

MIGRATION MANAGEMENT – THE CASES OF GERMANY AND HUNGARY

Zoran Milosavljević^{a*} and Andrijana R. Maksimović^b

^a*Institute for Political Studies, Belgrade, Serbia*

^b*State University of Novi Pazar, Novi Pazar, Serbia*

(Received 13 September 2022; accepted 12 May 2023)

Abstract

The authors of the paper deal with immigration policies, migration management, migration management policy via case study based on the example of two purposefully chosen countries which have diametrically opposite immigration policies. The aim is to see up to which extent and whether these countries are interested into integrating immigrants into their social, legal, political and cultural space, through their institutional capacities, by the means of comparative analysis of German and Hungarian immigration policies, their social, demographic and economic structure, and their cultural and security policies. By defining concepts of migration, immigration, integration, immigration policy, migration management, immigration border management, the authors precisely pinpoint the differences, and the causes of those differences, in the policies towards migrants in these two countries.

Key words: migration management, case study, Germany, Hungary, integration, immigrant policy

1. INTRODUCTION

Since the problem of migration is a growing concern among the scientific and professional public, thus the special interest is shown for accompanying side effects of physical and social phenomenon of migration. Consequences of migrations as a physical phenomenon in society are tightly

connected with immigration, emigration, and integration. Before the introductory observations, it would be beneficial to define the terms migration, emigration, immigration, and integration.

Under the term migration we refer to the movement of people from one place to another. Migrations can be without an aim, in which case they are not different from

* Corresponding author: andrijanam0809@yahoo.com

running because their purpose is surviving. Simultaneously, and more often nowadays, migrations have an aim, specific purpose and intention. In that case, the migrant, or the person moving, has another goal besides surviving. The reasons for migrations can be economic, educational, social, family or of some other nature. On the other hand, emigration is the term signifying leaving a certain place and moving into another. Emigration is a connection between the emigrants and their country of origin. Unlike emigration, the term immigration denotes moving into a new physical and legal space. Finally, the term integration refers to a set of measures and procedures used to integrate immigrants or immigrant groups into new political, legal, economical and social systems, thus becoming active and/or passive participants of the new social and cultural environment where they circulate¹.

Broadly speaking, the authors deal with immigration policies, migration management, migration management policy through case study², based on the example of two purposefully chosen countries with diametrically opposite immigration policies. Thus, they emphasize the comparative analysis of the immigration policies of the two countries as the main aims, as well as the effort to see whether, and to what extent, the countries are interested to integrate immigrants into their social, legal, political, and cultural space via their institutional capacities.

Migratory movements involving refugees and asylum seekers are inherently chaotic

and unpredictable, involving individuals and groups of people with strong fears, emotions and aspirations. While the notion of ‘migration management’ has a reassuringly technocratic ring to it, we can be sure that the reality will prove to be considerably more complex, controversial and costly than this concept implies (Crisp, 2003). Migration management’ refers to at least three different trends. First, it is a notion that is mobilized by actors to conceptualize and justify their increasing interventions in the migration field. This points out to the role played by the agencies mentioned above and to the importance of their strategies and functioning. Second, migration management refers to a range of practices that are now part of migration policies, and that are often performed by the institutions that promote the notion; these include, for example, counter-trafficking. And third, migration management relies on a set of discourses and on new narratives regarding what migration is and how it should be addressed (Geiger & Pécoud, 2010).

Immigration policies, generally speaking, are institutionalized forms of predetermined policies. Under the term immigration policy we refer to “any policy of a state that deals with the transit of persons across its borders into the country, but especially those that intend to work and stay in the country”.³ Thus, immigration policies imply “governments’ statement on what they intend to do (either through action or laws, regulations, decisions or orders) regarding selection, reception, solving and deportation

¹ In linguistic encyclopedias, philosophers, sociologists, demographers, political scientists and others, define the term integration as a certain state which they describe by using the word mixing. (Cambridge Dictionary, Cambridge University Press, 2001). However, due to the significance that the institutional phenomenon has in this process, it would be more appropriate to describe integration as fitting in.

² The case study will comprise the comparative method or the method of comparison in order to clearly describe and identify immigration policies and immigration policy management.

