economic and cultural fields will continue to harmonize, because with this process the recognizes the equality of people independently from their nationality. When looking at the word cosmopolitanism, which is often translated to 'world citizenship' a limitation of this concept to the European Union can be viewed as too limited, due to its political and geographical limitations. But the European Union is the closest entity which pursues a form of world citizenship due to its unique structure and rights for its citizens. But cosmopolitanism is not an established world order, but a concept that especially in the field of migration could benefit the EU and individuals. Because cosmopolitanism and its features are not fixed in the following chapter concepts from different authors will be elaborated. But more generally if we assume the recognition of human rights and acceptance among people in a cosmopolitan society, individuals in the society would have general values of acceptance and tolerance also towards migrants. If we assume cosmopolitanism as a more moral concept it could produce a shift in a society towards a more open and accepting society. Especially the enforcement of human rights that could follow with cosmopolitanism in practice could be a guide to a more ethical approach on migration. Most of the individuals who migrated in 2015 and 2016 to the EU left due to war and terror in their home country. A cosmopolitan EU could be a greater entity to ensure human rights and protection for these individuals in need because these rights would be protected by a different entity than the nation state. With a body that is above the nation states, human rights protection are binding for governments which would not only benefit individuals in need that seek refuge in the EU, but also the citizens. Eriksen (2014) even suggests a regional

form of cosmopolitanism as the future for the European Union. With regional he describes a distinction from the EU functions in a cosmopolitan system, which means that the regional institutions i.e. the member states or local governments still remain. But the EU in this case would act as a higher ‘cosmopolitan’ government with the focus on human rights protection and other normative elements (Eriksen, 2014). With this form of cosmopolitanism in the EU based on a legal framework the legitimacy basis of the entity would have more foundation. Therefore the European Union should strive to achieve to be as cosmopolitan as possible within in their scope.

In conclusion, there are even different views on how a cosmopolitan future in the European Union can be achieved. But before this implementation can be pursued, it is to be found out if a general notion of cosmopolitanism is considered for migration in the EU.

Cosmopolitan Imaginations

Cosmopolitanism, as the chosen concept to underline and identify the future visions on migration of the European Union, needs to be explained. The very concept has been discussed by many scholars in the past and is not a singular theory or concept. Although most descriptions are similar and include the ideal of a world citizenship, cosmopolitanism can be conceptualized on many different dimensions. In this research I will concentrate on the works of Ulrich Beck and Kwame Anthony Appiah.

Yet, some of the other scholars that have conceptualized, explained and compared cosmopolitan ideas and/or societies in the past, deserve a brief mention. Amit and Gardiner Barber (2015) discuss the distinction between cosmopolitanism as competencies of a person/individual and/or cosmopolitanism as a moral aspiration. The authors pinpoint an important distinction within the literature on cosmopolitanism, the focus on cosmopolitanism as either a practical achievement or even a set of skills that are being followed or, as a more abstract concept based on ethics, which follow one's individual moral aspirations (Amit & Gardiner Barber, 2015, p. 544).

Amin (2004) already describes a phenomenon within european citizens who detach themselves and their views from traditional views of nation within their own country of origin. With this detachment of individual traditions a shift to cosmopolitan living happens which can especially be noted in plural and global consumption patterns which these citizens have. While originally Amin had identified a relapse to traditional values as the european core, then suggested that “empathy/engagement with the stranger will become the essence of what it is to be ‘European’” (Amin, 2004, p. 3). This research does not aim to identify or discuss the European essence or identity, however the analysis of EU documents in the thesis may suggest that empathy and engagement towards the stranger can be seen as the future vision of cosmopolitanism in Europe (Amin predicted this more than ten years ago) .

Nonetheless, cosmopolitanism is not a new concept, but I would suggest it is being revived at the moment. Nussbaum (1997) compares Kant's ideas of cosmopolitanism to these of stoic philosophers and finds many parallels, in regards to hospitality, an affirmation of humankind as a whole, that suggests a moral community through humanity. Additionally both groups of thought see in cosmopolitanism a form of connectedness, shared purposes and a call for political engagement led by reason. This comparison makes clear, that cosmopolitanism is a concept which can be traced back in historical theoretical thought, not impossible to be applied in practice today. Cosmopolitanism is not only limited to its conceptualization within enlightenment, but can and should set guidelines and principles for the future of Europe. These guideline and principles will be identified in the following with the ideas of Beck and Appiah.

