European Union and the Geopolitics of Migration

Roderick Parkes

Executive summary

For twenty years now, Europeans have been encouraged to view migration as the epitome of globalisation, the triumph of global economic drive over territorial order. So it's significant that migration is now becoming an object of geopolitical competition. Across the world, countries are not only trying to reassert control of their borders but to use people flows and differences of population size for geostrategic gain. Is this a sign that geography now trumps economics? It suggests rather that US-led globalisation, as an organising principle of world politics, is losing its hold. This has triggered competition to promote alternative units and modes of power. Migration, as a culturally and ideologically-loaded form of cross-border interaction, has become a particularly strong vector in this reshuffle. This paper charts the challenges facing the EU in the field of migration, and suggests how Brussels might promote its own form of order.

About the author

Roderick Parkes is a research fellow at the Swedish Institute of International Affairs (UI) where he is working on immigration policy. He is also a senior fellow (non-resident) of the German Institute of International and Security Affairs (SWP) and the Polish Institute of International Affairs (PISM). In 2014, he co-authored the European Global Strategy.

Keywords

Table of Contents

Introduction: whatever happened to the EU's migration strategy?

In June 2014, EU leaders updated their strategy on immigration and mobility (European Council 2014).[1] They focused, as they have done every five years since 1999, on: passport-free travel inside the Schengen Area; on 'free movement' (the right of EU citizens to work in another member state); as well as on labour immigration from outside the bloc and on asylum. But unlike previous documents, this new strategy still has no name. With European voters suspicious of the very mention of European integration and immigration, and with hostile countries like Russia apparently ready to exploit these political difficulties, EU leaders preferred to quietly bury their new programme. In that light, one of the names proposed for it might just prove prescient. The initial suggestion to call this strategy the 'Ypres Guidelines' was inspired by EU leaders' decision to spend part of the summit in a small Flemish town commemorating the beginning of the First World War (de Bruycker 2014). If the suggestion was prescient it's because, a century after that first industrial-age clash, Europe is once again going into battle, and once again without a proper strategy.

Why the June guidelines count as the EU's final word on immigration

The EU's labour migration and asylum regime has positively mushroomed over the past 25 years. 1992: the EU reboots the common European labour market; 1995: it launches a passport-free travel area (the now 26-strong Schengen area); 1998-9: it makes ambitious prescriptions for a European Area of Freedom, Security and Justice comprising a joint immigration, border and asylum policy; 2004-5: it adopts a Global Approach to Migration, setting these efforts in an international context; 2009: it continues this effort at internationalisation, and prescribes ways to exploit the beneficial development policy effects of migration. Despite the constant refrain from critics about the EU creating a "fortress Europe", therefore, leaders have shown a fair amount of political bravery and liberalisation here. Their progress can be charted in a series of five-year strategies – the Tampere (1999), Hague (2004) and Stockholm (2009) programmes. Each of these has been adopted at the highest political level, by the European Council. Each has been proudly named after the city in which it was adopted.

This pattern is broken only by the most recent strategy. The six pages of conclusions from the June 2014 European Council summit are still referred to as the 'post-Stockholm programme' (i.e., 'the programme after the last one'). The retention of 2009's Stockholm moniker was not a bid for political ownership by the Swedes. If this new programme is still using the name of its predecessor it's because nobody will take ownership for it – this is a political orphan. The Greek government, having taken on the role of guiding the debate, struggled grimly with its own domestic limitations and the lack of interest shown by the outgoing President of the European Council, Herman Van Rompuy, not to mention the uncertainties surrounding the change of guard in the European Parliament and the European Commission in May 2014 nor the complete lack of appetite for discussion in northern European countries where immigration questions were a source of political tension.[2] It seems that the only consensus

was that there was no consensus, and so nothing contentious was put on the table (Collett 2014).[3]

Of course, EU officials have their own justification for the strategy's namelessness. They point to recent efficiency-reforms that mean almost all EU summits will now be held in Brussels. In other words, the usual practice of naming the legislative programmes after the town of their adoption has become obsolete: this, and any future migration strategy, would now have to be known as a 'Brussels Strategy' – a cause of confusion (Pascouau 2014). Critics would probably counter that the poor quality of the 2014 strategy merits the Brussels moniker even more – it would be a testament to the decline in standards that occurs when processes are 'brusselised'. Yet, there is another, more straightforward grounds for sticking with the old naming tradition: this is likely to be the first and the last 'Brussels Programme'. Policy activists surmise that this is the last time leaders will attempt to deal openly and proactively with migration - this programme contains EU leaders' 'final word' on migration.

How the EU went from global trend-setter to political football

All this is a far cry from the 1990s and the EU's first immigration and home affairs programme. Old hands reminisce about the process of adopting the Tampere Programme of 1999, a time when far-sighted EU officials and an ambitious Finnish prime minister joined forces to bounce the British Prime Minister Tony Blair and German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder into a genuinely pro-European and progressive agenda on migration. The Tampere summit, which had been preceded by the usual downbeat noises from Berlin and London about how the EU should focus on measures for restricting illegal immigration (Bunyan 2003), ended up prescribing ambitious common minimum rules on asylum, as well as first steps in the highly sensitive field of immigrant integration, and a more solidary approach to managing the EU's external border. For today's EU negotiators, that 1999 Programme has something of the quality of the recent Rosetta Mars mission - launched in earlier and more self-assured times, it is an awkward relic of past ambition.

A simple illustration of the EU's political decline: fifteen years ago at Tampere, EU leaders bound themselves to a rather ambitious goal. They pledged to treat immigrants from outside the EU as they would the EU citizens working in their country. Or to put it another way: they would, as far as possible, extend to 'third-country-nationals' the generous economic and political rights enjoyed by their own migrant nationals under EU law. Up until that point, EU leaders had focused their efforts on trying to exempt intra-EU workers from the general stigma attached to the term 'migrant' in Europe. Citizens of one EU member state working in another were referred to first as "free movers" and then as "European citizens"[4]. At Tampere, EU leaders were thus going a significant step further – they were trying to apply this liberal terminology to immigrants who had entered the EU and to exempt them too from stigma. Today, 15 years later, the reverse is the norm: mobile EU citizens are now treated like workers from outside the bloc, and face hostility and protectionism (Ghimis et al. 2014).

Thus the terminology used for the far less advanced global migration regime is now being adopted within the EU itself, and the European Union, which once ranked as something of a global trend-setter in migration policy[5], is now reactive to rougher powers. This raises serious concerns not least about whether Europe's democracy can operate under such circumstances. In the 1990s, Europeans rose to the challenge of maintaining democratic control over their increasingly globalised economy (Milward 1992). The Tampere Programme illustrates well the chosen methodology: they used the EU to amplify the international impact of their norms; they encouraged non-EU members to cooperate with the EU and search out mutual gains; and they advocated creating further international institutions which reflected their own liberal methods. Today, however, Europeans find themselves increasingly reactive to international changes, and they feel straightjacketed by their own past rules and procedures.

What questions should the EU ask about migration today?

So how should leaders actually have approached the issue at their summit in June? With serious refugee crises to the EU's South and East, the EU clearly needs to go beyond the programme's slightly apologetic recipe for shoring up the status quo[6], let alone the prescriptions made by experts when they called for - well what exactly? – a general need to mobilise and educate European voters on the need for tolerance towards foreigners?[7] But the EU cannot think strategically without answering a basic question: what exactly is the situation facing the bloc – how can it be described let alone managed? 'Unprecedented' is the word most often used today: brutal and turbulent, the geostrategic situation engulfing the EU-28 is beyond anything discussed during the Tampere, Hague or Stockholm summits, and has unleashed refugee and migration crises of a scale Europe had more or less forgotten. Still, that historical progression over the past fifteen years gives initial clues:

→Back in 1999 at Tampere, EU leaders focused on problems such as the integration of immigrants into the European way of life. 1999, remember, was still a time of optimism, and the EU was facing up to its role as a pole of economic and political attraction.

→ In 2004 at The Hague, the focus had shifted to internal security issues, as the EU noted that migration might pose a challenge to stability and that terrorism had taken on a new international dimension. Western countries were suddenly feeling vulnerable, albeit from non-state actors.

→ By 2009, the foreign and development policy aspects of migration were to the fore. EU leaders now acknowledged that they needed to cooperate with third countries if they wished to deal with irregular migration or compete for high-skilled labour without causing international tensions.

→ Today, in 2015, migration ranks as a source of serious inter-state tensions, less a facet of cooperation or foreign policy than of power projection and competition. As such, the world appears to be undergoing a return to a pre-1989 order (as described in Mitchell 1992), with globalisation being rolled back and replaced by geopolitics.

In its bid to conceptualise these migration problems, this paper unfolds in four main sections. The *first* is a horizon-scanning exercise. In it, I ask whether there are patterns underlying the present migration crisis or if this is sheer anarchy – a situation whereby the EU and others have so eroded national borders that migrants are simply running amok, a kind of *over*-globalisation. I argue that this is not anarchy, that there are clear sets of powers, interests and agendas at play. In the *second* section, I ask whether a process of '*de*-globalisation' is instead at work here – whether a country or group of countries which has lost out under globalisation is forcing a roll-back. I argue that this is indeed de-globalisation, and that the EU itself is instrumental in it: the EU-28 are struggling to maintain representative democracy in the face of comparatively high levels of immigration. *Third*, I ask whether 'globalisation' post-1989 was somehow inevitable in the way it ordered human mobility or whether the EU in fact complied with a vision of the world that did not quite suit it. I find in favour of the latter: with its emphasis on global trade and national representative democracy, 'globalisation' prevented the EU from tailoring its usual recipe of regionalism and constitutional innovation to migration. *Fourth*, I ask whether the EU today has a viable alternative approach of its own for ordering time and space that might play to its strengths in this field.

A warning: I began this essay in a genuine spirit of enquiry and without a fixed point to make. As a result, each section was written individually and sequentially, on the basis of a (presumably) logical proposition, the answer to each leading onto the next. On the plus-side, that means this essay may encourage you to look at migration questions in a different way, as it did me. On the down-side: I'm afraid there's no skipping the various sections: turn this page and you're in it for the duration. I hope it repays the investment.

Question 1. Is the EU's migration crisis a result of overzealous globalisation?

The idea of a 'geopolitics of migration' will sound strange to many people in the EU. For 25 years, Europeans have been encouraged to view migration as a fact of globalisation, involving individuals who are pursuing economic ends that stretch beyond the Westphalian territorial settlement. Migration was seen to mark the triumph of economic interdependence over territorial order. If anything, therefore, Europeans are likely to look upon today's large flows of migrants and refugees as a simple continuation of this process – the result of a misguided effort at de-bordering epitomised by initiatives like the EU's Schengen Area, and a sign of international anarchy caused by the wilful weakening of states by the EU and the West (Clark 2014). To be convinced that this is not anarchy but a geopolitics of migration, you would probably need to see evidence of broader patterns of organisation and interest at work. That is the task this chapter sets itself. Drawing on current trends, it distils twenty future scenarios to show geopolitical competition.

A horizon-scanning exercise to reveal the patterns of 'migration geopolitics'

The following horizon-scanning exercise should serve to highlight the connection between the migration crisis and geopolitical manoeuvring across the four layers of the EU's migration regime. These layers are: first, the EU's internal regime for free movement and passport-free travel; second, policies pertaining to the EU's common outer border, including immigration and asylum; third, the EU's migration-related cooperation with its neighbours and with accession-hopefuls; and, fourth, the EU's role in the global regulation of migration. The patterns underlying the political scenarios described below can be clearly summarised. When it comes to free movement, European states – particularly the UK and France - are using migration to alter the EU's political geography; in the EU's border politics, member states – particularly Germany and the southern EU members - are using their geography to achieve zero-sum political gains; in the neighbourhood, migration is being used in an increasingly violent civilizational competition; and at the global level, migration is being used in a bipolar game of one-upmanship.

It is also worth setting out now what these scenarios *do not* show: this is not about international anarchy unleashed by economic interdependence. Thus it is not about "Europe under siege" - the idea that the EU is separated from a large, unemployed African population only by the bulwark of the Mediterranean, or that it is exposed to a shrinking but motivated migrant population in the East by a kind of barren *Zwischenzone* to Russia (as described in Behnke 2012: 112), a space that needs to be filled by buffer states (as in Collinson 1996). Nor is it about the unmediated effect of the EU's own economic difficulties on its neighbours and their workers, with Europe's declining level of demand leading to high levels of unemployment in North Africa (on this: Ahmed 2012). Nor is it about the EU as some kind of neoliberal beast plundering its neighbours' human resources (as in Hansen and Jonsson 2011). And nor is it about pure 'political demography', a world in which migration determines politics - where rapid population changes cause social unrest or where a change in a state's population levels somehow define its relative power.

In short, this is not about migrants running amok. Rather, the below scenarios (which are by no means mutually exclusive) illustrate how various governments and political bodies are using migration to effect changes to the international order:

Free movement: leveraging migration to change Europe's political geography

→ *The UK and Switzerland form an alliance of 'localists':* both the UK and non-EU member Switzerland are seeking to reform and loosen the EU's free movement rules on democratic grounds. Local communities never agreed to be exposed to European migration in this way, London and Bern say, and they feel overwhelmed. In July 2014, EU member states turned down Switzerland's bid to renegotiate its bilateral free movement agreement in the wake of a negative referendum there. Bern reacted with talk of holding a more fundamental referendum in 2016/2017 on the Swiss relationship to the EU (Open Europe 2014). The UK

sided with other member governments against Switzerland in July 2014, although the free movement question is increasingly central to its own attempts to renegotiate its relations to the EU (ahead of a possible in/out membership referendum in 2017). Such actions feed into a broader critique that the UK prefers to leverage the EU's political gridlock on these matters, rather than dealing with the problem cooperatively (Oltermann 2015).

→ *Hungary and the UK leverage the EU's 'trapped populations':* when London made the case for restricting free movement in January 2014, it was heavily criticised by the EU's main sending countries in Central and Eastern Europe. Yet, the two sides actually have similar concerns about free movement, albeit from different angles - significant population loss for one, population gain for the other (Weinar 2014). There have indeed been signs of an alliance between governments of East and West, and between London and Budapest in particular. This alliance would oppose free movement on the grounds that the current regime does not, as advertised, entail short-term mobility back and forth across the EU but leads to permanent mass migration. As such, this coalition would seek to restrict free movement over the heads of the mobile citizens who actually use it. The alliance would thus speak to a new transnational constituency - the so-called 'trapped population'[8] – and take a very partial and zero-sum approach to the question of migration.

