

*Salihe Salihu*<sup>★</sup>

## **Migration and the Democratisation of Sovereignty**

### **Abstract**

Migration in relation to democracy and sovereignty<sup>1</sup> is considered one of the great challenges of this century. At the local, national, and global levels, migration is causing tensions in the development of democracy and security, which often calls the sovereignty of a given state into question (International IDEA, 2017).

The challenges about migration in relation to democracy and sovereignty will increase even further since, according to relevant data, it has been warned that the next exodus is likely to occur as a result of climate change. In accordance with the assertion of the UN Climate Panel, it is said that this coming exodus will occur in the distant future as it is calculated that somewhere around the year 2100 there will be a climate-related warming of the planet of 2 to 3 degrees.

The emergence of violent conflicts, climate change, persecution based on ethnic and religious affiliations, and various forms of violence are also endangering state sovereignty.

These reasons why migrants leave their own countries, along with migrant perspectives, are topics that need to be addressed. It is important to examine migration as the main topic, especially migration in relation to democracy and state sovereignty. Seen in its totality, migration is taking on global dimensions and will be the hottest point of political topics with regard to finding the formula for its management in accordance with

---

<sup>★</sup> **Salihe Salihu** – Department of Research in the Parliament of Kosovo, e-mail: [salihe.salihu@hotmail.com](mailto:salihe.salihu@hotmail.com), ORDIC ID: 0000-0002-7068-0342.

<sup>1</sup> The concept of democratic sovereignty is a replacement for the concept of absolute sovereignty as it is intended to be subject to the values of democracy. The author thinks it necessary to use democratic sovereignty since it is envisaged that sovereignty is embodied with the values of democracy. This concept – as a tool to facilitate our future understanding of the migration process – is necessary to be used if we want to invoke the values of democracy in the international system.

democratic values and their compatibility with state borders. Therefore, a debate should be subject to the following questions: how are we to preserve democratic values and the stability of sovereignty, and, should sovereignty be democratised?

**Keywords:** Migration, Democracy, Sovereignty, Solidarity

## **Introduction**

Migration in relation to democracy and sovereignty is considered one of the great challenges of this century. At the local, national, and global levels, migration is causing tensions in the development of democracy and security, which often brings the sovereignty of a given state into question (International IDEA, 2017, p. 202).

The challenges in relation to migration as regards democracy and sovereignty will increase even further since, according to data from the UN Climate Panel, the next mass exodus is likely to occur as a result of climate change. In accordance with the assertion of the UN Climate Panel, it is said that this upcoming exodus will occur in the distant future, as it is calculated that, somewhere around the year 2100, there will be a climate-related warming of 2 to 3 degrees (Avellan, 2022).

The emergence of violent conflicts, climate change, persecution based on ethnic and religious affiliations, and various forms of violence are also endangering state sovereignty.

These reasons are why migrants leave their own countries of origin, and the perspectives of migrants is a topic that needs to be addressed (Weiner, 1996). It is important to examine migration as the main topic, with especial focus on migration in relation to democracy and state sovereignty. Seen in its totality, migration is taking on global dimensions, and will be the hottest point of political topics with regard to finding the correct management formula in accordance with democratic values and their compatibility with state borders. Therefore, related debates should be subject to questions regarding how we are to preserve democratic values and the stability of sovereignty, and whether sovereignty be democratised.

## **Migration and Democracy**

Migration, according to the Report of the International Migration Agency (IOM) for 2020, has increased on a massive scale, with the number of migrants reaching 272 million people worldwide, among whom are

79.5 million who have been forced to migrate. It is well known that migration that is driven by push policies differs from pull policies that are primarily driven by a need to enter the labour force. But, in total, and within just a decade, i.e., only from 2010 to 2020, the number of migrants was 51 million. The number of migrants, in global terms, has reached 3.5 percent worldwide. Looking now at the gender of the migrants, 48% of them belong to the female gender, and looking at the destination country of the migrants, it can be seen that, in descending order, 31% are in Asia, followed by Europe with 30%, 26% in America, 10% in Africa, and 3% in Oceania (United Nations, N.D.).

This high level of migration has hampered the functioning of receiving states and has consequently caused a crisis in the development of democracy in democratic countries, bringing to the surface the urgency of revising the democratic system. In the continuation of the migration process, the developments related to this process have been highlighted and it is clear to see that democracy now needs to be redefined, and new alternatives for withstanding the management of the socio-political situation need to be found (Michael, 2022).

The socio-political position is highly charged in every country that has accepted migrants and made efforts to offer migrants opportunities and living conditions that conform to the standards that exist in those countries. In their effort to fulfil these conditions, it is seen that it is not easy for receiving countries to manage the acceptance of migrants because, in addition to the necessary economic resources, a unification of political and social attitudes is also needed.

The governments of the countries receiving migrants face two conflicting poles; on the one hand, they have to provide acceptable living conditions for the migrants and, on the other hand, they face dissatisfaction among and from their citizens for the outlaid expenses towards covering the needs of the migrants. Achieving equilibrium in such situations is difficult, but politicians who are determined to preserve democratic values remain committed to not infringing on these values even during periods burdened by waves of migration, and even in times of crisis regarding migrant waves. Maintaining this position both during times of crisis management and also after the time of a given, related crisis can be confronted with different aspects. Firstly, there comes the method of acceptance, and then the continuity of the permanent maintenance of the process with respect to democratic values.

The specifics of migration during the times of urgent crises are directed around the management of providing shelter, clothing, food, and other basic elements. Also, in addition to other aspects, in these periods, there

was a need for the provision of health care as many of the migrants go through many difficulties until they manage to be sheltered in a safe place. Even when they reach the border of a country where migrants feel safe and full of hope that the receiving state will accept them, there begins the second phase. Migrants go through the procedures pertaining to letters and notes kept. At the border lines, it is required to document entries and the causes or reasons why migrant X wants to enter and be accepted within the defining borders of a sovereign state. During these procedures, many questions are asked in the receiving country, investigating the need for housing but also the possibility of meeting the conditions for allowing migrants to be housed.

Unlike this phase, it is the post-migrant crisis period which has other characteristics and is a much longer phase. This phase has other dimensions that host governments must address. In this post-crisis phase, other dimensions related to the maintenance of migrants are specified, including the social aspect. The characteristics of this phase are related to the integration of migrants and, at the same time, the implementation of local laws and regulations that are part of the scope of state sovereignty. The most sensitive point is precisely the compatibility or non-compliance of local laws with the traditions and customs of migrants. Special importance has been devoted to preserving and reforming the traditions of migrants, which have often been unacceptable to states of a democratic order. And in order not to risk any collision between local traditions and the traditions of the migrants, the laws and regulations of the receiving countries – which are instruments of preserving sovereignty – need to be adapted to a level that does not compromise democracy. With this in mind, we can conclude that democratic countries, by accepting some traditions of migrants, can change their laws and regulations and, in this way, contribute to democratising the sovereignty of a given, democratic country.

Consequently, in addition to accepting the various requirements for the democratisation of sovereignty, and, aside from the dilemma of opening or closing the borders, there is another, rather complicated series of dilemmas that have to do with accepting or allowing (or not allowing) some traditions of migrants, such as the wearing of a headscarf, the opportunity to practice religion such as praying in mosques and workplaces, and being released from work when migrants have to celebrate religious holidays. All these aspects require the amendment of local laws which directly democratise the sovereignty of a receiving state, or, in other words, thereby make a given state's sovereignty more flexible. Despite the elasticity of sovereignty, however, democratic states must not

allow the values of their system to be violated and actively reject harmful traditions, such as the practice of polygamy that is still preserved in the traditions of a number of migrant groups.

All these dimensions have their own characteristics, but they are all related to the level of democratisation of a country and how to understand democracy and at what level democracy has developed, which is seen directly in relation to migrants. In other words, the level of development of democracy can be seen or measured by the condition of migrants, namely, the treatment a democratic state gave to migrants during the crisis as well as in the post-migration crisis.

Any support of and solidarity with the needs of migrants requires changes that affect the renewal of the democratic spirit. In this transition, absolute sovereignty passed into the power of democratic sovereignty. The results of the transition were good for all people living in receiving countries. So, both locals and migrants are winners, and this process helps to strengthen the state and preserve democratic values.

### **Migration-affected Democracy and Sovereignty**

Migration as a process has and will have an effect on all countries that accept migrants and will inevitably affect all UN member states. In a proper assessment of the importance of this process in relation to the democracy of sovereign states, in 2000, the United Nations proclaimed December 18 as Immigrants' Day – in order to rank the process of migrants on a special day (United Nations, N.D.), and will be dedicated to paying attention to migration in relation to sovereign states. It cannot be overlooked that sovereignty, even in times of democracy, is invoked in the Westphalian model in view of the fact that a state extends its sovereignty to the territorial borders of the country.

In the Treaty of Westphalia, despite being an important document as it is, the issue of migration is not clearly limited or regulated. The issue of migration is partially touched on in Article V, in paragraph 36 of the Treaty of Westphalia, which defines the permission of emigration for religious reasons, while in paragraph 37 of the same article, the regulation of war refugees is defined. With these definitions, it can be concluded that the Treaty of Westphalia guaranteed the crossing of land and sea borders (Bauder, 2018) just for two particular reasons, namely, the religious issue and religious wars.