Beck (2002) describes cosmopolitanism on a societal level. The cosmopolitan society is introduced as a possible new political order. This change in political order is, according to Beck (2002) necessary in today's globalized world. Beck's notion of cosmopolitanism has a strong institutional focus, as it is applied to society. Appiah's concept on the other hand, offers a much narrower notion. The title of his book "Ethics in a world of strangers" already hints on its content being more focused on the individual level. For Appiah, cosmopolitanism is seen as a universal concept, but the approach on values and ethics are on an individual level. The different approaches of both authors contribute to two aspects which the European Union's future visions can be analyzed on. The general features of a cosmopolitan society are described as well as the individual goals and ideas for a cosmopolitan ethical approach is suggested. To be able to analyze both, the two theories will be explained briefly.

What is a cosmopolitan society and how can it be achieved? Cosmopolitanism is seen as a response and new order of globalization. Beck (2002) describes that this will not only include a shift in international relations between different nation states but also a transformation of individuals inside a society, with the acknowledgment of diversity and encountering it. Beck (2002) defines the latter as 'cosmopolitanization from within'. Cosmopolitanization from within is described as the clash of different perspectives and cultures in the life of an individual and leads to some form of adaptation of these differences. Additionally, cosmopolitanism is described as an "this-as-well-as-that" rather than an "either-or" principle (Beck, 2002; p. 19). This inclusion of diversity challenges principles of exclusion, and with this national borders recede due to the inclusion of diversity, which can be beneficial to migration. A discussion on how societies can be more cosmopolitan is often sparked by a crisis. This crisis can be economic, political or of other nature but it does challenge the order of the society and triggers a response. In a cosmopolitan society people and the society itself propose on a future with a shared collective (Beck, 2002). This future collective is shared within society and can deviate in its content, however it is contradictory to nation-based memories of the past. In regards of migration this shared collective could include a society based on the premise of migration

as a contribution to diversity in contradiction to a nation-based stance of exclusion of foreigners. However, such a view alone does not necessarily spark an action. To overcome the crisis and introduce a change, the shared collective future of cosmopolitanism must outweigh “tradition and memory in the pastorientated national imagination and paradigm” and form “the traditions of future” (Beck, 2002, p.27). Beck’s concept of a cosmopolitan society is defined as global, plural and civil. Additionally, Beck included specific attributes which specify features of a cosmopolitan society: “the clash of cultures within one’s own life; globally shared collective futures (as opposed to past-based forms of action); a sense of global responsibility in a world risk society, in which there are ‘no others’; a commitment to dialogue and against violence; and a commitment to destroy faith in the supposedly natural artifice of ‘society’ and stimulate the self-reflexivity of divergent entangled cosmopolitan modernities.” (Beck, 2002, p. 35-36). These features can be connected to the author's sense of cosmopolitanization from within, the shared future of traditions explained above, his critique on global market imposing no responsibilities on itself, consumers or producers, and introduces social standards like communication and peace and self-reflection.

On the philosophy and the ethics of an individual cosmopolitanism, Appiah's concept will be discussed. One prominent distinction from the theory of Beck is that in the term “cosmos” of cosmopolitanism is understood as ‘universe’ or ‘cosmos’ instead of ‘world’. This makes the general definition of Appiah much broader. The main distinction which Appiah (2006) suggests cosmopolitanism is hindered by, is that the obligations individuals have to one another are very different on strangers in contrast to people one is familiar with. Cosmopolitanism is not introduced as a theory but rather as a program on how to act individually in a manner to accept and engage in the differences among people in order to live peacefully together. Appiah (2006) introduces cosmopolitanism with working human values, including hospitality, peaceful solutions of conflict and generosity with universal values of wrong and right and good and evil in order to sympathize with another. Cosmopolitanism perceives differences among people on the principle of basic tolerance. Individual identity based on family, religion, ethnicity etc. are not seen as problematic but offer an exchange on acceptance of different cultures which is a basic notion of cosmopolitanism. Principles on how to act according to Appiah's cosmopolitanism include seeking out conversation with others to engage in other ideas, views and cultures and follow experiences of other people. With this he also introduces the universal value of kindness that should follow when engaging with other people (Appiah, 2006). Additionally, this kindness includes the golden rule, meaning to treat other people as you wish to be treated. His proposal on ethics is very much contradictory to philosophical positivism because it recognizes the differences in cultures in their individual explanations as well as the acceptance of other people of these.

The distinction of cosmopolitanism as practical competences or as moral guidelines is also noticeable in the works of Beck and Appiah. Beck identifies features of a cosmopolitan society and sets guidelines to be achieved by this society in order to be cosmopolitan. Whereas Appiah conceptualizes cosmopolitanism as an ethical ideal on the basis of individuals' moral standards. This distinction is especially important in order to identify multiple aspects of cosmopolitanism which will also guide the analysis in this research.

