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Abstract
This paper researches how the migration-asylum nexus plays out in the migration policy of the European Union in its use of labels. Today the European Union and its member states are coping with the challenges of recent migration streams, specifically mass flows of displaced migrants originating from conflict areas such as Syria or Eritrea. In the media, these flows are often referred to as “the refugee crisis”. In the context of globalisation and mixed migration, it has become increasingly difficult to distinguish between migrants and refugees. Policy makers on the national level have tried to make sense of the complexity of migration by dividing people into categories. However, the continuous conflation of categories and labels on the migrant-refugee continuum together with a proliferation of labels have shifted attention from humanitarian protection to migration control. In the national discourses, there has grown a discourse of deservingness serving a restrictive migration agenda. The current refugee crisis has demonstrated the important role of the European Union in the area of migration and asylum. By researching the use of labels in the legal framework of the EU and in the discourse of the European Commission, this paper wants to investigate if the discourse of deservingness has renegaded into the migration policy of the European Union. This paper concludes, that conflation of economic migrants and refugees has not yet affected the discourse of the Commission. However, there are some elements of the discourse of deservingness seeping through in both the legal framework as in the Commission’s discourse.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEAS</td>
<td>Common European Asylum System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG HOME</td>
<td>Directorate-General for Migration and Home Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI</td>
<td>Discursive Institutionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>European Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Internally Displaced Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>International Organization for Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCN</td>
<td>Third Country National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Samenvatting in het Nederlands

Deze masterproef onderzoekt op welke manier de migratie-asiel nexus speelt in het gebruik van labels in het migratiebeleid van de Europese Unie. De EU en haar lidstaten worstelen sinds 2014 met de uitdaging van grote migratiestromen, specifiek uit conflictgebieden zoals Syria of Eritrea. In de media wordt naar deze stromen van onheemde migranten verwezen als ‘de vluchtelingen crisis’. In een context van globalisering en *mixed migration* is het steeds moeilijker om een onderscheid te maken tussen migranten en vluchtelingen. Beleidsmakers op het nationale niveau hebben getracht duidelijkheid in te scheppen in de complexiteit van migratie door mensen in te delen in categorieën. Echter, het indelen in categorieën is geen neutraal proces, hierachter zitten bepaalde machtsverhoudingen of verborgen agenda’s.

In het geval van de migratie-asiel nexus hebben twee processen ervoor gezorgd dat de focus is komen te verschuiven van humanitaire bescherming naar migratie controles, enerzijds door het continue vermengen van de categorieën migrant en vluchteling en anderzijds door een fractionering en proliferatie van labels. In het discours van nationale overheden is zo een moreel discours gegroeid, het zogenaamde *discourse of deservingness*, dat de toegang tot bepaalde geprivilegieerde categorieën beperkt en een hiërarchie creëert en zo een restrictieve migratie agenda tegemoetkomt.


De paper besluit dat de vermenging tussen migranten en vluchtelingen het Europese migratiekader en discours nog niet echt heeft aangetast. Desalniettemin, zijn er zowel in het juridisch kader als in het discours een aantal elementen aanwezig vergelijkbaar aan het *discourse of deservingness*. Deze hebben onder andere betrekking op de proliferatie van labels en het gebruik van bepaalde adjectieven die een hiërarchie en morele demarcatie (kunnen) creëren tussen bepaalde categorieën. Daarnaast moet worden opgemerkt dat de beperkte conflatie tussen economische migrant en vluchteling ook het gevolg kan zijn van de zwakkere competenties van de EU op het gebied van economische migratie. Bovendien, wijst de discours analyse uit dat er wel een zekere vermenging is tussen de categorie of asielzoeker en irreguliere migrant.
Introduction

Today the European Union and its member states are coping with the challenges of recent migration streams, specifically large flows of displaced migrants originating from conflict areas such as Syria, Afghanistan and Iraq, but also from Kosovo, Albania, Pakistan, Eritrea and Nigeria (Eurostat, 2017). In the media, these flows are often referred to as “the refugee crisis”.

Since many decades, the European Union has been the scene of people moving around. Ever since its seeds were planted in 1957 with the Treaty of Rome, free movement of workers – next to the free movement of goods, services and capital – has been one of the key building stones of the European Union and its Single Market (Castles, 2004; Geddes, 2014). However, this free movement did not include refugees. Further, the Single European Act (1986), which objective was to abolish internal border controls, did not address the question of the free movement of refugees and asylum seekers (Guild, 2006). The refusal of member states to integrate refugees in the European project, required the conception of flanking measures that would define the borders for asylum seekers. The Schengen and Dublin agreements, which escaped the EU treaty framework until 1999, were devised to keep asylum seekers from interfering with the abolition of internal borders. Member states searched for mechanisms to either confine asylum seekers within a member state, to prevent them from entering the internal market in the first place, or to remove them rapidly (Guild, 2006; Vested-Hansen, 2012).

Many scholars agree that several of the principles and tools laid out in the Dublin and Schengen agreements, fit within a securitarian frame, placing focus on the protection of Europe’s external borders by ‘combating illegal immigration’, and serving a policy of non-entrée (Pirjola, 2009; Guild, 2006; Lavenex, 2001; Geddes, 2014; Vested-Hansen, 2012; Cholewinski, 2001). Principles such as manifestly unfounded applications, safe third countries, safe countries of origin, accelerated procedures and visa requirements were designed to avoid having to take responsibility for the examination of the asylum application and even to move asylum seekers out of the administrative systems of the member states without a substantive examination of their application (Guild, 2006; Vested-Hansen, 2012; Pirjola, 2009).

The Treaty of Amsterdam (1997/1999) incorporated Schengen and Dublin and provided for the establishment of an “area of freedom, security and justice”, where people can move around in freely. However, with this, the distinction between EU citizens and non-EU migrants (this includes refugees and asylum seekers) was further consolidated (Pirjola, 2009; Geddes, 2014). Although the distinction that is made in EU policy between migration by EU nationals, the so-called intra-EU mobility, and migration of non-EU nationals, the extra-EU migration, might seem logical, it is not neutral, nor does it represent the dynamics of migration. Rather, it is a purely political categorization, based on territorial, organizational or conceptual borders (Boswell & Geddes, 2011, p. 14). As Geddes (2014) and Roos (2013) have pointed out, this division represents a clear contrast between the generalized right of free movement for nationals of European member states and the restrictions towards non-EU migrants; It reflects the inequality between the EU citizen and the Third Country National (TCN).

“Third Country National” is the label that EU policy makers use to address migrants from outside the EU. But sometimes policymakers also speak about “immigrants”, “arrivals”, “persons in need of protection”, “flows”, “highly skilled migrants”, “asylum seekers”, “border crossings”, “long term residents”, “refugees”, “seasonal workers”, “intra-corporate transferees”, “applicants”, “irregular migrants”, “entries”, …

Labelling people and making use of categorizations, have always been fundamental tools to make sense of complex phenomena. This is no different for migration. To identify the underlying patterns of the migration process, scholars and policy makers have categorized migration according to direction, distance, time, cause, motivation, the form of entry in the place of destination, individual traits, the degree of agency, and so on (Bakewell, 2011; Kosser & Martin, 2011; Lucassen & Lucassen, 1997; Lucassen, Lucassen & Manning, 2010; Müller, 2016). But not only scholars and policy makers on the national and international level play a part in
the classification of migrants, also humanitarian organisations, the media, and even migrants themselves have been labelling people on the move (Bakewell, 2011; Holmes & Castañeda, 2016; Zetter, 2007). We talk about immigration, emigration, labour migration, family reunion, political migration, exodus, irregular migration, seasonal work, displacement, long distance migration, forced migration, internal mobility, brain drain or high-skilled migration, slave trade, transit migration, human trafficking, circular migration, network migration, return migration, smuggling, resettlement, and the list goes on.