³ “An immigration policy is any policy of a state that deals with the transit of persons across its borders into the country, but especially those that intend to work and stay in the country” (<https://www.definitions.net/definition/Immigration+policy>)

of the foreign citizens who live in the reception country” (Bjerre et.al. 2015). Immigration policies include “the combined framework of legal norms, laws and regulations, policies and traditions as well as organizational structures (subnational, national, regional, and international) and the relevant processes that shape and regulate the States’ approaches with regard to migration in all its forms, addressing rights and responsibilities and promoting international cooperation.”⁴

The EU is developing a border management strategy which aims at an “integrated and global response” to the challenges emerging from irregular immigration through the common external borders. In November 2006, the European Commission published a communication calling for the reinforced management of the EU’s Southern maritime borders and for the maximisation of the capacities of the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union –FRONTEX. Under the auspices of the Finnish Presidency, the Council agreed on a common definition of what ‘Integrated Border Management’ (IBM) means in the EU. The prioritisation of borders has been coupled with the emergence of a ‘global approach to migration’, which aims to ensure a multifaceted response covering all the dimensions relevant to migration, with particular attention to irregular mobility by third-country nationals coming from Africa. The EU policy seems to be based on two distinct but closely interrelated and complementary approaches: on the one hand,

an integrated approach to the management of common territorial borders, and on the other hand a global policy covering migration (Carrera, 2007).

The phenomenon of irregular immigration, especially coming from the Southern European borders, represents the target against which “the EU border” and its multilayered components as framed by the IBM have been conceived. In fact, one of the more important objectives of EU border management is the building of a common immigration policy which “manages comprehensively” and “fights against” the sort of mobility negatively qualified as “illegal”. This is the sort of mobility that is at stake because of its non-compliance with the rigid legal rules of the common Schengen regime (Bigo & Guild, 2005). It is somehow surprising to see how the EU still continues to use the term “illegal immigration” and verbs like “fight against” and “combat” when dealing with the phenomenon of irregular immigration. The negative implications inherent in the use of this terminology have often been qualified as ascribing to the person involved a status which implies suspicion and criminality (Carrera, 2007). The call to ensure a global response covering all the dimensions relevant to migration had been already adopted at the European Council meeting of December 2005.⁵ The Council defined at that meeting the Global Approach to Migration as aiming to reduce “illegal migration flows and the loss of lives, ensure safe return of illegal migrants, strengthen durable solutions for refugees, and build capacity to better manage migration”. The current EU policy on irregular immigration

⁴ IOM Glossary on Migration, 3rd Edition, 2018 – forthcoming

⁵ Brussels European Council Conclusions, Presidency Conclusions, 15 and 16 December 2005, Council of the European Union, 15914/01/05, 30 December 2005.

legitimise the practice and promotion of a paradigm of control and surveillance, and whose implementation through systems like operational cooperation, risk analysis and exchange of information opens a series of concerns regarding the principle of legality, transparency and accountability as well as the compliance with human rights and European Community law on borders.

2. POLITICAL AND LEGAL ASPECT OF MIGRATION MANAGEMENT

German logic of immigration policy starts from direct life experience of immigrants, their direct living and working environment. Therefore, German federal policy of immigrant integration fully understands all the multilayered arrangements based on partnership and cooperation between immigration worker, his/her domiciled employer and “the third legal constituent” – the local government and self-government (free cities and municipalities). That is the reason why the federal government pays attention not to get involved excessively into the relation between the abovementioned subjects, while making and enforcing regulations and decisions. The federal office has taken the attitude to intervene only where absolutely necessary and to leave all other issues be spontaneously solved between immigrant-worker, domiciled employer, and local government/self-government.

This is the root of the national umbrella policy of migrant integration, which, basically, mostly deals with modeling processes of integration processes through coordination and planning. Lately, the federal government and federal administration are performing re-distribution of assets and implement control measures of

financial assets allocated for accommodation and integration of immigrants into local communities.

Hungarian geopolitical and international-integration viewpoint states that Hungary should be a part of “Western world”, a member of all Euro-Atlantic structures, but that it should not “sacrifice itself” in those processes and renounce its sovereignty, integrity and the right to decide about its own fate. Legally and politically speaking, one of the central levers of the immigration policy and the relationship towards immigrants is the right to asylum. This right enables the stay on Hungarian territory, thus providing protection from return and extradition. The permit for temporary protection for a specified period, or for the period until all the facts about a potential asylum-seeker are confirmed, may extend the protection for a specified following period approved by the Hungarian parliament. Besides the recognized refugee status and temporary protection, the law introduces the subsidiary, i.e. additional protection (Gyöngyvér, 2007). Recognized refugees and beneficiaries of subsidiary rights have special status which enables them the right to legal benefits which Hungarian citizens have as well. The beneficiaries of subsidiary protection do not get residence permit but Hungarian identification which expires after three years.