Closing this theoretical section, it must be highlighted that both notions of cosmopolitanism have a different scope but do interchangeably connect to a broader picture. The connection of both theories ensures a discussion of the European Union upon the basis of societal aspect and ethical notions that follow from cosmopolitanism. Political language, especially the jargon of the EU, can be very imprecise and broad.

Data and Methods

The research question of this paper, *How did the European Commission include cosmopolitanism in their visions of Europe on migration from 2015 onward?*, has to be answered. This question is especially designating 'visions of Europe' in order to seize future ideas the EU wants to implement. In context of this question it is important to indicate, that the European Commission's vision will be discussed as a response to recent migration. As the migration crisis sparked a debate, the response of the Commission is of high importance and has to be discussed in context and content. As indicated above this debate and response will be connected to a theory: Cosmopolitanism, which will guide the interpretation of language use with possible intentions and on how visions of future Europe are laid out. In order to analyze the rhetoric, acknowledge the different viewpoints and interpret statements in context, a critical discourse analysis is thought to be the most appropriate research method of analysis. Discourse analysis, and especially critical discourse analysis, is used to identify underlying power structures in the original data, in this cases text. It helps to identify the meaning of text in context. It cannot be denied that the European Union is one of the biggest actors in regard to the migration crisis especially due to the competences assigned by the member states with the Treaty of the Functioning of the EU in this field of policy.

Discourse analyses have been a tool for conducting research by many scholars, however there is no fixed procedure on how this approach is executed (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). Depending on the content of the discourse, which could vary from newspaper articles, social media, photos or policy documents, and use of theory different designs have been carried out. But Wodak and Meyer (2009) distinguish important characteristics one has to concern when using the general approach of a discourse analysis. Language is seen as a form of social practice and the context of it must be acknowledged. This means that language is not limited to the words and their meaning itself but also in the context these words are set. The European

Union is by any means a political institution embedded in international relations, thus the response of the EU must be considered as that, political. The analysis of this research will be guided by the features of cosmopolitanism, which will be distinguished in the following chapter. Based on the presence or absence of these features an analysis on how well cosmopolitanism is inherited in the EU policy documents will be executed.

Concerning the political response of the European Commission a variety of policy documents of the European Commission will be analyzed on their discourse on migration. To specify what will be analyzed a distinction has to be made. In this paper both terms ‘migrant crisis’ and ‘refugee crisis’ have been used. This has been done due to the mainstream media using both terms, refugee crisis and migrant crisis interchangeably. Yet the European Union mainly uses the term migrant, and is forming policies based on migration, even when talking about the refugee crisis. Both terms do have fixed definitions, yet in the media the distinction between refugee and migrant is often seen as the former leaving their home country unwillingly due to political, social or other circumstances while the latter is seen as someone leaving their home country voluntarily (Holmes & Castaneda, 2016). However, for the purpose of a migrating or integration process, this distinction is not of importance. Therefore, policy papers on migration will be discussed and the term used will be migrant.

All data that will be analyzed is exclusively publicly accessible and official. It is important to note that, policy documents are viewed in a broader sense in this essay, since the goals and visions cannot always be framed in existing policies. Here, they are understood as official statements such as policy papers but also websites and speeches of members of the Commission as these documents are aspirations for future policies. The least recent document is from 2015 where the Agenda on migration has been set by the Commission. The other documents are from 2016 onward and are in direct relation to the Agenda from 2015. These policy documents were selected based on their content and the direct link to the agenda that was formulated in response to the migrant crisis. A variety of different types of documents have been selected to capture different channels the Commission uses to distribute their visions for the future of Europe. The speech of the President of the Commission Juncker is selected to capture this vision on migration more extensively. The policy documents are as follows:

Name of Document	Date of Document	Type of Document	Size
A European Agenda on Migration	13.05.2015	Communication	22 Pages
President Jean-Claude Juncker's State of the Union Address 2017	13.09.2017	Speech	10 Pages
Progress Report on the European Agenda on Migration	15.11.2017	Report	21 Pages
Commission contribution to the EU Leaders' thematic debate on a way forward on the external and internal dimension of migration policy	07.12.2017	Communication	20 Pages
Statement on Irregular Migration and Return of European Commission Migration and Home Affairs	Last update: 23.03.2018	Website	~ 4 Pages
Statement on Legal migration and Integration of European Commission Migration and Home Affairs	Last update: 21.03.2018	Website	~ 3 Pages

Analysis: Cosmopolitanism in the European Union

The documents will be analyzed in regard to cosmopolitanism, and of course the research question. The importance of this analysis is constructed by the aim of the European Union to strive to have equal rights for citizens, as well as be inclusive and show solidarity among strangers and migrants. The European Union is very selective with choosing the term cosmopolitanism specifically as their own, or even as a theme that guides decisions. However, many attributes which the EU links to their actions, policies and goals are deeply inherited in cosmopolitan concepts. With these goals it is important to distinguish if the European Union can host this term - cosmopolitanism - and emerges the liberties and freedoms within their organization and thus the society the EU achieves to build.

