

A Research Agenda for the Study of Migrants and Minorities in Europe

GWENDOLYN SASSE

London School of Economics and Political Science

EIKO THIELEMANN

London School of Economics and Political Science

I. Definitions and Policy Relevance

Migration and minority policy issues are now at the forefront of the political debate in Europe. Both issues denote a dynamic and rapidly changing set of sensitive political, economic and social questions that affect domestic and international policy-making. They have developed a distinctly European and EU dimension, and the parallel processes of EU constitution-making and enlargement have underscored the relevance of these issue areas. The current political context in Europe – between the first and second round of the EU's eastward enlargement and at a time when the whole notion of an EU constitution and future enlargement (in particular in the case of Turkey) have been called into question by the French and Dutch rejections of the Constitutional Treaty – makes discussion about minority and migration issues particularly relevant. This special issue places these issues in a set of research trends and tries to define a new research agenda.

The terms 'migrant' and 'minority' share an underlying definitional imprecision that blurs the respective fields of study and policy-making as well as the linkages between the two. Moreover, some countries (e.g. the UK) explicitly refer to migrants as 'ethnic minorities', thereby adding to the confusion. This special issue adopts sufficiently broad definitions of 'migrants' and 'minorities' to facilitate dialogue beyond narrow specialized circles without, however, glossing over meaningful distinctions. Thus, the term 'ethnic minorities' can subsume a range of migrant groups, while the term 'national minority' is reserved for established minorities claiming minority rights (e.g. forms of

autonomy) to preserve their distinctive features and status. Table 1 provides a taxonomy which maps the most prominent categories of migrants and minorities. It emphasizes the variety of sub-groups and interests subsumed under seemingly distinct labels and groups. Mapping this variety provides a definitional framework for the discussion of migrants and minorities. The taxonomy is designed to be broad, and the categories under ‘migrants’ and ‘minorities’ are not mutually exclusive.

According to a widely used definition, migrants are persons who have been outside their country of birth or citizenship for a period of 12 months or longer. On the migrant side of the taxonomy, one can usefully distinguish three main groups – economic, forced and family migrants – a distinction based on the motivations for leaving one’s country of origin. As for economic migrants, a common distinction is made between legal and illegal migrants, the former entering their new host country through a legal route (such as a temporary or permanent immigrant visa or a work/study permit), the latter often being associated with illegal human trafficking. It is often overlooked that a substantial number of so-called illegal migrants entered their new country legally, but lost their legal status by overstaying their visa. In principle, economic migrants have to be distinguished from those individuals who have left their country in the belief that they cannot or should not return in the near future due to risks to their safety. This category, here referred to as ‘forced migrants’, includes those who been granted asylum under the Geneva Convention or some similar status, but also to other asylum-seekers who hope to be granted refugee or some subsidiary protection status.¹ In practice, the distinction between economic (voluntary) and forced (involuntary) migrants is often not clear-cut, as political and economic causes (and related pressures such as environmental ones)

Table 1: A Taxonomy of Migrants and Minorities

<i>Migrants</i>	<i>Minorities</i>
Economic	National
Legal	Ethnic
Illegal	Religious
Forced	Linguistic
Asylum-seekers	Political
Refugees	
Family	Social

Source: Authors’ own data.

¹ The Geneva Convention (UN Convention on the Status of Refugees 1951, as amended by the 1967 New York Protocol) defines a refugee as a person who ‘owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality, and is unable to or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country’.

frequently impinge on a individual's decision to migrate. Thus, the freedom of choice is rarely absolute, and might be limited in both types of migration. Despite its low profile in most industrialized countries, the often neglected category of 'family migrants' outstrips the numbers involved in the other two migrant categories. In recent years the type of immigration that is related to arranged (or sometimes forced) marriages has brought this type of migration to wider public attention.

It is estimated that there are about 160 million migrants worldwide (2–3 per cent of the global population), supplemented by an estimated 10 million illegal migrants. In 2003 there were an estimated 17 million forced migrants (asylum-seekers and refugees) worldwide; of these 4.1 million were being hosted in Europe (*UNHCR Statistical Yearbook*, 2003, p. 16).² It is further estimated that the annual net inflow of migrants into the EU 15 was about 1.7 million in 2002 (*Eurostat Yearbook*, 2004, p. 52), with just under 50 per cent coming from other European countries. Spain, Italy, Germany and the UK accounted for about 70 per cent of this net inflow. Immigrants have been a politically salient and important aspect of population change in many European countries, constituting a net increase of over 1 per cent of the population in the case of Ireland and Spain in 2001. Without immigration Germany, Greece and Italy would already have registered a population loss in 2003. In the context of an ageing population and a need for certain skills, migrants make an important economic contribution.

Under 'minorities', our taxonomy focuses on three main categories: national minorities, political minorities and social minorities. The distinctions underlying this classification are of a different type from those on the migrant side of the taxonomy. While the category of 'national minorities' focuses on a range of ascriptive markers, the other two categories bring in the political and social context in which different types of minorities operate. Due to this wider definitional framework used for the classification of minorities, there are even closer links between the various categories than in the case of the different migrant groups. Moreover, groups like the Roma that straddle the different categories highlight the inherent difficulties and limits of classifications of minorities.

Generally, a national minority describes a numerical, non-dominant group of individuals that combines objective criteria, such as specific cultural characteristics (ethnicity, language, religion) distinct from the majority of the population, with subjective criteria, such as a collective sense of community.³ The cultural specifics tend to form the basis of these groups' claims to certain

² The 17 million people 'of concern to the UNHCR' in 2003 include just over 4 million internally displaced persons.

³ For the definition by UN Special Rapporteur Capotorti along these lines, see United Nations, E/CN.4/Sub.2/384 Add. 1, 10.

rights or autonomy. As mentioned above, the term ethnic (or racial) minorities is the least precise, as in some countries it is the standard term of reference to immigrant communities. Despite the absence of a clear international definition of a 'national minority, a set of norms and soft law measures has evolved over time. The UN Charter enshrined the principle of 'self-determination'; the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) spelled out this principle as a right of individuals (Article 1) and groups (Article 27). Article 27 stipulates that 'in states in which ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities exist, persons belonging to such minorities shall not be denied the right, in community with other members of their group, to enjoy their own culture, to profess and practice their own religion, or to use their own language' (reprinted in Steiner and Alston, 2000, pp. 1381–94). The exact nature of this right and its implementation, however, have never been elaborated in detail. The Council of Europe and the CSCE/OSCE⁴ gradually emerged as Europe's standard-setting institutions in the field of minority protection, especially after the end of the cold war. In the context of the disintegration of former Yugoslavia and the EU's eastward enlargement, the EU obtained an explicit voice in the discussion about minority protection. Lacking in competence and expertise in this area, the EU by and large adopted the standards of the Council of Europe and the OSCE.

Given that a part of the definition of a 'minority' is its position *vis-à-vis* a 'majority', the political and social dimension of this implicit interaction deserves to be made explicit. It places the discussion about national minorities in a wider context and simultaneously creates space for an integrated discussion of minorities and migrants. The notion of a 'political minority' is a rather loose category. The term itself does not figure prominently in public discourse, but it captures an essential element of democracy. A democratic political system revolves around the balance between political majorities and minorities, and the institutional mechanisms safeguarding this balance. The existence of a political minority presupposes the organization and mobilization of a group or a party aiming for a voice in the political system. A national and/or social minority can, but does not have to be, the backbone of a political minority.

The notion of a 'social minority' forms part of the logic of capitalism, democracy and the welfare state. The term itself sporadically arises in national and international public discourse, usually as a general point of reference without further explanation as, for example, in the UN Secretary-General's *Agenda for Peace* (UN doc. A/47/277-S/241111, 17 June 1992, at para. 18; quoted in Packer, 1999, p. 246). The category includes individuals or groups disadvantaged on the basis of their social characteristics, ranging from their socio-economic profile to their sexual orientation.

⁴ The Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) became the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) in December 1994.

Our basic taxonomy maps some of the linkages between minorities and migrants: national and political minorities are most likely to become forced migrants in the context of repression or war. Social minorities have an incentive to become economic migrants, though social exclusion does not always provide the means and environment for emigration. Conversely, all types of migrants usually become ethnic/racial, religious and linguistic minorities in their new host societies (while the status of a national minority is usually reserved for 'old' minorities defined by their historical residence in the territory). Initially, if not for an indefinite period of time, these migrants tend to find themselves on the margins of society and the political system, thereby becoming both social and political minorities (although the latter of course already presupposes a degree of political engagement and mobilization).

II. The Policy Context

The Domestic Policy Context

Policies towards migrants are also both varied and changeable, characterized by both liberal and restrictive elements. In most industrialized countries concerns about labour market shortages and negative demographic trends mean that states have become more welcoming to particular groups of migrants. For example, in January 2005, following a long and difficult legislative process, the new German Immigration Act came into force which, for the first time in post-war Germany, provides for a legislative framework that makes highly-skilled workers eligible for a permanent settlement permit on entering Germany. In a similar vein, the UK has continued to apply its liberal working permit scheme for highly-skilled workers (such as those in the health sector) and a new 'highly skilled migrants' programme based on a points system (similar to those that exist in Australia and Canada) has operated since 2002. Other countries, such as Greece and Spain, adopted laws for the legalization of undocumented migrants. At the same time, destination countries across the world, and in particular in western Europe, have tried to clamp down on new 'illegal migrants' and so-called 'bogus asylum-seekers'. Such measures have included: turning back boats on the high seas, the introduction of a safe third-country provision under which states turn away asylum-seekers at their borders, the restriction of welfare and legal support, the introduction of fast-track review procedures in cases of 'manifestly unfounded' asylum claims or the increased use of provisions that allow the authorities to detain and deport migrants.

Although minority issues are prevalent across Europe, the OSCE, the EU and, to a lesser extent, the Council of Europe in recent years have focused their engagement in minority issues on eastern Europe and the former Soviet

Union. The violent disintegration of the former Yugoslavia and a number of intractable post-Soviet conflicts, resulting in a dramatic increase in refugees and asylum-seekers in the EU, as well as a perception of further conflict potential in view of sizeable minorities in many east European countries, have underpinned this policy focus. Some figures suffice to sketch some of these dimensions: in Latvia, for example, the titular nationality accounts for only 58 per cent of the population (and about 20 per cent of the population is made up of stateless residents); countries like Slovakia, Romania and Bulgaria have to accommodate Hungarian and Turkish minorities of 7–10 per cent that are politically represented by their own parties; and most countries in central and eastern Europe (CEE) comprise large Roma populations (e.g. over 1 million in Romania).

Across Europe attitudes to national minorities and the political and legal salience of minority issues vary considerably. In prominent cases of sub-state nationalism, such as Spain or the UK, the groups in question fit the description of ‘nations without a state’ better than that of a national minority. While some countries have established complex institutional power-sharing mechanisms (e.g. Belgium), many have been reluctant (e.g. Germany or Greece) or outright unwilling to recognize the existence of national minorities in principle (e.g. France). Among the EU Member States, Belgium, Greece, Latvia and Luxembourg have signed, but not yet ratified the Council of Europe’s Framework Convention on the Protection of National Minorities, and France has neither signed nor ratified it. Despite the only hesitant take-up of the Framework Convention by several old Member States, this instrument of minority protection has been used as a key measure of ‘progress’ and compliance with EU norms by the candidate countries.

The EU Policy Context

During the recent round of eastward enlargement ‘the respect for and protection of minorities’ formed part of the EU’s political conditionality enshrined in the first Copenhagen criterion. Although the ultimate effectiveness of this type of conditionality and the sustainability of the policy outcomes are still an issue of debate, it is clear that human and minority rights are a policy area in which the EU’s external relations have driven a (partial) rethinking of the EU’s values and objectives. This development has taken place against a paradoxical backdrop: while minority issues have been at the forefront of the enlargement rhetoric and are often singled out as a prime example of the EU’s positive stabilizing impact in the CEE states, the EU has in fact promoted norms which lack a basis in EU law and do not directly translate into the *acquis communautaire*. In the area of minority protection, the EU borrowed standards and monitoring practices from the Council of Europe and the OSCE. While the former links

minority issues and democracy, the latter underpins the significance of minorities for security and stability in particular. As long as enlargement continues, the issue of minority protection will remain on the EU's agenda through the regular monitoring of candidate countries.

The EU constitution-making process could have potentially raised legal and political questions relating to minorities to a new level of communitarization. Article I-2 of the draft Constitutional Treaty of June 2004 refers to 'the respect for human rights, including the right of persons belonging to minorities' as one of the Union's key values. Article 21 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights, incorporated as Part 2 of the draft Constitutional Treaty, makes an even more explicit reference to 'membership of a national minority' among the grounds for discrimination to be prohibited. Alongside Article 22, stipulating the Union's respect for 'cultural, religious and linguistic diversity', it would apply to any action of the EU institutions and the Member States when implementing EU law if the draft Constitutional Treaty had been ratified or the charter had been made legally binding on its own merits. At present, the race equality directive 2000/43/EC represents the EU's most far-reaching constitutional measure on minority-sensitive policies. Member States are obliged to transpose the directive fully into domestic legislation, thereby legally embedding the norm of 'equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin'.

In the area of migration the EU has been most active in the (de-)regulation of the movement of EU citizens and in the management of forced migration from outside the EU. In contrast, the rules concerning economic and family migrants from the rest of the world have largely remained in the hands of Member State authorities. The initial focus of the integration process in migration matters was on free movement to enable citizens from the Member States to live and work anywhere in the EU. The Treaty provisions on free movement were further developed by the signing of the Schengen agreement in 1990, which created an area within the EU in which residents and visitors from outside are free to travel as they wish without systematic passport checks at national borders. However, for such freedoms to be fully enjoyed, it was recognized that the EU's external borders have to be controlled effectively, and specific co-operation between the Member States on issues such as cross-border crime, police and judicial co-operation, and joint visa and asylum policies has been developing since the mid-1970s. The Dublin convention establishing rules on the assignment of responsibility for asylum-seekers was signed in 1990 and constituted the cornerstone for co-operation in this area. The Treaty on European Union, which entered into force in November 1993, took a further step by incorporating

the regulation of third-country nationals within its institutional framework.⁵ The entry into force of the Amsterdam Treaty in May 1999 incorporated the Schengen rules into this framework. The declared objective of the Amsterdam Treaty is to maintain and develop the Union as an area of 'freedom, security and justice', in which there would be free movement for EU citizens combined with suitable measures pertaining to the control of external borders, asylum, immigration, as well as the prevention and combating of crime (for an overview see Guild and Harlow, 2001). Since then, EU developments aimed at jointly controlling migration from outside the EU have undergone rapid revisions. In particular, the European Union has been developing a more co-ordinated asylum and immigration policy so that asylum applicants are treated in the same way across the Member States, legal immigrants are integrated into European societies, and joint actions can be taken to prevent abuses of the system and to tackle illegal immigration more effectively. These developments have been sparked not only by the provisions of the Treaty of Amsterdam but also by the Vienna action plan of 1998 and, above all, by the Tampere European Council conclusions in 1999. These have led to a number of prominent initiatives such as: the creation of the European refugee fund in 2000; the 2001 temporary protection directive; the 2002 political agreement on a common definition for persons eligible for refugee and subsidiary protection status; the directives on common reception conditions for asylum-seekers; family reunification; the status of third-country nationals; the Dublin II regulation on the state responsible for examining an asylum application in 2003; and the recent commitments made in the November 2004 Hague programme which lays out the EU's policy agenda in the area of 'freedom, security and justice' for the period 2005–10.⁶ In addition, the European Commission has negotiated more than a dozen re-admission agreements with third countries to facilitate the return of illegal immigrants and failed asylum-seekers. Since 1 May 2004, the Schengen agreement is no longer the only instrument in the area of free movement. With the recent round of enlargement, the old EU-15 Member States have established transitional restrictions on free movement of labour from the ten new Member States which will remain in place for up to seven years. These policy developments have led to intense research interest in the areas of migration and minorities in recent years.

⁵ It should be noted that Denmark, the UK and Ireland do not participate fully in a number of justice and home affairs matters, or participate only under certain conditions. In particular, the UK and Ireland do not take part in the Schengen rules on free movement of persons, external border controls and visa policy.

⁶ For the European Refugee Fund, see OJ L 252/12 of 6 October 2000 (renewed in 2004, see OJ381/52 of 28 December 2004); the Council Directive on temporary protection in the case of mass influx is published in OJ L 212, 7 August 2001; for the Directive on common reception conditions see OJ L/2003/31/18; for the Directive on family reunification OJ L 251 of 3 October 2003; for the Directive on third-country nationals OJ L 16 of 23 January 2004; for the Dublin II Regulation on the state responsible for examining an asylum application (OJ L50/1 of 25 February 2003) and for the Hague Programme OJ C53/1 of 3 March 2005.

III. Research Trends

The literature on national minorities has traditionally focused on definitional issues and the evolution of the concept of minority rights (Thornberry, 1990; Jackson-Preece, 1998; Packer, 1999; Pentassuglia, 2002). Minorities and minority rights have figured prominently in three areas of research: the study of ethnic conflicts, multiculturalism and human rights. Post-cold war and post-communist developments in Europe have induced a new momentum into these debates. The institutionalization of the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM) in the early 1990s, the inclusion of 'the protection of and respect for minorities' in the EU's set of Copenhagen criteria for membership, the Council of Europe's Framework Convention on the Protection of National Minorities (FCNM) of 1995 and the high-profile international engagement in the conflict zones of the Balkans provide the supranational institutional point of reference in this regard. Apart from case-specific or comparative studies of minority governance and language policies in eastern Europe (Gál, 2002; Evans and Need, 2002; Kovács, 2003; Daftary and Grin, 2003; Smootha and Järve, 2005), the transfer of the legal and political norms of minority protection to countries undergoing a regime transition (Kymlicka and Opalski, 2001), case studies of minority self-governance and language policies in central and eastern Europe, an analysis of the EU's involvement in minority issues during its eastward enlargement and beyond (EUMAP, 2001, 2002; Hughes and Sasse, 2003; Toggenburg, 2004; Sasse, 2005), detailed accounts of the OSCE High Commissioner's engagement in eastern Europe (Kemp, 2001; Kulyk, 2002; Sarv, 2002; Horváth, 2002; Dorodovna, 2003), the first assessments of the complex policy process surrounding the FCNM (Thornberry and Estébanez, 2004; Weller, 2005), have emerged as the focal points of recent research on minority rights (for a recent overview see Malloy, 2005). Increasingly, the study of national minorities and minority rights has developed an interest in groups and issues that have traditionally been closer to the study of migration. The latest edition of the *European Yearbook of Minority Issues*, for example, chose Muslim minorities and the economic participation of minorities as its two special foci. These issues were discussed alongside (though not integrated with) an update on international and institutional developments in the area of minority rights and discussions about the accommodation of diversity in the Balkans (Lantschner and Malloy, 2005).

Comparative research on migration in Europe has remained divided into two major strands. One strand deals with questions of immigration control (Joppke, 1998; Guiraudon and Joppke, 2001; Cornelius *et al.*, 2004), the other with issues of migrant integration (Brubaker, 1992; Bommers and Geddes, 2000; Koopmans and Statham, 2000; Hansen and Weil, 2001). The real growth

area in recent years, however, has been the study of the role of the European Union in regulating migration in Europe (see, e.g., Guild, 1996; Geddes, 2000; Peers 2000; Hailbronner 2000; Noll, 2000; Koslowski, 2000; Kostakopoulou, 2001; Lavenex, 1999, 2001; Byrne *et al.*, 2002; Lavenex and Uçarer, 2002; Boswell, 2003; Lahav, 2004). In particular three questions have framed the EU research agenda in this field. The first addresses the question of why there has been increased co-operation between Member States in this area. Research has focused on functional explanations which have emphasized gains from co-operation in an increasingly interdependent Europe. Some have argued that with the move to the European level, governments have circumvented national constraints on migration control by creating transnational co-operation mechanisms dominated by law and order officials (Bigo, 1992; Guiraudon, 2000; Huysmans, 2000).

Linked, but separate is the question of why there has been a shift from 'intergovernmentalism' to 'communitarization', i.e. the type of European co-operation that has become increasingly supranational over time. Studies have used principal-agent theories to explain this trend that started with the Amsterdam Treaty (Stetter 2000) and continued with the negotiations on the draft Constitutional Treaty (Ricchi, 2005) and decisions recently taken in the context of the 'Hague programme', as a result of which Community institutions are now able to exert much greater influence on policy-making in this area.⁷ Finally, a number of recent studies have tried to assess the impact of EU policy on three key aspects of the EU's 'area of freedom, security and justice': human rights, control of unwanted migration and 'refugee burden-sharing'. Regarding the first, researchers have dealt with the question of how migration has developed into a security issue and what role European integration has played in this development. They have explored the political processes connecting migration to criminal and terrorist abuses of the internal market and have shown how this has led to an environment where immigrants, and in particular asylum-seekers, are portrayed as a challenge to security, identity and welfare (Huysmans, 2000; Geddes, 2000). As to the second, analysts have tried to assess the extent to which EU policy has been effective in controlling unwanted migration, with studies generally cautioning against placing too much confidence in the regulatory capacity of border control measures (Hatton, 2004; Neumayer, 2004; Thielemann, forthcoming). Regarding the third, a number of studies have called into question the EU's refugee burden-sharing agenda which, according to the Amsterdam Treaty, aims to 'promot[e] a balance of effort between Member States in receiving and bearing the consequences of

⁷ The governance rules in this area are now similar to those in other areas of the single market and include the standard use of qualified majority voting and a greater role for the European Parliament through the use of the co-decision procedure.

receiving refugees and displaced persons' (Article 63.2b). With similar declarations having been dismissed already in the context of the Dublin convention (Noll 2000), recent research findings have questioned the effectiveness of EU burden-sharing initiatives that have sought to harmonize Member States' asylum policies (Thielemann 2004; Thielemann and Dewan forthcoming).

IV. A Research Agenda

Against the backdrop of the broad research trends presented above, this special issue formulates a research agenda around four themes: the interlock between migrants and minorities; the tension between security-based and rights-based approaches to migrants and minorities; the role of public and elite perceptions on migration and minority issues; and the impact of supranational policy-making on domestic institutions, actors and policies. By exploring different facets of these four themes, this special issue keeps with the long-established multi-disciplinary approach of *JCMS*. Its contributions rely on political science, legal and sociological approaches in an attempt to advance and to further encourage research on migrants and minorities in Europe

The Interlock between Migrants and Minorities

Minorities referred to as 'old' or 'established' are often the result of earlier waves of migration. New immigrants often experience similar integration problems to those of old minorities. These problems, in turn, can become incentives for new migratory movements. In Europe's dense institutional environment, policy-making at different levels of governance is shaped by minority and migration issues. So far researchers and policy-makers have treated both issue areas separately. While there have been a number of studies, especially edited volumes, acknowledging implicit linkages between migrants and minorities (Cesarani and Fulbrook, 1996; Joly, 1998; Geddes and Favell, 1999; Wrench *et al.*, 1999; Koopmans and Statham, 2000; Hudson and Reno, 2000; Guiraudon and Joppke, 2001; Castles and Miller, 2003), this volume attempts to make these underlying conceptual and policy linkages more explicit. Several authors place the exploration of these linkages at the centre of their analysis (see, in particular, Sasse, Cholewinski, Hughes, Gulgielmo and Waters, and Toggenburg). It is not suggested here that a new policy paradigm, reflecting the interlock between both issue areas, is already in existence. Instead several contributions to this special issue discuss both the scope and the limits of these linkages.

Security- and Rights-Based Approaches

A tension between security- and rights-based approaches characterizes the literature on migrants and minorities. A security-based approach concentrates on the control of migration or conflict potential; a rights-based approach focuses on different sets of rights as well as on notions such as 'justice' or 'post-national membership'. Rather than presenting the two approaches as normative alternatives, this special issue draws out the need to reconceptualize them as being interlinked (see Sasse), spells out the overlap in the concerns for security and rights through a discussion of the role of different types of borders (Geddes), provides two case studies on policy-making towards groups that straddle the categories of 'minority' and 'migrant', namely the Russophones in Estonia and Latvia (see Hughes) and the Roma (see Guglielmo and Waters), and explores the potential pitfalls of the concept of 'integration' as a policy response to concerns for security and rights (see Sasse, and Cholewinski).

Public and Elite Perceptions

Perceptions critically shape political behaviour and policy-making. This is particularly true in sensitive policy areas dealing with migrants and minorities. On balance, interest groups have played a less important role in shaping policies on migrants and minorities in Europe than in the US, for example, where interest group politics has often been regarded as being responsible for the gap between the (restrictive) policy preferences among a wider public and the more liberal policies pursued by policy makers. The question to what extent policies on migrants and minorities develop in line with the preferences of citizens or influential political/economic elites is a research area that deserves to be explored further. Data sets such as the recent European social survey⁸ have provided a starting-point for the analysis of beliefs, attitudes and perceptions regarding migrants and minorities. In this volume, *Eurobarometer* surveys form the basis for an analysis of the evolution of anti-immigrant opinions among EU citizens and the determinants of such sentiments over time (see Kessler and Freeman). Two sets of original survey data of Members of the European Parliament (MEPs) are used to analyse MEP positions on migrants and minorities over a ten-year period (see Lahav and Messina). Finally, survey and interview data are used to study the perceptions and the behaviour of British pro-migrant no-governmental organizations (NGOs) (see Gray and Statham).

⁸ More information on the European Social Survey, which covers 20 nations and is funded by the European Commission's 5th and 6th framework programmes, can be found at <<http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/>>.

The Impact of Supranational Policy-Making

Finally, this volume continues the research trend linking existing country- and comparative research on migrants and minorities with the increasingly important EU dimension in these policy areas. The wider Europeanization literature has been described as ‘a cause in search an effect’ (Goetz, 2001), in particular when referring to the ability of domestic institutions to resist adaptation pressures originating from the EU. A consensus has emerged that such resistance has been stronger in the institutional than in the policy realm, where the impact of EU initiatives on domestic policy outputs and outcomes is seen to have been more significant (see, e.g., Hughes *et al.*, 2004). With regard to migrant and minority matters, the evolution of EU initiatives has been widely documented, but it has often remained unclear to what extent such EU (and, where applicable, OSCE and Council of Europe) measures have achieved their objectives and what their impact on national (and sub-national) institutions and actors has been. This special issue addresses this fourth theme through two minority case studies (see Hughes, and Guglielmo and Waters), a study of NGO behaviour at the interface of national and EU policy-making (see Gray and Statham), an analysis of the redistributive impact of European refugee fund (see Thielemann) and an examination of the impact of European integration on wider international migration relations (Geddes).

Post-communist conflicts and migration raised concerns about security and stability within Member States, and in candidate or neighbouring countries from the early 1990s. These concerns drove the increasing prioritization of minority and migrant issues on the policy agenda of EU Member States and the EU. Today, the prospect of east–west migration within the enlarged EU and concerns about the failure of integration of minorities and terrorism have further accentuated the political salience of these issues. In this politically charged climate the conceptual and policy interlock between migrants and minorities, the compatibility of security- and rights-based policy approaches, the role of elite and public opinion, and the impact of supranational policy-making are of crucial importance to a better understanding of the policy challenges posed by migrants and minorities.

Correspondence:

Gwendolyn Sasse
European Institute
London School of Economics
Houghton Street
London WC2A 2AE, UK
Tel: +44 (0)207 955 7538 Fax: +44 (0)20 7955 7546
email: g.sasse@lse.ac.uk

Eiko R. Thielemann
 Department of Government
 London School of Economics and Political Science
 Houghton Street
 London WC2A 2AE, UK
 Tel: +44 (0)207 955 6012 Fax: +44(0)20 7831 1707
 email: e.thielemann@lse.ac.uk

References

- Bigo, B. (ed.) (1992) *L'Europe des polices et de la sécurité intérieure* (Brussels: Complexe).
- Bommes, M. and Geddes, A. (eds) (2000) *Immigration and Welfare: Challenging the Borders of the Welfare State* (London: Routledge).
- Boswell, C. (2003) *European Migration Policies in Flux: Changing Patterns of Inclusion and Exclusion* (Oxford: Blackwell).
- Brubaker, R. (1992) *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Byrne R., Noll. G. and Vedsted-Hansen, J. (eds) (2002) *New Asylum Countries? Migration Control and Refugee Protection in an Enlarged European Union* (Boston: Kluwer Law International).
- Castles, S. and Miller, M.J. (2003) *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World* (3rd edn) (New York: Guildford Press).
- Cesarani, D. and Fulbrook, M. (eds) (1996) *Citizenship, Nationality, and Migration in Europe* (London: Routledge).
- Cornelius, W.A., Takeyuki, T., Martin, P.L. and Hollifield, J.F. (eds) (2004) *Controlling Immigration: A Global Perspective* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).
- Daftary, F. and Grin, F. (eds) (2003) *Nation-Building, Ethnicity and Language Politics in Transition Countries* (Budapest: LGI Publications).
- Dorodovna, J. (2003) 'Challenging Ethnic Democracy: Implementation of the Recommendations of the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities to Latvia, 1993–2001', CORE Working Paper 10 (Hamburg: Centre for OSCE Research).
- EUMAP (2001) *Monitoring the EU Accession Process: Minority Protection* (Budapest: Open Society Institute).
- EUMAP (2002) *Monitoring Minority Protection in the EU Member States* (Budapest: Open Society Institute).
- Eurostat (2003) *Eurostat Yearbook: The Statistical Guide to Europe* (Luxembourg: OOEPEC).
- Evans, G. and Need, A. (2002) 'Explaining Ethnic Polarization over Attitudes towards Minority Rights in Eastern Europe: A Multilevel Analysis'. *Social Science Research*, Vol. 31, pp. 653–80.
- Gál, K. (ed.) (2002) *Minority Governance in Europe* (Budapest: LGI Publications).
- Geddes, A. (2000) *Immigration and European Integration: Towards Fortress Europe?* (New York: Manchester University Press).

- Geddes, A. and Favell, A. (eds) (1999) *The Politics of Belonging: Migrants and Minorities in Contemporary Europe* (London: Ashgate).
- Goetz, K. (2001) 'European Integration and National Executives: A Cause in Search of an Effect?'. In Goetz, K. and Hix, S. (eds) *Europeanised Politics? European Integration and National Political Systems* (London: Frank Cass).
- Guild, E. (ed.) (1996) *The Developing Immigration and Asylum Policies of the European Union: Adopted Conventions, Resolutions, Recommendations, Decisions, and Conclusions* (Boston, MA : Kluwer Law International).
- Guild, E. and Harlow, C. (eds) *Implementing Amsterdam: Immigration and Asylum Rights in EC Law* (Oxford: Hart).
- Guiraudon, V. and Joppke, C. (eds) (2001) *Controlling a New Migration World* (London: Routledge).
- Guiraudon, V. (2000) 'European Integration and Migration Policy: Vertical Policy-making as Venue Shopping'. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 38, No. 2, pp. 251–71.
- Hailbronner, K. (2000) *Immigration and Asylum Law and Policy of the European Union* (The Hague: Kluwer Law International).
- Hansen, R. and Weil, P. (eds) (2001) *Dual Nationality, Social Rights and Federal Citizenship in the U.S. and Europe: The Reinvention of Citizenship* (Oxford /New York: Berghahn).
- Hatton, T. (2004) 'Seeking Asylum in Europe'. *Economic Policy*, Vol. 38, pp. 5–62.
- Heisler, M.O. and Schmitter, B. (eds) (1986) *From Foreign Workers to Settlers?: Transnational Migration and the Emergence of New Minorities* (New York: Sage).
- Horváth, I. (2002) 'Facilitating Conflict Transformation: Implementation of the Recommendations of the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities to Romania, 1993–2001'. Core Working Papers 8 (Hamburg: Centre for OSCE Research).
- Hudson, R. and Reno, F. (eds) (2000) *Politics of Identity: Migrants and Minorities in Multicultural States* (Basingstoke: Palgrave).
- Hughes, J. and Sasse, G. (2003) 'Monitoring the Monitors: EU Enlargement Conditionality and Minority Protection in the CEECs'. *Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe*, No. 1, pp. 1–36.
- Hughes, J., Sasse, G. and Gordon, C. (2004) *Europeanization and Regionalization in the EU's Enlargement to Central and Eastern Europe. The Myth of Conditionality* (Basingstoke: Palgrave).
- Huysmans, J. (2000) 'The European Union and the Securitization of Migration'. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 38, No. 5, pp.751–77.
- Jackson-Preece, J. (1998) *National Minorities and the European Nation-States System* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Joly, D. (ed.) (1998) *Scapegoats and Social Actors: The Exclusion and Integration of Minorities in Western and Eastern Europe* (New York: St. Martin's Press).
- Joppke, C. (ed.) (1998) *Challenges to the Nation-State: Immigration in Western Europe and the United States* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Kemp, W.A. (ed.) (2001) *Quiet Diplomacy in Action: The OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities* (The Hague: Kluwer Law International).

- Koopmans, R. and Statham, P. (eds) (2000) *Challenging Immigration and Ethnic Relations Politics: Comparative European Perspectives* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Koslowski, R. (2000) *Migrants and Citizens: Demographic Change in the European State System* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).
- Kostakopolou, D. (2001) *Citizenship, Identity, and Immigration in the European Union: Between Past and Future* (New York: Manchester University Press).
- Kostakopolou, T. (2000) 'The Protective Union: Change and Continuity in Migration Law and Policy in Post-Amsterdam Europe'. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 38, No. 3, pp. 497–518.
- Kovács, M.M. (2003) 'Standards of Self-determination and Standards of Minority Rights in the Post-communist Era: A Historical Perspective'. *Nations and Nationalism*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 433–50.
- Kulyk, V. (2002) 'Revisiting a Success Story: Implementation of the Recommendations of the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities to Ukraine, 1994–2001', Core Working Paper 6 (Hamburg: Centre for OSCE Research).
- Kymlicka, W. and Opalski, M. (eds) (2001) *Can Liberal Pluralism be Exported? Western Political Theory and Ethnic Relations in Eastern Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Lahav, G. (2004) *Immigration and Politics in the New Europe: Reinventing Borders*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Lantschner, E. and Malloy, T. (eds) (2005) *European Yearbook of Minority Issues* (Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff).
- Lavenex, S. (1999) *Safe Third Countries: Extending the EU Asylum and Immigration Policies to Central and Eastern Europe* (Budapest: Central European University Press).
- Lavenex, S. (2001) *The Europeanisation of Refugee Policies: Between Human Rights and Internal Security* (Aldershot: Ashgate).
- Lavenex, S. and Uçarer, E.M. (ed.) (2002) *Migration and the Externalities of European Integration* (Lanham, MD: Lexington).
- Malloy, T.H. (2005) *National Minority Rights in Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Noll, G. (2000) *Negotiating Asylum: The EU Acquis, Extraterritorial Protection, and the Common Market of Deflection* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff).
- Neumayer, E. (2004) 'Asylum Destination Choice: What Makes some European Countries more Attractive than Others?'. *European Union Politics*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 155–80.
- Packer, J. (1999) 'Problems in Defining Minorities'. In Fottrell, D. and Bowring, B. (eds) *Minority and Group Rights in the New Millennium* (The Hague: Kluwer Law International).
- Peers, S. (2000) *EU Justice and Home Affairs Law* (Harlow: Longman).
- Pentassuglia, G. (2002) *Minorities in International Law. An Introductory Study* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe).

- Ricchi, O. (2005) 'Between "Agency Loss" and Effective Policy Making: JHA in the Constitutional Treaty'. Paper presented at the Ninth Biennial International Conference of the European Union Studies Association (USA), 31 March–2 April 2005, Austin, Texas.
- Sarv, M. (2002) 'Integration by Reframing Legislation: Implementation of the Recommendations of the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities to Estonia, 1993–2001'. Core Working Paper 7 (Hamburg: Centre for OSCE Research).
- Sasse, G. (2005) 'EU Conditionality and Minority Rights: Translating the Copenhagen Criterion into Policy'. EUI Working Paper, RSCAS No 2005/16 (San Domenico di Fiesole: European University Institute).
- Smooha, S. and Järve, P. (eds) (2005) *The Fate of Ethnic Democracy in Post-Communist Europe* (Budapest: LGI Publications).
- Stetter, S. (2000) 'Regulating Migration: Authority Delegation in Justice and Home Affairs'. *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 80–102.
- Steiner, H.J. and Alston, P. (2000) *International Human Rights in Context. Law, Politics, Morals* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Thielemann, E.R. (2004) 'Why European Policy Harmonization Undermines Refugee Burden-Sharing'. *European Journal of Migration and Law*, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 43–61.
- Thielemann E.R. (forthcoming) 'The Effectiveness of Asylum Policy in Controlling Unwanted Migration'. In Parsons C. and Smeeding T. (eds) *Immigration and the Transformation of Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Thielemann E.R. and Dewan, T. (forthcoming) 'Why States Don't Defect: Refugee Protection and Implicit Burden-Sharing'. *West European Politics*, Vol. 29, No. 1.
- Thornberry, P. (1990) *International Law and the Rights of Minorities* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Thornberry, P. and Estébanez, M.A.M. (2004) *Minority Rights in Europe: A Review of the Work and Standards of the Council of Europe* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe).
- Toggenburg, G.N. (ed.) (2004) *Minority Protection and the Enlarged European Union: The Way Forward* (Budapest: Open Society Institute).
- UNHCR (2003) *Statistical Yearbook: Trends in Displacement, Protection and Solutions* (Geneva: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees).
- Weller, M. (ed.) (2005) *The Rights of Minorities in Europe. A Commentary on the European Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Wrench J., Rea, A. and Quali, N. (eds) (1999) *Migrants, Ethnic Minorities and the Labour Market: Integration and Exclusion in Europe* (New York: St. Martin's Press).