→ *Denmark and the UK form a pro-welfare bloc:* in its bid to reform free movement, London has also been reaching out to its free-trade allies in the EU's North. Like the UK, the Nordics have a pronounced 'universalistic' element to their welfare systems. This gives anyone in these countries- on occasion, also illegally - relatively easy access to social benefits, especially when compared to systems that rely more heavily on insurance contributions. The problems could likely be solved through a mix of domestic reform and EU-wide cooperation (APPG 2013; Collier 2014). But again, this new alliance would not grasp that opportunity: welfare reform goes to the heart of national identity. And in order to prevent the French conditioning any reversal in the free movement of labour with a concomitant roll-back in trade and services, it will seek to decouple these elements[9]: rejecting the idea that the 'four freedoms' (goods, services, capital, labour) are a package, it will claim that the EU in fact faces a fundamental choice between free trade and the free movement of labour.[10]

→ *France and the UK marry protectionism and libertarianism:* in a number of member states, libertarian and protectionist agendas are finding common ground in their opposition to free movement. For example the UK Independence Party, Britain's principal Eurosceptic party, brings together both strands (Snell 2013). UKIP opposes EU free movement on the grounds that it requires the UK to discriminate against migrants from the Commonwealth – a libertarian, globalist message espousing open borders to the rest of the world.[11] But the party is also successfully appealing to voters who want to 'close the UK's borders', against both European migrants and those from the rest of the world. UK officials speculate that there may be common ground between Britain and France, subject to a change of government in Paris. Each would marshal a coalition pursuing restrictive ends but for different reasons – one, the UK, on the basis of the need for openness to global skilled migration, the other, France, due to a dislike of the Polish plumber.[12]

→ *France pushes for a two-tier regime:* the eurozone labour market must be deepened if it is to offset so-called asymmetric economic shocks: the EMU lacks many of the tools necessary to redistribute resources and offset a crisis in one of the members, making it particularly important that workers in hard hit countries be allowed to move to healthier economies. With non-Eurozone members (the UK, Central and Eastern Europe, the Nordics) either ready to roll back free movement, or locked in a battle with the UK about its reform, France may push for the Eurozone alone to deepen the free movement rules. The creation of a European migration fund (for hard-hit local communities in sending and receiving countries) is one idea, the harmonisation of employment laws and social policies another. France, always keen to create a core of EU states if this is what it takes to maintain its social system, may thus leverage the gridlock between non-euro members over east-west migration in the EU to push for eurozone-only cooperation on north-south migration flows (for a historical perspective Ingham 2003).

The EU's border: member states leverage geography for political gain

→ *The EU's asylum regime splits in two:* the fault-line in EU asylum policy is between a German North and an Italian South. Northern states like Germany are effectively sheltered from the worst of the EU's refugee and immigration problems by the south. Yet, the division has less to do with proximity to refugee trouble spots than with regulatory traditions.[13] Just like in the Eurozone, this has been distilled into a question of principle - of solidarity and mutual responsibility. Southerners stand accused of squandering northerners' financial and operational resources with their lax policies, northerners of demanding that southerners implement northern-style policies without sufficient respect for local circumstances (Angenendt and Parkes 2010). Only in this context is geography playing a role: now, southerners complain that they were always conceived as 'buffer states' by northern member states, and that they have the right to turn their geography to their benefit. Northerners use their lack of exposure to the MENA region to resist.

→ *The EU's border regime splits three ways:* in borders policy a tricky eastern dimension creates a three-way split. There too the problem seems at first sight to be simple differences of geography: the EU contains three types of border, each concentrated in a different part of the Union. Western Europe houses the EU's major air and seaports; Eastern Europe, the principal land borders; Southern Europe, the major sea border. Each is exposed to a different set of problems (in the East, for instance, "strong border controls" are those that permit large volumes of legal traffic – not so in the South), and the EU's border coordination agency, Frontex, has duly begun differentiating (Frontex 2010). Once again, however, it is primarily issue of regulatory culture. The uncertainty about the dimensions of the refugee crisis in Ukraine makes it hard for states like Poland to side definitively with southern demands for solidarity or northern demands for a strong set of common practices. Northerners and Southerners are leveraging the East's geography to push it in their direction.

→ *Italy threatens to 'suspend itself' from Schengen:* Italy argues that its geography leaves it heavily exposed to Central Mediterranean migration flows (Lampedusa lies south west of

Malta, close to Tunisia) meaning it effectively guards access to Europe's labour markets and passport-free travel area. When pushing for solidarity from other members, Italy has been ready to resort to brinksmanship, like in the wake of the Arab Spring when it allowed refugees and migrants to move north or more recently with its threats to draw down its own search and rescue exercises in the Med if no help was forthcoming (Traynor and Hooper 2011). Under new EU rules, it is possible to suspend members from Schengen for poor border control. Rome, with its reputation for theatrical politics, might just threaten to 'suspend itself' from Schengen, shifting the external border of Schengen northwards and passing migration flows on to its northern neighbours. The threat of a Sangatte-style stand-off[14] at the border to Italy would concentrate minds in Munich, Berlin and Vienna.

→ **_France and Malta game the system:_** classified neither as a northern nor a southern member state when it comes to migration, France struggles to impact European immigration policy. The usual link between population size and clout in EU decision-making rules does not apply to this policy field.[15] But if southern states like Italy have been able to use their own physical geography to leverage new settlements, then France has used others'. A member state's 'refugee burden', for example, is usually calculated relative to its _per capita_ population, meaning that countries like Malta are deemed worst hit and enjoy disproportionate political weight. Back in 2008, when France pushed for a new 'European pact on immigration and asylum', Malta hinted at blocking it on grounds that its interests were not met.[16] From this stand-off emerged an alliance between France, one of the EU's Big-3, and the bloc's smallest member state. This apparently lop-sided alliance again represents an attempt to use geography for political gain, an attempt to reassert Euromed thinking.

→ **_Germany goes it alone:_** Germany was always hesitant about an EU regime for legal immigration.[17] Berlin acknowledges that the EU could act as a platform for attracting foreign labour, and it recognises the need to offer legal pathways to the EU as part of the effort to combat irregular immigration. Still, it has never seen legal and illegal immigration as two parts of a complete immigration policy: whilst borders policy pertains to the constitutionalisation of Europe, labour migration pertains to social policy, is a national matter. Thus it sees no contradiction in having deep cooperation on irregular immigration, and almost none on labour migration. Moreover, Germany can now use its size and weight to go it alone: as the OECD's second most popular migration destination, and one that has managed to source most of its labour needs from within the EU itself (Hurriyet Daily News 2014), Germany does not need a common European policy. If it goes it alone, geography would again be leveraged in pursuit of regulatory principle.

The EU's region: rival powers use migration for civilizational competition

→ **_The Western Balkan reform-model collapses:_** the EU has long been accused of 'mortgaging'[18] its internal market, labour market and Schengen area to gain political leverage in its surrounding region: it has given enlargement-candidates such as Serbia early access to the Schengen area in return for domestic reforms. Importantly, Brussels does so with the promise that the Balkan states will one day be able to co-define the free movement regime –

otherwise such reforms would be leveraged undemocratically and by dint of the EU's greater power. Yet, EU enlargement is now more or less formally frozen for the next five years (EUbusiness 2014). Moreover, the EU might actually suspend the travel agreements with the Western Balkans in the wake of the Syria crisis.[19] If this happens, the reform model will unravel. Forced to praise Serbia's two-vector model of international relations, balancing East and West, following the debacle of the trade agreement with Ukraine, the EU would have to watch as other Balkan states look East.

→ **Turkey hints at unleashing a wave of refugees on the EU**: 'weapons of mass migration' is the term for the phenomenon (Greenhill 2010): Western countries have spent the past 25 years trying to co-opt smaller, poorer or culturally-distant neighbours into migration control. Sending and transit countries positioned along this kind of arbitrary fault-line (Borg 2014) can thus threaten to unleash a wave of migrants in order to gain political leverage. Gadhafi's Libya was known to do this, using the threat of migration to even the field in a series of bilateral deals from Rome (Paoletti 2011). More recently, Turkey has been accused of turning a blind eye as people-smugglers organise routes to Europe and of pushing refugees towards the EU. Angry at the EU's failure to lift visa restrictions for Turkish nationals, and at the pressure to facilitate the expulsion of non-Europeans from the EU; disappointed at the failure of its own Muslim visa-free regime (Devrim and Solar 2010), and bound by international law to recognise only European refugees (Frelick 2002), Ankara may try to leverage the more than 1 million Syrians on its territory.

→ **Russia and the MENA states create new ideologies of migration:** once upon a time, the EU aspired to create a single zone of mobility stretching throughout the neighbourhood and Russia. This program was being (slowly) rolled out via a series of quid-pro-quos like those used in the Western Balkans - EU liberalisation in return for regulatory change. Russia, however, disliked the idea of acting as a 'policy-taker', adopting on EU norms just so that its nationals could leave the country, and MENA states were increasingly frustrated by what they saw as European hypocrisy about the universalism of EU values and norms. Now countries across the region are trying to use mobility to create new forms of order (autocracy or theocracy). Existing border settlements – the Sykes-Picot agreement in the Middle East and the recognition of Ukraine's borders in the East – are being challenged on the grounds that they are the result of Western manipulation (Gordon 2014). And migrants are becoming less vectors of Western liberalism than of conservatism and revanchism.[20]

→ **Europe faces a new form of 'mixed migration':** 'mixed migration' is not a new problem for the EU. The term applies to migration flows that confound the EU's distinction between forced (political asylum, protection) and voluntary (economically-motivated) migration (UNHCR 2007) – economic migrants try to gain access to the EU by pointing to human rights problems at home for instance, or refugees use irregular modes of accessing the EU associated with economic migrants. But now a new kind of mixed migration flow is predicted, comprising terrorists and radicals. EU officials worry about individuals who are implacably opposed to the EU gaining entry, hidden amongst the economic migrants and refugees. The US had similar fears about immigration from Europe following the attacks in 2001, of course.

But the focus has now shifted from the transatlantic to the neighbourhood. Moreover, mixed migration flows will likely include EU citizens smuggling themselves home after fighting in the Southern Mediterranean or Eastern Ukraine (Holden 2015).

→ *The EU develops a 'sense of place':* The EU recently begun a monitoring-exercise for the seas around it, seeking to identify boats carrying irregular migrants. This is the Eurosur project, which combines satellite-data and ship-to-shore tracking with algorithms that predict a boat's trajectory. Eurosur is a technical project, and yet it comes at a very political juncture: growing anger amongst EU citizens about the EU's shifting borders; hostility towards Europe's key long-standing geographical alliance (the North Atlantic Treaty); efforts to encourage a new sense of geographic attachment amongst Europeans.[21] EU leaders talk about trying to create a shared "sense of place" amongst EU citizens (Parkes 2013), and Eurosur does indeed assert this kind of political geography. Through technocratic superiority, the mapping-exercise will give EU citizens a sense of territorial ownership in the neighbourhood as well as changing their relationship to those people crossing into the EU (people crossing legally will become consumers of the EU's mapping information, those illegally, mere objects).[22]

The global level: 'the West' is marginalised by 'the Rest'

→ *The remilitarisation of borders:* The demilitarisation of border control has been a key characteristic of the EU's model of conflict resolution and political transformation, both at home and abroad. The global trend towards demilitarisation is also an expression of the broader roll out of liberal democracy, because it relates to the state's monopoly of violence and its readiness to renounce its use in favour of political processes (Giddens 1987; Dandeker 1990). The spread of border demilitarization in Europe and abroad has not, of course, been unidirectional since 1989 and there have been setbacks.[23] Nevertheless, it has progressed sufficiently to permit international trade and (to a lesser extent) migration to occur relatively unimpeded, with global trading routes more or less free from military threat. Until now that is: from Eastern Ukraine to the South China Sea, borders are being remilitarised. This is occurring in a softer form within the EU, with the re-emergence of internal border disputes (Natural Gas Europe 2014; Christou 2010), and the increased presence of the military in EU border-control tasks (Duevell 2012).

→ *The international refugee regime fractures:* The global refugee regime is based on an ideological assumption: all countries are moving towards liberal democracy, but some are moving more quickly than others; it is thus incumbent upon democratic states like those in the EU to offer temporary protection to anyone who suffers in the process. As the spread of liberal democracy slows, however, and political multipolarity deepens, this basic assumption is challenged. The refugee regime could become a playground for ideological battles and regional variation. Indeed, such battles are in UNHCR's political DNA: it grew up in the context of geopolitical competition between East and West, and was pushed towards a more enlightened path only by the actions of non-aligned countries in Africa and Latin America (these extended the temporal and geographical limits imposed on the refugee regime by the

West and decreed that offering asylum should not be perceived as a hostile act). As 'history returns' to world politics a roll-back to that earlier era is altogether thinkable.[24]

→***The messy global noodle bowl.*** Of course, this general trend towards the regionalisation of migration flows might seem to be in the EU's interest: not only would it take some of the pressure off the EU's external borders, a new regional layer of cooperation might lead to a strengthening of global governance. This, indeed, was one of the rationales behind EU integration: the EU's template for regional integration and its cooperation with other world regions would encourage others to copy it. Just like EU-style regional trade regimes were supposed to boost the World Trade Organisation (Aggarwal and Fogarty 2004), so EU-style free movement regimes should lead to the creation of a World Migration Organisation.[25]. Yet the EU's free movement regime may instead spark copy-cat competition amongst other regions and powers, all trying to promote regional free movement for exclusive advantage (for analysis of the regional factors Hansen and Koehler 2010). Just as in trade affairs, where analysts now talk about a messy global 'noodle bowl' of regional agreements (Economist 2009), the EU risks triggering fragmentation in the global migration regime.

→ ***Weaponising migration:*** The West liberalised trade in part due to its positive relationship to liberal democracy: as their contribution to the economy grew, middle classes would demand greater say over domestic politics, spreading democracy; this would in turn diminish the incidence of war, as formerly autocratic governments now had to take greater care of their population's wishes. Migration was presented as a complementary part of this trend: the global middle-class would come into contact with liberal western norms and then promote them at home. And yet, the emergence of the global middle-class has become associated with political instability (Lamy 2013), and migration cuts to the heart of those tensions. The emigration of the newly-affluent middle class, for instance, robs a country of precisely those people who would usually push for democratic reform.[26] Yet, in one aspect at least the theory seems to be proving correct: states seem increasingly reluctant to resort to force. The trouble lies instead in the tendency to 'weaponise' trade and migration.[27]

→ ***Bipolar global tension:*** The global migration regime long reflected a Western perception of migration, focusing on incoming flows and typically viewing migrants as poor and helpless. This frustrated countries-of-origin who worried about losing their elites to low-skilled jobs abroad (Docquier and Marfouk 2006). Today, however, the real differences between developed and developing countries are diminishing: not only are the global North and West no longer the poles they once were, global flows are giving way to regional and inter-regional[28] dynamics. Countries which think of themselves as countries of immigration, are thus more obviously becoming countries of emigration, and their workers are heading to countries that they once considered poor and backward. And yet, the polarisation of the debate is actually worsening: and, as in other fields of world affairs, international institutions are part of the problem. These are felt to privilege Western – principally European – incumbents. Thus 'the West' vs. 'the Rest' (Huntington 1993) is really an unnecessary battle of incumbents vs. challengers.

Question 2. Is the EU's migration crisis an example of de-globalisation?