On the basis of the theory explained above three themes are selected under the umbrella of cosmopolitanism that will guide this discourse analysis. The themes are solidarity and responsibility, recognition of human rights and aid and the third theme is the missing elements of cosmopolitanism. The selection of these themes was done based on the premises of the cosmopolitan idea, in connection to values of the European Union. Cosmopolitanism as explained above, includes certain values and goals individuals and societies have to follow. The European Union, to host the term of cosmopolitanism needs to inherit

these goals and introduce these values to the citizens. Especially in connection to migration in the European Union the ideal of solidarity and responsibility is of utter importance to establish a cosmopolitan society. This ideal connects to a greater sense of obligation towards migrants from the European Union and citizens, the willingness to help and rescue migrants - show solidarity and responsibility - is deeply connected to cosmopolitan values. Human rights as a fixed principle is one of the most important ideals of cosmopolitanism. The belief of every person to be equal and be protected with basic rights, such as protecting the human dignity, is also inherited in the European Union's principles. The inclusion of the theme recognition of human rights is included here because this ideal is of high importance for migrants coming to the European Union. Their human rights need to be protected and enforced, to be able to migrate to the European Union. The third principle - additional features of cosmopolitanism - is selected because cosmopolitanism is a diverse and broad concept. Solidarity, responsibility and human rights are very much important in the cosmopolitan ideals, however these themes would be too limited to capture an essence of cosmopolitan imaginations. In connection to migration a dialogue between migrants, citizens and institutions is highly important for migration to succeed. Cosmopolitan ideals additionally include a shared collective future and the equality of people in and outside of Europe that can be connected to migration.

In the following the themes will be explained briefly to touch upon their sense and importance within the European Union. Overall it is important to note that not only the existence of these themes will be noted but also the absence, which means a contradictory statement to the narrative will also be identified.

1. Solidarity and Responsibility: Solidarity is one of the main principles the European Union identifies itself with the aim to act upon this value. This is very much in line with cosmopolitan ideals especially in connection to migration, not alone because the EU mentions to have solidarity with migrants. Solidarity within the European Union can be seen as a forced principle which is enforced with laws of the EU. However the solidarity that is implied with the law may be applied more strongly within the European member states instead of in a global manner. It is to be found out if the EU strives and suggests a global responsibility that follows its aims.
2. The second principle: Recognition of human rights and aid, may at the first glance seem as a fixed principle within the EU. All member states and the European Union itself have signed multiple declarations of human rights and recognize them fully. However in context of migration there has been a discussion that some human rights, such as the right to apply for asylum have been more selective than the declarations suggest. With this in mind there may be a distinction, between the recognition of human rights of Europeans and foreigners. It is to be analyzed if both are applied in the same way and if assistance and aid in regard of human rights are applied equally to migrants with different countries of origin.

3. The third theme can be condensed to: additional features of cosmopolitanism - to strive and be a cosmopolitan society additional features need to be applied within the European Union. As of now these features cannot be explicitly noted within the EU frameworks, however they might be suggested or implied within their policies. These include a form of equality of people outside of Europe to people in Europe which would overcome the “us vs. them” distinction than is often made in context of migration. Additionally, we can talk about a commitment to dialogue which Appiah (2006) suggests as an individual approach to be more kind and cosmopolitan to strangers. Thirdly, the shared collective future which Beck (2002) conceptualizes as one of the most important features for a cosmopolitan society has to be mentioned. With this approach the distinction from migrant and citizen can also be minimized and goals for a future approach of inclusion within the EU can be conceptualized. In the following it will be established if these features are found or hinted in the documents or even opposed.

The general content of the documents analyzed are a range of different documents issued by the European Union. All documents are directly connected to migration. It is important to note that the documents were issued in response to the migration crisis within the European Union. The European Agenda on Migration is a direct response on how migration should be handled to the migration crisis. It especially calls for immediate action and recognizes the needs of migrants. The agenda sets a guideline for the EU on how to proceed. The agenda is also guiding the additional documents because it is setting a form the basis for future migration in the European Union. This is of course most visible with the Progress Report on the European Agenda on Migration. The report summarizes which actions or ideas set out in the Agenda have been accomplished and which need further establishment. The State of the Union Address, while also addressing other topics of importance within the EU, is setting out visions and future goals on migrations. The President of the Commission is touching upon the progress made in the EU but does also introduce new approaches on handling migration in the European Union. The Commission's contribution to the EU Leaders' thematic debate on a way forward on the external and internal dimension of migration policy is discussing a more future based approach on migration. This means it is discussed how migration is envisioned in the future with implementing an asylum framework. But a debate on current approaches and goals is done as well. The websites dealing with irregular and legal migration are a more general and shorter description of the procedures and aims the EU implemented with the European Agenda on Migration.