The persons with the “international protection” status are of great importance. Those are the persons who can stay at the reception centres up to 30 days from the day of passing the decision. According to the Hungarian law, the applicants for family reunification must be family members of a refugee in Hungary, and not simply refugees. Therefore, only refugees have the right to family reunification under favourable conditions and within the timeframe of three

months after they had been granted their status. In that case, they are exempt from fulfilling the usual material conditions, such as financial support, accommodation and health insurance (Ibidem). All other immigrants are not entitled to the right of family reunification which is considered to be a rather restrictive measure. The asylum-seekers do not have access to public employment services (PES) and employment on the regular labour market. In this way, Hungary kept its restrictive regulations thus protecting its national labour market from “the newcomers without status”.

3. ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL ASPECT OF MIGRATION MANAGEMENT

Among the motifs for moving into the Federal Republic of Germany, the immigrants usually emphasize economic and social reasons. The initial guiding motive “to earn some money” (in order to help their families who had stayed in their country of origin to “survive”) evolved in time to “to find a better life for myself and my family”.⁶ At the same time, German employers opened their factories for “foreign workers” in order to maintain the developing flywheel of their companies within a capitalist-structured economy. Thus, the needs of German employers and the needs of German immigrants overlapped and united. It seems that demographic reasons and German low birth rate which is not able to keep up with the flywheel of German economy, caused the

need for immigrants, thus forming a quite liberal immigration policy (Özoğuz, 2017). The estimates go so far that it is assumed that German economy significantly depends on the flow of migrant workforce and that in the certain parts of the Federal Republic of Germany “it would become unsustainable if the immigration policy became more restrictive” (Craig, 2015). This is how one immigration system was created, and in its core German employers and immigrant workers merge capital on one hand, and work on the other.

The national integration plan foresees that the units of local self-government i.e. municipalities, cities, districts, and provinces-regions become and remain centres of integration in several regards: cultural, economical, and social.⁷ At the same time, local communities, especially powerful cities, have wide social mechanisms which can encourage migrants’ social integration. Some of those mechanisms are economic and social such as programmes for actively finding jobs for immigrants by addressing and negotiating with economy employers, which is in the spirit of German concept of social market (Klopp, 2002).

Among other programmes of social integration, some are quite prominent such as welfare benefits for immigrants’ children and unemployed spouses, training programmes for exercising certain civil and social rights, apartment allocation, etc (Joki & Wolffhardt, 2017).

Hungary does not have separate state

⁶ Economic and social motivational factors were dominant in the studies conducted before the migrant influx of 2011. [For example: Erhabor S. Idemudia, Klaus Boehnke: I’m an Alien in Deutschland – A Quantitative Mental Health Case Study of African Immigrants in Germany, Peter Lang, 2010, p. 48: “Regarding the reasons of migration to Germany, 40,5% mentioned economic problems at home as the main reason, 20,3% emigrated because of political problems at home, 19,5% came to study in Germany, 11,4% looked for a job (without mentioning economic problems at home), and 8,9% came because of family reasons (one or the other type of family reunification being the main reason).]

⁷ Germany has several authority levels, federal state comprising constituent states (Länder): Bundesstaat (federal government), Landstaat (constituent state’s authority/government), and Stadtstaaten (city-state).

support for employment. International protection beneficiaries have the right to use the services of the National Employment Service under the same conditions as Hungarian citizens, even though it is difficult to find a clerk for the needs of English speaking areas. The main support for integration process comes from non-governmental organizations. In practice, due to linguistic and cultural barriers, the access to employment is limited. Besides, the employers often discriminate against international protection beneficiaries compared to Hungarian citizens, because they simply do not trust foreigners. In Hungary, the asylum-seekers, refugees, and the persons with subsidiary protection status also have the right to primary health care which includes medical examinations, treatments within the field of general practice, and specialized care in cases of emergency. The health care expenses are covered by the Office for immigration and asylum. Health care services are also available for refugees and persons with subsidiary protection status, as well as minors of the same status if they had been granted stay in Hungary. The right to primary health care, however, expires only 6 months after one was granted refugee status or subsidiary protection which is not covered by social insurance system.⁸

The social welfare expenditure allocated from the budget for Germany and Hungary is shown in the Table 1.

Training of workers for new skills and practices: retraining, additional qualification, professional and/or academic courses are

Table 1. Budget allocations on the basis of welfare benefits⁹

	Budget allocations on the basis of welfare benefits for 2017, presented in 2018. (% of GDP)
Germany	19,5
Hungary	14,5

becoming a significant tool for economic and social integration of immigrants and their inclusion into German society, starting from local (municipalities and free cities), regional (states - *Länder*; *Landstaat*) to federal government level (The Federal Republic of Germany).¹⁰

In this way, a new wide space for social inclusion and broader social involvement is created, thus getting its full meaning and content via programmes for cultural integration.

Besides facing the issue of migrants, Hungary simultaneously faces serious demographic challenges such as ageing population, mass emigration to western countries and low birth rate. The greatest Hungarian challenge is that no one wants to stay. This is closely connected with the strong feeling of existential threat. Hungarian government is making an effort to solve the problem of lack of workforce with population growth by implementation of measures from the domain of demographic and social policy. Simultaneously, the Hungarian government has launched an unsuccessful campaign for the employment of workers from Ukraine.

The share of demand for highly qualified workforce in Germany and Hungary in 2018 shows the following results (Table 2):

⁸ Integration of Refugees in Greece, Hungary and Italy – Comparativ analysis, Directorate-General for Internal Policies, Policy department A: Economic and Scientific Policy, European Parliament's Committee on Employment and Social affairs, December 2017, p.64

⁹ https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Government_expenditure_on_social_protection

¹⁰ The new law recognizes more subjects engaged in these programmes: syndicates, labour associations, professional organizations, trade associations and chambers of commerce. (More on this topic in the Speckesser (2013))

Table 2. The share of demand for highly qualified workforce¹¹

The share of demand for highly qualified workforce in 2018	
Germany	68%
Hungary	29%

4. CULTURAL ASPECT OF MIGRATION MANAGEMENT

German immigration model is conditioned by economic needs, but the very immigration policy of integration is conducted through shared values, symbols and meanings from the field of culture, thus creating social cohesion. With culture as a mediator, the idea of integration is directly connected with the idea of social cohesion. The first and the most important mechanism of integration of migrants into German society is seen in the efforts of German governmental and non-governmental organizations to help immigrants achieve certain level of proficiency of German language necessary for successful communication in the society (Bendel, 2014). The significance of language as the basic aspect of integration has grown so far that nowadays “everyone who wants to move into Germany must pass the elementary level test of German language” (Leise, 2007).

Nowadays, the federal government level, although having no jurisdiction over education, participates in various programmes encouraging multiculturalism, and especially in inclusion of immigrants’

children into German society (Bendel, 2014), stating that working on the integration of migrants’ women and children is an investment for future (Hübschmann, 2015). “Also, creating a more efficient system of language learning and opening of schools would encourage participation of immigrants’ parents” (Bendel, 2014). The idea is for schools to become the centers of integration of immigrant families and to “encourage social cohesion” (Süssmuth, 2009).

Culture plays an important role in “raising awareness about the positive aspect of migration” (Joki & Wolffghardt, 2017). This form of social engagement contributes to better integration of immigrants and bigger social cohesion. The activities are led by non-governmental organizations, with the support of the government at local, regional and federal level, with the aim of acting preventively, so as not to open the space for the negative campaign and negative public opinion about immigrants.

German identity of “national citizen” inevitably influences German policy towards immigrant problem, despite poor agreement on the definition of German nation.¹² German identity approach starts from the notion of the same territory and the same language, moving on to joint history and similar tradition (from state to state – from *Land to Land*), whereas nowadays the idea of Germany as a multicultural society is widely accepted, i.e. a society of those who “contribute to the fiscal system”, beneficiaries of quality social services and

¹¹ <https://skillspanorama.cedefop.europa.eu/en/news/oecd-skills-jobs-database-2018>

¹² Some sociological research went so far that they “scanned the image of an average German” and defined “German” as person “X” who drinks 0,27l of beer a day, eats 1,1kg of pork meat a week, is hard-working and responsible, recycles conscientiously, takes a break during Sundays, respects and preserves the environment, and never invades privacy of other at work”. Zuzanna Hübschmann, „Migrant Integration Programs – The Case of Germany“, Global Migration Research Paper, N° 11/2015, Global Migration Centre, 2015, p. 42) Rita Süssmuth, *The Future of Migration and Integration Policy in Germany*, Migration Policy Institute, 2009, p.7. Brett Klopp, *German Multiculturalism – Immigrant Integration and the Transformation of Citizenship*, Greenwood Publishing Group, 2002, p. 25.