If the EU's migration crisis isn't an example of anarchy occasioned by globalisation, therefore, there's a second possibility: this is an example of *de-*globalisation, a sign of the general re-emergence of national barriers and state prerogatives. World history has after all been written as a series of economic tides, with globalisation driven forward by a lowering of communication and transport costs and driven back again by hostility to the uneven social and economic effects unleashed.[29] The recent de-globalisation of trade and capital flows is well documented (for a memorable assessment: Mason 2014). Migration, as just another form of factor mobility in the world economy (indeed, a rather niche one with only 3% of the world's population actually living outside its country of birth[30]) may seem less problematic than goods and capital given that it does not create acute bonds of supply-and-demand between states. Yet, global migration as a form of factor mobility has proved particularly hard for classic nation-states like the EU-28 to regulate, and it begs the question whether this gives the EU an incentive to de-globalise it.

How 'migration geopolitics' echoes trade de-globalisation

Many current geopolitical tensions can be put down to the way that trade and capital flows are being forcibly de-globalised. The victors of 1989 –the North Americans, West Europeans, Japanese - find themselves dependent on rougher states who feel that they have either lost out in the process of globalisation (Russia) or have benefited and wish a greater say over the rules (China). These states are prepared to leverage the West's need for capital, resources and markets in return for gains of status, either by embracing the role of *puissance pauvre* and taking a financial hit (Russia) or by exploiting the West's need to expand the cake (China).[31] And yet this particular dynamic clearly doesn't pertain to migration. The West is not exactly dependent on other states for labour – indeed states like Japan have reduced any dependence by trying to raise native birth rates, better training the domestic workforce, improving the labour market integration native workers and automating labour – not to mention helping businesses outsource low-skilled work that might be covered by immigrants (Kashiwazaki and Akaha 2006).

And yet, the effects of economic de-globalisation are clearly making themselves felt in a number of the EU's more progressive migration policies. The principle of encouraging migrants to adopt multiple identities is one example. This approach was pursued by the EU as part of an effort to blur the identity politics that got in the way of economic gain. Workers from other parts of the EU were described as 'European citizens', and workers from outside the EU as citizens both of Europe and their home country. EU governments which had tried to stamp out the notion of dual citizenship as late as the 1980s as a threat to state-based order, suddenly tried to turn it into the international norm: as economic interdependence grew and the threat of conflict receded, national loyalties seemed less relevant.[32] As the threat of conflict now returns to international affairs, however, the EU's post-nationalism is seen as a source of instability within the international order (although, for a more optimistic

assessment: Duevell 2014). EU members themselves are now unwilling to 'share' their population, and instead pursue an aggressive national citizenship and diaspora policy.

The current debate about EU refugee policy is another example, albeit illustrating a slightly different dynamic –the EU aggressively defending its post-national policies if this brings it some kind of geopolitical gain. The European refugee regime rests on a set of Republican principles that trump the self-interest of the domestic majority (Lavenex and Wagner 2007). This post-national straightjacket was sustained after 1989, even in the face of so-called welfare nationalism (Karolewski and Suszycki 2013), by an understanding that the EU's economic advantages came with certain duties attached. But as those economic advantages diminish, EU foreign policy strategists defend the bloc's attempts at liberal refugee policy with a different, harder logic. Throughout 2014, there were discussions about whether to introduce travel sanctions against Russian officials to match the trade sanctions. But some strategists argued for the reverse – for asylum liberalisation: the EU should create channels for Russian officials to reach the West and claim political asylum. It was a return to the Cold War logic of using asylum to score ideological points against rivals.[33]

So is it Russia or China or some other illiberal world power that is driving the process of de-globalisation in this field, gambling away the long years of cooperation? No: it's the Europeans themselves. The European Union, apparently exhausted by the demands of migration globalisation would be quite happy to pull up the drawbridge and go into quiet retirement. And, whilst other countries – Russia, Turkey – certainly seem ready to exploit this weakness and to compete with Europe over the conceptualisation and control of migration, it is the EU-28's own fragility which is at the heart of this competition. The EU has opened itself up to large-scale migration flows and now finds itself unable to maintain representative democracy. The EU-28's attempt to embrace global migration flows without properly liberalising their citizenship laws or modernising welfare rules has invited nationalism and essentialism (the idea that boundaries between nations and cultures are immutable) into European societies, and encouraged zero-sum international politics.

How migration was related to the globalisation of trade

Until recently, globalisation was felt to have imposed a happy political economy on the West thanks largely to the beneficial effects of trade liberalisation: global trade was seen to promote economic growth even between unequal economies, and to expand the world's middle class and reduce instances of armed conflict. Above all, trade was seen as conducive to the spread of representative democracy and international cooperation (Ikenberry 1999). As such, it simply fell to the EU to adapt itself to a friendly order. The heavily armed European 'garrison states' of the Cold War were thus encouraged to become (more vulnerable) 'trading states' and 'virtual states': they should restructure so as to embrace the international flow of services, capital and goods (Rosecrance 1999). Europe duly embraced the 'challenge to the Nation State' (see the debate in Joppke 1999). Yet, the EU's effort to become a 'migration state', one able to embrace cross-border labour, has been more strenuous (Hollifield 2004). This

arguably results from the fact that trade and migration impose slightly different political economies.

The political economy imposed by international labour mobility and trade since the end of the Cold War can perhaps be boiled down to the following principles:[34]

→ ***Migration and trade are both global.*** The end of the Cold War introduced a scalar shift in trade and migration. Trade and migration flows were previously bound by competing political economies, colonial and post-colonial ties, as well as more parochial factors such as language and culture. The development of new channels of communication and transport since 1989 has changed that. Manufacturers and workers have increasingly gained a 'globalised mindset' on the basis of a common consumerist outlook, as well as linguistic and cultural homogenisation.

→ ***Migration and trade are both inter-national.*** Migration and trade support the global state-based order. Trade relations are based on a country's 'comparative advantage', leading to mutual economic gains on the basis of reciprocity, non-discrimination (Hansen and Koehler 2010). Migration is based on a country's 'absolute advantage', with high-wage states holding the advantage, and sending countries gaining from the political incorporation of their nationals there (Brzezinski 1997). In this way, the prime site for regulating trade and migration is inter-state cooperation.

→ ***Migration and trade are equivalent.*** Migration and trade are both forms of factor mobility. Both are thus determined by economic push factors in the sending countries and pull factors in the receiving – as well as by the level of 'transaction costs' involved in getting from A to B (for instance the ease of transport). Moreover, both forms of factor mobility have the same effect: they serve to equalize international disparities in wage levels and welfare spending. For the West, this means that large-scale high-wage industries (in the case of trade) or workers (in the case of immigration) have to compete or die (Wellisch and Walz 1998; Hollifield 2012).

→ ***Migration and trade are substitutable.*** States don't have to accept both trade and migration if they don't wish to. Since both forms of factor mobility have the same effect, states can select one to promote. This is always likely to be trade, not least because an increase in trade diminishes the pressure to migrate. By reducing international wage differentials, the push and pull factors for migration diminish. Since it can be assumed that most individuals prefer to stay close to home, this is one reason why trade liberalisation should be considered a global good (Hoppe 1998).

→ ***Trade is preferable to migration.*** Trade is more conducive to international stability than migration. In trade, for instance, it's easy for states to match supply to demand, simply increasing or reducing the production of goods; in migration, by contrast, we are dealing with relatively finite stocks (of human resources) leading to concerns about population loss and brain drain. Trade can also be easily regulated at a global level (in the World Trade

Organisation), whereas migration falls into intrusive employment law (Winters et al 2003). But most importantly, trade is conducive to representative democracy whereas migration – which involves population flows – poses a challenge (Greenaway and Nelson 2004).

How the EU de-globalises migration

Europeans have failed to cope with this global political economy of migration. They are now criticised for turning their apparently strong hand – their 'absolute advantage' in international negotiations on control and liberalisation - into a weak one. They have mismanaged the happy connection between trade and migration, taking on far more immigration than they needed, antagonising sending countries and leading to the emergence of a transnational mobile population that owes no allegiance to the current territorial order (Caldwell 2009). Worst of all, Europeans have broken the mutually-reinforcing link between globalisation and the spread of liberal democracy: as classic nation-states, the EU-28 have struggled to incorporate immigrants in the same way as do, say, the US and Australia.[35] Europeans have attempted large-scale immigration without recognising the inherent challenge to representative democracy (Corfe 2014) and without even bothering to alter their citizenship laws or modernise their welfare systems.

The EU-28's attempt to take on immigration without giving immigrants proper access to representative democracy gives a zero-sum flavour to international relations. The sending countries are the first to lose out. They have typically come round to the idea of their nationals gaining citizenship elsewhere. In the case of migration to the US, it strengthens their international standing (their nationals gain citizenship in a world power with a tradition of diaspora lobbying). For another thing, sending countries have come to recognise that they don't 'lose' nationals when these gain citizenship in another country – just the reverse in fact. If migrants gain a secure status in a receiving country, then it is easier for them to find work there, to come and go, and to return to their country of origin for extended periods without losing re-entry rights. This created mutual gains between migrants and their sending and receiving countries: mobile workers can accrue knowledge and capital in the host country which they invest back home (McKenzie and Gibson 2010).

The receiving country also loses out if immigrants have no vote. This is because its political parties have no incentive to reach out to the newcomers, leading to political gridlock (Downs 2011). Representative democracy, by definition, cannot function if large sections of the population are rendered invisible in this way. It is not just the 'invisible immigrants' that potentially lose out. Immigration creates political facts for the native population too. It exacerbates the cracks in national cohesion - between genders[36], generations[37], classes[38] and between rural and urban populations[39] - along the frontiers of cosmopolitanism.[40] Immigrants are thus ideological vectors who can alter and deepen left-right tensions in European economies. The effect is to create a greater distance between governments and voters. It also leads to a split between socially-marginalised individuals who rely on the state and are the main clients of mass political parties, and more go-getting individuals pushing for modernisation.[41]

This has the effect of disempowering voters in sending and receiving countries, thus reducing scope for international cooperation. It also leads to the crystallisation of a powerful third constituency: an individualistic class of mobile workers. This is the age-old problem of mob rule, the empowerment of the mobile at the cost of territorial order (Cresswell 2006). In discussions about 'factor mobility', migrants have of course long been recognised as trickier to handle than goods and capital because of the assumption that they tend to demand the vote (Hatton 2007). Yet, the real difficulty may be the reverse: the trouble is when they don't demand a vote. When migrants move countries, this is an act of political self-empowerment outside the realms of representative democracy. It involves 'voting with your feet', 'exit and voice', and choosing your own from geography and history. The EU's general failure to incorporate migrants – and its preference for instead dabbling in clever identity politics - merely legitimates the existence of an up-rooted international grouping which owes little allegiance either to its host country or its country of origin.

Question 3. Did the EU have a choice about migration globalisation?

All this raises a more fundamental question: why the EU ever embraced globalisation. After all, globalisation entailed global economic liberalisation coupled with classic representative democracy, whereas the EU's own brand of political economy has usually been for regionalism coupled with constitutional innovation. The obvious answer of course is that it had no choice: the economic forces unleashed by the end of the Cold War overwhelmed the EU, and it is only now that those forces recede that the bloc can think about asserting its own model (only this time, probably, with a self-defeating new recipe of protectionism plus reactionism). Yet, this presumption of economic determinism inevitably ignores the importance of political choice. 'Globalisation' in its current form can be seen as no more than a politically-constructed geospatial order. Nothing obliged the EU to sign up for this particular political economy beyond its own lack of political imagination. [42]

Political choice not economic diktat – the example of East-West migration in the EU

Politicians and commentators across the EU, and particularly in the UK and Eastern Europe, have apparently accepted the idea that migration is determined by the laws of global economics rather than political choice (Bennett 2014). But it's hard to see why. Take the problems of East-West, of Polish-British, migration within the EU. If Polish workers are being transformed from political subjects – and cultural kin (Collier 2014) - into mere economic objects in the UK this is not because of economic forces. It is politics – politics, indeed, that is squandering the sizeable economic benefits of migration to the UK and pushing up its long-term costs: thanks to a failure of cooperation between Warsaw and London, Polish workers, often highly-educated, are being funnelled into low-paid work, leading to a growth of menial sector that contributes little to the economy besides creating more jobs for immigrants (Parkes and Gastinger 2008). For their part, Polish workers are prepared to accept this treatment for reasons besides the wage disparity between Lodz and Luton (Iglicka 2010).

Both Warsaw and London have apparently failed to understand this. They look at the current economic fundamentals and assume that the EU's free movement regime can only lead to mass, permanent migration. London assumes Polish immigrants, given the comparatively low wages in their homeland, are low-skilled and possibly benefit tourists who will come *en masse*. It thus sees no sense in investing in language training or skills recognition for the newcomers, because these immigrants are presumably only fit for low-wage work.[43] Warsaw meanwhile looks at the economic fundamentals and sees only the prospect of significant population loss s workers chase wages. As such, the government does not prepare Polish citizens for a mobile life. Thus, instead of returning home, its workers end up lodged in low-wage work in the UK,[44] leading to a sense of estrangement with the government in Warsaw.[45] In short, Warsaw and London's readiness to capitulate to the economic data makes their prophecies about the laws of economics self-fulfilling.

It's not by chance, moreover, that Poland and the UK have been at the forefront of Europe's embrace of US-led globalisation. In 2004, the UK chose not to take advantage of a transitional period of border control after Poland's EU accession, thus passing on the available option of labour market restrictions until EU funding had properly stimulated the Polish economy, instead opening its borders to the East and the world.[46] The Polish government also pushed hard for the lifting of EU and broader international labour market restrictions despite fears of mass emigration and the exploitation of its citizens. But perhaps more interesting than the way these two countries complied with the above laws of the global political economy was the way they actually diverged from it. Poland, for instance, has resisted the move to an economic model in which emigration fuels higher wages, clinging instead to a low-wage model of competitiveness. The UK eschewed the opportunity to use trade flows as a means of substituting for migration.

So it really is politics, not global economic determinism, which is at work here. And decision-making in the EU – whether at the national or European level – has failed to cope with the political choices inherent in coping with the post-Cold War world. Indeed, we can say that, since 1989, the EU has failed at 'spatial politics' (Lebel et al. 2005; Dyer-Witheford and de Peuter 2009): 'globalisation' is just another spatial order, a political narrative that melds time and space according to a specific set of preferences. And given the circumstances of its emergence, it's no surprise to find that it reflects certain US norms and exceptions. It was shown above, for instance, that the US feels in principle able to maintain classic representative democracy in the face of immigration because sending countries are grateful for the access this gives them to Washington's pluralist politics. But the more interesting point is that the US has not really made use of this advantage, focusing principally on restricting immigration. 'Globalisation' didn't entail a wholesale 'flattening' of world geography. The US may have tried to shrink trade links, but it also sought to maintain a physical distance between its own and other peoples.

The spatial politics of migration and trade

As we have seen, the political economy of globalisation has rested on two pillars – 'global trade liberalisation + national representative democracy'. Numerous academic works have served to paint these pillars as the logical result of the end of Cold War hostilities, and as mutually producing.[47] These are, in other words, shown to be the *inevitable* units of a global order. But it should also be acknowledged that for a state like the US which was seeking to establish its global influence, trade and representative democracy are the logical units of choice – perhaps the only combination that might justify global reach whilst still securing classic sovereignty (for a flavour of this: Baker 2007). Labour mobility challenges this ordering. Migration is not properly global in its logic, and tends to be more driven by parochial regional, cultural and kinship ties than is trade. The flow of persons between countries also triggers changes to classic forms of democracy, demanding a flattening of hierarchies and de-centralisation of power, as well as requiring more intrusive supranational cooperation.