Solidarity and Responsibility

Solidarity towards migrants is often mentioned in all of the documents and framed as a general principle of the European Union. Especially in the Introduction of the documents, the aim to act with solidarity is mentioned. This is especially the case when introducing the documents, as seen in the following quotes.

“To try to halt the human misery created by those who exploit migrants, we need to use the EU's global role and wide range of tools to address the root causes of migration.” (Appendix A, line 80-81).

“We need to restore confidence in our ability to bring together European and national efforts to address migration, to meet our international and ethical obligations and to work together in an effective way, in accordance with the principles of solidarity and shared responsibility.” (Appendix A, line 91-94).

“Even if it saddens me to see that solidarity is not yet equally shared across all our Member States, Europe as a whole has continued to show solidarity.” (Appendix A, line 1061-1062).

“This policy – currently under development – is built upon solidarity and responsibility.” (Appendix A, line 3018-3019).

The aim of solidarity, to help migrants, is introduced and it is said to guide the following obligations and aims on migration. In the first quote solidarity and responsibility are especially mentioned to be ethical obligations which would strongly connect to the cosmopolitan vision. However how solidarity is implemented is not always made clear. It is said that solidarity should last during the complete migration crisis, however the approaches on migration are not directly connected to solidarity. *“This welcome solidarity will need to be maintained for as long as the migratory pressure persists. The new Triton Operational Plan will be presented by the end of May.”* (Appendix A, line 117-119). The Triton Plan does not only include the welcoming measures but also measures on how to protect the borders of the EU.

Within migration guidelines the EU always makes the distinction between legal migration and irregular migration but within the documents it is not always clear what the distinction between both ‘forms’ of migration are. The main difference that is noted and often approached when talking about tackling irregular migration is the way or route migrants took to come to the European Union. When talking about irregular migration the principle of solidarity is shifted towards the European Union instead of the migrants. *“While the current schemes are coming to an end, the EU should continue to show solidarity with Italy and Greece.”* (Appendix A, line 2109-2110). Irregular migration is framed as a problem. Whereas before, solidarity was focused on helping migrants in need, when talking about irregular migration solidarity towards Greece and Italy is highlighted. The relocation of migrants is not considered as a humane act to help migrants in need but to help Italy and Greece to reduce their responsibilities. The duty to protect people in need is not only an obligation towards these people in need but a strong asylum system that the EU

introduces with this duty is especially important to the opinion of the EU citizens, which should be in favor of the EU. This concern about the public's opinion can especially be seen in the following. *“This has a direct impact on asylum seekers who seek to “asylum shop”, but also on EU public opinion: it encourages a sense that the current system is fundamentally unfair. But the EU has common rules which should already provide the basis for mutual confidence, and a further development of these rules will allow for a fresh start.”* (Appendix A, line 523-526). In connection to this concern, in all documents the contribution of the European Union is mentioned very frequently. Especially in the progress report on the European Agenda on Migration, when the current situation is addressed, the focus is on the EUs contributions in financial support and support teams.

“Over EUR 440 million has now been provided from the Emergency Support Instrument within the EU to support the work of 15 humanitarian partners. This instrument has been able to ensure that sufficient reception places are available on the mainland, modulating availability according to need up to a total of 40 000, as well as to contribute to the creation of capacity on the islands.” (Appendix A, line 1585-1597).

“The EU Regional Trust Fund in Response to the Syrian Crisis has so far allocated EUR 290 million to projects in Lebanon (EUR 152.3 million contracted) and EUR 141 million to projects in Jordan (EUR 96.5 million contracted).” (Appendix A, line 1707-1709). This emphasis on numbers and actions of the European Union can be interpreted to direct the public opinion on what has been done instead of what is lacking. The actions of the agenda on migration are not critically reviewed but mentioned. These mentions on contributions, especially because the financial support is not related to i.e. the budget of the EU, can help to frame the public opinion of the citizens more positively. However these programs are also connected to solidarity, i.e. they are mentioned to help people in need of international protection *“Resettlement allows the EU and its Member States to both fulfil the imperative to help those in need of international protection, and to reduce the incentives for irregular migration.”* (Appendix A, line 2120-2121).

Within the different documents the frame on solidarity is also different. Especially in the speech solidarity towards migration is mentioned as a fixed principle, which is to be considered the main guide on migration. *“Even if it saddens me to see that solidarity is not yet equally shared across all our Member States, Europe as a whole has continued to show solidarity. Last year alone, our Member States resettled or granted asylum to over 720,000 refugees – three times as much as the United States, Canada and Australia combined. Europe, contrary to what some say, is not a fortress and must never become one. Europe is and must remain the continent of solidarity where those fleeing persecution can find refuge.”* (Appendix A, line 1061-1065). However only a few lines later, solidarity towards migrants is more selective, i.e. only towards

people who have the right so stay. Yet how this distinction, on who has the right to stay and who does not, is made is not made clear.

In connection to responsibilities the European Union recognizes that multiple actors should contribute to a solution, however the approach is to introduce a common European migration policy. The EU is aware of a global responsibility in regard of migration. *“This is a joint responsibility of the international community [...]”* (Appendix A, line 178-179). And the EU supports approaches with third countries and organizations. Especially solidarity is mentioned not be exclusive to the European Union but shared with other countries. *“So far the Commission has been formally authorised to negotiate EU readmission agreements with Russia, Morocco, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Ukraine, the Chinese Special Administrative Regions of Hong Kong and Macao, Algeria, Turkey, Albania, China, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Republic of Moldova, Georgia, Cape Verde, Tunisia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus and Nigeria.”* (Appendix A, line 3002-3006) Agreements on the basis of migration have been made with a significant amount of other countries which would suggest that the EU initiates migration to be discussed in a global manner.

Recognition of human rights

The cosmopolitan ideal of the recognition of human rights is very noticeable in the documents on migration. The aim of assisting and helping people in need and the recognition of violations of human rights is guiding all documents. A general notions of this can also often be seen in the introduction of the documents in the following quotes.

“The immediate imperative is the duty to protect those in need.” (Appendix A, line 69)

“We must also urgently improve migrants' living conditions in Libya. I am appalled by the inhumane conditions in detention or reception centres.” (Appendix A, line 1057-1058)

“The actions taken meant more than 620 000 lives rescued in the Mediterranean Sea, more humanitarian support, stronger intervention to address the root causes of migration and better control of our external border.” (Appendix A line, 2311-2314)

In this context people who have lost their lives at sea are remembered. The European Union sets the aim to minimize these tragedies and save lives and to be a safe haven for people in need *“Europe cannot stand by whilst lives are being lost. Search and rescue efforts will be stepped up to restore the level of intervention provided under the former Italian 'Mare Nostrum' operation.”* (Appendix A, line 109-110). Yet these aims are often connected to securing the outside borders of the European Union, this is continuously mentioned as one of the main goals next to helping migrants *“The goal should be to encourage*

more secure borders, but also to strengthen the capacity of countries in North Africa to intervene and save lives of migrants in distress.” (Appendix A, line 513-514).

Irregular migration is portrayed as a threat to security for the European Union, but again the distinction between legal migration and irregular migration is not completely clear. Thus, the security issue of irregular migration for the EU is not clear. When looking on the emphasis of irregular migration referring to how people migrated to the EU, I would propose that the greater threat to security is on the lives of the people who risk their lives at sea to migrate. The EU is recognizing the incentives for irregular migration

“There are many different motivations behind irregular migration. But often, it ends in deep disappointment. The journey is often far more dangerous than expected, often at the mercy of criminal networks who put profit before human life. Those who fail the test of asylum face the prospect of return. Those who live a clandestine life inside Europe have a precarious existence and can easily fall prey to exploitation.” (Appendix A, line 302-306),

“Migrant smuggling is a dynamic global criminal activity. Poverty, social and political instability, as well as the limited availability of legal migration routes, push people towards criminal networks to facilitate their unauthorised entry into, transit through or stay in the EU.” (Appendix A, line 2926-2928).

One of these incentives is the limitation of legal ways to migrate to the EU, but solutions on this specific problem are not debated on strongly. A need for a common asylum policy and visa system is addressed but the implementation is not elaborate *“A clear and well implemented framework for legal pathways to entrance in the EU (both through an efficient asylum and visa system) will reduce push factors towards irregular stay and entry, contributing to enhance security of European borders as well as safety of migratory flows.”* (Appendix A, line 271-274).

The EU is contributing to the safety in the Mediterranean with stopping traffickers and smugglers, however the safety is not always directed towards the people in need but also towards the European Union. This means that safety in connection to the current situation is not only considered on humanitarian ideals i.e. protecting the people in need, but on domestic policies with the aim to secure safety in the EU. This can especially be noted in the progress report on the european agenda on migration where the last chapter is dedicated to securing the borders within the EU, with the aim to identify shortcomings in border controls *“A key area of the Agency's work is the development of vulnerability assessments to identify possible shortcomings in Member States' border controls.”* (Appendix A, line 2187-2188). Nevertheless further protection of human rights is an aim within all aspects of migration mentioned in the policy documents of the EU. Stronger protection of human rights is a priority for children and vulnerable groups in need, the procedures of return, for migrants in third countries and migrants on the greek islands.

A common asylum system in the European Union is suggested in order to face the challenges of migration, however decisions on the volume of admissions of third country nationals remains within the member states. Admissions are supported by programs such as Erasmus+ by the EU “*Decisions on the volume of admissions of third country nationals coming to seek work will remain the exclusive competence of Member States. But there is a specific role for the EU. Over the next seven years, European programmes such as Horizon 2020 and Erasmus+ will attract talented individuals to the EU.*” (Appendix A, line 626-629). The limits member states could set on admissions could especially infringe on the human rights of people in need when they are not admitted. Additionally the member states are able to decide on admissions based the country of origin of the migrant. This can lead to a disbalance of the application of human rights within the EU and within citizens of the EU and third country nationals.

Additional features of Cosmopolitanism

In general a discussion of the distinction between migrants and citizens is not visible in the documents of the the European Commission. However additional features are hinted at in the documents. There is a general concern of integrating migrants to the societies within the European Union to support Europe within the demographic decline “*While most Europeans have responded to the plight of the migrants, the reality is that across Europe, there are serious doubts about whether our migration policy is equal to the pressure of thousands of migrants, to the need to integrate migrants in our societies, or to the economic demands of a Europe in demographic decline.*” (Appendix A, line 76-78). This connects to an idea of a shared collective future of migrants and citizens in the European Union, however the focus, when migration is set as a solution for the demographic decline is not to help migrants but to solve an internal problem.

Additionally the concern of migrants being treated unequally is mentioned. These concerns very much reflect the additional features of cosmopolitanism such as a shared collective future and the equality of people outside of Europe “*Migration should be recognised as one of the primary areas where an active and engaged EU external policy is of direct importance to EU citizens. Civil war, persecution, poverty, and climate change all feed directly and immediately into migration, so the prevention and mitigation of these threats is of primary importance for the migration debate.*” (Appendix A, line 311-314). However the focus is still on EU citizens instead of the needs of migrants.

A suggestion for dialogue in regards to migration is mentioned “*The Commission will support Member States in promoting a permanent dialogue and peer evaluation at European level on issues such as labour market gaps, regularisation and integration – issues where decisions by one Member State have*

an impact on others.” (Appendix A, line 661-664), however the dialogue is only suggested internally within the European Union and does not include other organizations that, such as NGOs, that could help with migration in the EU. Additionally the migrants themselves are never part of the dialogue with regards to integration, migration or further needs within travelling to the EU or inside the EU. Nonetheless a dialogue or engagement from Europeans and migrants is highlighted *“I am particularly proud of the young Europeans volunteering to give language courses to Syrian refugees or the thousands more young people who are serving in our new European Solidarity Corp.”* (Appendix A, line 1066-1067).

The shared collective future of migrants and citizens is only notable with the distinction of legal and irregular migration *“The policy aims to establish a framework for legal migration, taking fully into account the importance of integration into host societies. The EU measures on legal immigration cover the conditions of entry and residence for certain categories of immigrants, such as highly qualified workers subject to the ‘EU Blue Card Directive’ and students and researchers. Family reunification and long-term residents are also provided for.”* (Appendix A, line 3025-3028). Irregular migrants are not considered in the shared future and the selection of legal migrants is limited by certain requirements.

Conclusion and Discussion

Cosmopolitan ideals can be found in the European Commission's visions on migration, as many can be connected to ideals the European Union has itself. The European Union does recognize the global responsibility of the migration crisis and is willing to support other countries and their member states in helping migrants. Nonetheless solidarity within the European Union is much more diverse than cosmopolitanism may suggest in connection to migration. Cosmopolitanism would assume solidarity to be connected to the people in need, migrants, and helping them. But the European Union does set a focus on solidarity within their member states and the aims of solidarity towards migrants and the EU can differ. Importantly the distinction between legal and irregular migration limits the solidarity towards migrants within the European Union.

The recognition of human rights is very much prominent in the documents of the European Commission and is set as a priority within the migration process. Human rights are considered during the process of application and return as well as of vulnerable groups. However the protection of human rights falls short with the distinction of irregular migration. Irregular migration is framed as a threat to security. The European Union wants to protect the outside borders from this ‘threat’, meaning human rights are not considered the priority in this scenario. But the European Union does help rescuing migrants taking illegal

routes to come to the European Union. Legal pathways to help prevent dangerous routes, and therefore protect the human rights of migrants are only limited.

The additional features of cosmopolitanism can partially be found in the documents of the Commission. The focus on integration of migrations is very small but it can be distinguished. Migrants are encouraged to be included into the member states which suggests a shared collective future and lowers the us vs. them distinction. However the commitment to dialogue is very limited and does not include migrants.

To answer the research question on “*How did the European Commission include cosmopolitanism in their visions of Europe on migration from 2015 onward?*” the three themes have to be considered. All themes can be partially found in the documents. The European Union includes cosmopolitan visions of Europe on migration limited to legal migration. Irregular migration to the European Union lacks of cosmopolitan visions. However for the European Union to host the term of a cosmopolitan society, even with regards to legal migration, cosmopolitan concepts can be implemented further and idealized.

This research focused on only limited theories of cosmopolitanism. Thus limitations of this research can be found with the limited theoretical frame. Additionally the analysis of more documents could have broadened the scope of this research. For future research I would suggest to broaden the frame of cosmopolitanism and to analyse policies which are already implemented within the member states in context of migration, to see if the visions that are set, are implemented into the european society.

References

- Amin, A. (2004). Multi-ethnicity and the Idea of Europe. *Theory, Culture and Society* 21 (2): 1-24.
- Amit, V., & Gardiner Barber, P. (2015). Mobility and cosmopolitanism: complicating the interaction between aspiration and practice. *Identities*, 22(5), 543-550.
- Appiah, A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Bannas, G. (2015, August 31). Merkel: „Wir schaffen das“. *Frankfurter Allgemeine*. Retrieved from: <http://www.faz.net/aktuell/politik/angela-merkels-sommerpressekonferenz-13778484.html>
- Beck, U. (2002) The Cosmopolitan Society and Its Enemies, *Theory, Culture & Society* 19 (1-2): 17-44.
- Consolidated Version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union art. [67(2)], 2008 O.J. C 115/47.
- Dunnai, M. (2015, June 17). Hungary to fence off border with Serbia to stop migrants. *Reuters*. Retrieved from: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-hungary-immigration/hungary-to-fence-off-border-with-serbia-to-stop-migrants-idUSKBN0OX17I20150617>
- Eriksen, E. O. (2014). Regional cosmopolitanism: the EU in search of its legitimation. *European Journal of Futures Research*, 2(1), 51.
- Ferry, J. (2011, November). Understanding the European Union in a cosmopolitan sense What is civic participation?. In *European workshop on closing the empowerment gap through citizenship education* (Vol. 1719).
- Holmes, S. M. and Castaneda, H. (2016), Representing the “European refugee crisis” in Germany and beyond: Deservingness and difference, life and death. *American Ethnologist*, 43: 12-24.
- Kant, I. (1903). *Perpetual peace: A philosophical essay, 1795*. London: S. Sonnenschein.
- Macron, E. (2017). Initiative for Europe. retrieved from: <http://international.blogs.ouest-france.fr/archive/2017/09/29/macron-sorbonne-verbatim-europe-18583.html>
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1997). Kant and stoic cosmopolitanism. *Journal of political philosophy*, 5(1), 1-25.
- Raffaelli, R. 2018. Fact Sheets on the European Union. Immigration Policy. *European Parliament*. Retrieved from: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/atyourservice/en/displayFtu.html?ftuId=FTU_4.2.3.html
- Rheindorf, M. & Wodak, R. (2017): Borders, Fences, and Limits — Protecting Austria From Refugees: Metadiscursive Negotiation of Meaning in the Current Refugee Crisis, *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*.
- Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis*. (pp. 1-33). London: Sage (2nd revised edition).

Documents which are included in the Appendix:

A European Agenda on Migration. (13.05.2015). European Commission. Retrieved from: https://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/sites/antitrafficking/files/communication_on_the_european_agenda_on_migration_en.pdf

President Jean-Claude Juncker's State of the Union Address 2017. (13.09.2017). European Commission. Retrieved from: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-17-3165_en.htm

Progress Report on the European Agenda on Migration (15.11.2017). European Commission. Retrieved from: https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-migration/20171114_progress_report_on_the_european_agenda_on_migration_en.pdf

Commission contribution to the EU Leaders' thematic debate on a way forward on the external and internal dimension of migration policy. (07.12.2017). Retrieved from: https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-migration/20171207_communication_on_commission_contribution_to_the_eu_leaders_thematic_debate_on_way_forward_on_external_and_internal_dimension_migration_policy_en.pdf

Irregular Migration and Return (23.03.2018). European Commission Migration and Home Affairs. Retrieved on 23.03.2018 from: https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/irregular-migration-return-policy_en

Legal Migration and Integration (21.03.2018). European Commission Migration and Home Affairs. Retrieved on 23.03.2018 from: <https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/legal-migration>