relatively high standard of living. Multiculturalism should point out to the moderation of German integration model which is somewhere in between the extreme notions of ghettoization and assimilation. The idea is that several cultures can coexist if they are connected by joint “connective tissue”. These are the reasons why immigrants in Germany are treated as “our foreign fellow citizens” (*unsere ausländische Mitbürger*) which is more than a picturesque illustration of the conflict between the wish to integrate non-ethnic Germans into German society, and emphasizing the fact that they are visibly different (Hübschmann, 2015).

This “dissimilarity” and “difference” can certainly act as a catalyst for suspicion with certain political and social groups. If suspicion grows into greater political action then the security aspect arises with its approaches and measures in accordance with the outlined immigration policy.

It seems that the Hungarian government does almost everything to discourage refugees from staying in the country, even if they had already been granted legal status. While countries like Germany allocate funds for immigration programmes, this summer Hungary suspended monthly scholarship for refugees, whose goal was to help them learn Hungarian language and start “a new life” in the country (Bayer, 2016). Integration is more difficult when the refugee comes from the culture which largely differs from the host culture. In such cases, integration implies re-socialization of the refugees in many aspects (Gyöngyvér, 2007).

Personal relationship between the refugees and the local people can play a key role in immigrants’ social integration. Such

relations can facilitate the integration and help mastering the knowledge of Hungarian culture, tradition, customs, language, etc. Despite the difficult economic situation, the immigrants are required to completely adjust to the new environment which implies mastering Hungarian language which is difficult and atypical even for the foreigners who come from the immediate surrounding countries of central and Southeast Europe (Ibidem).

Strong prejudice towards minority groups is a significant characteristic of Hungarian citizens and it is often based on racial and cultural prejudices. The impression is that Hungarians feel most comfortable “among themselves”. Thus, many believe that Hungarians are rather intolerant (these viewpoints are strengthened by numerous research regarding other nations and countries of central and Eastern Europe).

As it is shown in the Table 3 above, Germany has high level of integration of immigrants into its society, whereas Hungary shows significantly lower level of integration.

Table 3. Integration of immigrants into society

The EU member states	MIPEX ¹³ (carried out in 2014)
Germany	19,5
Hungary	14,5

5. SECURITY ASPECT OF MIGRATION MANAGEMENT

German security policy is divided as follows: outer borders and “issue of

¹³ <http://www.mipex.eu/play/>

foreigners” belong to federal state, whereas other immigration issues are lowered to the level of de-centralized units. Thus “border protection and asylum procedures are within the area of responsibility of federation, whereas accommodation and care of asylum seekers are the under the jurisdiction of states (Länder) and local authorities which cover the expenses up to great extent” (Özoğuz, 2017). This is logical since “migration control is crucial for national sovereignty, it limits the territorial borders and membership borders” (Fauser, 2006).

According to the viewpoint of the German authorities, the integration of immigrants is the best preventive security measure because “integration means living together as one society, and not in separate worlds” (Hübschmann, 2015). German authorities have taken strong measures for integration of immigrants, starting from economic and social, primary and motivational, to those from the field of culture and education (Hoffmann, 1987). All those mechanisms have the goal to built functional and safe security system without ideological extremism, interracial intolerance and radical political acts. “The aim of integration is to enable migrants to become active members of a linguistically homogenous society” (Hübschmann, 2015). There is a tendency to achieve security prevention through elements of soft power through social and identity engineering by creating a linguistic model of civil affiliation with the vision of a multicultural society united by a common language (Ibidem, 26-27).

The physical barriers which Hungary placed on its borders were limiting the access to central and Northern Europe, thus increasing the number of migrants and refugees in other Balkan countries and Greece. Hungary approves the right to

asylum at its own rate, which is below the EU average rate, compared to the EU final decisions. Hungary has the highest rejection rate (above 90%) compared to three countries from war zones, once initial and final decisions are taken into consideration. The number of immigrants sharply declined in 2016 due to the closing of the borders, and it was 1.220 which is 4,1% of all asylum seekers (Hübschmann, 2015). All this points out to restrictive political action with repressive coercive measures.

The overall fear and “mistrust of the unknown” are replaced with a specific image of an enemy who is embodied in an “asylum-seeker”. This tangible image of the enemy has become connected with even more specific fears, such as fear from influx of migrants (Hübschmann, 2015). Hungarian officials believe that the migrants have caused harm to public security and that they spread diseases. Legislation regarding anti-terrorist activity has been strengthened across Europe. The introduced changes in Western Europe reflect high level of existing threats and are built into stable democratic systems.

We cannot escape the impression that Hungarian immigration policy has come a long way: starting from one of the most liberal countries during the last decade of the 20th century, to a country that has become rather restrictive in terms of securitization along with negative campaign towards immigrants and sporadic cases of application of violence on a small scale.

6. CONCLUSION

The whole integration process stems from the need to merge labour (immigrants) and capital (German employer). This merging

happens in a factory or some kind of a shop, and it is assisted by communal bodies (of municipalities and free cities), state's government, i.e. Länder, Landstaat, (province or "federal state" authorities) and federal authority in Berlin. Lately, upon suggestion of the federal government, the best ones among immigrants are being employed within the local government and self-government (communal services, municipal and city authorities, etc.), thus achieving proportional representation and reward incentive for successful integration into German local environment.

Along with economic interest and social protection, the mechanisms in the field of culture are the most important methods of encouraging immigrants to integrate into the society they arrived to. Among these methods, achieving competence in German language has turned out to be the most significant and basic integration method. The immigrants who intend to stay in Germany must acquire basic knowledge and communication skills in German language.

Language competence is a prerequisite for integration of foreigners into German local communities. In addition, some of the benefits of competence in German language are communication in working environment, productivity, interaction with surroundings (neighbours, local services, etc.). If immigrants intend to stay longer and later apply for citizenship, besides German language course, they must pass the training and tests regarding the basics of country's education system – German geography, history, basics of the Constitution and legal system, etc. However, for the time being, some courses are still not being held such as communication science, sociology, and social psychology, which would enhance the switch from mechanical to organic

integration of immigrants into German society.

Finally, speaking of security issues, it should be pointed out that German security system is still complicated and multi-layered and it operates on information exchange coordination, operational and analytical affairs on several government levels. German strategy of security action is more committed to preventive measures rather than action. The Federal Republic of Germany allocates significant funds in order to prevent religious and ethnic conflicts, especially because the large part of immigration population still has plural identity – even though they have accepted the Federal Republic of Germany as their new country, they still nourish their customs, culture, and tradition in the local communities where they live.

Hungary strongly relies on asylum policy in its immigration policy. This immigration instrument enables rigorous control over immigrants entering Hungarian territory, the inner-period when security checks on every migrant individually are carried out, and finally granting asylum, i.e. declining to grant asylum and extradition of migrant across the border into the direction from which they arrived. All this requires strong security measures such as construction of border checking points, securing the border line, construction of so called buffer zone for the reception of identified migrants, as well as other similar measures.

In this way, migrant movement is under direct measures of constant surveillance and control. The attitude of Hungarian immigration policy is that migrants are actually economical and not political refugees.

The concepts of immigration policies of Germany and Hungary are shown in the Table 4.

Table 4. Germany / Hungary: migration management

GERMANY	HUNGARY
immigration is an instrument for filling-in the demographic gaps societies are founded upon territorial-civil concept of nation state	immigration threatens to change society's demographic structure societies are based on ethnic majority whereas traditional ethnic communities are minority
immigration tradition	no immigration tradition
culture of differences – racial and ethnic tolerance	racial and ethnic duality
legislative and administrative activity are oriented towards migrant integration	legislative and administrative activity are oriented towards protecting the borders from immigration influx
prominent role of local self-governments in migrant integration process open labour market	local self-government does not participate in migrant integration process closed labour market
tolerant budget policy for migrants' welfare expenditure	immigrants are a burden for welfare system
efficient services for issuing residence visas and work permits open borders	very formalized legal procedures for issuing residence visas and work permits closed borders – asylum policy for the purpose of protecting the borders
developed system of financing the projects which encourage integration of migrants into new surroundings	poorly developed system of financing the projects for migrant integration
pragmatic approach towards solving migrant issues	anti-immigrant party populism
security prevention through intelligence work	security prevention –
positive public opinion about migrants	anti-terrorist action negative public opinion on migrants

References

Bigo, D., Guild, E. (2005). *Controlling Frontiers: Free Movement into and within Europe*. London: Ashgate.

Bayer, L. (2016). *Hungary's 'Zero refugee' strategy*. Politico. Bruselles.

Bendel, P. (2014). *Coordinating immigrant integration in Germany. Mainstreaming at the federal and local levels*. Migration Policy Institute.

Bjerre, L., Helbling, M., Römer, F. (2015). *Conceptualizing and Measuring Immigration Policies: A Comparative Perspective*. *International Migration Review*, 49 (3). 555-600.

Carrera S., (2007). *The EU Border Management Strategy FRONTEX and the Challenges of Irregular Immigration in the Canary Islands*. CEPS Working Document No. 261. Available from: <https://www.cidob.org/ca/content/download/>

УПРАВЉАЊЕ МИГРАЦИЈАМА – СЛУЧАЈ НЕМАЧКЕ И МАЂАРСКЕ

Зоран Милосављевић, Адријана Р. Максимовић

Извод

Аутори рада се баве имиграционом политиком, управљањем миграцијама, политиком управљања миграцијама кроз студију случаја на примеру две намерно изабране земље које имају дијаметрално супротне имиграционе политике. У којој мери и да ли су ове земље заинтересоване за интеграцију имиграната у свој друштвени, правни, политички и културни простор, кроз своје институционалне капацитете, разматрано је упоредном анализом немачке и мађарске имиграционе политике, њихове социјалне, демографску и економску структуру и њихову културну и безбедносну политику. Дефинисањем појмова миграција, имиграција, интеграција, имиграциона политика, управљање миграцијама, управљање имиграционим границама, аутори прецизно указују на разлике, као и на узроке тих разлика, у политикама према мигрантима у ове две земље.

Кључне речи: управљање миграцијама, студија случаја, Немачка, Мађарска, интеграција, имигрантска политика

26415/320701/file/Border+Management+Strategy+by+Carrera.pdf

Craig G., (2015). Migration and integration, a local and experiential perspective. Institute for Research into Superdiversity. Edgbaston : Birmingham UK.

Crisp, J. (2003). A new asylum paradigm? Globalization, Migration and the Uncertain Future of the International Refugee Regime. Geneva: UNHCR. New Issues in Refugee Research. Working Paper No. 100.

Fauser M. (2006). Transnational Migration – A National Security Risk? Securitization of Migration Policies in Germany, Spain and the United Kingdom. Reports and Analyses, N° 2/2006. Center for International Relations : Warszawa.

Geiger, M., & Pécoud, A. (2010). The Politics of International Migration Management. Basingstoke: New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 45-72.

Gyöngyvér, D. (2007). Integration of refugees in Hungary -4th Training School of Challenge. Brussels: CEPS.

Hoffmann-Nowotny, H.J. (1987). Social integration and Cultural Pluralism: Structural and Cultural Problems of Immigration in European Industrial Countries. ed. William Alonso: Population in an interacting world: Harvard university Press.

Hübschmann, Z. (2015). Migrant Integration Programs: The Case of Germany. Global Migration Research Paper, N° 11/2015. Global Migration Centre.

Joki, A.L. & Wolffhardt, A. (2017). Local and central government co-ordination on the process of migrant integration: good practices from selected OSCE participating States. Policy Study. Migration Policy Group Warsaw.

Klopp, B. (2002). German Multiculturalism – Immigrant Integration and the Transformation of Citizenship.

Greenwood Publishing Group.

Leise, E. (2007). *Germany Strives to Integrate Immigrants with New Policies*. Migration Policy Institute.

Özoğuz, A. (2017). German Commissioner for Immigration, Refugees and Integration. *International Migration*, 55 (6), 5-11.

Speckesser, S. (2013). *The immigrant workforce in Germany: Formal and Informal barriers to addressing skills deficits*. TransAtlantic Council on Migration/Migration Policy Institute.

Süssmuth, R. (2009). *The Future of Migration and Integration Policy in Germany*. Migration Policy Institute.

The internet sources

https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statisticsexplained/index.php/Government_expenditure_on_social_protection

<https://skillspanorama.cedefop.europa.eu/en/news/oecd-skills-jobs-database-2018>

<https://www.migrationpolicy.org/news/germany-strives-integrate-immigrant>

<http://www.mipex.eu/play>

<https://www.definitions.net/definition/Immigration+policy>