*De facto*, the Treaty of Westphalia, from which absolute state sovereignty also originated, was compiled in the prevailing circumstances of the old-time system of the Middle Ages. From that time until now, the state

system has completely changed and a significant number of states have embraced the democratic doctrine that has also influenced the features of sovereignty.

With the extension of democracy, sovereignty has been changed to some extent by amending local laws in accordance with democratic values and after taking into consideration the development of migration processes. After a series of specific changes through a changing of the relevant laws, the wearing of headscarves was allowed in some countries and, with this permission, the recognition of the rights of immigrants increased. A fine example of this is the Swedish state, which allows the teaching of the native languages of migrants in state schools, and offers it as an elective subject (Bunar, 2017).

Historically, if we look at the validity of the Westphalian Treaty, we see that the borders of sovereign states have been completely open at different times. In fact, it is worth mentioning that open borders between countries existed during the years 1945–1975 (Rystad, 1995) but, later, the borders were closed once again.

Later, optimism re-emerged during the 1990s as global flows began to dynamise, and it was hoped that the borders of sovereign states would also be opened or more flexible, but it turns out that this expectation was an illusion (Bauder, 2022). In the European Union, border entry and exit from Member States was liberalised for a while, and the Schengen visa was enabled to facilitate entry and exit, but all of this border liberalisation was not directly related to the migration process.

In fact, when it comes to migration, border access has been more tightly controlled, as the policies of the countries of the European Union (EU) have changed and the restriction of the borders goes beyond the borders of the states. With the new policy of controlling its borders, border management has expanded to a coordination with states outside the jurisdiction of EU membership. Even from these actions, the sovereignty of the receiving states has become more flexible because the control of sovereignty is believed to be controlled by states outside the European Union. With these actions, the sovereignty of a receiving state is preserved, and is dependent on the agreements that have been formalised between the Member States and the states outside from EU, such as third party countries. In this way, an extraterritorial government has been allowed, i.e., outside state borders, in order to prevent migrants from entering clandestinely and resulting in undocumented migrants (Palme, 2020).

With this, there is a proclamation to democratically expand sovereignty by making agreements for governance outside the territory of the EU in preventing migration and reducing the crises that can be caused by this

process. As clarification for the externalisation of migration control, we can recall the cooperation between the EU and Libya according to the 2017 Malta Declaration (EU Immigration and Asylum Law and Policy, 2020).

But the phases of migration, as known, are divided into two phases, the first of which is called the crisis phase, and the second phase which is the post-crisis phase of migration. Awareness has been raised about these transitional phases, since the first phase is temporary and the second is permanent. The last phase has been raised as a problem since a number of migrants have encountered some extreme attitudes of local people who do not want to accept migrants. Extremist groups in support of their claims against migrants claim that local sovereignty and culture is vulnerable and under threaten due to migrants. With their reactions seemingly in the name of preserving state sovereignty or culture, they also violate the basic principles of democracy. In this context, the discrepancy between democracy as an ideological doctrine and its implementation in practice is growing in relation to the issue of the migration process. In examining this discrepancy, the question arises as to whether sovereignty can be democratised.

Anti-immigrant, restrictive attitudes are held by many countries of the European Union, with one of them having been Poland (Kuzelewska, Weatherburn, Kloza, 2018), but now, at the time of this writing, the war in Ukraine has changed the attitude of Poland's policy, which is now very much in favour of migrants. Poland now sets an excellent example by its welcoming of Ukrainians and sheltering them. The change in Poland's attitude calls for a deeper analysis of the possibilities to change attitudes towards migrants. In fact, we can welcome the change in attitude and we can take it as an example that the favourable policies of receiving states should be applied even in cases wherein migrants, refugees, and asylum seekers come from outside the borders of Europe.

In this context, we can compare the Ukrainian and Syrian refugees and recall the reactions of Polish locals. Polish people tend to fear Syrian culture because of its differences and, therefore, the Syrians' culture is considered disharmonised with the culture of the West. However, it is thought that the Ukrainians had the same democratic values and they have been more readily accepted and considered more acceptable. If you think, on these bases, about the acceptance or rejection of migrants, namely refugees in this case, it is a serious mistake. The origin of the migrant should not be the only reason for their acceptance, but it should be underlined that the motive of acceptance is to save the lives of the migrants, regardless of ethnic or cultural affiliation, etc.

Based on the facts presented in many documents, it appears that democratic countries have used a different method for migrants who originated outside the territory of Europe. As mentioned above, in order to prevent waves of migrants by supporting and taking measures to restrain migrant movements, control has been moved beyond state borders and has passed under the management and control of states outside the European territory. In this way, the extraterritorial border administration was created, where third-party countries became responsible for that management and for stopping the wave of migrants outside the EU's borders. Some Member States financed this new method to avoid the problems of migration procedures on their own borders, and this method was a new, limiting method aimed at migrants (Palme, 2020).

This method was used prominently in 2015 as the number of irregular migrants increased, thereby creating tension among the countries that were the migrants' final destinations. Consequently, this tension highlighted the fact that there is a crisis in the relationship between democratic values and the migration process. This crisis is evaluated as being a new era of mass migration on the one hand, and, on the other hand, as a failure of migration policy management that has caused the instigation of an anti-migration movement.

The situation, mentioned above, of the management of the migration process soon reached a harmful limit and it was assumed that it was on the threshold of anti-democracy or, as Charles Tilly put it, of "de-democratisation". Tilly explains that de-democratisation bears the signs of a process where the connection between the state agent and the citizen decreases. From this explanation, we can draw parallels with the migratory process, since the democratic governments fell into the same situation with the citizens against the migratory process. States were unable to hold consultations with their citizens and convince them to accept migrants, specifically, refugees. Rightfully, a dilemma has been posed as to whether we are entering an era of de-democracy (Kuzelewska, Weatherburn, Kloza, 2018). The measures taken by the European states that put up border fences to prevent migrants from being able to penetrate those states and practically made the migration process impossible also speak of whether we have entered this era of de-democratisation.

Examples of strict measures on a state's borders during 2015 were to be found in, for example, Hungary, which acted contrary to the values of the previous liberals of Europe. The process of de-democratisation in European countries has been manifested by some parties that promote anti-immigrant policies in the points of their programs. Consequently, it has prompted a division of attitudes among European states towards migrant



policies and contradicts the basic values of democracy. The need to take corrective measures in politics around the issue of migration is great, but it seems that it is becoming a difficult task for many democratic states to face the challenges of the migration process (Kuzelewska, Weatherburn, Kloza, 2018). Also, the Court of Justice of the European Union's latest ruling in a case centred around a Muslim headscarf in Belgium could set a precedent for EU companies to ban the visible wearing of religious symbols (Reuters, 2022).

The migration process has been met with unfavourable reactions in the EU's many host countries. The requirements to preserve humanitarian feeling and judgement are being minimised in many circles, and, with this minimisation, the question arises as regards how the values of democracy can be preserved. Reactions emanating from an unfriendly, emotional place are prompted by the thinking that the process of migrants, refugees, and asylum seekers is that of a new invasion. In addition, migrants are considered as a new source of crime and terrorism, along with being a cause of the further deterioration of economic, social, and cultural development. In the period of 2015, there were also harsh reactions to migrants from some groups of protesters who marched with "go home" posters and who made migrants the target of xenophobic, racist reactions, and there were also scenes in which vandals were witnessed attacking migrant shelters (Reuters, 2022).

The leaders of the Member States of the European Union themselves did not have a unifying policy. Angela Merkel came out in defense of migrants by calling for the opening of borders, while, conversely, Hungary's Viktor Orbán took restrictive measures against migrants. At the same time, the leaders of the European Union launched rescue operations for migrants by sponsoring countries that would host migrants. It was clear that the International Conventions for the Protection of the Rights of Migrants were not being implemented and, therefore, the European Council in 2016 tasked a Special Representative for Migration and Refugees to provide information on how migrants and refugees are being treated and to which protections they have access (Reuters, 2022).

During the migration crisis in 2015, regional agreements were also violated in many countries of the European Union. A concrete illustration of these violations is the case of when Sweden started checking every traveller entering from Denmark. These Nordic countries had not practiced identity document checks for passengers crossing the borders between their countries for a long period of time, but when the wave of migration spread around the world, ID card checks then began for all persons crossing the border between Denmark and Sweden. Even in

other countries, the reaction was very much anti-migrant where a drastic violation of the Schengen Agreement was also observed. An example of this is Austria, which strictly manages border control. A person who was obstructed at the border reacted against Austria's action and complained about this obstruction to the Court of the European Union. After reviewing the appeal, the court's decision was in favour of the appellant and the declaration was that the decision as regards the Austrian border's closure to the appellant was illegal. Despite this court decision, there is still a demand from the Austrian people to close the borders, even at a time when the war in Ukraine is going on (Avellan, 2022). Indeed, this request contradicts the notion of solidarity with regard to accommodating migrants. Good examples among countries that showed solidarity to Ukrainian migrants are Poland, Sweden, and several other countries. This readiness to help in the name of solidarity has also been expressed by the countries of the Balkan region, including Kosovo, Albania, and Macedonia. Meanwhile, Serbia does not stand with Ukraine, and neither does it support Ukrainian migrants, since its position is in favour of the invading forces of Russia.