On the one hand, categorization is a useful tool to disentangle different migration processes. It allows us to see otherwise invisible groups or patterns and helps to provide targeted policy responses (Geddes & Boswell, 2011; Koser & Martin, 2011). On the other hand, categorization also leaves out important nuances in favour of simplicity and clarity and often shows a too narrow representation of complex and messy realities. Too often, categories are placed in a binary way, with little room for overlaps and whereby migration is reduced to fixed dichotomies such as free versus forced migration, legal versus illegal/irregular migration, (economic) migrants versus refugees (Holmes & Castañeda, 2016; Lucassen & Lucassen, 1997; Lucassen et al., 2010). Certain dichotomies might seem logical and could be justified for several reasons. Yet, what is problematic, as pointed out by Müller (2016, p. 38), is that in the case of migration policy, categorization has led to the creation of a hierarchy between migration categories and is simultaneously used as a tool for restricting migration streams. Goodman & Speer (2007) add to this that categorization can also serve as a rhetorical tool in the migration and asylum debate to justify one’s own position or policy.

As will be clarified further on, the choice of categories and use of labels is not a neutral process. “The act of categorization, when it manages to achieve recognition or when it is exercised by a recognized authority, exercises by itself a certain power” (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 223). Categories are never just neutral descriptors, they reflect and even exert power relations and serve hidden agendas (Moncrieffe & Eyben, 2007; Zetter, 1991, Goodman & Speer, 2007, p. 167). To paraphrase Leudar, Marsland and Nekvapil (2004, p. 244), membership categorization, or categorizing people into groups is usually done to accomplish something other than mere categorization, it orients to practical action. By reflecting and composing a moral reality, categorization may constitute political action.

One specific categorization that has been the subject of ongoing academic debate, regards the ambiguous distinction and relation between economic migration and forced migration, or between migrants and refugees. This is also known as the Migration-Asylum Nexus (Castles, 2003) or the Migration-Displacement Nexus1 (Koser & Martin, 2011). This nexus is about “the increasing complexity of determining who is a refugee, no longer contained in the South but arriving in large numbers at Europe’s borders” (Zetter, 2007, p.175). The fact that “many migrants and asylum seekers have multiple reasons for mobility and it is impossible to completely separate economic and human rights motivations” is a challenge for policy makers who try to impose sharply defined categories (Castles, 2003, p.17).

(1) One part of the debate about the Migration-Asylum Nexus is whether there should be a strict separation between the category migrant and the category refugee. Whereas some scholars point to the dangers of confusing migrants and refugees (Feller, 2005; Feller, 2006; Hathaway, 2007; Steiner, 2000), others point to the pitfalls of separating these two categories too strictly (Long, 2013; Castles, 2003; Lucassen et al., 2010). While reaching different conclusions, both sides of scholars, however, depart from the same humanitarian concerns. As Bakewell (2011) has pointed out, evaluating whether a strict categorization between migrants and refugees is either ‘good’ or ‘bad’, depends on the semantic level you are looking at. He distinguishes three levels to look at migration and displacement, namely process, condition and category.

---

1 To avoid confusion about terminology, in the remainder of this paper I will always use the term Migration-Asylum Nexus as coined by Castles (2003), instead of the Migration-Displacement Nexus. Even though, the term “displacement” is a more holistic term that better captures the mixed reality of forced migration, analytically the term “Asylum” is more convenient, since it has a slightly narrower meaning. The term “Asylum” also holds a certain degree of migrant agency, namely a person/migrant applies for asylum.
While reading this paper, it is important to always keep in mind Bakewell’s semantic levels. Sometimes, migration is discussed as a process (e.g. section 1.1), whereby migration can be defined in its broadest sense as “a change in residence beyond a communal boundary…” (Moch, 1997, p. 43), regardless of the causes for the movement, the length of stay or whether it is voluntary or involuntary (IOM, 2015). However, for the most part of this paper the migration-displacement nexus is discussed on the semantic level of the ‘category’. Migrant as a ‘condition’, which Bakewell (2011) explains as the result of the process of migration, is not discussed in this paper.

(2) A second important observation that is part of the Migration-Asylum Nexus, goes beyond the migrant-refugee dichotomy. It is about the proliferation of labels on the migrant-refugee continuum. For example, Zetter (2007) has demonstrated a fractioning of the refugee label, whereby new labels such as ‘Internally Displaced Person (IDP)’, ‘asylum seeker’, ‘bogus refugees’, ‘illegal migrant’ are further blurring the line between migrants and refugees and paradoxically at the same sealing off access to the more privileged refugee label. Many other scholars consider the proliferation of labels problematic because the creation of in-between labels has served national governments to keep migrants and asylum seekers in a transient state. The labels form a tool for migration restriction or to delegitimize claims for protection by conveying an image of immorality (Castles, 2003; Holmes & Castañeda, 2016; Kirkwood, Goodman, McVittie & McKinlay, 2016; Robinson, 1995; Zetter, 2007).

While there is a vast range of literature discussing the different motives of national governments who are using certain migration categorizations to their advantage, remarkably little has been said about the role of the European Union in all this. Yet, as was said at the beginning of this section, since the 1990s the European institutions are playing an increasingly important role in the domain of migration policy. Moreover, when death tolls of migrants in the Mediterranean were peaking in 2014 and rising even more in 2015 (IOM GMDAC, 2015), people and member states turned to the EU to find solutions.

Research question

In this paper, I will investigate how the Migration-Asylum Nexus plays out in the migration policy of the European Union by doing a discourse analysis on the use of labels by the European Commission. What are the existing legal categories of the European migration and asylum policy? Which labels on the migrant-refugee continuum does the European Commission use in its communicative and coordinative discourse and how do these correspond to the legal framework? How consistent is the meaning of a certain label? In which contexts is a certain label used? Which labels refer to migrants, which refer to refugees and which labels are ‘in-between’? Is there a strict separation between the labels and categories or are economic migration and forced migration rather mixed? These are some of the questions guiding my research.

My research consists of two different types of documents. The first are legal documents such as regulations and directives, which I will use to map out the legal framework of the European Union’s migration and asylum policy and its corresponding categories used to classify migrants and refugees. The second type of documents comprises legislative proposals, communications, reports, recommendations, and speeches by the Commissioner Dimitris Avramopoulos. These documents are considered to reflect the discourse of the Commission and will be coded using the programme Nvivo. The chosen time frame is the response of the European Commission to the "refugee crisis", the start of which I place for both practical as substantive reasons at the publication of the European Agenda on Migration (13/05/2015).

Finally, by investigating the Commission’s use of labels in both the legal framework of the European Union’s migration and asylum policy and in its communicative/coordinate discourse, I hope to get a clearer view on the way labels on the migrant-refugee continuum are used. In how far are migrants and refugees distinguished or conflated and what does this teach us about the ‘wanted’ and ‘unwanted’ categories of migrants? Is there a moral distinction between certain labels or categories? And does the use of labels place attention on humanitarian considerations or rather on migration control?
The question of how the migration-asylum nexus plays out in the use of labels by the European Commission, must be situated in the broader debate about the Europeanization of the migration and asylum policy and the tension between the EU’s human rights commitments and the particular interests of member states that often tend towards a security dimension (Lavenex, 2001; Guild, 2006; Guiraudon, 2000; Acosta Arcarazo, 2012; Vested-Hansen, 2012; Cholewinski, 2001; Pirjola, 2009; Boswell & Geddes, 2011, Geddes 2014). By taking a discursive approach, investigating the use of labels by the European Commission, I wish to contribute to the question whether the EU’s focus is on the protection of asylum seekers or rather on the prevention of their arrival, in other words migration control. Although the member states continue to play an important part in the EU’s common migration and asylum policy, the scope of my research does not allow to make any statements about the influence of member states’ positions on the discourse of the European Commission. Neither does this thesis make an evaluation of the effectiveness of EU policy and how successful it is implemented. Rather, my focus is purely on the discursive practices of categorisation and labelling and how these are used as a tool of power or how they can even be a source of transformation (Goodman, 2007; Schmidt, 2010).

**Structure of the paper**

In the first chapter, I will elaborate on the Migration-Asylum Nexus and further problematize the use of labels on the migrant-refugee continuum. What does the Migration-Asylum Nexus entail exactly? Where does it come from? What makes this nexus so problematic in a policy context? What is so dangerous about using labels interchangeably in different contexts? Which explanatory factors or motives does the academic literature reach us to explain the use of certain labels? In the second chapter, I will give a more detailed account of the choice of sources and my method and approach. I will also say a few words about the empirical focus of the research, namely the response to the refugee crisis by the European Commission.

In the third chapter, I discuss the labels referring to migrants and refugees in the legal framework of the European migration and asylum policy. The fourth chapter contains the analysis of the use of labels in the discourse of the European Commission, based on the qualitative research that was done using the programme Nvivo. In the fifth chapter, I bring chapter three and four together to compare the labels from the discursive context with the categories in the legal framework and make some concluding remarks.
1. The Migration-Asylum Nexus in close-up

1.1. Globalisation and Mixed Migration

To really grasp what the Migration-Asylum Nexus is, it is important to understand the phenomenon of migration and specifically migration streams in a context of globalisation. After all, there is a wide consensus among scholars that globalisation and migration are inextricably linked, or as Castles (2002, p. 1144) phrases it: "Migration is clearly a systemic element in processes of globalization". More importantly, scholars such as Castles (2002; 2003), Conrad (2010), Koser & Martin (2011), Boswell & Geddes (2011), Zetter (2007), Feller (2006) and others claim that the character of migration has changed fundamentally with the advent of globalisation; migration streams have become more and more complex.

Both voluntary and forced migration streams are strongly connected to North-South relations and are an integral part of processes of global transformation (Castles, 2003; Zetter, 2007). According to world-system theory and globalisation theory, globalisation sharpens and maintains inequality through processes of inclusion and exclusion, which are at the basis of many conflicts that lead to displacement. At the same time, material and cultural relations between core and periphery generate and stimulate international migration streams. The flow of goods and capital are reciprocated by streams of migrants in the opposite direction (Castles, De Haas & Miller, 2014, p. 32; Castles, 2003; Massey et al., 1993, p. 444). Because of globalisation and the inequality it produces, poverty and persecution are intertwined at the source and the distinction between forced migration and economic migration fades more and more (Castles, 2003; Feller, 2006).

Scholars speak about "mixed migration" to point out the increasing overlaps between different types, forms or categories of migration (Feller, 2006; Koser & Martin, 2011; Zetter, 2007). Migrants move for a variety of reasons. Yet, even though economic motivations usually prevail among economic migrants, while persecution, war, indiscriminate violence or natural disasters drive refugees from their homes, the a-priori distinction between free and forced migration, labour migrants and refugees does not always reflect reality. As Lucassen and Lucassen (1997, p. 14) point out: "Although the motivations of refugees and labour migrants undeniably differ in principle, the disparities are less obvious in practice than is commonly assumed. The (...) problem with refugees is that they are defined by governments of the receiving countries on the basis of ideological and economic considerations."

Moreover, the fact is that almost all refugees combine political with economic motives. Even ‘forced’ migrants such as refugees have a certain degree of agency (Lucassen & Lucassen, 1997; Koser & Martin, 2011). This becomes apparent in the characteristics of people in conflict areas taking flight towards Europe, who are usually young and male. For example, a study by IOM about migrant crossings from Libya in 2016, showed that 94% of the surveyed migrants were male, with an average age of 29 (Ouederni, Bishop & Sha’ath, 2017, p. 10 & 17). Another IOM report about Afghan migrants taking the Western Balkan route, mentions an average age of 25 (DTM IOM, 2016), while an IOM report about Iraqi migrants in 2015 mentions a ratio of 93% males, with an average age of 29 (IOM IRAQ, 2016, p. 5-6). While some people in a context of conflict choose to seek refuge elsewhere, others choose to stay and fight, or only move locally. Refugees can combine many different motivations; apart from a fear of persecution or indiscriminate violence, they might also be pushed by the loss of livelihood or because of separation from their family (Koser & Martin, 2011).

Not only the motives of migrants and forced migrants are mixed. This is also true for the migration flows. Mixed migration streams are a consequence of the fact that migrants with different motives, often use the same routes, the same transit points, head towards the same destinations or run into the same intermediaries, such as smugglers, migration agents or humanitarian organisations. Moreover, different types of migrants rely on similar survival strategies or coping mechanisms such as social networks (Koser & Martin, 2011; Castles, 2004). The result is that these mixed migrations are not easily translated into clear-cut categories. Migrants not only move between places, they can also ‘migrate’ between migration categories and change status, for example when they overstay a visa.
The North-South inequality, inherent to globalisation, pushes through in the process of labelling and categorization. For example, this is reflected in the migration policy of the European Union, in its distinction between intra-EU mobility and extra-EU migration. As Zetter (2007), has pointed out, today the governments in the global North dictate the refugee regime. The definition of ‘refugee’ is based on the Convention of Geneva (1951), which was signed in a completely different geographic and historic context than the migration streams Europe is encountering today (Koser & Martin, 2011; Long, 2013). Moreover, according to Roos (2013), through the categorization of extra-EU migration, policymakers have created a certain hierarchy between categories by stratifying rights across these categories. He claims that the EU level replicates and even reinforces inequalities among immigrants, originating from the national level. By using categories and labels, the ‘wanted’ migrants are separated from the ‘unwanted’ migrants, whereby “EU legislation offers a blueprint for member states to precisely select and sort their immigrant population” (Roos, 2013, p. 189). The artificiality of categories, based on political, ideological, economic and bureaucratic choices, lies at the base of the migration-asylum nexus (Koser & Martin, 2011; Lucassen & Lucassen, 1997; Zetter, 2007).

1.2. The Migrant-Refugee Dichotomy

A Historic Perspective

The preceding paragraph shows that it is important to look at labels and categorization in their broader context. The migration-asylum nexus cannot be understood without an understanding of the complexity of migration streams in a context of globalization, and it has been pointed out that the use and choice of labels is embedded in ideological, political and economic considerations. Yet, to really get to the bottom of the migrant-refugee dichotomy, why it is problematic and which motivations lie behind this categorization, a historic perspective is essential.

“Optimism or pessimism has often dominated the public discourse in an irrational way. Scholars, policy makers and the media alike tend to ignore relevant historical analogies and interpret current developments as unprecedented. (...) Such moral panic is nothing new. (...) [p.5] Re-reading the historical record can provide an important temporal comparison for our own times, and thus put in perspective the recurring moral panic. (...) In short, we argue that the basis of contemporary optimism or pessimism regarding migration movements and settlement processes has been built on a weak understanding of the past, and thereby of the nature of these phenomena.” (Lucassen et al., 2010, p. 4-5)

The distinction between migrants and refugees is fairly recent. It was with the Convention of Geneva in 1951 that refugees were first considered as a distinct category, with a separate legal status. For this reason, in refugee studies, the year 1951 is often considered ‘point zero’ (Long, 2013). Yet, refugees didn’t start to exist in 1951. Forced migration has been part of human mobility since the start of human history (Castles, 2003). Several scholars have pointed out how the Geneva Convention was “a politically crafted construction of Western states, intended to respond to the specific dynamics of the post-1945 European refugee crisis and shaped by Cold War rivalries.” (Long, 2013, p. 3; Robinson, 1995; Zetter, 2007; Koser & Martin, 2011) It was by no means a natural or obvious conclusion of previous policy developments (Long, 2013).

In fact, between 1920 and 1930, European states worked together in the Nansen-regime to cope with the large numbers of displaced persons. Indeed, World War I had been an important breaking point in the European refugee experience. The war, accompanied by migration restrictions, had made it impossible to transfer Europe’s refugee ‘problem’ to other countries, such as the United States, as they had previously done. In response to the closing down of transatlantic possibilities for onward movement, Fridjof Nansen invented an international passport system which facilitated the transit and resettlement of refugees in Europe, so that they could reunite with their families or find employment opportunities. The Nansen-regime, which operated as a system of burden sharing on supranational level, was an important step to overcome the national migration controls and restrictions in European countries (Long, 2013). Moreover, the historic
importance of Nansen’s refugee system was that it approached refugee-policy from the idea of economic inclusion, rather than a classic form of humanitarian help. The displaced persons, such as Russian refugees (and later also Armenian, Assyrian and other repressed minorities), were not seen as a separate category, but rather as impoverished economic migrants (Long, 2013).

Economic migrants and refugees were thus not strictly separated by policy makers, furthermore the economic aspect was seen an important part of the solution to the refugee problem. Policy makers recognized the displaced migrants’ search for economic livelihood. This contrasts with more recent discourses on ‘refugee crises’. For example, Kirkwood et al. (2016) have showed in their study of British popular media discourse (e.g. the Guardian, the Sun, BBC, …) how the claims to protection of asylum seekers in the United Kingdom are delegitimized when associated with seeking economic gain. A moral distinction is made between ‘bogus’ and ‘genuine’ asylum seekers, those that are in the UK for financial gain only, and those that are ‘really’ seeking protection. Kirkwood et al. are not alone in their observation that a discourse of deservingness has developed around the distinction between economic migrants and forced migrants. For asylum seekers, renouncing economic motives has become an important requirement to be considered as a ‘genuine’ or ‘deserving’ refugee (Holmes & Castañeda, 2016; Robinson, 1995; Steiner, 2000).

Long (2013) argues to reconnect refugees to broader migration processes because the distinction between refugee protection and migration has many times proven counterproductive. The refugee-category, defined by the Geneva Convention of 1951 and the Protocol of 1967 is too narrow, says Long, with an exclusive humanitarian focus. The protection regime, as it was developed after 1951, barely recognizes the economic and development needs of refugees. Moreover, by continuously victimizing displaced persons, the Western refugee regime deprives them of agency. For example, this becomes clear in the ‘sedentary bias’ of the refugee system. A too mobile refugee population is not convenient in terms of distributing humanitarian aid and thus displaced people are gathered in camps. Their freedom of movement is denied. Yet, in the long run this trend of encampment threatens the quality of refugee protection. By disconnecting refugees from other migration channels and their search for economic livelihood, the options to build a new life in exile also diminish (Long, 2013).

By moving back behind the 1951 line, Long (2013) has showed how a historic perspective helps to understand processes of refugee migration and the responses to it without becoming entangled in contemporary debates surrounding the political use of ‘refugee’ and ‘migrant’ labels. Moreover, Long (2013), like other scholars (Bertrand, 1998; Robinson, 1995; Lucassen & Lucassen, 1997; Zetter, 2007) has stressed how radical social events such as the Great Depression of 1929, the Second World War, and the context of decolonisation and Cold war have influenced the development of the current refugee regime. The labels and definitions used to describe different types of migrants in Europe are inherently Western, rooted in European history and reflecting the unequal North-South relations that are part of globalisation. For example, as Bertrand (1998) has pointed out the terms ‘migrant’ and ‘refugee’ cannot even be clearly translated in Asian and Pacific Rim languages.

**A Human Rights Perspective**

Scholars with a historic approach to the migration-asylum nexus, such as Long (2013), are mostly proponents of a holistic view on this nexus (Castles, 2003; Lucassen et al., 2010). They stress that it is important to pay attention to the overlaps between refugees and migrants instead of strictly separating the two categories. One of the arguments, as was explained in the previous paragraphs, is that strictly separating the motives of these two types of migrants also serves to delegitimize displaced migrants who are seeking asylum, by pointing out their economic motives. At the same time and from similar humanitarian concerns, others argue that a strict separation between categories is necessary. Often this strand of scholars has a strong connection to the situation of refugees in the field as part of refugee organisations such as UNHCR. They advocate a more individual approach with a focus on the protection of human rights, based on international law. (Feller, 2006; Feller, 2005; Hathaway, 2007; Steiner, 2000).
When Erika Feller was director of the Department of International Protection of UNHCR in 2005, her message was clear: “Refugees are not migrants” (Feller, 2005, p. 27). With this statement, she referred to the increasingly blurring distinction between the category ‘migrant’ and the category ‘refugee’ in a context of globalisation. According to Feller (2005; 2006), the mixing of the categories is not only wrong from a conceptual and legal point of view, but also dangerous from a humanitarian perspective. Feller stresses the distinct legal status of refugees. The international community has granted refugees specific rights, just because of the vulnerable security situation of this specific group of migrants. According to Feller (2006, p. 515), the overlaps between the two categories work in the favour of “irresponsible politicians, whose rhetoric draws upon and feeds the fears of those who see foreigners as taking jobs, who might be terrorists or criminals, who might upset the ethnic balance, or who might just stay too long.” By equating refugees to economic migrants, the focus shifts from humanitarian protection to migration control and restriction.

Although Feller (2006) and Long (2013) propose a different approach to the migration-asylum nexus and whether there should be a strict separation between the categories, both argumentation is based on the fact that governments use labels and language to manage migration to their needs. As was said in the introduction, power can function through discourse and categorization (Bourdieu, 1991; Goodman & Speer, 2007; Moncrieffe & Eyben, 2007). The opposition between Feller and Long, shows the importance of analysing labels and discourse in their respective context. Where Feller (2006) fears a conflation between migrants and refugees in a legal context, Long (2013) was rather focusing on policy makers and how they viewed the displaced migrants during the Nansen-regime. Kirkwood et al. (2016), in their turn, were looking at the popular and media discourse. Yet, even though the discourses are different, the labels being used are the same. What Feller (2006) is so worried about is that the conflation of the labels “migrant” and “refugee” by politicians or in popular discourse is also affecting the legal refugee-status and the humanitarian protection that comes with it.

Thus, depending on the discursive context, the speaker or the intention of the speaker, categories can be distinguished or conflated and the meaning and connotation of a certain label can change. In their study of the discursive psychology of the asylum debate in the UK, Goodman & Speer (2007) have demonstrated how politicians sometimes distinguish between refugees and migrants, sometimes conflate refugees and economic migrants, and sometimes simultaneously distinguish and conflate categories. They do this to justify their own position or policy on asylum or to justify the harsh treatment of asylum seekers. Goodman & Speer (2007) made the important observation that participants in the asylum debate don’t just use categories, they are also debating and transforming the categories. This confirms with Zetter’s (1991, p. 45) assertion that “labels are not only political but also dynamic.”

1.3. Discourse of Deservingness

Zetter (2007), Robinson (1995), Holmes & Castañeda (2016), Steiner (2000) and Kirkwood et al. (2016) have pointed out that economic motives and claims for asylum are deliberately conflated to serve national interests. For example, as Robinson (1995) explains: From the 1980s, when more and more refugees were arriving spontaneously at Europe’s borders, the discourse was redefined because governments couldn’t regulate migration flows anymore as they had done in previous decades. Until the 1980s, they had been selecting refugees on their own terms, with numerically limited quotas and based on criteria of assimilability or refugees’ value for the labour market. But thanks to new technologies and travel possibilities, migrants and refugees found new migration routes leading them directly to the gates of Europe. When European countries could not keep immigration at arm’s length anymore, their focus shifted from humanitarian protection to migration control. Refugees were increasingly described as economic or irregular migrants. In popular and media discourse the labels ‘genuine’ and ‘bogus’ refugee emerged (Robinson, 1995; Zetter, 2007; Kirkwood et al., 2016).
Holmes & Castañeda (2016) and Kirkwood et al. (2016) have showed how in the current refugee crisis these labels are connected to a discourse of deservingness, in which a moral distinction is made between the ‘genuine’ refugees, who are ‘really’ seeking protection and the ‘pretender’ refugees, who are ‘just migrants’ seeking economic gain. The two categories are thus not only separated by a different legal definition but also by different symbolic framings, whereby refugees are worthy of deserving aid and economic migrants are undeserving. Holmes & Castañeda (2016) say that the ambiguous distinction between ‘migrants’ and ‘refugees’ unfolds in many ways, such as in the ‘safe countries’ rhetoric, the precarious notion of ‘asylum seeker’, or the securitisation of migration. In their observation, the migration-asylum nexus has become part of a Gramscian war of position, where a liberal discourse of hospitality and moral duty, exemplified in Merkel’s “Wir schaffen das”, is in contestation with an anti-immigration rhetoric.

Another example demonstrating how labels were used in a discourse of deservingness, is the observation by Steiner (2000) of German policymakers in the 1990s. Steiner explains how, in Germany, proponents of a strict migration- and asylum policy, avoided using the term ‘Flüchtling’ (refugee), because it generated a feeling of sympathy among the population. Instead, they consistently used the more pejorative term ‘Asylant’ (asylum seeker), because the word sounds similar as other negative terms such as ‘Spekulant’ or ‘Simulant’ (pretender). Goodman & Speer (2007) on their end focused on the use of categories in the construction of asylum seekers in the asylum debate in the UK. They asserted that by using terms such as ‘bogus’ and ‘genuine’ or by categorizing asylum seekers in refugees and economic migrants, the discussion tends to focus on the question of legitimacy rather than on the need for protection. “Although it may at first seem entirely rational to separate these two groups – some who claim asylum may, in fact, be economic migrants – the rhetorical effect of this differentiation is, in the overwhelming majority of cases, used to delegitimize and justify the harsh treatment of all asylum seekers, whatever their circumstances.” (Goodman & Speer, 2007, p. 179)

The underlying assumption of several authors describing the use of discourse in the migration and asylum debate, is that labels and discourse are used to serve certain interests. Discourse is viewed in function of interests, rather than the other way around. For example, Robinson (1995) explained how the discourse of European governments was transformed when their interests changed in the 1980s, going from humanitarian protection to migration control. Goodman & Speer (2007) demonstrated how the conflation of certain categories served to legitimate one’s own position on asylum or the harsh treatment of asylum seekers. However, in a constructivist perspective, language is not only a tool to legitimate one’s actions or ideas, it also has a transformative power to shape ideas and values. Discourse can be an important driver for policy change by altering actor’s preferences, their perception of policy problems and eventually their interests (Schmidt & Radaelli, 2004, p. 188; Schmidt, 2010; Holmes & Castañeda, 2016; Zetter, 1991). The use of certain labels and categorizations, may thus constitute a moral reality that influences the policy preferences of, for example, the European Commission.
1.4. Conclusion

The above paragraphs have showed that the categorisation of migrants and refugees is a way for governments to cope with the increased complexity of migration streams (or ‘mixed migration’) inherent to globalisation. Yet, as the processes of globalisation exacerbate inequality, so does the refugee regime reflect the unequal North-South relation. It is the governments of the receiving countries who dictate the refugee regime and who decide how migrants are labelled. Consequently, migration categories do not reflect the dynamics of migration, but rather bureaucratic, economic and ideological policy preferences. By stratifying rights across different migration categories, categorization has become a tool to separate the ‘wanted’ migrants from the ‘unwanted’.

Secondly, the ambiguous relation between migrants and refugees has also played an important part in the attempt of national governments to control migration. Categorization is part of a process of selection. Migrants that are perceived to have an added value for the host societies are singled out. On the EU-level, this is reflected for example in directives such as the Blue Card Directive or the Directive on intra-corporate transfers which, as Roos (2013, p. 186) has pointed out, target very specific groups of migrants and prescribe less demanding and more flexible admission and residence criteria. However, as the previous paragraphs have showed, categorization not only serves the selection of wanted migrants; it is also a tool to seal off access to unwanted migrants. A quick glance at the historic record has showed that the distinction between migrants and refugees is not self-evident and that in the past governments recognized the search for economic livelihood of refugees. Today, the labels migrant and refugee are conflated to delegitimise claims for protection by pointing out economic motives.

Thirdly, the migration-asylum nexus is not only about the ambiguous relation between (economic) migrants and refugees and the conflation of these two labels, it is also about the emergence of numerous in-between labels on the migrant-refugee continuum or as Zetter (2007, p.180) calls it: a fractioning of the “refugee” label. This proliferation of labels is reflected in the combination of the labels “migrant” or “refugee with all kinds of adjectives such as “genuine”, “bogus”, “legal”, “irregular”, “undocumented”, “economic”, and more. One of the most ubiquitous in-between labels, which also most obviously reflects the migrant-refugee connection is that of the “asylum seeker”. This label combines both the agency of displaced migrants seeking protection in another country – or literally “seeking asylum” – and the unequal power relationship with the receiving country, that decides whether the claim for asylum is legitimate or not and whether it will grant the refugee status or not. Many scholars have pointed out how in-between labels such as asylum seeker – although “irregular migrant” is proving to be a worthy competitor – have served as a convenient tool to keep migrants in a transient state (Zetter, 2007; Robinson, 1995; Holmes & Castañeda, 2016; Kirkwood et al., 2016). Rather than functioning as a simplifying tool to better cope with complex migratory processes, these in-between labels have become part of a discourse of deservingness, serving and shaping political preferences.

From the literature overview, I have distilled several problems regarding the categorization and labelling of people on the move by governments of receiving countries. One particular problem that arose from studies of the political and media discourse (such as Kirkwood et al., 2016; Holmes & Castañeda, 2016; Steiner, 2000, Goodman & Speer, 2007), is the development of a discourse of deservingness around a moral distinction between the category (economic) migrant and the category refugee. This moral distinction is conveniently used by certain policymakers to delegitimize claims for protection by conflating the two categories. Moreover, the creation of numerous in between labels such as “irregular migrant”, “asylum seeker”, “bogus and genuine refugee” reinforces the discourse of deservingness and the process of delegitimization. The discourse of deservingness becomes even more problematic when it flows over to the policy arena and is transformed into judicial categories, separating the wanted migrants from the unwanted.

By investigating both the legal framework of the European Union’s migration and asylum policy and the Commission’s use of labels in its (communicative/coordinative/political) discourse, I hope to find out whether this moral distinction between ‘wanted’ and ‘unwanted’ categories of migrants that we have seen in popular
and national discourses has renegaded to the discourse of the European Commission and whether or how these distinctions overlap with the judicial categories of European migration policy. In other words, I want to find out whether the discourse of the European Commission is placing attention on the question of legitimacy rather than humanitarian protection, and how this confirms with the policy categories that are in place in the legal framework. In the next chapter, I will clarify my empirical focus and discuss my choice of sources and method.

2. Sources & Method

2.1. Empirical focus: The European Commission

The empirical focus of this paper for the study of the migration-asylum nexus is the discourse of the European Commission. Since the Amsterdam treaty (1997/1999), the Commission plays both a role as executive power, regarding the management and implementation of policy, and as legislative initiator, making new policy proposals for the European migration and asylum policy. According to Boswell & Geddes (2011) the Commission is not just a neutral broker between the interests of different member states, but does have quite clear views and preferences in the area of migration and asylum. Roos (2013) and Acosta Arcarazo (2012) have pointed out as well that the Commission grabs opportunities to push towards a further harmonization of the migration and asylum policy and tends to adopt a relatively modernizing, liberal position. However, sometimes the Commission also holds back when sensing a certain issue might be too sensitive for the member states (Roos, 2013; Boswell & Geddes, 2011). Ultimately, Boswell & Geddes (2011, p.64) maintain that “the Commission’s aspiration is to harmonize EU approaches, but where possible at a level that codifies commitment to norms of international law.”

The timeframe of my research on the Commission’s use of labels is the response to the refugee crisis, the start of which I place at the publication of the European Agenda on Migration on 13 May 2015 (European Commission, 2015a). The European Agenda on Migration is chosen as the starting point, for both practical and substantive reasons. Although this document was far from the Commission’s first reaction to the refugee crisis and although the conflicts forming the root causes of the refugee flows originated years before, the Agenda is significant in that it was a first comprehensive response. The Agenda proposed short, medium and long-term solutions in both the area of asylum and migration. It identified six areas for immediate action: (1) Saving lives at sea, (2) Targeting criminal smuggling networks, (3) Relocation, (4) Resettlement, (5) Partnerships with third countries and (6) Hotspots to help frontline states, such as Greece, Italy, Hungary (COM, 2015a). In the medium and long-term, the Agenda outlines four pillars to “manage migration better”: (1) ‘Reducing the incentives for irregular migration’, by addressing root causes, fighting smugglers and traffickers, and by amping up Return; (2) ‘Border management, saving lives and securing external borders’; (3) ‘Europe’s duty to protect: a strong common asylum policy’, by ensuring a coherent implementation and reforming Dublin; and (4) ‘A new policy on legal migration’ (COM, 2015a).

The Agenda is further significant in that it proposed several actions that would lead to further harmonisation, such as the proposed reforms of the Common European Asylum System, or a stronger role (including more funding) for EU agencies, such as the European Border and Coast Guard Agency (COM, 2015a). Moreover, the Commission managed to launch certain new tools, such as the temporary relocation system, introducing a new ‘distribution key’ model for allocating responsibility between member states on the basis of new criteria (GDP, population, unemployment, etc.) (Carrera, Blockmans, Gros & Guild, 2015).

2.2. Types of Sources and Types of Discourse

As mentioned before, my research consists of two different types of sources. The first type comprises legal documents such as regulations and directives to map out the legal framework of the European Union’s migration and asylum policy. From these documents, I will put together an overview of the legal categories
that are in place to classify migrants and refugees. There are also other legal outputs such as decisions, recommendations and opinions, but regulations and directives are particularly important because they are binding and have ‘direct effect’ (Boswell & Geddes, 2011). Moreover, as these directives and regulations have run through the complete (ordinary) legislative procedure, starting with an initiative from the Commission, passing through the European parliament and the Council, who both must give their approval and can make amendments, they reflect the multilevel governance so specific for the EU. Although, the European Commission has the executive power, shared with the member states, it plays an important part in the legislative process as initiator of legislation, laying the groundwork for many regulations and directives (Vos, 2015, p.99). By investigating the use of labels by the European Commission, I hope to shine a light on the position of this actor in the common European migration and asylum policy.

The second type of sources that form part of my research, reflect the coordinative and communicative discourse of the Commission in its response to the refugee crisis and is a selection of proposals, communications, recommendations, reports, and speeches by Commissioner Dimitris Avramopoulos.

The difference between coordinative and communicative discourse derives from the theoretical framework of Discursive Institutionalism (DI) that analyses ideas and discourse to explain political change (and continuity) in an institutional context. In the DI framework, the ‘coordinative’ policy sphere is where the ideas are constructed, whereas the ‘communicative’ policy sphere is where ideas are deliberated and legitimated to the public (Schmidt, 2010, p.2-3). The studies on the migration-asylum nexus that were discussed in chapter one, were mostly about the communicative discourse. Scholars such as Goodman & Speer (2007), Holmes & Castañeda (2016), Steiner (2000), Kirkwood et al. (2016) and Müller (2016) studied the discourse of politicians in public debates or the media discourse in newspapers and on television. According to Schmidt & Radaelli (2004, p. 198), “countries in which power is concentrated in the executive, such as Britain or France … are most likely to have an elaborate ‘communicative discourse’ focused on persuading the general public of the necessity and appropriateness of policies developed with little outside input.” By contrast, multi-actor, multi-level systems such as the European Union where both European-, national-, regional-level governmental and non-governmental actors are involved in the decision and policy making process, tend to have a more elaborate coordinative discourse.

The discourse of the European Commission is thus mainly to be situated in the coordinative realm, addressed to the networks of governmental and non-governmental actors involved in the construction of policy, organised in ‘epistemic communities’ of elites or ‘advocacy networks’ (Schmidt, 2010). Nevertheless, the Commission also has a communicative discourse, especially since the institution is under increasing attack for its perceived democratic deficit. According the Schmidt & Radaelli (2004, p.199) these communicative elements play a dual role. They serve to reassure the public about the impartiality and transparency of the policy process itself, but they are also intended to appeal to the national publics and in this way put pressure on the member states’ leaders.

2.3. Discourse analysis using Nvivo.

The labels in the communicative and coordinative discourse of the European Commission will be coded using the qualitative data analysis software Nvivo. The documents that were uploaded for analysis in Nvivo are listed in the Bibliography (Primary Sources, under ‘Avramopoulos’, ‘European Commission’ and ‘European Commission and High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security’). In Nvivo codes are called ‘nodes’. A ‘node’ is a tool that functions as a kind of container or ‘bucket’ that holds all the references and pieces of information related to a certain code (Mortelmans, 2011).

For the creation of nodes, my approach has been both deductive and inductive. Based on the policy framework that will be discussed in chapter 3, I created three categories of nodes reflecting the migration and asylum categories. The node-categories are Asylum, Irregular Migration and Migration and will be
discussed more in detail in section 3.5 and chapter 4. In these categories, I collected the different labels referring to migrants and refugees in separate nodes. To create these nodes, I first did a word count query on the different documents to get an idea of frequently used words.

The word count queries, together with the labels from the legal framework served as a basis for a first round of text queries. I made text queries for the following search terms: ‘Asylum’, ‘Protection’, ‘applicant’, ‘people/persons’, ‘migrants’, ‘third country nationals’, ‘refugee’, ‘arrivals’. For each of these search terms, I scanned word trees to identify labels and pieces of text referring to migrants or refugees that were used for a second round of text search queries with more narrower search terms, such as for example ‘asylum claims’, ‘persons in need of international protection’, ‘irregular migrants’, ‘asylum seekers’, ‘illegally staying third country nationals’, … Text references containing these more narrower search terms were collected in a corresponding node with some narrow context and categorized under one of the policy categories. In Annex II, I have included an example of such a ‘word tree’ for the search term ‘arrivals’. In Chapter 4, I will discuss the results from these queries and the nodes and labels that were created to group these results. The nodes will be discussed in relation to their narrow context, as well as to the type of document in which they appeared. Unfortunately, the limited time frame in which this research was conducted, does not allow me to discuss the use of labels in depth. The use of labels will rather be discussed on an aggregated level and with particular attention to the labels themselves.
3. The legal framework of the European Migration and Asylum Policy

In this chapter, I will give a short overview of the legal framework of the European Migration and Asylum Policy, based on the main directives and regulations. The purpose of this overview is to focus on the way migration policy is categorised, rather than to describe the content of the different aspects of the common migration policy. The different migration categories and their corresponding legislation have been poured in a schematic overview (Annex I), which will be further discussed in the following paragraphs. For each migration category, the regulations and directives were scanned for labels referring to migrants or refugees. The overview also contains the definition of each label. While some of these labels simply refer to a specific category of migrant within the European migration policy, other labels refer to a migration status, linked to certain rights or privileges (these statuses are the labels in italic in the overview). In chapter 4 and 5, I will return to this overview to compare the labels used in the communicative and coordinative discourse of the European Commission with the legal migration categories and labels laid out in this chapter.

On the website of the Directorate-General for Migration and Home Affairs², there are four policy categories concerning migration: ‘Legal Migration and Integration’; ‘Irregular Migration & Return’; ‘Common European Asylum System’; and ‘Schengen, Borders & Visas’. Since the purpose of this paper is to investigate the migration-asylum nexus in the Commission’s use of labels, some parts of the policy will be left out in the discussion, such as Integration, Readmission, EASO, and some more technical policy-segments concerning Schengen, Borders & Visas. The focus is thus on the labels used in the first three policy categories, legal migration, irregular migration and asylum.

3.1. Third-country national

The general label used in the migration and asylum policy, returning in every legislation is “third country national” (TCN). A third country national is “Any person who is not a citizen of the European Union within the meaning of Art. 20(1) of TFEU and who is not a person enjoying the Union right to free movement, as defined in Art. 2(5) of the Schengen Borders Code” (European Parliament & Council of the EU, 2008, Art. 3(1)). In other words, third country nationals are those migrants who are not citizens of an EU country or of a non-EU Schengen country, such as Switzerland, Liechtenstein, Norway and Iceland³.

Although this label might seem quite neutral, the name itself reflects the hierarchy intrinsic to the design of the European Union as an area of freedom security and justice. As was pointed out by Roos (2013), Geddes (2014) and Guild (2006), there is a huge gap in rights between EU citizens, the “first-country nationals” and non-EU, non-Schengen citizens, the so-called “third-country nationals”. By using the numerical labels first-, second- and third- to categorize the different groups of nationals, the hierarchy is even more underlined. Moreover, there is a certain connotation attached to this numerical order, reflecting the rather outdated classification of the world in a First, Second and Third World (Vlassenroot, 2016). Indeed, many of the so-called third-country nationals arriving in the European Union have a country of origin located in the Global South, the former ‘Third World’ (Eurostat, 2011; 2017). Even though, in principle, the label ‘third-country national’ does not refer to any specific geographic area, the association with the ‘Third World’ is not far away and this might give a negative connotation to nationals from so-called ‘third-countries’ arriving in the EU. Although the scope of this research does not allow to confirm if the usage of the term ‘third-country national’ does result in negative associations, it can be questioned if the numerical classification is necessary. The

---

² https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/index_en
‘second country nationals’, that is Schengen country citizens who are not EU, are in many of the directives considered as third-country nationals (COM, 2017b, “third-country national”).

In the framework of this paper, ‘third-country national’ can be considered as equivalent to the general category or label ‘migrant’. TCNs can be labour migrants applying for an EU Blue Card, they can be family migrants reuniting with a family member residing in the EU, or they can be people seeking protection in a certain member state. Some might be entering the EU on the basis of a resettlement programme, but the vast majority of asylum applicants will have to resort to irregular ways of entry. In the next paragraphs, I will discuss how the TCN label is further divided over the different policy categories and sub-categories.

3.2. Labels under ‘Legal Migration’

Looking at the sub-categories of the first policy category ‘Legal Migration & Integration’ (see Annex I (1.)), there are three ‘legal ways’ for TCNs to migrate to the European Union, through labour migration, family reunification or for purposes of study and research. The first thing that stands out, is that the legislation in place regarding labour migration pertains only to very specific categories of migrants, namely ‘highly-qualified persons’, ‘seasonal workers’ or ‘intra-corporate transferees’. Having an employment contract seems a prerequisite to be considered any of the fore-mentioned categories. Moreover, the categorisation is based predominantly on a very specific type of work or work contract; that is highly qualified work (“genuine and effective work, for, or under the direction of someone else…and has the required adequate and specific competence, as proven by higher professional qualifications.”), seasonal work (“carry out an activity dependent on the passing of the seasons, under one or more fixed-term work contracts”), or work in the context of “an intra-corporate transfer” (Annex I). Other migrants, planning to move to the EU for economic purposes, not fitting in one of these three categories, will fall easily in the policy realms of ‘irregular migration’. The (potential) danger of this is that migration by people with economic motives (‘economic migration’), becomes more and more associated with ‘irregular migration’.

It seems that the proliferation of labels has not only taken place for ‘refugees’ (Zetter, 2007), but also for ‘migrants’, limiting the legal ways for economic migration to just a few narrow categories. However, while the literature explains the fractioning of the refugee label as being motivated by restrictive interests (Zetter, 2007; Robinson, 1995; Holmes & Castañeda, 2016; Kirkwood et al., 2016), Roos (2013) and Geddes (2014) have pointed out that one of the reasons for the narrow economic categories is the weak competences of the EU in the area of admission. Admission policy regarding labour migration, remains a very sensitive area for the sovereignty feelings of the member states (Geddes, 2014; Boswell & Geddes, 2011) and Roos (2013) has proposed an alternative explanation for the very specific labour migration categories. According to him, the Commission tries to advance the process of Europeanization by proposing policies for very narrowly defined migrant categories that allow the member states to precisely select their immigrant population. Thus, following Roos’ reasoning, the fractioning of the ‘economic migrant’-label, or as he calls it, the ‘partitioning’, is not in the first place to facilitate migration restriction, but rather to advance the Europeanization of migration.

If we look at the sub-category Study and Research (Annex I), a similar proliferation of labels stands out. The directive (EU)2016/801 encompasses, researchers, students, school pupils, trainees, volunteers and au pairs. However, the nature of these labels is very different from the ones discussed under labour migration. Migrants falling under the Blue Card Directive (2009/50EC) or the Directive on intra-corporate transfers (2014/66/EU) can acquire a certain status as EU Blue Card holder or Intra-corporate transfer permit holder, making them entitled to certain rights and expansive residence conditions. The Study & Research Directive (EU)2016/801 allows for a broader range of migrants with less rigid admission criteria, but the conditions of residence are much stricter making it harder to acquire expansive rights (Roos, 2013).

Thirdly, there are the migrants coming to the EU under the category of ‘Family Reunification’. This category is special in the sense that it extends both to economic migration as well as to forced migration or asylum. It is one of the only categories reflecting personal preferences of migrants and the logic of migration processes,
as described in network theories (Massey et al., 1993; Castles, 2002). In addition, migrants arriving in the EU on the basis of family reunification account for two-thirds of the total immigration (Ruffer, 2011).

Among the labels in the Family Reunification Directive (2003/86/EC), there are ‘sponsors’, which are the TCNs “residing lawfully in a Member State and applying or whose family members apply for family reunification to be joined with him/her” (Annex I), and ‘family members’. However, family members falling directly under the directive are limited to the sponsor’s spouse and their minor children, regardless whether they are adopted or whether the sponsor/spouse has only custody. Other family members, such as the sponsor’s parents, or adult unmarried children must rely on the goodwill of the member states (Council of the EU, 2003a, Art. 4.2). The label is thus very narrowly defined. Several scholars have discussed the Family Reunification Directive as being very restrictive, both as regards admission criteria and as regards residence conditions, and they have demonstrated their concerns regarding human rights and the right to family life (Geddes, 2014; Roos, 2013; Ruffer, 2011). However, when it comes to ‘refugees’, who also fall under the directive, the admission criteria and scope of family members are somewhat less restrained (Council of the EU, 2003a, Art. 9-12). Yet, this is only the case for people with full refugee-status. The Directive does not apply where the sponsor is still applying for international protection, has temporary protection status or subsidiary protection status (Council of the EU, 2003a, Art. 3).

Finally, there is a category under ‘legal migration’ that is somewhat different than the former three categories. The sub-category ‘Long term residents’ does not categorize migrants based on their cause of movement, but on the duration of their stay. TCNs that have acquired long term resident status can enjoy a substantial number of rights comparable to those of an EU-citizen (Roos, 2013). However, migrants who acquire long-term resident status must meet the demanding criteria of having five continuous years of legal residence, sufficient stable and regular resources, being independent of social assistance and having a sickness insurance, and sometimes (depending on the member state) complying with additional integration criteria (Annex I). Similar as the Family Reunification Directive, the Long Term Residents Directive also involves beneficiaries of international protection. It does not apply to migrants in the process of an asylum application or people under temporary protection.

3.3. Labels under ‘Irregular Migration’

The policy category ‘Irregular Migration & Return’ is divided in two subcategories, namely ‘Migrant Smuggling’ and ‘Return & Readmission’. Looking at the labels referring to migrants or refugees, falling under the category of ‘Irregular Migration & Return’, only a few directives were relevant. The Directive on sanctions against employers of irregular migrants gives a definition of an ‘illegally staying third-country national’, namely “A third-country national present on the territory of a Member State, who does not fulfil, or no longer fulfils, the conditions for stay or residence in that Member State.” (EP & Council of the EU, 2009). Other relevant labels were mentioned in the Council decisions on the conclusion of the UN Protocol against migrant smuggling (2006/616/EC and 2006/617/EC) and in the Return Directive (2008/115/EC). Two of these labels do not directly refer to a person, they are instead actions, namely ‘illegal entry’ and ‘illegal stay’. Nevertheless, these actions are done by people and thus the labels implicitly refer to migrants. Illegal entry is defined as “Crossing borders without complying with the necessary requirements for legal entry into the receiving State” (Council of the EU, 2006, Annex I, Art. 3b), illegal stay as “The presence on the territory of a Member State, of a third-country national who does not fulfil, or no longer fulfils the conditions of entry as set out in Article 5 of the Schengen Borders Code or other conditions for entry, stay or residence in that Member State” (EP & Council of the EU, 2008, Art. 3.2). There is also mention of ‘vulnerable persons’, these are “minors, unaccompanied minors, disabled people, elderly people, pregnant women, single parents with minor children and persons who have been subjected to torture, rape or other serious forms of psychological, physical or sexual violence.” (EP & Council of the EU, 2008, Art 3.9).

Remarkably, there is no actual hard legislation pertaining to the EU’s “fight against illegal migration” (COM, 2006) or that defines the boundaries of ‘irregular migration’, even though scholars have argued that the EU
has particular strong competencies regarding unauthorized immigration (Geddes, 2014; Boswell & Geddes, 2011). The reason why the legal framework under the policy category ‘Irregular Migration & Return’ might seem quite thin at first glance, is because the ‘the fight’ is mostly fought out somewhere else. As Boswell & Geddes (2011, p. 33) argue: “Irregular migration is a byproduct of national policies to restrict the legal entry of certain types of immigrants.” Irregular migration is inextricably linked to the legal pathways for migration, as explained in the paragraph about legal migration. Also, the cooperation on external border management, plays an important role in combatting migrant smuggling and controlling irregular migration (Boswell & Geddes, 2011; Geddes, 2014; Guild, 2006, Papagianni, 2013). Moreover, as was pointed out by Morehouse and Blomfield (2011), although there has been established considerable cooperation in areas such as border management, “ultimately, unauthorized migrants are categorized as such by the states into which they migrate, and EU Member States have not reached a common definition of this migrant population.” (p. 4). This is reflected in lack of hard legislation defining the boundaries of irregular migration and in the definition of ‘illegally staying third-country national’, cited above, which is very vague and ultimately leaves the specification on the meaning of an irregular migrant up to the member states.

3.4. Labels under the ‘Common European Asylum System’


The overview of the different labels in Annex I.3 of this paper, shows that the directives and regulations under the CEAS have several labels in common (‘applicant’/‘application for international protection’/‘applicant for international protection’, ‘beneficiary of international protection’, ‘international protection’, ‘family members’, ‘minor’, ‘unaccompanied minor’, ‘refugee’, ‘person eligible for subsidiary protection’, ‘refugee status’, ‘subsidiary protection status’). As most of the directives and regulations refer in their definitions to the definition of the Qualification Directive 2011/95/EU, I will further discuss the different labels based on the definitions in this Directive. Apart from the labels already mentioned above, there are a few labels that are not part of the Qualification Directive, but do appear in other Directives. These are: ‘applicant with special reception needs’ and ‘vulnerable persons’ (in Directive 2013/33/EU on Reception conditions), ‘applicant in need of special procedural guarantees’ (in Directive 2013/32/EU on Asylum procedures), ‘temporary protection’, ‘displaced persons’, ‘mass influx’ and ‘sponsor’ (in Directive 2001/55/EC on Temporary protection). Table 1 shows the full list of labels and in which directives or regulations they appear.
There are a couple of things that stand out. First, the legal framework makes no use of the label ‘asylum seeker’ in its asylum policy, whereas this label was apparent in the discourse of national politicians as discussed in chapter 1. The directives and regulations consistently use the term ‘applicant’ to refer to an asylum seeker or in other words “a third-country national or stateless person who has made an application for international protection in respect of which a final decision has not yet been taken” (EP & Council of the EU, 2011a, Art. 2i). The replacement of the label ‘asylum seeker’ with a term such as ‘applicant for international protection’ is something that would have been applauded by Goodman & Speer (2007). They argued that the term ‘asylum seeker’ conveys an image of people “who have come here to take something from us” and this image requires a rather different moral responsibility from the host country than in the case of an application for a certain legal status (Goodman & Speer, 2007, p.179).

Secondly, as it appears, the CEAS framework contains a lot more labels than ