



LUND
UNIVERSITY

Department of Political Science

Factors affecting solidarity

An argumentative analysis of the European Parliament debate on
migration in the Mediterranean Sea

Abstract

The 12th of April 2016, the European Parliament held a debate concerning the migration on the Mediterranean Sea. The issue has turned into a political crisis that has divided the member states of the European Union. This study intends to examine whether geographical distance may condition solidarity. Through an argumentative analysis, arguments by Swedish, Finnish, Greek and Italian members of the European Parliament will be analyzed to establish whether political orientation, or geographical location is more likely to explain the difference in statements. It is found that the hypothesis of North European arguments more often being characterized by logic and South European by emotion is correct. Thereby the conclusion of the study is that the geographical distance, in this case, is more likely to explain the different arguments, than political orientation.

Keywords: European Union, European Commission, European Parliament, Migration, Human Rights, Solidarity and Argumentation.

Word count: 9895

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	2
INTRODUCTION	4
AIMS AND QUESTIONS OF THE STUDY	6
DISPOSITION	7
BACKGROUND	7
EUROPEAN UNION	7
THE MIGRATION ON THE MEDITERRANEAN SEA	9
EMPIRICAL MATERIAL	10
THEORY	11
SOLIDARITY CONDITIONED BY GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION?	11
LEFT- OR RIGHTWING POLITICS	12
RESEARCH DESIGN	14
ARGUMENTATIVE ANALYSIS	14
THE APPLICATION	15
OPERATIONALIZATION	16
PREVIOUS RESEARCH	17
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	20
PLACEMENT OF EP GROUPS ON THE LEFT-RIGHT POLITICAL SPECTRUM	21
ANALYSIS	23
STEPS 1-3	24
STEPS 4 & 5	28
DISCUSSION	30
CONCLUSION	31
SOURCES	32
LITERATURE	32
ARTICLES	32
AUDIO SOURCES	33
OTHERS	35

Introduction

Alan Kurdi was three years old when he washed up ashore on a beach in Turkey, September 2015. He is the little boy, whose lifeless body in the hands of a Turkish military, was framed and spread like fire through social media. He is the little boy whose life has become a symbol for the ongoing situation at the Mediterranean Sea, where thousands of refugees has met the same faith as little Alan. (Zachariasson, SVT, 2015). The Mediterranean Sea has over the past few years turned into a mass grave where several thousand lives has been taken. This border between continents is the deadliest in the world where, only in 2016, more than five thousand human beings drowned. These are the refugees that are fleeing in hope of a better future, with a dream of living in a safe environment far away from the terrors that drove them away from their home countries, from all over Africa and the Middle East (UNHCR, 2017).

What is the greatest movement of men and women since the Second World War[...] (Kyenge, CRE 12/04/2016 – 3, EP, 2016).

To save lives the European Union has since 2015 tripled their operations in the Mediterranean Sea, which has led to 400.000 people being saved from drowning. This is a situation that the European Union or more specifically European Commission is currently working with. In January this year, the EC together with the representative for external affairs, sat together to try to discuss plausible actions in order to stop the loss of human lives (EC, IP/17/134, 2017). However this was neither the first nor the last time the EU has met to decide on what measures to take on the situation in the Mediterranean. May 13^h 2015 the EC proposed a European Agenda on Migration that was supposed to not only unravel the immediate challenges of 2015, but also to supply the tools needed to better manage migration long term. Moreover, the EU has taken a variety of decisions on how to approach the refugee crisis on the Mediterranean, and amongst those measures that has been introduced by the EC is funding frontline member states, strengthening bonds with third part countries and international organizations, relocating and resettling refugees and combating human smuggling. Although, the migration on the Mediterranean Sea is estimated to continue to be a challenge for decades, as a result of the coordinated work on migration the situation has become somewhat stabilized with a 63% decrease in irregular arrivals in Europe 2017 (EC, IP/17/5132, 2017).

The refugee crisis over the Mediterranean Sea is a current issue covering all communication channels. Families torn apart, human deaths, displacement, terrorism, human smuggling and slave trade are some of the biggest, most media covered and most urgent effects of the migration crisis. The European Union has on numerous occasions discussed these issues and what measures to take. On a global scale, it is observed that the crisis initially divided the European Unions member states and that the lack of solidarity is what sparked the crisis within Europe (BBC, 2016 – Tisdall, *The Guardian*, 2017). As an example the Czech Republic accepted 12 people and then “slammed the doors”, Austria paid refugees to leave and multiple countries decided to close their borders and refuse replacement deals. As most refugees take the route to Europe by crossing the Mediterranean see, the majority arrives in Greece and Italy (BBC, 2016 – Tisdall, *The Guardian*, 2017).

In Greece and Italy refugees arriving in boats and tragedies happening have not been too unusual, but what about the rest of Europe? Strangely enough Alan Kurdi’s death became the symbol for this crisis, but only after what was the greatest movement since the World War two. Does the geographical distance affect solidarity, or how come the situation on the Mediterranean is still almost three years later an ongoing crisis? Madelaine Seidlitz, who is a lawyer and also head of refugee department at Amnesty International, is amongst many others who claim that human beings may act and/or think differently when we are not directly affected by an issue. Seidlitz appeared on the Swedish show *Radiokorrespondenterna* where she explained that the migration politics is tricky as our attitude might depend on the distance. She claimed that issues occurring in Europe and that affects us, for example through economic factors, we take more seriously and deal with immediately, whereas when issues on a global level or too far for us to be affected we may want to handle the problem differently (Seidlitz, Sveriges radio, 2017). This is what this paper intends to address, the question on if geographical distance may condition solidarity in the case of the European Parliament on migration in the Mediterranean, or if the different arguments seem to only be based on right- or leftwing politics.

Aims and questions of the study

The aim of this study is to examine whether geographical distance can condition solidarity. This will be executed by dismantling a European Parliament debate and describing the different arguments as well as analyzing what factors may have affected them. Thereby this essay has both a descriptive- as well as an explanatory aim. Thus the questions formulated in order to fulfill the aims for this study are:

- What are some of the different arguments presented at the Debate April 12th, 2016?
- Comparing the two factors of political orientation and geographical distance, which one is more likely to explain the arguments?

Disposition

The introduction, aim and questions of the study have already been presented. Below a brief background will be provided, in order to give a greater understanding of the subject. The background will thus contain an explanation as to why a debate chosen by the European Parliament was chosen, as well as a concise background of the debate. After that the empirical material will be introduced and reasoned. Followed by a section of various limitations that has been made. Then comes the sections of theory and the research design where both are presented and the design operationalized. After that follows the previous research that, in various ways, has influenced the different theoretical and methodological choices that has been made. Then the limitations of the study as well as the EP parties placement on the left/right scale will be presented. At last the analysis, discussion and conclusion are stipulated.

Background

This chapter is primarily going to give a greater understanding of the background to the chosen debate. Whereas chosen material will be introduced in the following chapter. However the background will, before diving into the chosen subject, also give an overview of the EU as a whole. To further explain why a debate held by the European Parliament is most suitable as well as a brief description what roles the different EU instances have.

European Union

The European Union is a hybrid organization with both supranational instances and intergovernmental decision-making and can therefore not be compared to any other international organization, like for example the UN. It began as a community in 1952 called *European Coal and Steel Community*, which was the first international organization based on the principles of supranationalism. The ECSC was founded as a common coal and steel market to rearm the member states, that were feeling inferior arms wise, and through the

rearm regain security and also prevent another war. At first there were only six countries who signed in on this collaboration, but after only a few years expanded into making an economical collaboration. This economical collaboration, European Economic Communities or EEC, was built upon the Treaty of Rome, 1957, which is often referred to as the foundation of the European Union (Sundström & Sundström, 2012:45-47).

Today EU consist of five central institutions; the European Commission, the European Parliament, the European Council, the Court of Justice of the European Union and the Council of the European Union. However for this specific subject only three of these instances are relevant because only three that have legislative power and thereby more influence over the European Union as well as the decisions that are being taken there. The European Commission is the only institution within the EU that has legislative initiative, in other words the EC is the only institution that can propose legislative. Though it is not the EC's only task, it is also known as the "Guardian of the Treaties", because of its task to monitor the implementation of legislation passed by the Council and Parliament. It thereby goes without saying that both the Council and the Parliament have key roles in the EU decision-making process. The two are basically equally powerful, as the Parliaments power has increased for each new treaty, while the Councils power has decreased. Both the Council and the Parliament has to accept the EC's proposals for it to become legislation. However the most relevant difference between the two is that the Council consists of ministers from each member countries government, while the Parliament consists of 754 directly elected politicians (Sundström & Sundström, 2012:50-53). The Parliament is therefor more suitable, as it consists of the politicians chosen by the people, and can give a more impartial view than the different governmental ministers. The Parliament members elected from the different member states contains both leftwing and rightwing politicians. It is for this reason that a debate held by the EP is the most suitable for this study as the aim is to analyze left- and rightwing politics in relation to location. Nevertheless a debate held by the Council would have been equally important and interesting, although a different kind of study.

The Migration on the Mediterranean Sea

There have been numerous debates on the subject, but the one chosen for this study is the most recent one held by the EP. Initially another debate on the subject was considered for this study. During that debate, which was held in 2015, some very extreme connections between migration from outside Europe and terrorism were made. This debate was held as a result of a report from a European Council meeting and was called: *The latest tragedies in the Mediterranean and EU migration and asylum policies*. (EP, 2015/2660(RSP)) However it was not chosen for this study, as it was not deemed suitable since the refugee crisis in 2015 took place after the debate. The division between EU-member states is what makes this subject interesting from a “solidarity – geographical distance” perspective. In other words, this debate from 2016 is chosen to possibly confirm the hypothesis of that there may be geographical limits for moral obligation. Although obviously the geographic distance within Europe is the same the year 2015 and 2016 there might be, because of the division between European member states, a greater distance politically.

Concerning the debate chosen for this study, once a legislative draft is handed over to the European Parliament it is assigned to a committee responsible for whatever the proposal regards. The committee then designates a rapporteur that takes the lead in negotiating the resolution before the EP. The legislative draft needs to be passed by the committee responsible to be passed on into plenary of the European Parliament, if the legislation is accepted it moves on to the European Council. In this case it was the Committee on *Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs* that is the EP’s committee responsible for amongst other things migration (EPPGroup), that issued the report tabled for plenary; (2015/2095(INI)). This report was presented by the rapporteurs Roberta Metsola and Kashetu Kyenge on April 12th in front of the European Parliament and is the foundation of the debate on *The Situation in the Mediterranean and the need for a holistic EU approach to migration*.

Empirical material

The Empirical material chosen for this study is, as earlier briefly mentioned, a debate held by the European Parliament 12th of April 2016. This debate; *The situation in the Mediterranean and the need for a holistic EU approach to migration* handles the subject of the refugee crisis that the European Union has been trying to handle since 2015. The debate intends to and also reaches a resolution with guidelines to a European Union migration policy, however in this study the content in the debate is of relevance, rather than it's effects.

This material, together with all debates held by the European Parliament, was found on the EP's website below "Plenary sitting", "Debates and Videos" and then using the keyword "Mediterranean". This specific debate was selected upon the premises that certain elements, such as right- or leftwing politics or geographical location, may play a role in the argumentation. As mentioned, the EU had gone through a fragmentation due to the refugee crisis in 2015. Basically it is chosen in an ambition to make a feasibility study, or in other words to find out if the theoretical choices can help explain the different arguments in the debate. It is chosen to either prove or rebut the hypothesis that solidarity may have geographical boundaries. The results should therefore not be seen as generalizing, as different materials may generate diverse results. It may in a way be a biased result, as the material is chosen by its likeliness to prove the hypothesis.

European Union: European Parliament, *The situation in the Mediterranean and the need for a holistic EU approach to migration*, 12 April 2016, (Debate) 2015/2095(INI).

The debate was held based on the issued report tabled for plenary by the *Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs Committee* in the European Parliament. The head negotiators Roberta Metsola and Cécile Kashetu Kyenge initiates the debate followed by Dimitris Avramopoulos who is the European Commissions representative. The three present the issue of the migration on the Mediterranean, with different statistics and the effect that earlier decisions has had, followed by an introduction of their new ideas and solutions. The debate then opens up and different members of the European Parliament, from diverse committees get the word. These members are from different countries and with different placements on

the left- rightwing, and are also ascribed to different political groups within the EP. However there are also members that are not attached to any group.

Theory

This study is based on a hypothesis that geographical distance may affect solidarity. The most suitable theory for this study will be developed through two different theoretical works. David Millers work *The Ethical Significance of Nationality* together with *Key Concepts in Politics and International Relations* by Andrew Heywood lays the foundation of succeeding theory. Mentioned composition is intended to possibly explain political arguing, more specifically what factors may affect solidarity. Obviously there could also be others than the two chosen factors that might condition solidarity, but the two chosen ones are basic and with high plausibility.

Solidarity conditioned by geographical location?

The duties we owe to our compatriots may be more extensive than the duties we owe to strangers, simply because they are compatriots (Miller, 1988:647)

Miller argues that a view of that we owe more towards those close to us than to strangers is rather usual. He explains that our societies are build upon this view, that we all have certain duties towards each other as co-nationals. Miller claims that in life we put up different boundaries, usually social ones, which he calls moral errors. But in the case of solidarity he argues that the basic principles are worked out, without any regard to social boundaries. But he means that in the case of ethicality there are limits, and those limits are geographical. This theory is a response to overly naive internationalism, and not a defense of exclusive nationalism or an attempt to underwrite all national identities. Miller puts nationality in opposition to universalism and defines it as a subjective phenomenon. He claims that nationality is constituted by a common belief that a set of people belongs together based on different principles, which does not necessarily always have to be language, race or religion.

But stems from a history of living together as well as common distinctive characteristics that can tell “us” apart from “them”. Miller also mentions that some kind of political autonomy is what differentiates the definitions of the terms nationality from ethnic group (Miller, 1988:647f).

In accordance to Rawls notion of the original positions, where subjects are asked about some principles without any knowledge about their own position in the world, certain fundamental rights for all is most likely to be established. After determining that, the subject would possibly move on to duties and/or rights for people placed in particular circumstances. As an example Miller brings up parents duties towards their kids. However if the subject were asked about the same principles while already having pursued deep social relationships this ethical agency is prone to have a different outcome. Because as the subject has social relationships he or she will be partly defined by the rights and obligations those relationships contain. The subject can still strive for rationality, but a rationality that will be based on existing duties. Such rational appraisal may for instance be impacted by commitments based on false assumptions, whereas a group had made a commitment towards each other but the parties does not take theirs seriously. As one discovers that a commitment was based on false assumptions the allegiance dissolves (Miller, 1988:649f). This is a relevant assumption to demonstrate as the European Union has gone through something similar attempting to deal with the refugee crisis. The principle of helping the person next to us makes sense as long as the presumption that each person is in equally need of help and each person is equally capable of helping. Nevertheless this principle is not suitable for the international arena according to Miller. Every state official is responsible to protect it's own citizens, as they should, but the question is whether this principle is the most suitable in relation to the general principle demands (Miller, 1988:652). In this study the question is based on Millers supposition that nationality, by his definition, can condition solidarity.

Left- or rightwing politics

Left and right are used as a method to describe political beliefs and ideas. It is viewed as a political spectrum where a party, movement or politician can be placed, in order to distinguish between their similarities and differences. The spectrum enables different intermediates such

as “center-left” or “far-right” etcetera. Nonetheless the definitions of the terms left and right are not exclusive but rather attempts of narrowing down various ways of attitudes towards economy and the role of the state. The distinction is supposedly reflecting ideological and value differences. While the distinctions are not set in stone ideas as freedom, equality and internationalism are generally associated with the leftwing and hierarchy, tradition and nationalism with the rightwing (Heywood, 2015:119).

As already established the terms demonstrate values and ideology on a political scale. However the distinction is simplistic and very generalized and should therefore be used with caution. Heywood argues that the spectrum is problematical since it leaves no room for anarchism, which could be both ultra left or ultra right. He means that the left/right division ignores the resemblance that communism and fascism have, the two left- and rightwing extremes. He also argues that it reduces politics into one dimension, the market – state divide, and thereby disregard other as important political divisions. At last Heywood explains that the new political issues or orientations such as feminism, ecologism and animal rights have caused criticism towards the conventional spectrum as they do not fit in. But that two-dimensional spectrum has been developed to offer a more complete political overview (Heywood, 2015:120).

For this study it is not relevant to use the different spectrums in order to distinguish between the political groups. Neither is it important to declare exactly what ideology and what values are connected to what position, as the intent is not to analyze the differences in political ideas. Nonetheless it is important to introduce the left/right division, as it will be a theoretical tool in the analysis. It will be used merely to decide whether politicians with the similar political ideas is suitable to explain the difference in opinions or if it is another factor in this specific case that has a higher degree of explanatory power. The different European Parliament groups will be introduced as well as their placement on the left-right spectrum, later in the text.

Research design

This chapter will initially describe the chosen methodology for the study; its purpose, strengths and shortages in addition to its classical design. It will then motivate the choice as well as present how the design will be applied on the Empirical material.

Argumentative analysis

The word debate is defined as a formal discussion on a specific matter in which opposing arguments are presented and that usually ends with a voting (Oxford Dictionaries). In other words a debate is a gathering of statements and to get an understanding about any debate one needs to distinguish the different arguments. Persuasion is a big component in human communication; analyzing arguments or debating can therefore be very essential in research, and the interest to analyze arguments goes far back in history. Rhetoric's evolved during the classical antiquity and was obligatory studies in western-schools until 19th century. Its primary purpose is to study persuasion, how to effectively inform others as well as how languages and texts are used. Rhetoric's thereby gives a comprehensive view of persuasion and presents three central terms; Logos, Ethos and Pathos. (Boréus & Bergström, 2012:91) Logos, Ethos and Pathos are all terms describing an argumentative statement. Logos is the part of an argument that appeals to the receivers, the person receiving the message, rationality and logic and therefore normally consists of very few emotive words or expressions. Ethos can be defined as the characteristics or traits one wants to prescribe themselves to win over the receivers, either by seeming trustworthy, honest, wise etc. While Pathos is the emotive, passionate words to appeal to the receiver's empathy, rage or in awaken any kind of strong emotions that may help persuade the receiver (Boréus & Bergström, 2012:91f)

An argumentative analysis has, according to Kristina Boréus and Göran Bergström in *Textens mening och makt: metodbok i samhällsvetenskaplig text- och diskursanalys* three aims. Those aims are descriptive, prescriptive and evaluative (Boréus & Bergström, 2012:92f). It is important to differentiate between argumentative analysis and studying arguments, where the focus lies with studying the arguments rhetorical characters. Studying arguments thereby means to study the rhetorical skills in arguments, while argumentative analysis intends to study the reasons behind the argument. Björnsson, Kihlbom & Ullholm claims that

argumentative analysis is suitable for debates, since it's common that the argumentation goes on a level that is far too complex for most people. In these cases an argumentative analysis can be very useful to make a debate more available and legible, by critically analyzing the arguments. This analysis is also suitable for political speeches, legal reasoning's and other argumentations where the arguments are either for or against an assertion. It is not suitable for situations where the aim is not to analyze what arguments are based on. The argumentative analysis is also subjective in a way, since the author has to interpret, structure and evaluate the arguments as they see fit. The results from the same material may consequently differ depending on the author (Björnsson, Kihlbom & Ullholm, 1994:7-10).

The descriptive aim is relevant because of the way arguments are presented; they are generally not isolated but an element in a longer statement. The descriptive aim is therefore intended to separate the argument from the statement. The second purpose of an argumentative analysis, the prescriptive aim intends to assess to what extent the argument lives up to certain norms, as an example rationality or objectivity. The third, the evaluative aim means to examine if an argument strengthens or rather undermines the statement (Boréus & Bergström, 2012:92f)

The application

Argumentative analysis is suitable for this study as the intent is to illustrate the different arguments in the debate rather than evaluating or studying its rhetorical qualities. It is also desirable for the purpose of examining what arguments are based on, which connects with the theory that intends to explain how certain factors may have played a role in the argumentation. It is important to highlight that this analysis is going to be somewhat biased and formed after the author's prospect as the same arguments may be interpreted or categorized differently by others.

In this study both the descriptive- as well as the prescriptive aim are relevant. For every chosen statement certain steps will be followed for properly analyzing the arguments;

1. The first step will be to appoint where the politicians belong on the right-leftwing according to the theory.

2. The second step is according to the descriptive aim; discerning the argument and separating it from the rest of the speech.
3. The third step is going to be a categorization the different arguments into Logos, or Pathos. Ethos is not included as one may assume that all members of the European Parliament is more or less affected by acting accordingly to what voters are expecting to gain further support in his or hers political carrier.
4. The forth step to assess if there seems to exist any kind of pattern as to the geographical positioning of the politicians. The hypothesis being that north European politicians will be placed in Logos, and south Europeans in Pathos.
5. The last step entails the prescriptive aim, and is going to be the assessment of if the argument seems more likely to be affected by the politician's political orientation or geographical position.

The first three steps will be presented initially in the analysis, as every politician and his or her argument are introduced. Afterwards the comparison in order to test the hypothesis that geographical distance may condition solidarity will consist of step four. At last step five will be discussed below the "Discussion" section, as it is more of a subjective analysis.

Operationalization

In order to establish what arguments will be categorized as Logos or Ethos operationalization of the terms are needed. As Logos appeals to the receivers' logic and rationality, the statements using Logos are likely to contain statistics. They are also likely to emphasize issues as environmental damage, economical issues, human smuggling or criminality etcetera, rather than the ongoing drowning's' in the Mediterranean. While Pathos, to the contrary, appeals to the receivers' emotions. Arguments using Pathos are likely to contain terms such as: Refugees rather than Migrants, Human Lives, Human rights and Children as well as Catastrophe. They are also likely to stress the issues of human beings drowning in the Mediterranean or that our societies may collapse by taking in more immigrants. As not all arguments may consist of these terms, the lack of mentioning any emotionally provoking terms will be deemed as Logos. These terms and factors thereby are going to decide the placement of the different arguments, in Logos or Pathos categories in the analysis.

Previous research

A lot of previous research exists on different debates held by the European Parliament, as well as on migration within the EU. However for this study the previous research that has been applicable are those regarding the different European countries in regard to the refugee crisis. It would have been interesting to present previous research on other EP debates as well as research on the migration in the Mediterranean, although it is not relevant for this study. Thereby this chapter will consist of the three papers that have laid the groundwork for the selecting of relevant politicians for this study as well as the pinpointing the political orientation placement for the EP groups.

Zimmerbauer, Kaj, 2013. "Unusual Regionalism in Northern Europe: The Barents Region in the Making", *Regional Studies*, Vol. 47.1, pp. 89–103, 2013-01/01.

The author Kaj Zimmerbauer examined regionalism, but more specifically the Nordic countries as a region. His focus is to write about the so-called Barents region that straddles the border of NATO and Russia, with the aim to contribute to a better understanding of regionalism beyond nation borders. Zimmerbauer claims that the Barents region is a distinct peripheral cross-border region, which he argues makes his study deviant from other regionalism studies. The aim of his study is to study how and why the Barents region has become institutionalized as a manifest on both business oriented aspirations as well as geopolitical issues (Zimmerbauer, 2013:90). Zimmerbauer presents a general theoretical background to regionalism and the creation of regional identity. Then he focuses on the Barent region as he first off mentions the official establishment of BEAR (Barents Euro Arctic Region), which was founded in Norway the 11th of January 1993. The declaration stated that the region should serve as a cooperation in multiple fields including economics, cultural exchange and environmental issues. The initiative is often described as an attempt to promote security, although military cooperation not included, and came as a result of the Cold War. When the Barent region was established parts of Sweden, Finland, Norway and Russia were included. The different parts of the Barent region had numerous similarities, as the fact that they all had a sparse population over a large area, peripheral location, many ethnic minorities, similar economic systems, standard of living, culture and languages. The region is also unique

because of its location; it encompasses many borders as it is placed between the East and West. Another factor that makes this region distinct is its ethnic minority groups the Saami people who lives in all four countries, that have had a greater contact across borders than other nationality groups in these countries (Zimmerbauer, 2013:91-93). Mentioned factors, as well as many other factors make this region distinct, consisting of some Nordic countries and Russia. This article has influenced the selection of chosen politicians in the debate. As Finland and Sweden has this history of collaboration, are geographically close and in ways politically similar, in addition to them being geographically furthest away from the Mediterranean makes them especially deviant. As the theory addresses geographical distance as well as nationality, or fellowship as borders for morality it is interesting to analyze how Swedish and Finnish politicians debate on this issue. It is based on these factors that Swedish and Finnish politicians were considered most relevant together with Italian and Greek which will be explained and motivated below.

Scipioni, Marco, 2017. "Failing forward in EU migration policy? EU integration after the 2015 asylum and migration crisis" *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 0, Iss, pp. 1-19 0,0, 2017-05/18.

Scipionis article discusses how the European Union has dealt with migration. It focuses on the asylum and migration co-operation between EU member states, especially during and after the refugee crisis in 2015. He discusses how various people, amongst those migration scholars, argues that the crisis in 2015 was bound to fail because of advanced cooperation suggestions through incomplete agreements. To look into established premise Scipionis analyzes different policy failures on migration and asylum up until the year of 2015.

Thereafter he examines agreements, as well as to what extent they address the instigators of the different crises. In his article Scipionis argues that a combination of weak monitoring, lack of conforming politics, absence of solidary and a shortage of central institutions is what led to the refugee crisis. Lastly he briefly concludes by summarizing successful measures that has been taken, that he believes is missing in previous research (Scipionis, 2017:1-19).

The author discusses how incomplete rules and regulations without harmonization paved the way for the crisis in 2015, whereas he mentioned several ones. However the one that is most relevant for this study may be when, within the Council, countries as Germany and France with long history of migration chose to support insufficient monitoring and sanctioning

measures. These measures were poorly implemented in some states, which proves that the monitoring of implementation was not a priority. Scipioni also argues that Frontex has had possibilities to run risk analysis on border control, which could have led to a more developed monitoring, but has refrained from doing so (Scipioni, 2017:1-19). However what is most relevant to mention for this study, is when the author discusses the initiatives relating solidarity. Scipioni mentions that the relocation and resettlement of refugees has been especially problematic, and that this has led to various issues. He specifically highlights that Italy and Greece has been very affected and that the resettlement and relocation scheme is in Greece's favor while not in Italy's because of their respective asylum flows (Scipioni, 2017:1-19). This article together with statistics that were mentioned in the introduction proves that both Italy and Greece has been strongly affected by the migration on the Mediterranean Sea. Therefore Greek and Italian politicians, together with Swedish and Finnish have been chosen for this study.

McElroy, Gail & Kenneth Benoit, 2005. *Party Groups and Policy Positions in the European Parliament*. Discussion paper No.101. Trinity College: Dublin.

In the discussion paper written by the students McElroy and Benoit the groups in the European Parliament are discussed. The authors state the relevance of the political groups to comprehend the work of the European Parliament. However they claim that there is a gap in knowledge that their study intends to address, by reporting about the policy positions of the political groups in the EP. (McElroy & Benoit, 2005:2) They introduce the different groups within the European Parliament and provide some basic information about them, combined with statistics of which the largest group is and by how many members, as well as the smallest group and its members. Their study is the first published provider of the EP group positions on the left-right scale, and is basing on expert surveys that were measured right before the European elections in June 2004 (McElroy & Benoit, 2005:3). Mentioned paper is relevant for this study because of the apparent lack of positioning the European Parliament groups on the left-right spectrum. It is essential to mention that McElroy and Benoit's study is based on experts placing the different groups on predefined dimensions. The author's mention in their paper that previous attempts to policy place the different groups has been made

through indirect methods such as coding of European election manifestos, interviews with elites and surveys of MEP's (McElroy & Benoit, 2005:3). Thereby this study is going to lay the groundwork for the placement of the different groups, which is vital in order to answer the second question of the study. However this discussion paper is more than ten years old which may be problematic since some groups has changed their names, therefore it will be accompanied by a website regarding the European Parliament. The groups positioning will thereby be decided by the two and will be presented further on in the text.

Limitations of the study

As this study's aim is to declare what factors may condition solidarity not all politicians present at the debate are necessary to cite. Therefore only some have been chosen for the analysis. The politicians chosen are those who represents one of the four countries; Sweden, Finland, Italy and Greece and who also are attached to a European Parliament group. Thereby those who don't belong to a group, as well as those who are not from mentioned countries will be excluded in this study. Neither will so called "blue card" questions where a politician gets the opportunity to ask another politician about a specific matter be included. Moreover there were some politicians who wrote their opinions, which were added to the debate, but only the video documentation is used in this study, consequently written opinions will not be included either. Mentioned limitations are made because of relevance and the word limitation of this assignment.

To avoid repetitive statements the analysis also does not include all 24 politicians from the chosen four countries. Instead 12 politicians were chosen, out of those equally many are from the two different sides of Europe. To be able to test the theory at least one politician from each group was picked. It is important highlight that this limitation implies that the results cannot be generalizable, but rather lay the foundation for chosen theory. The selection of politicians will be in favor of the hypothesis in order to test the theory selected for this study. Thereby the results will be biased; nonetheless the intention is merely to try the theory and not to provide the most just view possible of the debate.

It is also important to mention that the politicians chosen state their own opinions. It is therefore not a representation of the nation's opinions, as well as it is not a representation of the whole left- or rightwing scale ideas. Furthermore the statements have been interpreted and therefor as little as possible, to no citation will be used in the analysis. Nonetheless is it relevant to highlight that the analysis will not only consist of a translation by an interpreter, but it will also include the author's own interpretation of the statements and arguments. Thus the analysis will, to some extent be subjective and a different conclusion may seem more suitable to the reader. Even so it is believed that the conclusion will be a relevant contribution to Political Science. In the debate various references to earlier agreements are made, but as this study is limited those statements will not be included, as earlier agreements are not relevant to prove or discard the hypothesis for the study.

Placement of EP groups on the left-right political spectrum

There are seven political groups within the European Parliament, as well as one called "non attached members" which consists of members without any group inherency. These groups differ from national parties for the sole purpose of them incorporating politicians from various nations. Every member of the parliament is registered attached to one of the groups, except the 31 MEP's (Member of European Parliament) who are not attached to any group. The existing EP groups are;

- *Group of the European People's Party (PPE)*
- *Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists & Democrats (S&D)*
- *The Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (ALDE)*
- *The European Free Alliance Green (Verts/ALE)*
- *The European Conservatives and Reformists (ECR)*
- *European United Nordic Green Left (GUE/NGL)*
- Non-Attached Members
- *Europe of Freedom and Democracy (EFD).*

The mentioned order is in regards to the number of members every group has, with PPE being

the largest and EFD the smallest (It's your parliament 1). MEP's from each group will be represented in the analysis as chosen politicians are attached to all groups. The only ones not represented will be the non-attached MEP's as chosen theory would not be applicable to those members as the left and right scale will be based on the EP groups.

1. The Group of the European People's Party, which is a Christian Democratic group, which also is the largest in the EP, which has a center-right political orientation. (It's your parliament 2 – McElroy & Benoit, 2005:8).
2. Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists & Democrats has a center-left position according to a expert survey in 2004 (McElroy & Benoit, 2005:8)
3. The Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe, is placed in the center (McElroy & Benoit, 2005:8)
4. The European Free Alliance Green is a far left political group (McElroy & Benoit, 2005:8)
5. European Conservatives and Reformists was established on the initiative of those previously in PPE (It's your parliament 3) who is placed center right. Because of lack of positioning, as this group is relatively new it will be positioned right for various reasons. Both because it is an initiative from a center-right group that is conservative, which is a term, associated with the rightwing (Heywood, 2015).
6. The European United Nordic Green Left is placed on the far leftwing.
7. Europe of Freedom and Democracy is a right-wing political group formed after the European elections in 2009 (It's your parliament 4)

There are thus five categories to place the selected politicians in the left-right scale, the categories will be; Left, Center-Left, Center, Center-Right and Right. Those placed in Left will be those attached to Verts and GUE. The ones positioned in Center-Left will be ascribed S&D. The ones placed in Center thereby will be ALDE. Those belonging in Center-Right are members of PPE. At last the ones placed in Right will be EFD as well as ECR.

Analysis

This analyze is aiming to answer the first and partly the second questions of the study. Beginning with a brief introduction about and to the debate. Then the different politicians and their placement on the left-right spectrum are presented accompanied with a description of their arguments. As each politician and their arguments are introduced they will also be placed in the two categories “Logos” and “Ethos” together with a brief motivation. This will be followed by the comparison between the three mentioned factors; nationality, political orientation and argument. Additionally is the explanatory part, though placed in discussion where the second question will be answered.

The following analysis will consist of twelve members of the European Parliament; six South European, originating from Greece and Italy and six North Europeans from Sweden and Finland, excluding the two rapporteurs and the representative of the European Commission. These twelve MEP’s are members of all seven European Parliament groups, which will expectantly provide the comprehensive analysis needed to validate or discard the hypothesis (CRE 12/04/2016 – 3, EP, 2016).

The debate starts off with Roberta Metsola and Cécile Kashetu Kyenge who are both rapporteurs of the rapport tabled for plenare by Committee on *Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs*. Both Metsola and Kyenge stress the fact that solidarity and cooperation is the solution to deal with migration on a EU level. They brings up facts about the situation, and emphases that it is a humanitarian crisis and that the European Union needs to change its approach in order to deal with the predicament. They both argue that the absolute priority being to save lives, but also mentions the importance of establishing measures towards human smuggling. Both rapporteurs stress the vitality of solidarity for migration to be well managed, and highlights that migration is something to handle not hinder. However, especially Kyenge emphases the significance of shared responsibility between all member-states. The commissioner Dimitris Avramopoulos then thanks the two rapporteurs for their report and adds how essential it is to make legal and secure ways to Europe, to prohibit the loss of lives on the Mediterranean. Avramopoulos also highlights that the current system is not effective in tackling the crisis (CRE 12/04/2016 – 3, EP, 2016).

Steps 1-3

The debate opens up and the first politician, applicable in this analysis, to speak is *Merja Kyllönen*, who is a Finnish politician belonging to GUE and is therefore placed in category “Left”. Kyllönen gives a rather detached impression as she expresses worry about accidents occurring and the loss of human lives as well as the environmental damage that the transport in the Mediterranean causes. She emphasizes a need for proper proposals and finishes her speech by wishing that solidarity will increase (Kyllönen, CRE 12/04/2016 – 3, EP, 2016). Kyllönen's argument is that the environmental damage caused by the refugee crisis needs attention as well the loss of human lives. Her speech gives a rather unemotional impression and strives to a person's logic and rationality; it will therefore be categorized as “Logos”.

Then it is *Elisavvet Vozemberg-Vrionidi* from Greece's turn. She is attached to PPE and is thus placed in “Center-right” on the scale. Vrionidi is enthusiastic towards the report and claims that it provides a suitable long-term solution to the crisis. She mentions how this migration issues is forcing the European Union to face its values and principles, it is needed to change the EU's mindset and attitude. Thereby she explains that the relocation scheme and institution of resettlement cannot work while some member states does not accept the EU decisions and chooses to close their borders. At last she stresses the fact that a common immigration system is needed to enable dealing with unaccompanied children or those desperate enough to risk their lives fleeing over the Mediterranean. She also condemns the use of statistical numbers and figures rather than speaking about human lives (Vrionidi, CRE 12/04/2016 – 3, EP, 2016). Vrionidi also claims that a migration policy based on solidarity is needed. Her statement is categorized “Pathos” based on the last sentence where she emphasizes that these are human lives at stake and not merely statistical numbers.

Next politician chosen is *Cecilia Wikström* from Sweden, belonging to ALDE, which has a “Center” political orientation. She believes that the report contains various worthy elements and considers it a blueprint of how EU could create a well-functioning asylum system that would be suitable for the current situation. She blames the crisis on national leaders and argues that they have convinced themselves and others that there is no real solution to the crisis and demonstrates that the number of refugees only represents 0,2% of the European population. Wikström states that the European people want a fair system which grants protection for those fleeing, where member states sharing the responsibilities. She also

pressures the need to ensure that the initiative is also followed by concrete legislation (Wikström, CRE 12/04/2016 – 3, EP, 2016). Wikström argues for a common migration policy within EU and stresses the need for the practical implementation. She only briefly mentions that the European people wants to secure protection for people fleeing and does not express whether they reflect her own opinions or not. Therefore her statement is deemed to belong in “Logos”.

Thereafter the Italian *Barbara Spinelli* is chosen. She is attached to the GUE and thereby placed as “Left” in the spectrum. Spinelli begins with explaining how the negotiations have been going on for a year and a half and that they had two strong ambitions. The ambitions she mentions were to get a holistic view of the situation on the Mediterranean and the loss of lives as well as the understanding that it is not an immigrant issue, but a refugee issue. She stresses the fact that a holistic approach requires cooperation and argues that the current attempts have not been based on solidarity. At last she emphasizes that the report has some good elements but argues that if the fact that the crisis being is a refugee one rather than an immigrant crisis is not understood, she means the EP will not be able to claim that it has maintains a holistic view of the Mediterranean (Spinelli, CRE 12/04/2016 – 3, EP, 2016). Spinellis speech, while very critical does not contain a lot of emotional words that is generally connected to Pathos. Nonetheless she emphasizes that it is refugees, who flees from atrocities and that it is vital to reach that understanding, this argument places Spinelli’s statement in “Pathos”.

Then the Italian *Ignazio Corrao* from EFD, which is placed “Right” on the political scale. Like his compatriot Spinelli, Corrao is rather critical. He also pressures the need for a holistic approach and argues that the Parliament has been completely impotent in suggesting solutions as the member states prioritizes their own interest first. Corrao emphasizes that the egoism of member states has and will only lead to failure as he stresses that the relocation was decided but not correctly executed. At last he focuses on highlighting how human rights are being violated, how children are being teargassed. To solve the situation he argues a more transparent approach to fund management is needed, to avoid those taking advantage of migration economically and politically (Corrao, CRE 12/04/2016 – 3, EP, 2016). Corrao focuses a lot on the international level, but as he stresses the situation where children are teargassed as well as human rights violations his argument will be placed in “Pathos”.

Next person chosen is *Bodil Valero* from Sweden. As she is a member of Verts she is placed “Left” in the spectrum. Valero says that the focus should be on the failed reception and not the crisis, but that it is also needed to holistically look at why people are migrating. She argues that what we call a refugee crisis is actually only a result of the failed reception system and means that the humanitarian visa is the most important question moving forward (Valero, CRE 12/04/2016 – 3, EP, 2016). Valero’s argument is the need to focus on why people are migrating rather than the ongoing situation in Europe. She stresses the importance of humanitarian visas but not once does she mention the on going situation for those fleeing. Her statement lacks any emotional words and is deemed to be using “Logos”.

Next is *Kristina Winberg* a Swedish politicians belonging to EFD with a “Right” political orientation. Winberg is critical to the whole idea of a common asylum system as some states has managed immigration incredibly irresponsibly and now tries to be exemption from suggested actions that the EU is attempting to force upon the member states. She criticizes preceding statements and claims that solidarity and integration rarely ever works practically (Winberg, CRE 12/04/2016 – 3, EP, 2016). Winberg is particularly critical and argues that the whole idea of a holistic approach to migration is unrealistic as many states has already received more migrants than they can handle. Her statement completely lacks Pathos and is thereby regarded a “Logos” argument.

Thereafter is the Finnish politician *Jussi Halla-Aho*, who is placed “Right” on the political scale as a member of ECR. Halla-Aho argues that the question in focus, making irregular migration regular, does not address the issue at hand. He claims that there are more refugees and immigrants arriving to the EU than it can handle. He also states that the more people who are allowed into EU the more will want to come. Halla-Aho supports his arguments by mentioning that Europe now has numerous “no-go areas” and states that if the immigration ratio continues to grow the results will be catastrophically both economically as well as politically (Halla-Aho, CRE 12/04/2016 – 3, EP, 2016). Halla-Aho thereby uses some emotionally provoking expressions such as “no-go areas” and catastrophic results, thereby his statement will be deemed to be using mostly “Pathos”.

Then it is the Swedish politician *Soraya Post*’s turn, from S&D and thereby with a “Center-Left” political orientation. Post starts off by stating that everybody speaks about solidarity, and she claims that the only solidarity she is currently experiencing is the common act of

dismantling the respect for human rights and the EU's fundamental values. We are experiencing member states putting refugees in detention and using teargas towards women and children, thereby the EU is not taking its responsibility according to the UNHCR. Post also States emphasizes that people say Europe does not have recourses enough to receive more immigrants while €300.000 is spent on the border control between Sweden and Denmark on a daily basis. She claims that the issue is not economical, it's the increasing nationalism and prejudice. She argues that this issue will decide the future for the European Union and that the new migration policy needs to be built on human rights and solidarity for the EU fundamental values. At last she states that it is the matter of human lives and deaths and that the need for immediate rescue missions as well as secure and legal pathways to Europe are needed (Post, CRE 12/04/2016 – 3, EP, 2016). Post's statement is appeals to people's emotions and is thereby categorized "Pathos".

The next person chosen is *Lara Comi* from Italy. Comi is a member of PPE, which is placed "Center-right" on the scale. Comi's focus is regarding borders and she argues that the only borders that should be closing are external borders. In other words she means that the borders of the European Union should close, but not borders within the EU. She also suggests that those member-states that refuses to take in refugees should have their EU funding's revoked. She ends by stating that those who do not aid should also not receive any aid (Comi, CRE 12/04/2016 – 3, EP, 2016). Comi's arguments lacks any empathic elements and is thereby deemed as "Logos".

Thereafter is the Italian *Luigi Morgano*, member of S&D and therefor placed "Center-left" on the political scale. Morgano begins with supporting the report and states that it consists of useful steps towards a common migration policy within the EU. He also agrees with that solidarity and shared responsibility are the means to build a common policy. Morgano stresses the focus on a centralized asylum system that will manage migration flows and provide legal and secure ways to enter Europe. He mentions that legal pathways will handle the issue of human traffickers as well as the deaths on the Mediterranean. At last Morgano argues that the EU should build bridges not walls (Morgano, CRE 12/04/2016 – 3, EP, 2016). Morgano's statement is rather neutral, he provokes some emotions by his suggestion to build bridges not walls. However he spoke merely on an international level which gives a detached impression, therefor his argument will be placed in "Logos".

Lastly is the Greek politician *Notis Marias* from ECR, a “Right” positioned group. Marias stresses the fact that Greek situation is marginal after receiving the influx of refugees and migrants. He also claims that the resettlement process is not functioning as only 569 out of 66.400 has been relocated (Marias, CRE 12/04/2016 – 3, EP, 2016). Marias focus is on the situation in Greece as well as the resettlement scheme that he claims is insubstantial. As his arguments only appeals to the rationality and logic his argument thereby deems to be based on “Logos”.

Steps 4 & 5

In order to compare and analyze the different factors that were presented in the previous section a quick summary is deemed necessary. Therefor a brief overview of the Logos and Pathos categories and their content will be presented below.

The politicians whose arguments were based on Logos and in other words appealed to the logic and rationality of the receiver were;

- Merja Kyllönen a Finnish politician placed in category “Left”
- Cecilia Wikström, who is a Swedish politician deemed as “Center”
- Bodil Valero a politician from Sweden, with the political orientation “Left”
- Kristina Winberg who is a Swedish politician in the category “Right”
- Lara Comi, an Italian politician placed in “Center-right”
- Luigi Morgano a politician from Italy with the political orientation “Center-left”
- Notis Marias a Greek politician in category “Right”

The politicians who on the other hand appealed to the receivers emotions and thus based their argument on Pathos were;

- Elisavvet Vozemburg-Vrionidi a Greek politician placed in “Center-right”
- Barbara Spinelli a politician from Italy in category “Left”
- Ignazio Corrao an Italian politician with the political orientation “Right”
- Jussi Halla-Aho a Finnish politician placed in category “Right”
- Soraya Post a politician from Sweden placed in “Center-Left”

As this analysis is only based on the arguments of twelve people it is problematic to find a pattern, and if a pattern exists it may not be liable as it is based on a very low amount of subjects. Nevertheless it is relevant to mention that the majority of politicians who's arguments were categorized as "Logos" are North European, despite it not being a vast majority. Accordingly there is also a small majority of South Europeans in the "Pathos" category. This result proves the hypothesis partly right, that north Europeans would be placed in Logos and South Europeans in Pathos.

Discussion

Lastly the assessment of whether the arguments seems more likely to have been affected by the politicians political orientation or rather his or hers geographical distance from the situation will be established below.

It seems as though the hypothesis that solidarity may be conditioned by geographical distance may be true. It is however very puzzling to determine based on the analysis. Although the hypothesis of North European being a majority of the Logos arguments and South Europeans of Pathos was validated it is problematic to claim that Pathos or Logos determines solidarity. Because while it seems logical that a situation like the ongoing migration on the Mediterranean provokes ones empathy and rage not all arguments based on Pathos were debating for humanity and saving lives. As an example one of the arguments deemed to be built by Pathos argumentation was Jussi Halla-Aho, who merely argued against migration and did not ones mention the people fleeing with their lives at stake. Furthermore there were statements focusing on solidarity and morality that were based on Logos, because of formulation. As an example both Luigi Morgano and Cecilia Wikström argued for a more humane and solidarity approach towards migration, although both lacking formulation to appeal to the receivers emotions.

However if we do, despite the fact that this methodology may not have resulted in the most correct supposition, try to answer the question on whether solidarity is conditioned by distance? The answer would be that yes, according to this analysis that assumption may very well be correct. Either way geographical location as a factor seems more likely to explain the arguments than political orientation, using this methodology. The analysis shows that there is no pattern showing that political orientation had any affect as all groups on the left-right spectrum can be discovered in both Logos and Pathos. With an exception for “Center” since only one politician chosen for this study was placed in that category.

The results would possibly have differed if the categorization were for and against the report suggesting a solidarity policy on migration instead of Logos and Pathos. The political orientation would presumably have been more distinct through another sectioning. Although

it, according to this analysis, is likely that geographical distance would have still had an impact, which may be the most relevant conclusion, drawn from this study.

Conclusion

At last the questions that this study is based on were:

- What are some of the different arguments presented at the Debate April 12th, 2016?
- Comparing the two factors of political orientation and geographical distance, which one is more likely to explain the arguments?

It is safe to say that the majority of MEP's agreed on the need for a common migration and asylum policy based on solidarity and shared responsibility. However some argued that the egoistic nature of states makes a principle founded on solidarity next to impossible to maintain. Numerous issues were brought up but predominantly the loss of human lives in the Mediterranean along with the poor treatment of refugees arriving at various borders. The analysis proved that there was a modest pattern suggesting that geographical location was more likely to explain the arguments in the chosen empirical material.

For further research it could be interesting to subsequently study what effects the resolution that was molded by this debate and the voting that was held after the debate has had. Or to use the same kind of approach to a very current debate held by the European Parliament on the topic "The situation in Libya". The debate took place December 12th 2017 whereas the members of the EP is discussing the human smuggling issues as well as the slave trade that recently was revealed to the world. Lastly an idea for further research is to build on this essay; and to either compare the debate that constitutes Empirical material in this study with another debate on the same subject, preferably before the division within the EU 2015. Or expand the amount of politicians analyzed to find out if the discovered pattern exists beyond this study. The results of such a comparison could more precisely test the accuracy of chosen theory.

Sources

Literature

Bergström, Göran & Boréus, Kristina (red.). *Textens mening och makt: metodbok i samhällsvetenskaplig text- och diskursanalys*. 3., [utök.] uppl. 2012. Lund: Studentlitteratur

Heywood, Andrew. *Key concepts in politics and international relations*. 2015. Palgrave Macmillan

Sundström, Mikael, Rosén Sundström, Malena & Hall, Martin. *En guide till mellanstatliga organisationer* [Elektronisk source], 2012. Studentlitteratur, Lund.

Articles

BBC News, ”Migrant crisis: Migration to Europe explained in seven charts” 2016-03/04.

Scipioni, Marco, 2017. ”Failing forward in EU migration policy? EU integration after the 2015 asylum and migration crisis” *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 0, Iss, pp. 1-19 0,0, 2017-05/18.

Tisdall, Simon, “Divided Europe seeks a long-term answer to a refugee crisis that needs a solution now”, *The Guardian*. 2017/07-23.

Zachariasson, Helena. “Treårige Alan drunknade när familjen försökte fly”, *SVT*. 2015-09/03.

Zimmerbauer, Kaj, 2013. “Unusual Regionalism in Northern Europe: The Barents Region in the Making”, *Regional Studies*, Vol. 47.1, pp. 89–103, 2013-01/01.

Audio Sources

Comi, Lara, “The situation in the Mediterranean and the need for a holistic EU approach to migration.” 2016-04/12. (Debate) CRE 12/04/2016 – 3. *European Parliament*. 10:26:04–10:27:58.

Corrao, Ignazio, “The situation in the Mediterranean and the need for a holistic EU approach to migration.” 2016-04/12. (Debate) CRE 12/04/2016 – 3. *European Parliament*. 09:18:03–09:21:09.

European Union: European Parliament, *The latest tragedies in the Mediterranean and EU migration and asylum policies*. 2015-04/29. (Debate) EP, 2015/2660(RSP).

European Union: European Parliament, *The situation in the Mediterranean and the need for a holistic EU approach to migration*. 2016-04/12. (Debate) 2015/2095(INI).

Halla-Aho, Jussi, “The situation in the Mediterranean and the need for a holistic EU approach to migration.” 2016-04/12. (Debate) CRE 12/04/2016 – 3. *European Parliament*. 09:59:44–10:00:51.

Kyenge Kashetu, Cécile, “The situation in the Mediterranean and the need for a holistic EU approach to migration.” 2016-04/12. (Debate) CRE 12/04/2016 – 3. *European Parliament*. 08:36:30–08:41:52.

Kyllönen, Merja, “The situation in the Mediterranean and the need for a holistic EU approach to migration.” 2016-04/12. (Debate) CRE 12/04/2016 – 3. *European Parliament*. 08:58:03–09:00:15.

Marias, Notis, “The situation in the Mediterranean and the need for a holistic EU approach to migration.” 2016-04/12. (Debate) CRE 12/04/2016 – 3. *European Parliament*. 10:44:35–10:46:13

Morgano, Luigi, “The situation in the Mediterranean and the need for a holistic EU approach to migration.” 2016-04/12. (Debate) CRE 12/04/2016 – 3. *European Parliament*. 10:37:39–10:39:08.

Post, Soraya, “The situation in the Mediterranean and the need for a holistic EU approach to migration.” 2016-04/12. (Debate) CRE 12/04/2016 – 3. *European Parliament*. 10:24:14–10:26:28.

Seidlitz, Madelaine, “Radiokorrespondenterna”, *Sveriges Radio*. 2017-12/17. Time 3:30-4:10. Electronic source: <http://sverigesradio.se/sida/avsnitt/991019?programid=2946> [Accessed 2017-12/21]

Spinelli, Barbara, “The situation in the Mediterranean and the need for a holistic EU approach to migration.” 2016-04/12. (Debate) CRE 12/04/2016 – 3. *European Parliament*. 09:12:37–09:15:23.

Valero, Bodil, “The situation in the Mediterranean and the need for a holistic EU approach to migration.” 2016-04/12. (Debate) CRE 12/04/2016 – 3. *European Parliament*. 09:35:56–09:38:19.

Vozemberg-Vrionidi, Elissavet, “The situation in the Mediterranean and the need for a holistic EU approach to migration.” 2016-04/12. (Debate) CRE 12/04/2016 – 3. *European Parliament*. 09:04:22–09:06:32.

Wikström, Cecilia, Vozemberg-Vrionidi, Elissavet, “The situation in the Mediterranean and the need for a holistic EU approach to migration.” 2016-04/12. (Debate) CRE 12/04/2016 – 3. *European Parliament*. 09:10:05–09:12:43.

Winberg, Kristina, “The situation in the Mediterranean and the need for a holistic EU approach to migration.” 2016-04/12. (Debate) CRE 12/04/2016 – 3. *European Parliament*. 09:37:55–09:39:50.

Others

EPPgroup, “CIVIL LIBERTIES, JUSTICE AND HOME AFFAIRS” & “Our work in the European Parliament”. Electronic Source: <http://www.eppgroup.eu/> [Accessed 2017-12/22]

European Commission, *Framtidssäker migrationshantering: EU-kommissionen stakar ut vägen framåt*. 2017-12/07. (Press release) IP/17/5132.

European Commission, *Migrationen längst centrala Medelhavsrutten – Kommissionen bidrar till Maltadiskussionen*, 2017-01/25. (Press release) IP/17/134.

It's your parliament 4: Buhl & Rasmussen, “Europe of Freedom and Democracy” *It's your parliament*. Electronic source: <http://www.itsyourparliament.eu> [Accessed 2017/12/27]

It's your parliament 2: Buhl & Rasmussen, “Group of the European People's Party” *It's your parliament*. Electronic source: <http://www.itsyourparliament.eu> [Accessed 2017-12/27]

It's your parliament 1: Buhl & Rasmussen, “Political Groups”, *It's your parliament*. Electronic source: <http://www.itsyourparliament.eu> [Accessed 2017-12/27]

It's your parliament 3: Buhl & Rasmussen, “The European Conservatives and Reformists”, *It's your parliament*. Electronic source: <http://www.itsyourparliament.eu> [Accessed 2017-12/27]

McElroy, Gail & Kenneth Benoit, 2005. *Party Groups and Policy Positions in the European Parliament*. Discussion paper No.101. Trinity College: Dublin.

Oxford Dictionaries, “Debate”. Electronic source: <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com> [Accessed 2017-12/20]

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, *Fakta om båtflyktingar*, 2017-11/30. Electronic source: <https://sverigeforunhcr.se/batflyktingar#fakta> [Accessed 2017-12/05]