Above all, the essential issue remains current in the question concerning the democratisation of sovereignty, which is a very broad question and can be hugely multidimensional, but, in this paper, the focus will fall in close relation with the migration process. This issue is now being debated, but an even deeper debate is needed considering that migration crises can be increased not only by wars of conquest, but also by the war on climate change. In the debate about this issue, it is necessary to include the concept of solidarity. In finer specification, we can see how this issue can be better managed from the perspective of solidarity. With the centralisation of solidarity in the migration process, the strengthening of democracy and the preservation of the security of sovereignty will be helped, thus directly affecting the elasticity of sovereignty. The author considers that the best case to strengthen convictions about the centralisation of solidarity is the case of Ukraine.

### **Solidarity as an Infusion for the Migration Process**

As mentioned above, the war in Ukraine in 2022 caused a new wave of migrants, but the democratic world opened its borders to receive those migrants, thereby showing its solidarity with them. In the very name of solidarity, the borders were opened to Ukrainian migrants. In addition to this solidarity, the democratic world also stood in solidarity to help the Ukrainians with the material and military means to protect their country

and dissipate the compulsion of Ukrainians to migrate. This kind of solidarity could help to save the lives of Ukrainian women and to ensure peace. The Western world's recent displays of benevolence was carried out with solidarity, and the basic motive was the salvation of the Ukrainian people. Consequently, this solidarity is influencing the democratisation of the Member States' systems by making their sovereignty more resilient by allowing migrants within their borders.

The European Union made the sovereignty of the Member States even more flexible by guaranteeing protection to Ukrainians in EU countries until 2023 through the adoption of the Temporary Protection Directive for Displaced Persons. In solidarity with this Temporary Protection Directive for Displaced Persons, the Swedish state, namely the Swedish Migration Department, has proposed extending the deadline for the housing of Ukrainians for another year, taking into account the forecasts of the current course of the situation in Ukraine (Odynets, 2022). In this way, the EU Temporary Protection Directive has increased solidarity between states. Protecting people when they are most in need has had the effect of democratising sovereignty, making it easier for Ukrainians to escape the ongoing war.

In spite of this solidarity for Ukrainian immigrants, the issue of immigration has been and still is in a quite sensitive sphere, and it remains debatable as to just how well this process is developing.

The migration process in general faces various other dilemmas such as the integration of migrants as well as the fear of the potential demographic imbalance of the receiving countries. Trying to cope with demographic changes and the reactions that appear to their integration into society are quite challenging for all countries that have a large number of migrants. In particular, the migration crisis has caused a democratic crisis regarding the variety of migrants' origins. The feeling of solidarity is not being expressed towards migrants who have different values and traditions than those of a receiving country. It means that for migrants who do not have the same framework of values as found in a given, receiving country, it is difficult to be granted entry, as they are considered incompatible with democratic values.

When it comes to democratic values, a kind of erosion is felt, and, in a regressive turn, since tension is being caused precisely about democratic values, just how liberal they are and how the definition of the borders of sovereignty is regulated is also focussed upon (Michael, 2022). These tensions as regards values are the political battlefield of our age. Raising questions about policies which limit refugees is presented as the need to preserve the national sovereignty of countries that have

received large numbers of refugees. Specifically, while respecting the preservation of state sovereignty, clear regulation has been avoided to decisively guarantee the security of this process. We find this deficiency in Article 13 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in which the right to emigrate is guaranteed but not the right to immigrate, and with this definition it remains that states can accept or reject immigrants according to their will. The denial of the right to immigrate to a country is justified by the argument of protecting the borders of state sovereignty (Salihu, 2016).

So this problem is not new, and is a moral conflict that has ensured the collision of two types of claims. On the one hand, there are the claims of migrants to enjoy the humanitarian right to migrate, and, on the other, the claims of states as regards the preservation of their sovereignty. In this context, democratic principles have not ensured the fulfillment of the entire migration process, and, rightly, Myron Weiner included in his article *Ethnics, National Sovereignty and the Control of Immigration*, the question of whether people can be free to migrate and where they can go. These are claims with conflicting rights, since migrants, for various reasons such as poverty, persecution, war, etc., are forced to leave in order to save their own lives or secure a better lives. Meanwhile, the governors of sovereign states are elected to protect their citizens from risks and economic burdens that can worsen their well-being, as well as to ensure political stability and protect cultural identity (Weiner, 1996). With this commitment, the governments of receiving countries face the right to migrate.

Therefore, the relationship between migrants and state sovereignty has raised the question of what kind of sovereignty can be preserved in cases where a state is faced with waves of migration and how justifying arguments can be made.

Excuses for refusing to accept migrants are unacceptable when there is no ethical nor moral basis and when people's survival is in question. The death of thousands of people in an attempt to secure life cannot be based on the excuses that a state is being burdened economically or that it is affecting the demography of a country. The facts show that in 2015, 1,472 migrants died, while another 2,130 were lost trying to enter Europe from Tripoli (Libya) or Turkey at the borders of Italy and Greece. According to the database on migrants, from the beginning of 2000 to 2016, it appears that 31,811 migrants have died, among them men, women, and children. This number could be even higher since not every fatality has, as yet, been recorded or clarified in the relevant documents on migrants (Bauder, 2017).

In order to avoid unacceptable excuses, the best method of finding a solution is being discussed. In maintaining the values of democracy and sovereignty in relation to migration, an infusion of solidarity as an alternative path has been proposed. With an infusion of solidarity, the sovereignty of a receiving democratic state can be elasticised and thus the management of the migration process is facilitated. In this context, solidarity could influence a state not to make decisions only from the perspective of border protection. At the same time, solidarity could also contribute to the coordination of local policies so as to help migrants. The rethinking of migration should be seen from the alternative of solidarity towards elastic sovereignty – which would mean opening borders to save lives, as in the current, ongoing case to save the lives of Ukrainians, or a previous case that happened in 1998–1999 in Albania when upon their borders were opened to save the lives of refugees from Kosovo. In both cases, the motive for the opening of borders was predominantly that of feelings of solidarity. Today, Kosovo is a good example of why we should welcome Ukrainian people and provide them with assistance (International Federation of Journalists, 2023).

The challenge for the future development of society is the harmonisation of values. Therefore, other values that could colour the system of democracy should be taken into account. This inclusion of other values can be seen as the health of democracy, because democratic values must change with regard to the time and place *and* be suitable for the people. In search of better management to help migrants, an example is taken of the management of internal migration that preceded the management of the situations of the migratory process, how migration is managed, that is, at the country level. This example can be taken as a facilitative model of how competences for managing migrants are assigned at the urban level. The position of close communication gives opportunities to provide relief to migrants as it seems to be the right alternative as they know their own specific needs (Bauder, 2022).

The implications of the 21st century migration process, especially after the Arab Spring in 2010, re-emerge as a pivot of the deepest divergences in European politics, so claims the Norwegian sociologist Lars Mjøset (Kuzelewska, Weatherburn, Kloza, 2018). The increase in the number of immigrants was unprecedented since, only from 2011 to 2015, the number of immigrants, mainly refugees, increased from 10.4 million to about 19.5 million. This increase in the number of migrants as refugees and asylum seekers for a short period of four years caused humanitarian, social, and economic implications since the migration was forced and unplanned. (International IDEA, N.D.)

During the migration wave of 2015, the countries of the European Union that stood for welcoming migrants, i.e., refugees and asylum seekers, were Germany and Sweden (Petersson, Kainz, 2017). At that time, citizen solidarity was also manifested, which was shown in the people's mobilisation to help migrants, refugees, and asylum seekers, by supplying them with food and clothing (Bauder, 2022).

The increase in the number of migrants is also increasing the need for better treatment and, according to forecasts from the UN climate panel, it is said that in the not too distant future, in addition to the large number of migrants from war zones, the number of migrants due to climate-related issues will increase. Based on UNHCR data, there are currently 21.5 million people in the world who have fled their countries due to climate change, and according to the World Bank, this number is expected to reach 216 million by 2050 (Avellan, 2022).

Looking at the migration process, it is also interesting to see how this process is in harmony with the compass of democracy. If we look at the time investigation from the nineteenth century as regards the process of migration in relation to the policies of democratic states, it turns out that the focal point – as a preventive measure against migration – was the reconciliation of tense conflicts between social classes and poor groups that were considered dangerous.

Unlike the focus on other periods, it seems that the 20th and 21st centuries had – and continue to have – a different perception about the issue of migrants. Now, in general, with the arrival of migrants from Muslim countries, the need for a culturalisation of another Europe has also been laid out, i.e., the acceptance and recognition of the features of the Muslim religious affiliation. Overall, the focus is now on a religious conciliatory policy and the increase of social pluralism which is expected to include migrants as well.

This process is a new challenge which is faced with hostility from extreme currents, and now even more widely so, since there are prejudices that Muslim migrants who come from outside European borders have deep religious and cultural differences and cannot harmonise with the values of liberal democracy (Michael, 2022).

Another issue put forth by migration is the development of democracy and the potential of refugees to participate in political life and decision-making processes. Immigrants can also be considered as sources of democratic values for both countries, i.e., in host countries as well in countries of origin. Thus, the possibility of migrants to maintain ties with two countries is considered useful and beneficial since they have the influence of democratic values in both countries. The role of migrants

has given tangible results as in the case of Albanians in Kosovo who, instilled and equipped with democratic values in the countries where they had lived, carried these values back to their country of origin and, immediately after the war in 1999, the people of Kosovo embraced the democratic system (Salihu, 2016, p. 141).

Their dual role in the political sphere is beneficial because they can appear as political actors in the two countries and can influence other economic, social, and cultural spheres. Seeing the benefits of this commitment, a project called “Refugees, Asylum Seekers and Democracy” has been proposed, which aims to gather comparative knowledge about the impact of the dual role of refugees and asylum seekers (International IDEA, N.D.).

The migration process is a topic that requires a lot of dedication and treatment as a matter of rights and obligations of nation states. For this purpose, it is necessary to apply appropriate policies for the integration of migrants (Michael, 2022). The integration process is intrinsically linked and in harmony with democracy and, so far, is considered a project of the future (Kuzelewska, Weatherburn, Kloza, 2018). However, the increase in the number of waves of migrants has negatively affected the capacities of democratic governments to provide the appropriate responses. This burden has prompted the question of reconsidering the migration process to find an answer that would be in accordance with democratic values at the global level (International IDEA, 2017).

During the 1980s, the restrictive policy against migrants was revised, in recognition of the cultures and values of migrants. It is assumed that the confirmation of other cultures was an idea that was developed and accepted as a normative form of multicultural recognition that, in practice, meant the accommodation of cultural pluralism. However, even the multiculturalism that was accepted in some countries was considered somewhat vague because this concept did not reach the desired level. However, this was a serious effort that paved the way for the integration of many migrants in receiving countries (Michael, 2022). Now, with the new influx of migrants, but also with the expectation of a larger number of migrants that is predicted to happen, it is necessary to consolidate the policy of managing migrants with an approach of solidarity and with a policy that will cope with this process in the future.

## **Conclusions**

The wave of migrants of the 21st century migration process has called into question the likelihood of state governments issuing participatory and integrative policies as well as their ability to perform and provide

necessary services in accordance with democratic politics. Discussions on the subject of migration have polarised the states that face the dilemma of how to manage this process. However, the effects of migrants on the quality of democracy are seen both in host countries and in countries of origin. Above all, migration policy as a main principle should promote inclusiveness and create the necessary space for a more flexible democratic system. It means providing a space for listening to different voices, using methods to find solutions to any grievances that are expressed, and also to enrich democracy from different cultures. With this approach, we can ensure the presence of democratic institutions for a longer and more stable term. The way to strengthen democracy can be done through the inclusion of migrants in political representation. Their involvement in local associations and in various civil initiatives can also be considered as a step towards forming closer relations with migrants. Migrant policy also proves the capacity of the democracy of a state in which there is a considerable number of migrants (International IDEA, 2017).

The value of multiculturalism is achieved by the dialogue developed as a result of migrants in receiving countries and the process of migrant integration. Integration policy has now facilitated the integration of migrants. The integration policy for the recognition of cultural diversities is, however, stagnant and has not spread to a satisfactory level. In particular, there is stagnation as regards the recognition of cultures from non-European countries and their cultures remain almost on the margins. As a result of fractional integration policies, multiculturalism is weakening in the countries of the European Union. This approach has had a negative impact on the integration of migrants from third countries and has caused, as was seen in the description above, unsatisfactory conditions. This is looking like a planned exclusion of immigrants originating from beyond the European area.

Unfavourable policies towards migrants can result in further social unrest. Difficulties and obstacles appear in the further integration of migrants and, consequently, they become a security threat as a product of their mistreatment. In these situations, there is a real possibility that any migrant could join extremist and violent groups and, through these actions, would promote even worse prejudices against fellow migrants (Kuzelewska, Weatherburn, Kloza, 2018). We assume that if the integration of migrants is not achieved, the acceptance of migrants in democratic states may worsen, and anti-migrant sentiment may spread and dominate in receiving countries.

In the not-too-distant future, when migrant waves increase in size and frequency, there will be a need to change the treatment of the migration



process. The most suitable change with a solidarity-based approach could affect the preservation of the good health of democracy and ensure that sovereignty is more resilient.

### References

- Avellan, H. (2022) “Hit men inte längre för gränskontrollerna”, *Sydsvenskan*. Available at: <https://www.sydsvenskan.se/2022-08-10/hit-men-inte-langre-for-granskontrollerna> (Access 11.08.2022).
- Avellan, H. (2022) “Folk tvingas fly oavsett vad Åkesson tror”, *Sydsvenskan*. Available at: <https://www.sydsvenskan.se/2022-08-08/folk-tvingas-fly-oavsett-vad-akesson-tror> (Access 8.08.2022).
- Bauder, H. (2017) *Migration Borders Freedom*. New York: Routledge. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315638300>.
- Bauder, H. (2018) *Westphalia, Migration, and Feudal Privilege*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33182/ml.v15i3.356>.
- Bauder, H. (2022) *From Sovereignty to Solidarity – Rethinking Human Migration*. New York: Routledge. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003206859>.
- Bunar, N. (2017) *Migration and Education in Sweden: Integration of Migrants in the Swedish School Education and Higher Education Systems*. NESET II ad hoc question No. 3, Stockholm University. Available at: <https://nesetweb.eu/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Migration-and-Education-in-Sweden.pdf> (Access 10.03.2022).
- EU Immigration and Asylum Law and Policy (2020) *The Malta Declaration on search & rescue, disembarkation and relocation: Much Ado about Nothing*. Available at: <https://eumigrationlawblog.eu/the-malta-declaration-on-search-rescue-disembarkation-and-relocation-much-ado-about-nothing/> (Access 18.02.2023).
- International Federation of Journalist (2023) *Ukraine: In Kosovo, we have also experienced the difficulty of becoming a refugee*. Available at: <https://www.ifj.org/media-centre/news/detail/category/support-ukrainian-journalists/article/ukraine-in-kosovo-we-have-also-experienced-the-difficulty-of-becoming-a-refugee.html> (Access 22.02.2023).
- International IDEA (2017) *The Global State of Democracy-Exploring Democracy’s Resilience*. Available at: <https://iknowpolitics.org/sites/default/files/idea-gsod-2017-report-en.pdf> (Access 15.05.2022).
- International IDEA (N.D.) *Migration & Democracy*. Available at: <https://www.idea.int/our-work/what-we-do/migration-democracy> (Access 29.09.2022).
- Kuzelewska, E., Weatherburn, A. and Kloza, D. (2018) *Irregular Migration as a Challenge for Democracy*. Cambridge–Antwerp–Portland: Intersentia. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781780687025>.

- Michael, Ch.M. (2022) *Migration and the Crisis of Democracy in Contemporary*. Series *Europe Europe in Transition: The NYU European Studies Series*, Schain M.A. (ed.) [eBook]. New York: New York University. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64069-9>.
- Odynets, S. (2022) “Ge ukrainare chans att bidra till samhället”, *Sydsvenskan*. Available at: <https://www.sydsvenskan.se/2022-08-08/ge-ukrainare-chans-att-bidra-till-samhallet> (Access 8.08.2022).
- Palme, E. (2020) “Externalized Migration Governance and the Limits of Sovereignty: The Case of Partnership Agreements between the EU and Libya”, *THEORIA*. Vol. 86, pp. 9–27. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/theo.12224>.
- Petersson, B. and Kainz, L. (2016) *Migration in the Media: Naturalized Metaphorical Narratives in Swedish and German News Coverage*. Malmö, Paper for the Annual Spring Conference of the Swedish Network for European Studies in Political Science (SNES).
- Petersson, B. and Kainz, L. (2017) *Migration in the Media*. Available at: [https://edoc.hu-berlin.de/bitstream/handle/18452/19159/NEF2017\\_Art\\_Petersson\\_Kainz\\_Migration%20in%20the%20Media.pdf?sequence=1](https://edoc.hu-berlin.de/bitstream/handle/18452/19159/NEF2017_Art_Petersson_Kainz_Migration%20in%20the%20Media.pdf?sequence=1) (Access 10.01.2022).
- Reuters (2022) *Employers may need to justify bans on wearing religious signs, EU court says*. Available at: <https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/general-headscarf-ban-work-is-ok-europes-top-court-says-2022-10-13/> (Access 23.02.2023).
- Rystad, G. (1995) *Den internationella migrations makrohistoria* in Jervas, G. (ed.) *Migrationsexplosionen: Bakgrund och alternativ till den felslagna flyktingspolitiken*. Stockholm: SNS Förlag.
- Salihu, S. (2016) *Migracioni dhe Shteti Komb në Epokën Globale*. Prishtinë: Kolegji Evropian Juridika. ISBN 978-9951-618-06-9.
- United Nations (N.D.) *Peace, dignity and equality on a healthy planet*. Available at: [www.un.org/en/global-issues/migration](http://www.un.org/en/global-issues/migration) (Access 30.06.2022).
- Weiner, M. (1996) *Ethics, National Sovereignty and the Control of Immigration*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2547466?read-now=1&seq=1> (Access 2.03.2022).