In order to press human mobility into a more amenable form, the conception of international migration that has emerged since 1989 has thus rested on some somewhat questionable assumptions. This can be shown easily enough in the selective way that migration was coupled to trade in the globalised system. Specifically, migration has been presented as equivalent to trade insofar as it establishes a global territorial scale (both trade and migration are shown to be global in nature and as incorporating an economic logic that crosses borders regardless of cultural barriers); but migration is presented as inferior to trade as soon as it threatens to undermine the chosen unit of governing that territory (the cohesive nation-state). The political choices behind this global order emerge readily enough from a critical re-evaluation of the assumptions set out in the previous section:

Is migration really global? The end of the Cold War clearly changed the dimensions of migration. Nonetheless, it is worth noting that *global* migration flows even to the US have been comparatively limited. Indeed, the highest pressure has been inter-regional, in the US's case at the border between Northern and Hispanic America – this, despite the fact that the US pursued the NAFTA trade deal partly as a means of stemming migration (Demeny and MacNicoll 2006). The pressure on its southern border gives the US an incentive to downplay the legitimacy of inter-regional migration.

Is migration really inter-national? It's no surprise that migration is often portrayed as occurring only between states. That is where high-profile tensions play out in arguments about border crossings or brain drain. But this ignores the real experience of migrants themselves. Their movements will often 'scale up' over the years, a pattern that sometimes unfolds over generations – first there's the move from countryside to city, then within a country, then within a world region, and then finally they make a move between world regions.

Are migration and trade really equivalent? Trade and migration can have equivalent effect, but this stretches far beyond the harsh 'compete or die' wage effect outlined above. Both forms of factor mobility might, for instance, also be used for productivity gains.[48] These are achieved by ensuring workers are properly motivated. Thus immigration helps native workers step out of menial work; and their own migration takes them to places that offer the infrastructure to do what they are good at; and, when they are settled in jobs they like, trade can be used to provide new markets to sustain their employment.

Are migration and trade really substitutable? Not in the sense that trade replaces migration by increasing wages in developing countries – just the reverse in fact. If a state boosts foreign trade with a developing country, it may actually increase the incidence of migration. This is because of the so-called 'migration hump', whereby workers in middle-income, developing countries become more mobile as become wealthier. Workers in the poorest countries tend, by contrast, to be rural and they lack the funds for travel (not to mention the 'globalised' mind-set).[49] They travel only when trade has reduced wage differentials.

Is trade really more desirable than migration? The answer is probably one of degrees. With their proposed transatlantic trade deal the EU and US are accused of scraping the barrel for contestable gains, and at the possible expense of global cooperation. That assessment of TTIP may be rather drastic (House of Lords 2014), but "[i]f international policymakers were really interested in maximising worldwide efficiency, they would spend little of their energies on a new trade round or on the international financial architecture. They would all be busy at work liberalising immigration restrictions" (Rodrick 2012).

If it is indeed the case that the US has tried to assert its choice of geospatial order, one of global scale but national units, then Washington has had to overcome some serious conceptual contradictions. Most notably, it has had to stand by the principle that migrants have a right to global travel whilst maintaining tight control of its own borders. Key to this balancing act has been the US's reputation as a 'country of immigrants' (Ozimek 2012). The US (along with Australia, New Zealand and Canada) has underlined the fact that it was built by immigrants, presenting itself as the natural home of global immigration even as it has hardened restrictions. The implicit (and unfavourable) point of comparison is of course to European nation-states with their apparently fixed national identities. And EU states have unwittingly played along. They have, for instance, ignored their own citizens' history of mobility despite the fact that the emigration of their populations was the logical corollary to the settler states' emergence (Favell 2009: 168).[50]

Moreover, it's not just its history that the EU neglected, but its geography too. The EU overlooked the isolated reality of North American and Oceanic geography, although that geography not only explains the US's or Australia's settler history but also helps explain these countries aspiration to control migration and to maintain classic representative democracy.[51] Insofar as the EU has employed a model tailored to its own history and its own exposed, regional geography, then it has often been in pursuit of an all-too familiar template – statecraft (on this: Borg forthcoming 2015). The Schengen Area, the free movement of persons, the

common border regime, the creation of 'European citizens', the attempt at representative democracy in the European Parliament – these all show how the EU is creating the national state on a larger, regional scale fit for the global era. In other words, the EU has often used its supposedly trailblazing recipe of regionalism plus constitutional innovation simply to copy others' recipe of global scale plus representative democracy.

Question 4. Does the EU have a model of its own to promote?

Of course, if the EU has indeed accepted a global ordering that did not suit it, it has only itself to blame. [52] In 1989, there was speculation that this would soon be 'Europe's world': after a peak in US influence, greater responsibility would pass to world regions, and it would be the EU which stepped in to provide a possible template for managing it. Today, the first part of that prediction seems to be coming true – world order is giving way to multipolarity. The second part, less so: rather than providing a template for the management of regional tensions, the EU's impulse is to deepen transatlantic ties and to pass the lead to Washington. From the Brussels perspective, the EU has no choice: organisations like NATO were established to cement American supremacy in Europe, and Washington cannot now use them to browbeat Europeans. From Washington's perspective, this may be expedient in the short-term, but it doesn't make for a sustainable order (Biscop 2015). It begs the question: does the EU at least have the basis to offer something constructive of its own?

Why the EU remains trapped in the past

From today's perspective, it certainly seems that if the EU had only stood on its usual two legs – its usual recipe of regionalism and constitutional innovation - it might now be placed at the forefront of global trends. With US-led globalisation in decline as a geospatial order[53], and with an apparent shift towards multipolarity well under way (Petito 2012; Langenhove 2010), the world is open to innovative, new, EU-sized units of governance. Regionalism is looked upon as a potentially welcome form of cooperation between the national and global levels. And yet, other world regions – ASEAN, MERCOSUR, ECOWAS, even Moscow's Eurasian Economic Union – will look to the EU in vain for clues as to how this regionalism might look, unless of course they too wish to embark on a course of supranational state-building.[54] Tellingly, indeed, the EU's has actually taken multipolarity as grounds to drop its traditional inter-regionalism in favour of deeper supranational state-building and 'peer-to-peer' relations with regional hegemons like China. [55] No wonder the global competition for new geospatial order is so turbulent.

But in reality this apparent supranational state-building – the acceptance of the drive for globalism and classic representative democracy - only captures part of the EU's response to the post-1989 world order. The EU is today both far more and far less than a rescaled nation-state: instead of classic external borders and political hierarchy, the EU has pictured itself as a 'raindrop': in a flat and fluid global economy, it rippled outwards in that familiar series of concentric circles– European internal market, border regime, neighbourhood, world politics.[56] This has, moreover, been in pursuit of its own relatively distinct local approach to 'managing

globalisation' (Abdelal and Meunier), an approach which in 2000 crystallised in the so-called Lisbon Strategy. This approach was namely to establish the EU as a 'knowledge-based economy' which carefully embraced the new forms of communication that had emerged after the end of the Cold War so as to reinvigorate its economy and its democratic practices, and to thereby assert its own traditional social model and norm-setting ability.[57]

To understand how this complicated and multi-layered model emerged, and why it has now come unstuck, it is necessary to understand the EU's own internal spatial politics - because rather than embodying a brand of regional order *per se*, the EU has actually been the medium for at least three competing visions of time and space, each of which play out strongly in migration policy[58]. These are: France's idea of the EU as a Hegelian Euromed empire (a vision of European integration which accounts for the emphasis on a European social model and a suspicion of US influence); Germany's idea of the EU as a Kantian union of European states (which largely accounts for the state-building elements, but also for the EU's novel modes of norm-spreading); and Britain's idea of the EU as a Burkean Western bloc (which has led to the attempted embrace of global economic flows). As 'globalisation' breaks down as a spatial order, and competition breaks out to replace it, these three conceptions continue to provide the contours of the EU's response:

→ *France's Euromed empire* was a response to the country's security situation in 1945: France felt squeezed between two increasingly antagonistic 'empires', each boasting strong military power, global ambition, and a universal idea. The defeat of Germany by Soviet-Slavic and Anglo-American empires, had showed Paris that the nation-state as an entity was now consigned to history. One idea in Paris, therefore, was to establish the EU as a rival empire.[59] This Euromed empire would combine France, Italy, Spain and Portugal to embody civilization and *savoir vivre* (for critical analysis Kletzer 2006). In this context, Paris' vision of migration was primarily geopolitical: migration was about population management (Maas 2007: 61). More important than this though, the citizens of the Euromed empire were supposed to embody an idea of *savoir vivre*, and immobile, rooted citizens might actually be the best ideological vectors.[60] Yet, it soon became clear that France could not play off East and West in this way without exposing itself to a more traditional problem – Germany and German nationalism. France needed to involve its neighbour.

→ Whereas France's 'empire' involved a tightknit group of states forcing a universal way of life onto others, *Germany's European union* was about a region naturally cohering around innate European constitutional principles. This union was to be the first conglomeration of states founded 'not on hegemony but law' (Borchardt 2010). Unification entailed the establishment of a European court, parliament, constitution, but also territorial expansion particularly across the Iron Curtain.[61] Europe's border policy was thus about demarcating a Europe that was not yet whole. Borders should either be fixed where Europe had reached its limits or shift to permit its further unification (on the Kantian notion of free movement Hoogenboom 2014). Travel in the EU was a right of citizenship[62], but it had to remain available to nationals of European states that had not yet joined. And yet, this vision also had a birth defect: if Germany was the only one able to discern or embrace these constitutional

principles, the EU would simply constitutionalise German hegemony.[63] Germany needed the legitimacy of the master institution-builder, Britain.[64]

→ Resolutely non-ideological, **Britain's Western bloc** was everything that the top-down ideas from Bonn and Paris were not (on the roots of this: Vincent 1984). European integration would be driven bottom-up by social and economic forces gradually unleashed by the US's economic dominance. Britain's own engagement with Europe became possible only as the influence of the Anglosphere family spread and free market ideas took root on the Continent (on this modern incarnation of Burkean thought: Raeder 1997; Gray 2013). Migration was viewed primarily in a liberal perspective, as a vector of a free market, encouraging competition amongst European governments to create a low-tax, employment-friendly regime. Trade was the priority, however, and London recognised migration as an equivalent 'freedom' principally so as to ratchet progress in the various fields. But the problem with this conception of European integration as bottom-up and non-ideological was of course that it was neither of those things. It shifted political control from local communities in the UK to businesses and across the Atlantic to Washington, and it tied the supposedly pragmatic EU to a deeply ideological 'West'.

These three competing visions not only explain the EU's attempt to mix representative democracy with globalism, but also the pattern of current tensions around migration outlined in the horizon-scanning exercise above. In the internal market, France is trying to establish the EU along the political and geographic lines of its Euromed empire, exploiting the UK's ongoing struggle to reconcile localism with US-led economic globalisation. In the EU's border regime there is Germany's attempt to impose Kantian order as it uses the leverage of the EU enlargement process (in the Western Balkans, Turkey) and of Schengen enlargement (clashes with Italy's, France's or Malta's regulatory regimes) to help 'reunify' Europe around a set of shared norms.[65] There is the civilizational competition in the southern and eastern neighbourhoods, which reacts at least in part to Germany's hegemonic re-bordering of Europe and its interaction with chauvinistic French ideology. And at the global level, the EU finds itself joined in an unnecessary bipolar confrontation – the West versus the Rest – in part as a hangover from British Cold War policy and a rather outmoded idea of Transatlantic kinship.

The situation looks drastic, but in one sense at least it gives a reassuring sign of the EU's continued power: the emerging geopolitics of migration can, after all, still be classified according to the four layers of EU order and, insofar as these layers have rolled back, it is only to reveal older and deeper forms of European power. This suggests that the EU retains some global influence, albeit often expressed in a negative manner and only thanks to its largest member states. What we have yet to see is the serious influence of outside powers on the internal regulation of the EU itself, besides that which the EU itself has readily embraced. But events such as the January 2015 *Charlie Hebdo* massacre in Paris show how easily this might occur. And as the EU's ability to adopt a convincing vision of the future diminishes, traditional partners are increasingly revisiting old political battles lost and finding evidence only of unfair coercion. The European Union clearly needs to think about what form of spatial

order it wishes to assert, and how it wishes to mobilise the necessary resources – both internal and cooperative.

It's in that context that these three peculiar visions for melding time and space could usefully be rescaled for the multipolar age. At present, the EU is locked in three competing geographies - partly in a German regional geography, partly in a French Mediterranean geography, partly in a British Transatlantic geography. If, by contrast, the EU wants a set of guiding principles that both resonate with its population and internationally[66], then it could usefully map these agendas onto its common geography:

→ apply a little of France's Hegelian universalism when it comes to global governance;

→ apply Germany's cosmopolitan Kantianism more to the EU's inter-regional relations;

→ and above all, apply Britain's bottom-up Burkeanism to the EU's internal affairs.

Write your own EU migration guidelines[67]

And so back across time and space again to Brussels and that June 2014 Summit where EU leaders ducked public pressure to face up to Europe's migration crisis. It might now seem obvious that the European Council should have struggled to produce a plan on the matter. Summits, almost by definition, are top-down. Leaders struggle to imagine measures to leverage migration from the bottom up: they are too out of touch with developments on the ground to exploit the economic, cultural, diplomatic and political power associated with human movement.

And yet, a different and more hopeful reading is also possible. Last year, everyone was talking about the world-wide 'return of classic geopolitics' not least in migration affairs, and lamenting the EU's lack of prowess at playing the game. But if the EU is indeed bad at classic geopolitics, it's probably because its own brand of geospatial management has tried to disperse political power down and outwards, rather than focusing it at the top and the centre as in China or Russia. So if the summit failed to enter this brutish global competition over migration, it may well be because the EU's structures keep its leaders well grounded, despite themselves.

Should EU leaders be able to resist the temptation to engage in classic geopolitics just a little longer, and if they would prefer instead to expand the scope for international political choice, here's the kind of migration programme they might still write. Rather than running away from the popular hostility to migration, this programme would openly acknowledge it – and it would also acknowledge that this hostility comes down to political failure.

To do so, they would have to go back to 2000 when leaders laid out their plans for a knowledge-based economy. This was an attempt to further flatten Europe's political hierarchies to deal with cross-border communication and globalisation. But in the way they pursued it, this approach actually ended up centralising politics, marginalising parts of Europe's economy and excluding migrants. Instead of trying to replicate national representative democracy, the EU could exploit new technologies to create a form of

collaborative democracy, based on practical problem-solving rather than citizenship laws and delegated authority.

This would be the first, and also the last, "Brussels 12-point plan":

1. Back in 2000, we undertook to transform the EU's political economy, vying to turn the EU into the world's most competitive knowledge-based democracy. In the years since, we have therefore boosted the economy through support for training and innovation, thereby increasing the EU's stock of highly-educated citizens and encouraging the immigration of high-skilled workers. We have also made political reforms in fields from defence to energy, hoping to make our handling of these issues 'intelligent' and 'smart' and to ensure that the EU's rules become the global gold standard. But if we are now, in 2015, having to revisit that approach it is because it has not brought the economic or political dividend we expected: we had hoped that we were reinvigorating our democracy and our welfare systems – the reverse has occurred.

2. A knowledge-based economy was to serve two roles. The first was to embrace globalization without sacrificing Europe's social model and its cohesion. Global economic competition, and improved global transport links, were challenging our old industries of scale. Europe's high-wage economy was delivering only high unemployment. Moreover, a hostile new global economic model was emerging. It offered high employment, but with low wages and welfare. Our goal was to prevent a race to the bottom and to encourage our global competitors to aspire to a different way of life, a way of life that offered both high wages and high employment. By investing in education and innovation, we aimed to preserve Europe's viability in the high-end sector, both maintaining wage levels and preventing wholesale offshoring to cheaper locations.

3. The investment in knowledge aimed, secondly, to revitalise our political system: just as we recognised that embracing new forms of cross-border communications would be more fruitful for the European economy than protectionism, so too we believed that it would benefit our democracy and capacity to spread our norms. European politicians would be subject to new forms of scrutiny and new voices. Cable television, international media, the internet - these would provide new cross-national space for discussion, consultation, accountability. The various national democracies in the EU would be adapted to the reality of voters who were economically and geographically mobile, and the European Parliament would emerge as the true representative forum of the EU's *demos*.

4. There have certainly been some successes. The EU achieved the transition to becoming a services economy, with high wages and employment in certain sectors such as the finance industry in our major cities. Moreover, social media has become a vibrant forum for testing political opinion. But we have neglected the truly knowledge-intensive task of modernising our industries, peripheral economies, our agriculture and fisheries. And the introduction to our democracy of new technologies, actually seems to have narrowed down the kind of people involved in politics – typically those with the skills and levels of articulacy required to

broadcast on mass media. Across the EU, therefore, the most highly-educated 30% of the population now governs over the remaining 70%. The centralization of power around economic and political elites is the reality of our knowledge-based system, at least in its current form.

5. The EU has been a significant factor in this centralisation of power. The EU's brand of politics has seen power shift to Brussels, and the scope of its authority shrink. The EU was actually founded with the goal to decentralise. After the horrors of the Second World War, Europeans wanted to anchor power at the local level and in the peripheries. But integration also means shrinking the distances between us - bringing communities together politically and economically – and this has meant centralisation. This wasn't inevitable. Instead of exploring new means of flattening political hierarchies and redistributing power, too often we have simply replicated national-level structures in Brussels. The result: popular concern about a distant European technocratic and business elite who lacks responsiveness or sympathy for everyday problems.

6. The outcome of the European elections in May 2014 was an apt verdict on our misreading of voters' wishes. It's always this way: the greater the distance between government and voters, the greater the mismatch on burning issues – immigration, asylum, climate change, international development. Governments aren't too bad at guessing the preferences of voters on traditional left-right matters (such as national income redistribution). But on new issues of solidarity and cohesion in an international context we struggle. And when we are ignorant of the goals, aspirations and desires of voters, we cannot be properly representative. This creates a risk of a resurgence of precisely those things the EU was supposed to end - nationalism, racism and of course the kind of geopolitical thinking that comes when power is too distant and centralised.

7. No wonder immigration is such a flashpoint. Since 2000, European citizens have migrated across the EU in ever greater numbers; they have been asked to welcome newcomers from outside the Union; and they are themselves increasingly exploring opportunities outside the EU - indeed many of our newer citizens, foreign workers who gained citizenship in one of the member states, now appear to be returning to their home regions. Clearly, this mobility poses a challenge to old national loyalties and ties. If we can't create a political system that gives voice to all sections of society, we are missing out on precisely those discussions where practical daily solutions emerge. The everyday problems of citizens living alongside a mobile and foreign population are not properly recognised; and migrants' own experiences are sidelined.

8. Just as in 2000, then, Europe is facing a stark choice: either we remain open to global interdependence in pursuit of economic gain, or we reintroduce borders to save our way of life. The second option would seem the more honest: the public debate suggests that liberalisation has gone far enough. But of course things are not that simple: if we reject liberalization, we are cutting down our own freedoms. The failure to, say, welcome immigrants from outside Europe would considerably dent the willingness of other world

regions to accept our citizens. Even those skeptical about the EU would agree that a right to emigrate from it should be protected in Europe. And, given that it is not immigration but emigration that actually depresses Europe's wage rates, surely we need to remain open to immigration too.

10. So, just like in 2000, the choice really has to be in favour of embracing liberalization, and in such a way that sustains our way of life. But can we put in place the right political and economic system this time? The material gains of liberalisation have been considerable, and there are more on offer - indeed, the benefits even of a small restructuring of global migration are estimated to dwarf full trade liberalisation. However, such gains have come at the expense of a feeling of disempowerment. Trade and migration have become associated with the enrichment of the few and competition for the many. Migration and trade instead need to be directed instead at a simple task – empowering people. The EU, with its heavy investment in knowledge, possesses a highly-educated population; it has the space to help Europeans and newcomers move freely to the spots where they can use those skills; and it has the technical wherewithal to help them find foreign markets to sustain themselves and their businesses.

11. That is the task ahead of us. However this kind of 'smart' liberalization of the economy cannot occur technocratically. It requires a political and economic system genuinely responsive to the needs and limits of society:

→ In terms of economic policy, this means pursuing trade and migration for reasons of economic wellbeing. No longer should liberalisation be associated with forced competitiveness, nor should migration and trade be seen as substitutes for one another. We should encourage people to seek out meaningful work, making regional mobility part of their basic education, a recognised qualification in workers' skills set. For those people for whom moving between sectors and countries is no option, we must use trade to help them find the foreign markets necessary to sustain their business. That pertains to traditional industries, particularly in Europe's peripheries. Trade should not force states to 'compete or die', it should involve a search for markets and niches that sustain innovative European business. If we focus on improving citizens' motivation, the productivity gains could be huge.

→ As regards our constitutional policy, this means adapting democracy to the new spaces and rhythms of life in Europe. At heart, democracy is a very particular European response to uncertainty. Unlike other forms of rule – autocracy, technocracy, theocracy – it acknowledges there is no single answer for society. Uncertainty demands collaborative decision-making, not just to ensure that responsibility is mutual but to harvest practical experience wherever it exists. Representative democracy achieved this well enough. But delegating authority in this static and hierarchical way may not be sufficiently collaborative in this day and age. Increasingly, individuals and communities are using new technologies not to voice opinion but to solve problems. This form of active citizenship is not hemmed in by nationality laws or welfare rights.

→ For the EU's political economy, all this means tipping the European Union on its head. We normally picture the EU as a level of government sitting at the top of Europe's legal hierarchy – local government at the bottom, national government in the middle, Europe at the top. This hierarchy is cemented by Europe's constitutional principles, including the supremacy of EU law. Yet the EU has most legitimacy as a tool to leverage power from the bottom up and from the peripheries. It therefore makes more sense to focus the European level at the *bottom* of the constitutional hierarchy. The EU should be a cross-national base on which local and national governments join up, and on which workers and businesses move, connect and collaborate. It should cease to be only a top-heavy and fragile layer of bureaucracy at the pinnacle of European politics.

12. Like all politics, whether Progressive or Conservative, such processes mean change. Europeans risk losing sight of this fact. We increasingly use the word 'integration' – whether it be immigrant integration or European integration – to imply conformity to a fixed template. But integration in all cases is really a process of change and of invention. Outsiders are not being integrated into a fixed national community, and different member states are not being integrated into some pre-defined constitutional end-state. It is the job of a robust political system to allow that change to happen, and to seek out mutual benefits by giving people the space to flourish. That may seem far-fetched in a period of considerable turbulence and pessimism about the future. But just as the Great Depression was a trigger for the end of trade protectionism, so we must use the current financial crisis to open ourselves to migration.

Conclusions: Europe's migration wars

Like all too many analyses at present, this paper has been dealing with the supposed "End of History" and the apparent return of geopolitical tension to the world. Well that's one way of looking at things. But it's just as instructive to look at the *beginnings* of history, because this puts migration back at the heart of the international system. Ever since hunter-gatherers were first 'domesticated' by the cultivation of wheat (Harari 2014), the international system has been driven by a simple tension - between the human capacity for mobility and the collective need for order. Human mobility has been driven by economics, insecurity and curiosity. And at each stage of human history, the scale of that mobility has outstretched existing territorial order (Cresswell 2006: 11) thereby forcing the rest of society to evolve - from feudalism through to empire and beyond (Weber 1966). But migrants have not had everything their way, and territorial order has always been reasserted, in old or new forms, through economic efficiency, violence and the 'borders of the mind' – ideology and religion (Havel 1985).

Globalisation seemed to solve this tension. By liberalising cross-border traffic in goods, resources, capital and services, it was supposed to reduce the pressure for migration: business, raw materials and money would now come to you, rather than you to it. By thus reducing the need for migration, globalisation would also serve to reinforce the most successful form of territorial order that the world has so far produced – national representative democracy. Yet, the seemingly inevitable spread of global trade and national democracy (Fukuyama 1989) has not entirely occurred. The mix of mobile business and static, separate populations has

sometimes led to political elitism and centralisation, as well as growing nationalism. As the economic benefits of globalisation dip, the basis for its territorial settlement is being revisited. And it is not just the US but increasingly also the influence of Europeans that is being eyed critically: the world-wide spread of the nation-state, of representative democracy and trade is seen as a response to a very local European dilemma – the permanent settlement of a large population in a small space, attracted by a temperate climate, but afflicted by resource-poverty.

For the US, the unravelling of globalisation principally takes the form of trade wars with China. Both countries have a need for resources, and they have similar means of ensuring these are delivered to their citizens (Khong 2013). But these trade wars can be seen as a sign of a deeper tension over the way globalisation ordered human mobility, and its false promise that resources would be delivered equitably to the world's national populations. In the countries around the EU, to the south and east, that tension is playing out slightly differently. Traditionally-mobile populations feel cut off from resources by an artificial territorial order. The most obvious case is in the Sahel where the way of life has typically been nomadic and where national borders are viewed as a disruption. Meanwhile resource-rich states in the neighbourhood have actually used their trading hand to avoid democratization; there too, populations feel trapped. And, in the EU itself, although scope for migration has been opened up, classic forms of representative democracy persist. Europe must pull back from these migration wars.

Endnotes

[1] With thanks to Stefan Borg for his comments on an earlier draft.

[2] The UK Independence Party (UKIP) received around 28% in the May 2014 European elections; France's Front National around 25%. For a lively analysis of the run-up to the summit: Labayle and De Capitani (2014).

[3] This reluctance to broach contentious subjects pertaining to democratic legitimacy is of course nothing new. On the lack of readiness to mention the still-unratified Lisbon Treaty in 2009: Kietz and Parkes (2009).

[4] Individuals who hold the citizenship of an EU member state gain EU citizenship. Citizenship is conferred directly upon the individual by the Lisbon Treaty. It gives the individual the right to: vote and stand for election in municipal and European elections across the EU; reside and work in another EU state; enjoy consular protection of another EU state outside the EU; petition the EU ombudsman. A secondary set of rights has subsequently built up, including the right to participate in a "Citizens' Initiative", in which a million signatories can call for the European Commission to initiate legislation.

[5] In 1992, when EU citizenship was rolled out, it seemed a genuinely revolutionary idea. Advertised in part as a means of boosting mobility and blurring identity conflicts, it placed the EU at the vanguard of a whole new approach to migration. See: Geddes (2003).

[6] This was a recipe for "coherent policy measures" and "synergies with related policy areas" (p. 1), a design to attract the best international workers "based on coherent and efficient rules", an immigrant integration policy to "foster social cohesion and economic dynamism" by means unspecified (p. 2), the "full transposition and effective implementation" (p. 3) of asylum rules so that refugees are treated in a standard way across the EU, and a policy to tackle the "root causes of irregular migration" (p. 3) which again lacks definition.

[7] Local think tanks complained in the run-up to the summit about the lack of political engagement from EU leaders in the face of growing popular rejection of the bloc's immigration regime: "all stakeholders dealing with justice and home affairs issues in Brussels – institutions, organisations, NGOs, trade unions, think tanks – repeat the same question: 'what will replace the Stockholm programme?' Whilst difficult for the everyday man to understand, this question is nonetheless a crucial one and should urgently leave the 'Brussels arena' and be known to a wider public." Yet, there were few ideas about the content of this programme (beyond the creation of a dedicated European Asylum Court to expedite the asylum process and a general need to shore up the status quo). See: Pascouau (2014) p. 9.

[8] The term refers here to immobile workers resentful of their more mobile counterparts. Those in the EU's East feel left behind to deal with national problems. Those in the West feel that immigrants are dipping into common goods long in the making. See: Parkes and Schwarzer (2012). This is a term appropriated from descriptions of developing countries, where populations may be trapped by urbanisation in coastal areas, a lack of resources and growing national economic and environmental problems: The Government Office for Science (2011).

[9] A century ago most western countries had an open migration and a protectionist trade regime; with the development of the welfare state and de-industrialisation, the pattern has reversed. See: Hatton and Williamson (2006).

[10] In a soft version of this argument, this is about 'elastic substitutability' - the idea that the more a state liberalises trade, the less it needs to liberalise migration. This is because the effect of both free trade and free movement is to equalise wage rates. If you trade with a country, its workers will grow richer and won't wish to leave. In the harder version, the emergence of welfare goods as an aim of the post-industrial trading state will be threatened by migration liberalisation and should be absolutely precluded. See: Hoppe (1998).

[11] The argument is expedient, and doesn't bear scrutiny. It is used largely to protect UKIP from criticisms of xenophobia. For statistical analysis of how Commonwealth immigration to the UK in fact outstrips immigration from the EU: Hawkins (2014).

[12] Notwithstanding disagreements between the pair over the liberalisation of the services industry: Ames (2012).

[13] Many people predicted that northerners would use the effort from 1999 to create European minimum standards on asylum as an excuse to lower their own standards. In fact, they used it to try to tighten southerners' standards. Southerners have pursued a more laissez-faire policies on these issues. And for good reason. If asylum-seekers have some kind of access to the local labour market, for instance, they reduce the cost on the state. Thielemann and El-Enany (2010).

[14] Sangatte is the name of a refugee centre established in northern France and close to transport links to the UK. Its situation has been a constant source of tension between the two countries: Allen (2014).

[15] For details of the EU's recently altered decision-making rules: Haege (2014).

[16] Malta's leverage was particularly strong at that stage given that the immigration pact needed to be introduced by unanimity. On the episode: Malta Independent (2008).

[17] In 2001, Germany blocked the European Commission's ambitious plans for a single European policy that clearly set out procedures for third-country-nationals to come to the EU and the rights they would enjoy here.

[18] The word "mortgaging" is used in the sense that the EU is gaining immediate political credit vis-à-vis neighbouring governments on the promise of long-term payback. The trouble is that the payback, in the form of allowing these neighbours a proper say over the running of the EU's internal market or Schengen Area, is becoming more distant as enlargement slows down. On the difficulties of this kind of "partial EU enlargement": Parkes (2011).

[19] The removal of restrictions on Balkan travel has long been a source of tension, not least in Germany. After high numbers of Roma made asylum applications in the EU, West Balkan commentators suggested their governments were being put under pressure by the EU to exercise 'exit controls' on those people leaving for the EU. A get-out clause for the EU was introduced to the agreement with Balkan countries permitting Brussels to roll back on its commitments to liberalise the bloc's border regime, despite the fact that it still expected the Balkan signatories to keep on with their domestic reforms. The Balkan states are thus nervous that EU countries will look for excuses to restrict travel. The EU has a track record of this: when the EU permitted citizens of certain West Balkan countries to travel to the EU easily if they had a biometric passport, for instance, there was a spike in attempted irregular border crossings. The reason was simply one of poor public communication – travellers were not aware of the precise specifications regarding passports and so were trying to cross the border without the requisite document. The spike was nevertheless used by some EU governments to call for restriction. On the subject in general: Spiegel online (2010).

[20] Europeans are revisiting their ideas about the universality of European values too: Spiegel online (2008); Murray (2014).

[21] Two European seas are currently dubbed *Mare Nostrum* (literally: our sea) - the Mediterranean and the Baltic. This is part of an effort to encourage Europeans to feel a shared sense of responsibility for a common European geography.

[22] See the proposals on the internet of the sea: European Organisation for Security (2015).

[23] Since 1989, analysts have reported a militarisation of police activities within the EU both at and beyond the border as governments react to the "dark side" of globalisation (cross-border terrorism and trafficking). They also report the take-up abroad of European-style armed police for non-border tasks, not least in countries facing popular insubordination: Lutterbeck (2013).

[24] For a historical overview: Rogers (2013).

[25] See for instance the recent discussion "Can regional trade agreements create a path to global migration management?" at the Metropolis conference, 3rd-7th November 2014, Milan, Italy.

[26] This middle-class emigration would also discredit liberal values if it became associated with personal gain over national loyalties. There is already a polarisation between immobile and mobile populations in sending countries, as the former feel abandoned by the latter. As for receiving countries, their middle classes might react badly to immigration as global education levels converge and they feel they have to compete for white collar jobs. And, of course, immigration restriction on the part of sending countries such as the US or EU-28 could also discredit liberal values.

[27] In the field of trade and finance, this might refer to the willingness to withhold trade for geopolitical reasons. The dynamic in migration is different: the usual laws of supply and demand or acute dependency don't apply. However, it should be clear from this section how migration can be used aggressively by states. On the general trend towards weaponisation, see: Bremmer and Kupchan (2015).

[28] The idea of 'inter-regional' migration might seem to be straining the point somewhat (the EU long had a tendency to overplay the regional perspective, and there are no deep agreements between world regions on migration). Nevertheless, it is the case that many workers see migration within their own region as a stepping stone to migrating to another world region. A Polish worker might, for instance, move to the UK in order to facilitate a later move to Australia.

[29] The last wave of globalisation is said to have run 1952-2002, retracting after the attacks on the World Trade Center. See: Hillebrand (2010).

[30] And whilst the migration figures specifically for the EU may sound high (in 2012 the EU statistics agency counted 3.4 million international migrations – 1.7 million entering the EU, 1.7 million moving to another member state), with its population of 500 million, this equates to migrations equating to around 0.7% of the EU population. Eurostat (2014).

[31] For a more nuanced understanding of the relationship, the points of common interest and confrontation: Yan (2010).

[32] The change of heart in Europe was related to a number of factors. Women's movements challenged the principle of patrilineal ascription, in which children took on the father's nationality, and former migration-sending countries like Germany, which had always tolerated dual citizenship for their émigrés now brought this new perspective to policy. Outside the EU, meanwhile, sending countries like Mexico changed their policy to permit dual nationality, in the hope that their diasporas would influence policies in their host countries: Howard (2004).

[33] The debate had already begun to sharpen in mid-2013 with the Snowden affair: Penketh and Rawlinson (2013).

[34] I include the obvious caveat that there is no such thing as a catalogue of these principles – those presented here are simply gleaned from a reading of academic and political documents. Some of the papers I cite in this section actually take a sceptical view of these principles such as they are. I have also sharpened and simplified a broad and complex set of writings in order to distill these principles, and acknowledge the danger that this becomes a kind of 'strawdoll' presentation.

[35] Even in so-called settle states like the US, the expansion of the electorate creates political tensions as low-earning newcomers gain welfare rights, not to mention a voice in decisions on spending, often pushing costs onto native taxpayers: Hanson (2009).

[36] Women make up around half of international migrations, but migration as an activity tends to favour the masculine template – single workers, without close family dependents.

[37] Immigrants are viewed as an antidote to low birth rates in Europe. However, 'replacing' natives with immigrants clearly challenges inter-generational solidarity. A wealthy aging generation may not feel solidarity with a younger generation which is 'imported'. This comes in the context of growing inter-generational tension in Europe: Broughton (2014).

[38] As even skilled immigrants to Europe tend to be funneled into low-skilled jobs, thus expanding a low-pay sector that contributes little to the economy and creates jobs for new waves of immigrant rather than the domestic unemployed.

[39] Much recent low-wage migration is focused either on cities themselves or on industries such as meat-packing which are set up in rural areas but which require the support of an urban infrastructure.

[40] Cosmopolitanism essentially entails creating greater understanding between different peoples by means of travel and contact. However, cosmopolitanism may in practice actually widen gaps in mutual empathy along the lines outlined above – between the mobile and immobile, between genders, between peripheral and urban populations, between generations. This would largely confirm the findings in: Bovens and Wille (2009).

[41] In this tension between 'incumbents' and 'challengers', domestic polarisation once again seems to echo the polarization at the global level (where there is a battle between Western incumbents and emerging economies for control of political institutions). On the end of ideology, see: Glaser (2014); on global polarization: Parkes (2014).

[42] On the need for a more rounded concept for understanding migration choices: White (2007)

[43] The British government's effort to prevent Polish immigrants claiming welfare support for children who are not resident in the UK is illustrative. The UK argues that the free movement system was supposed to be one of mobility and short-term stays. It argues that this simply cannot be the case given the economic fundamentals – in particular the disparity in wages and welfare benefits between East and West Europe. This will automatically lead to large scale and permanent migration. The goal then is to restrict the inevitable immigration and 'welfare tourism', not least by reducing the right of EU workers to claim benefit in the UK for children resident elsewhere in the EU. In reality, its bid to cut child benefit could be the factor that makes this migration permanent and large-scale: it forces Polish workers to bring their dependents to the UK, encouraging family reunification and long-term settlement. See: Parkes (2014).

[44] This is the so-called 'migration trap': Polish migrants undergo a de-skilling in the UK and then struggle to find an equivalent job in Poland. The longer they stay in the UK in low-skilled work, the more outdated their original qualifications become. See: Iglicka (2010); see also the work done by Marta Stormowska on the 'EU's new diasporas', http://goodgov.pism.pl/o-projekcie.

[45] This is especially so since the government in Warsaw increasingly appeals to their patriotism and sense of national duty to persuade them to return home: Krupa (2014)

[46] The UK government wilfully relied on a low estimate about the scale of Polish immigration to Britain which had been predicated on the idea that other member states would also open their labour markets, even though it quickly became clear this was not so: Lowther (2013).

[47] Spawned not least by the much misinterpreted essay Fukuyama (1989).

[48] For a useful overview of the literature: Economist (2012).

[49] See also the profile of migrants to OECD countries in: Docquier et al. (2010).

[50] By thinking of themselves as immobile societies in this way, West Europeans have diminished their capacity to welcome immigrants. Countries with an emigration history often perceive immigrants positively, not least because they understand that it is often the most ambitious and qualified who move: Foreign Policy Magazine (2008). This can be shown quite clearly in the differences between Ireland (a self-conscious country of emigration, which tends to assume that migrants are the brightest and the best) and the UK (which has largely forgotten its history of emigration, and does not) when it comes to welcoming immigrants.

[51] By way of illustration: the EU's eastern border is twice as long as the US's troublesome southern border – and of course it has a sizeable southern border of its own.

<hr />

[52] In the years from 1989, European states found themselves feeling small and old-fashioned, an old form of territorial order. US strategists encouraged them to transform themselves so as to deal with the new global scale of economic activity, with trade a particular example (Hettne 1998: 225). European strategists proved receptive to this kind of thinking and pictured themselves as striving towards a kind of 'post-modernity' (Cooper 2003; for critical analysis also Buzan 1998). They could also readily agree with their US counterparts that cultural and perhaps even regional bonds were illegitimate units of governance in a globalised economy (with the exception, presumably, of a civilization called 'the West'). After all, the EU had led the field in overcoming the debilitating effects of just such bonds since the 1950s. The response in Brussels was to scale up the nation-state to fit the EU.

Europe's post-1989 policy was thus driven by an odd mix of inferiority and superiority complexes - unsurprising, given there is a history of Europeans picturing themselves as more sophisticated than the Americans so as to console themselves to their relative loss of influence: Ashton (2005). For analysis of Europe's desire to see itself as 'post-modern' and its use of the politics of time: Klinke (2012).

[53] As a sign that 'globalisation' along US lines is coming to an end, commentators in emerging powers like to point out that, in the 2007 financial crisis, 'the US sneezed and only Europe caught cold'. This apparently shows that the US no longer has a super-systemic status. They do not argue that the financial crisis spells the end of global economic interconnectivity or globalization in a general sense – it merely suggests that globalisation will now occur along different lines. See: Desai (2010).

[54] At this point, it is worth recalling the argument made by Grevi and Keohane (2015) that none of the world's regional hegemons are really happy with the current instability in global affairs. Whilst some a prepared to take advantage of the situation, there is an underlying desire for stabilisation.

[55] The EU views itself as a mid-size power in a world of mid-size powers, and seeks relations with its 'peers'. In the past five or so years, the focus has thus been on wooing regional hegemons into a series of so-called strategic partnerships (Renard 2012: 3). Admittedly, during discussions in 2014 on a 'European global strategy' and a 'comprehensive EU security approach', there was some talk about drawing together the EU's patchwork of regional strategies into a coherent whole. But insofar as the EU has held to its old inter-regional perspective, it is on an altered normative base. The EU either treats large powers as regions in their own right – for instance, offering China lessons about coordinating its social security system based on its own experience with 28 member states. Or it encourages clusters of countries to engage in regional integration, but for rather self-interested reasons of its own. The EU now encourages cooperation amongst African states so as to prevent China using its weight to secure access to energetic resources or fisheries there. But it has itself long been accused of taking a divide and rule approach to African states.

[56] This idea of EU power rippling outwards fits a classic conception of distance – the assumption that an actor's political influence naturally diminishes over physical space: Henrikson (2002). One of the problems with this conception of how power and cooperation drops off as distances increase, however, is that interests may diverge more strongly the further one moves from the core of power, requiring more robust cooperative formats. Thus the EU needed to put in place much stronger cooperation regimes at its border and the neighbourhood instead of concentrating on its internal affairs.

[57] In a political constellation not unlike today's (Watt 2015), Europe felt that it was facing a US model of globalisation which offered high employment but only at the expense of social solidarity and welfare. Europeans had in the past avoided being drawn into this kind of race to the bottom by establishing the EU as a social and political model for developing-economies to aspire to. Yet this US model was giving voice to a small but vocal economic elite who was ready to criticise the inefficient Continental model and legitimise competition with low-wage economies. The response in Brussels was thus to try reconciling its traditional emphasis on social solidarity with the new forms of cross-border communication unleashed by the end of the Cold War: by investing in education and innovation, the EU would master these new interconnections, ensuring high-skilled jobs remained in Europe and opening up its governance to a more mobile society (European Council 2000; Audretsch and Thurik 2000).

[58] Migration policy encourages states to think critically about the way they meld time and space. After all, it involves questions about who is allowed onto national territory and what obligations they bear to the community there. Receiving countries are forced into a process of self-definition. See for example: Geddes and Guiraudon (2004); Favell (1998).

[59] Oddly enough, there have been many attempts to portray the EU as 'imperial' in its behaviour, yet few of them actually visit the quite explicit vision of post-War Paris that the EU should be precisely that – imperial: Behr (2007); Waever (1997); Zielonka (2006); Armstrong and Anderson (2007).

[60] On the links between Hegelian thinking and French-style Republican citizenship: Bohman (2012).

[61] Germany has been happy to raise the spectre of the past – its own nationalism and aggression – in order to push France into agreeing to this Kantian vision: Behnke (2012).

[62] This legalistic idea of European citizenship and a right to free movement effectively rendered European workers invisible in the German system, exempting them from the usual controversy surrounding migration: Favell (2013).

[63] On the fault-lines in this area of Kantian thought see: Kleingeld (1998).

[64] For analysis of how German hegemony is coming to pass, at Britain's expense: Schmidt (1999).

[65] On Germany's initial exclusion of southern members like Italy from the Schengen project, and the subsequent pattern of geographic tensions: Zaiotti (2013); European Stability Initiative (2011).

[66] Not only would this re-ordering resolve some of the internal tensions within the EU, the combination might just appeal to other world regions. Analysts point to a bottom-up and inter-regional impulse elsewhere in the world: Rother and Piper (2014).

[67] This section relies on: Bovens and Wille (1994); Kosar (2010); Papademetriou (2014); Peri (2012); Pager (2011); Favell (2003) – in pretty much that sequence.

References

Abdelal, R and Meunier, S., (2010) "Managed globalization: doctrine, practice, and promise." *Journal of European Public Policy* 17(3), pp. 349–366.

Aggarwal, V. and Fogarty, E. (2004) "Between regionalism and globalization: European Union interregional trade strategies." In: Aggarwal and Fogarty (eds.), *EU Trade Strategies. Between Regionalism and Globalism.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ahmed, M. (2012) "Will Europe's economic problems affect the Middle East and North Africa?" International Monetary Fund commentary http://www.imf.org/external/np/vc/2012/022312.htm

All Party Parliamentary Group for European Reform (2013) "Inquiry into EU free movement and immigration: the lifting of transitional controls for Bulgaria and Romania." APPG paper.

Allen, P. (2014) "Fury as mayor of Calais plans for 'new Sangatte': camp will be 'refuelling stop' for migrants on way to UK, say MPs." Daily Mail (online), 23rd August 2014, http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2731891/Calais-mayor-opens-talks-new-Sangatte-house-400-migrants-final-leg-Britain.html

Ames, P. (2012) "Return of Europe's dreaded 'Polish plumber'." Global Post, 12th March 2012, http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/regions/europe/120311/return-europe-s-dreaded-polish-plumber

Angenendt, S. and Parkes, R. (2010) "A New Impulse for EU Asylum Policy? The Potential of the European Asylum Support Office", SWP Comments 2010/C 21, http://www.swp-berlin.org/fileadmin/contents/products/comments/2010C21_adt_pks_ks.pdf.

Armstrong, W. and Anderson, J. (ed.s) (2007) *Geopolitics of European Union Enlargement: The Fortress Empire*. Basingstoke: Routledge.

Ashton, N. (2005) "Harold MacMillan and the 'golden days' of Anglo-American relations revisited, 1957-63." *Diplomatic History* 29(1), pp. 691-723.

Audretsch, D. and Thurik, R. (2000) "Capitalism and democracy in the 21st Century: from the managed to the entrepreneurial economy." *Journal of Evolutionary Economics* 10(1-2), pp. 17-34.

Baker, G. (2007) "Post-territorial politics and the politics of difference.", In: *Journal of the Royal Geographic Society* 39(1), pp. 109-112.

Behnke, A. (2012) "The theme that dare not speak its name: Geopolitik, geopolitics and German foreign policy since unification." In: Guzzini, S. (ed.) *The Return of Geopolitics in Europe? Social Mechanisms and Foreign Policy Identity Crises* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Behr, H. (2007) "The European Union in the legacies of imperial rule? EU accession politics viewed from an historical comparative perspective." *European Journal of International Relations* 13(2), pp. 239-262.

Bennett, S. (2014) "Time to muzzle neoliberal rhetoric and find a new language to promote immigration", *New Statesman*, 11th November 2014, http://www.newstatesman.com/politics/2014/11/time-muzzle-neoliberal-rhetoric-and-find-new-language-promote-immigration

Biscop, S. (2015) "Get rid of reassurance." European Geostrategy, 15th January 2015, http://www.europeangeostrategy.org/2015/01/get-rid-reassurance/

Bohman, J. (2010) "Is Hegel a Republican? Pippin, recognition, and domination in the Philosophy of Right." *Inquiry* 53(5), pp. 435-449

Borchardt, K.-D. (2010) "The ABC of European Union law", EU publications office, http://europa.eu/documentation/legislation/pdf/oa8107147_en.pdf.

Borg, S. (2014) "Euro-crafting at border zones: the case of the Greco-Turkish border and the question of a European Union 'beyond the state.'" *Geopolitics* 19(3) pp. 1-22.

Borg, S. (forthcoming 2015) *European Integration and the Problem of the State: a Critique of the Bordering of Europe*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Bovens, M. and Wille, A. (2009) "Diploma Democracy: on the tensions between meritocracy and democracy", Report for the programme Contested Democracies, Utrecht/ Leiden http://www.uu.nl/SiteCollectionDocuments/REBO/REBO_USBO/REBO_USBO_OZZ/Bovens/NWO_Rapport_diplomademocracy_090316.pdf

Bremmer, I. and Kupchan, C. (2015) "Top risks 2015." Eurasia Group report, 5th January 2015, http://www.eurasiagroup.net/pages/top-risks-2015

Briffault, R. (1994) "What about the 'ism' - normative and formal concerns in contemporary federalism." Vanderbilt Law Review 47.

Broughton, P. (2014) "Deflation: the new spectre haunting Europe (and how to exorcise it)." Spectator, 22nd November 2014 http://www.spectator.co.uk/features/9375962/how-to-fight-europes-demons-of-deflation/

de Bruycker, P. (2014) "The Missed Opportunity of the "Ypres Guidelines" of the European Council Regarding Immigration and Asylum." EUI blogs, 29th June 2014 http://blogs.eui.eu/migrationpolicycentre/the-missed-opportunity-of-the-ypres-guidelines-of-the-european-council-regarding-immigration-and-asylum/

Brzezinski, Z. (1997) *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and its Geostrategic Imperatives*. New York: Basic Books.

Bunyan, T. (2003) "The story of Tampere." Statewatch briefing http://www.statewatch.org/news/2008/aug/tampere.pdf

Buzan, B. (1998) "System versus units in theorizing about the Third World." In: Neuman, S. (ed.) *International Relations Theory and the Third World.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Caldwell, C. (2009) *Reflections on the Revolution in Europe*. London: Allen Lane.

Cooper, R. (2003) *The Breaking of Nations: Order and Chaos in the Twenty-first Century.* New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.

Christou, G. (2010) "The European Union, borders and conflict transformation: the case of Cyprus." *Cooperation and Conflict* 45(1), pp. 55-79.

Clark, C. (2014) "Vaclav Klaus: the West's lies about Russia are monstrous." Spectator, 27th September 2014, http://www.spectator.co.uk/features/9322652/europe-needs-systemic-change/

Collett, E. (2014) "The EU's strategic guidelines on migration: uncontentious consensus but missed opportunity." MPI Commentary July 2014, http://www.migrationpolicy.org/news/european-union-strategic-guidelines-migration-uncontentious-consensus-missed-opportunity

Collier, P. (2014) "How to fix Britain's immigration crisis (without leaving the EU)." Spectator, 13th December 2014 (also online at: http://www.spectator.co.uk/features/9398682/how-to-fix-britains-immigration-crisis-without-leaving-europe/).

Collinson, S. (1996) "Visa requirements, carrier sanctions, 'Safe Third Countries' and 'Readmission': The development of an asylum 'buffer zone' in Europe." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 21(1), pp. 76-90.

Corfe, R. (2014) *The Democratic Imperative: The Reality of Power Relationships in the Nation State*. New York: Arena Books.

Cresswell, T. (2006) *On the Move: Mobility in the Western World*. Abingdon: Taylor and Francis (first chapter accessible at: http://sites.tufts.edu/carscultureplace2010/files/2010/09/Cresswell_On-the-Move_Chap-1.pdf).

Dandeker, C. (1990) *Surveillance, Power and Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Demeny, P. and MacNicoll, G. (2006) "The political demography of the world system, 2000-2050." Population Council, www.popcouncil.org/uploads/pdfs/wp/213.pdf

Desai, R. (2010) "The absent geopolitics of pure capitalism." in: *World Review of Political Economy* 1(3) pp. 463-484.

Devrim, D. and Solar, E. (2010) "Turkey's bold new visa diplomacy." Cidob notes internacionals 12 http://www.cidob.org/en/publications/notes_internacionals/n1_12/turkey_s_bold_new_visa_diplomacy.

Docquier, F. and Marfouk, A. (2006) "International migration by educational attainment, 1990–2000." In: Ozden, C. and Schiff, M. (ed.s) *International Migration, Remittances, and the Brain Drain*. Washington DC: The World Bank/ Palgrave Macmillan.

Docquier, F. et al. (2010) "The wage effects of immigration and emigration." NBER Working Paper No. 16646, http://www.nber.org/papers/w16646.pdf

Downs, W. (2011) "Social Democracy's strategic quandary: responses to immigration challenges and issue capture in Europe." *Perspectives on European Politics and Society* 12(3), pp. 242-262.

Duevell, F. (2012) "Clandestine migration in the Greek-Turkish border region: shifting routes and complex control infra-structures." Blog 24th April 2012 http://fduvell.tumblr.com/post/48683034387/clandestine-migration-in-the-greek-turkish-bo

Duevell, F. (2014) "Turning point in Ukraine's diaspora politics?" Blog 8th October 2014 http://fduvell.tumblr.com/post/99504859206/turning-point-in-ukraines-diaspora-politics

Dyer-Witheford, N. and de Peuter, G. (2009) *Games of Empire: Global Capitalism and Video Games*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

Economist (2009) "The noodle bowl." Economist 3rd September 2009 http://www.economist.com/node/14384384.

Economist (2012) "Border follies: liberalising migration could deliver a huge boost to global output." Economist 17th November 2012 http://www.economist.com/news/finance-and-economics/21566629-liberalising-migration-could-deliver-huge-boost-global-output-border-follies.

European Council (2000) "Presidency conclusions (Lisbon Strategy) 23rd-24th March 2000."
http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/lis1_en.htm.

European Council (2014) "Presidency conclusions, 26/27 June 2014." EUCO 79/14 27
http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/meetings/european-council/2014/06/26-27/.

EUbusiness (2014) "Juncker to halt enlargement as EU Commission head." EUbusiness, 15th
July 2014, http://www.eubusiness.com/news-eu/politics-juncker.x29.

European Organisation for Security (accessed 15th January 2015) "Internet of the Sea."
Sustainable Development Magazine (online),
http://www.sustainabledevelopmentmagazine.com/?p=1380.

European Stability Initiative (2011) "Land borders in Europe: a dramatic story in three acts."
European Stability Initiative 12th October 2011,
http://www.esiweb.org/rumeliobserver/2011/10/12/land-borders-in-europe-a-dramatic-story-in-three-acts/.

Eurostat (2014) "Migration and migrant population statistics."
http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Migration_and_migrant_population_statistics.

Favell, A. (1998) *Philosophies of Integration: Immigration and the Idea of Citizenship in France and Britain.* London: Macmillan.

Favell, A. (2009) "The multicultural challenge." *Comparative Social Research* 22, pp. 13-42.

Favell, A. (2009) "Immigration, migration, and free movement in the making of Europe." In:
Checkel, J. and Katzenstein, P. (ed.s) *European Identity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Adrian Favell, "The changing face of 'integration' in a mobile Europe", Council of Europe,
2013, http://www.adrianfavell.com/CESweb.pdf.

Foreign Policy Magazine (2008) "The List: the world's best places to be an immigrant",

Foreign Policy Magazine (online), 11th February 2008, http://foreignpolicy.com/2008/02/11/the-list-the-worlds-best-places-to-be-an-immigrant/.

Frelick, B. (2002) "Barriers to protection: Turkey's asylum regulations." *International Refugee Law* 9(1), pp. 8-34

Frontex (2010) "Frontex operational office opens in Piraeus." Frontex website, 1st October 2010,
http://frontex.europa.eu/news/frontex-operational-office-opens-in-piraeus-hk4q3Z.

Fukuyama, F. (1989) "The End of History." *The National Interest* (Summer), pp. 3–18,
http://www.kropfpolisci.com/exceptionalism.fukuyama.pdf.

Geddes, A. (2003) "Integrating immigrants and minorities in a wider and deeper Europe." In:
Spohn, W. et al., *Europeanisation, National Identities and Migration.* London: Routledge.

Geddes, A. and Guiraudon, V. (2004) "Britain, France, and EU anti-discrimination policy: the
emergence of an EU policy paradigm." *West European Politics* 27(2), pp. 334-353.

Ghimis, A. et al. (2014) "Stigmatisation of EU mobile citizens: a ticking time bomb for the
European project", EPC briefing, January 2014,
www.epc.eu/pub_details.php?cat_id=4&pub_id=4096.

Giddens, A. (1987) *The Nation State and Violence.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Glaser, G. (2014) "Bring back history: Fukuyama's 'end of history' 25 years on." Guardian (online) http://www.theguardian.com/books/2014/mar/21/bring-back-ideology-fukuyama-end-history-25-years-on.

Gordon, J. (2014) "ISIS' desire to erase Sykes-Picot is rooted in fiction, not history." National Interest, 17th September 2014, http://nationalinterest.org/feature/isis%E2%80%99-desire-erase-sykes-picot-rooted-fiction-not-history-11293

Gray, J. (2013) "Reviewed: 'Edmund Burke: Philosopher, Politician, Prophet' by Jesse Norman. History has no author." New Statesman, 16th May 2013, http://www.newstatesman.com/politics/2013/05/reviewed-edmund-burke-philosopher-politician-prophet-jesse-norman.

Greenaway, D. and Nelson, D. (2004) "The distinct political economies of trade and migration policy through the window of endogenous policy models." Paper presented to the 2004 Kiel Week Conference, Kiel: World Institute for World Economics.

Greenhill, K. (2010) *Weapons of Mass Migration* Ithaca: Cornell.

Grevi, G. and Keohane, D. (eds.) (2015) "Challenges for European foreign policy in 2015. How others deal with disorder." FRIDE report, http://fride.org/download/Challenges_for_European_Foreign_Policy_2015.pdf.

Haege, F. (2014) "The Lisbon Treaty's change to Council voting rules will have important implications for the democratic legitimacy of the EU." LSE EUROPP blog 3rd February 2014, http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/europpblog/2014/02/03/the-lisbon-treatys-change-to-council-voting-rules-will-have-important-implications-for-the-democratic-legitimacy-of-the-eu/

Hansen, P. and Jonsson, S. (2011) "Demographic colonialism: EU-African migration management and the legacy of Eurafrica." *Globalizations* 8(3), pp. 261-276.

Hansen, R. and Koehler, J. (2010) "The Future of Migration Governance and Regional Consultative Processes." WMR background paper, International Organisation for Migration, http://publications.iom.int/bookstore/free/WMR2010_governance_regional_consultative_processes.pdf

Hanson, G. (2009) "The economic consequences of the international migration of labor." *Annual Review of Economics*, 1, pp. 179–207.

Harari, Y (2014) "Who domesticated humans?", Blog, http://www.ynharari.com/happiness/articles/who-domesticated-humans/.

Hatton, T. (2007) "Should we have a WTO for international migration?" *Economic Policy* 22(5) pp. 339–383.

Hatton, T. and Williamson, J. (2006) "A dual policy paradox: why have trade and immigration policies always differed in labor-scarce economies?" IZA Discussion Papers/ 2146.

Havel, V. (1985) "The power of the powerless." In: *The Power of the Powerless* Armonk: ME Sharpe.

Hawkins, O. (2014) "Migration statistics." Parliamentary note SN/SG/6077 December 2014, www.parliament.uk/briefing-papers/sn06077.pdf

Henrikson, A. (2002) "Distance and foreign policy: a political geography approach." in: *International Political Science Review* 23(4), pp. 437-466.

Hettne, B. (1998) *Regional Integration and Multilateral Cooperation in the Global Economy*. The Hague: Fondad.

Hillebrand, E. (2010) "Deglobalization scenarios: who wins? Who loses?" *Global Economy Journal* 10(2), pp. 1-19, http://www.uky.edu/~ehill2/dynpage_upload/files/DeglobalizationScenarios.pdf

Holden, M. (2015) "Up to 5,000 European fighters in Syria pose problem: Europol." 13th January 2015, http://www.reuters.com/article/2015/01/13/us-france-shooting-europol-idUSKBN0KM1YC20150113

Hollifield, J. (2004) "The emerging migration state." *International Migration Review* 38, pp. 885-912.

Hollifield, J. (2012) "Why do states risk migration." Paper prepared for IPSA's 22nd World Congress of Political Science, Reshaping Power, Shifting Boundaries, July 8-12, 2012, Madrid, Spain.

Hoogenboom, A. (2014) "In search of a rationale for the EU citizenship jurisprudence." *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 34(4), pp. 1-24.

Hoppe, H.-H. (1998) "The case for free trade and restricted immigration." *Journal of Libertarian Studies* 13(2), pp. 221-233, http://mises.org/sites/default/files/13_2_8_0.pdf.

House of Lords (2014) "The Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership." 14th Report of the European Union Committee, May 2014, http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld201314/ldselect/ldeucom/179/17908.htm

Howard, M. (2005) "Variation in dual citizenship policies in the countries of the European Union." *International Migration Review* 39(3) pp. 697-720.

Huntington, S. (1993) "The clash of civilizations?" *Foreign Affairs* (Summer) http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/48950/samuel-p-huntington/the-clash-of-civilizations

Hurriyet Daily News (2014) "Germany the top European destination for immigrants and asylum-seekers." *Hurriyet Daily News*, 1st December 2014, http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/germany-top-european-destination-for-immigrants-and-asylum-seekers-oecd.aspx?pageID=549&nID=75055&NewsCatID=359.

Iglicka, K. (2010) "Migratory trap: return migration of Poles after 2004", Wydawnictwo Naukowo Scholar.

Ingham, H. and Ingham, M. (ed.s) (2003) *EU Expansion to the East: Prospects and Problems.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Ikenberry, J. (1999) "Why export democracy? The 'hidden grand strategy' of American foreign policy." *The Wilson Quarterly* 23(2), https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/exdem.htm

Joppke, C. (ed.) (1999) *Challenge to the Nation-state: Immigration in Western Europe and the United States*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Karolewski, I. and Suszycki, A. (2013) *European Welfare States – Citizenship, Nationalism and Conflict.* Osnabrueck: Fibre Verlag.

Kashiwazaki, C. and Akaha, T. (2006) "Japanese immigration policy: responding to conflicting pressures." MPI Profile, 1st November 2006, http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/japanese-immigration-policy-responding-conflicting-pressures.

Khong, Y. (2013) "The American tributary system." *Chinese Journal of International Politics* 6(1), pp. 1-47, http://cjip.oxfordjournals.org/content/6/1/1.full#xref-fn-121-1

Kietz, D. and Parkes, R. (2009) "Reprogramming the EU's home affairs policy: hostage to political short-termism?" SWP Comments 17, http://www.swp-berlin.org/fileadmin/contents/products/comments/2009C17_ktz_pks_web_ks.pdf.

Kleingeld, P. (1998) "Kant's cosmopolitan law: world citizenship for a global order." *Kantian Review* 2, pp. 72-90.

Kletzer, C. (2005-2006) "Alexandre Kojève's Hegelianism and the formation of Europe." *Cambridge Yearbook of European Legal Studies* 8, pp. 133-151.

Klinke, I. (2012) "Postmodern geopolitics? The European Union eyes Russia." *Europe-Asia Studies* 64(5), pp. 929–947.

Kosar, K. (2010) "Collaborative democracy on the move." *Public Administration Review* 70(4) pp. 656-660.

Krupa, J. (2014) "Polish migrants have been let down by their government." Guardian (online), 13th January 2014, http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/jan/13/polish-migrants-government-david-cameron.

Labayle, H. and De Capitani, E.(2014) "The next Justice and Home Affairs Programme: everything changed, so nothing can change?" EU law analysis, 19th May 2014, http://eulawanalysis.blogspot.be/2014/05/the-next-justice-and-home-affairs.html.

Lamy, P. (2013) "If we don't hang together in this multipolar world, we'll all hang separately." *Europe's World*, (Autumn), http://europesworld.org/2013/10/01/if-we-dont-hang-together-in-this-multipolar-world-well-hang-separately/#.VLegXmw5DIU.

Van Langenhove, L. (2010) "The EU as a global actor in a multipolar world and multilateral 2.0 environment." Egmont paper 36, March 2010, http://www.cris.unu.edu/fileadmin/user_upload/Egmont_paper_36_by_Luk_Van_Langenhove.pdf.

Lavenex, S. and Wagner, W. (2007) "Which European Public Order? Sources of imbalance in the European Area of Freedom, Security and Justice." *European Security* 16(3), pp. 225-243.

Lebel, L. et al. (2005) "The politics of scale, position, and place in the governance of water resources in the Mekong region." *Ecology and Society* 10(2) www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol10/iss2/art18/ES-2005-1543.pdf.

Lowther, E. (2013) "Prof says his '13,000 EU migrants' report was 'misinterpreted'." BBC news (online), 7th March 2013, http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-21682810

Lutterbeck, D. (2013) "The paradox of gendarmeries: between expansion, demilitarization and dissolution", SSR paper 8, www.dcaf.ch/content/download/150865/2344885/file/SSR_8_EN.pdf.

Malta Independent (2008) "EU leaders unanimously approve immigration pact." Malta Independent, 17th October 2008, http://www.independent.com.mt/articles/2008-10-17/news/eu-leaders-unanimously-approve-immigration-pact-214663/.

Maas, W. (2007) *Creating European Citizens.* Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Mason, P. "Why the world is like a real-life game of global domination" *Guardian* (online), 7th December 2014, http://www.theguardian.com/business/commentisfree/2014/dec/07/world-real-life-game-global-domination.

McKenzie, D. and Gibson, J. (2010) "The development impact of a best practice seasonal worker policy", World Bank report, https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/3970.

Milward, A. (1992) *The European Rescue of the Nation-State.* London: Routledge.

Mitchell, C. (1989) "International migration, international relations and foreign policy." *International Migration Review* 23(3), pp. 681-708.

Murray, D. (2014) "Why are we abandoning the Middle East's Christians to Isis?" Spectator, 13th December 2014, http://www.spectator.co.uk/features/9397482/christians-are-being-driven-out-of-the-middle-east/.

Natural Gas Europe (2014) "Slovenia fears Croatia's bidding round launch will jeopardize maritime dispute." Natural Gas Europe, 17th April 2014, http://www.naturalgaseurope.com/croatia-slovenia-maritime-dispute.

Oltermann, P. (2015) "Why Britain's lovebombing of Berlin has failed." Guardian (online), 7th January 2015, http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/jan/07/why-britain-lovebombing-berlin-failed-migration.

Open Europe (2014) "EU referendum to be held in 2016/2017… No not that one!" Open Europe blog, 31st July 2014, http://openeuropeblog.blogspot.se/2014/07/eu-referendum-to-be-held-in-2016-or.html.

Ozimek, A. (2012) "Is the US the most immigrant friendly country in the world?" Forbes (online), 18th November 2012, http://www.forbes.com/sites/modeledbehavior/2012/11/18/is-the-u-s-the-most-immigrant-friendly-country-in-the-world/.

Pager, S. (2011) "Beyond culture vs. commerce: decentralizing cultural protection to promote diversity through trade." MSU Legal Studies Research Paper Series Research Paper No. 12.

Paoletti, E. (2011) "Power relations and international migration: the case of Italy and Libya." *Political Studies* 59(2), pp. 269–289.

Papademetriou, D. (2014) "Migration's local dividends: how cities and regions can make the most of immigration." MPI Transatlantic Council Statement, July 2014.

Parkes, R. (2011) "The unreliable western partner: why the EU reneges on its home affairs commitments." Eastern Partnership Community, 15th December 2011, http://www.easternpartnership.org/publication/mobility-and-migration/2011-12-15/unreliable-western-partner-why-eu-reneges-its-home-aff.html.

Parkes, R. (2013) "Ein Koffer voller Werkzeuge: Ein Blick in die Zukunft der europäischen Migrationsdebatte." *Internationale Politik*, November 2013.

Parkes, R. (2014) "Whatever happened to the End of History?" Carnegie Europe (blog).

Parkes, R. (2014) "Free movement in the EU: promoting mobility not migration." PISM Bulletin 3(598), www.pism.pl/files/?id_plik=16066.

Parkes, R. and Gastinger, M. (2008) "Die Oeffnung des Arbeitsmarktes fuer Arbeiter der EU8." *Gesellschaft – Wirtschaft – Politik* 4, pp. 479-486.

Parkes, R. and Schwarzer, D. (2012) "The divisiveness of mobility: fuelling populism in the Euro and Schengen areas." SWP Comments 21, http://www.swp-berlin.org/fileadmin/contents/products/comments/2012C21_pks_swd.pdf.

Pascouau, Y. (2014) "The future of the area of freedom, security and justice." EPC Working Paper.

Penketh, A. and Rawlinson, K. (2013) "We never hand anyone over, says Vladimir Putin as Edward Snowden applies for asylum." Independent (online), 2nd July 2013, http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/we-never-hand-anyone-over-says-vladimir-putin-as-edward-snowden-asks-for-asylum-8682507.html.

Peri, G. (2012) "Immigration, labour markets and productivity." *The Cato Journal* 32(1) pp. 35–53, http://object.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/serials/files/cato-journal/2012/1/cj32n1-4.pdf.

Petito, F. (2012) "Dialogue of civilizations in international relations: some reflections on multipolarity, regionalism and peace." paper delivered at the Tenth Rhodes Forum, http://wpfdc.org/dialogue-of-civilizations/18382-dialogue-of-civilizations-in-international-relations-some-reflections-on-multipolarity-regionalism-and-peace.

Raeder, L. (1997) "The Liberalism/Conservatism of Edmund Burke and F. A. Hayek: a critical comparison." *Humanitas* 10(1), http://www.nhinet.org/raeder.htm.

Renard, T. (2012) "The EU strategic partnerships review: ten guiding principles." Fride-Egmont policy brief 2, http://www.ies.be/files/private/28)%20Renard%20-%20Ten%20Guiding%20Principles.pdf.

Rodrik, D. (2002) "Final remarks." In: Boeri, T. et al. (eds.), *Immigration Policy and the Welfare System.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rogers, R. (1992) "The future of refugee flows and policies." *International Migration Review* 26(4), pp. 1112-1143.

Rosecrance, R. (1986) *The Rise of the Trading State: Commerce and Conquest in the Modern World*. New York: Basic Books.

Rother, S. and Piper, N. (2014) "Alternative regionalism from below: democratizing ASEAN's migration governance." *International Migration* (pagination forthcoming).

Schmidt, V. (1999) "The EU and its member-states: institutional contrasts and their consequences." MPIfG Working Paper 99/7, May 1999, http://www.mpifg.de/pu/workpap/wp99-7/wp99-7.html.

Snell, J. (2013) "UKIP is not the home for true libertarians." The Commentator (online), 25th January 2013, http://www.thecommentator.com/article/2574/ukip_is_not_the_home_for_true_libertarians.

Spiegel online (2008) "Only Christians please: Germany's CDU interested in accepting refugees from Iraq." Spiegel online, 28th May 2008, http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/only-christians-please-germany-s-cdu-interested-in-accepting-refugees-from-iraq-a-556144.html.

Spiegel online (2010) "A surge of Serbs and Macedonians: Germany seeks to halt Influx of Balkan asylum seekers." Spiegel online, 25th October 2010, http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/germany-seeks-to-halt-influx-of-balkans-asylum-seekers-a-863345.html.

Thielemann, E. and El-Enany, N. (2010) "Refugee protection as a collective action problem: is the EU shirking its responsibilities?" *European Security* 19(2), pp. 209 -229.

Traynor, I. and Hooper, J. (2011) "France and Italy in call to close EU borders in wake of Arab protests." Guardian (online), 27th April 2011, http://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/apr/26/eu-borders-arab-protests.

Vincent, R. (1984) "Edmund Burke and the theory of International Relations", in: *Review of International Studies* 10(3), pp. 205-218.

Weinar, A. (2014) "Emigration policies in contemporary Europe." CARIM-East research paper 2014/1, https://www.academia.edu/6939353/Emigration_policies.

Wellisch, D. and Walz, U. (1998) "Why do rich countries prefer free trade over free migration? The role of the modern welfare state." *European Economic Review* 42(8), pp. 1595–1612.

UK Government Office for Science (2011) "Foresight: migration and global environmental change." Final Project Report, London: The Government Office for Science.

UNHCR (2007) "Refugee protection and mixed migration: a 10-point plan of action (revised 1st January 2007)." UNHCR action plan, January 2007, http://www.unhcr.org/4742a30b4.html.

White, G. (2007) "Sovereignty and international labor migration: the 'security mentality' in Spanish-Moroccan relations as an assertion of sovereignty." *Review of International Political Economy* 14(4), pp. 690-718.

Waever, O. (1997) "Emerging European analogies to pre-nation state imperial systems." In: Tunander, O. et al. (ed.s) *Geopolitics in Post-Wall Europe: Security, Territory, and Identity.* London: Sage.

Watt, N. (2015) "IMF Chief hails UK economic recovery." Guardian (online), 16th January 2015, http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2015/jan/16/imf-chief-hails-uk-economic-recovery.

Weber, M. (1966) *The City* New York: The Free Press.

Winters, A. et al. (2003) "Negotiating the temporary movement of natural persons: an agenda for the Development Round" In: *The World Economy* 26(8), pp. 1137-1162 (draft available at: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTRES/Resources/liberalising_temporary_movement_LAW.pdf).

Yan, X. (2010) "The instability of China-US relations." In: *Chinese Journal of International Politics* 3(3), pp. 263-292, http://cjip.oxfordjournals.org/content/3/3/263.full

Zaiotti, R. (2013) "The Italo-French row over Schengen, critical junctures, and the future of Europe's border regime." *Journal of Borderlands Studies* 28(3), pp. 337-354.

Zielonka, J. (2006) *Europe as Empire: The Nature of the Enlarged European Union.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

UI Papers

UI Papers are working papers and similar manuscripts reporting the results of research related to UI's focus areas. *UI Papers* are written by UI researchers, visiting researchers, or other researchers wishing to publish with UI (authors are occasionally invited based on their international profile and research reputation). *UI Papers* enable researchers to publish and register the results of research projects fairly swiftly while retaining the rights to publish in other outlets if so desired. Research quality, readability, and relevance are the main criteria for publication. *UI Papers* may also include in-depth policy analyses, which are rigorously researched but less ambitious in terms of theory and scientific methodology.

UI Briefs

UI Briefs are short commentaries (typically ranging from 2-10 pages) on international issues, events or trends related to UI's focus areas. They are written by UI staff, UI visiting researchers, or other researchers associated with UI. *UI Briefs* do not require adherence to strict academic conventions (thus, the traditional 'essay' or the journalistic 'opinion-editorial', and the policy-oriented 'policy brief' fits in this category). References and footnotes are typically rare in *UI Briefs*. Relevance and readability are the main criteria for publication.

Series editor of UI Papers and UI Briefs: Johan Eriksson, Head of Research at UI.

Papers in this series 2015

Parkes, R. (2015) "European Union and the Geopolitics of Migration". *UI Paper* no. 1/2015. February 2015.

UI paper

WOULD YOU LIKE TO
KNOW MORE ABOUT UI?

The Swedish Institute of International Affairs (UI) is an independent platform for research and information on foreign affairs and international relations.

The institute's experts include researchers and analysts specialized in the field of international affairs. While maintaining a broad perspective, research at UI focuses on unbiased scientific analysis of foreign and security policy issues of special relevance to Sweden. UI as an organization does not take a stand on policy issues.

The UI research department produces a number of publications to facilitate engagement with policy and research communities in Sweden and beyond. Each type of publication is subject to an in-house planning and approval process including quality control. UI Papers are reviewed by senior staff at the institute. They solely reflect the view of the author(s).

Please contact our customer service, or visit our website: www.ui.se, where you will find up-to-date information on activities at the Swedish Institute of International Affairs (UI). Here you can also book event tickets, become a member, buy copies of our magazines, and access research publications. Also, join us on Facebook and follow us on Twitter! You can get in touch with us through email: info@ui.se or +46-8-511 768 05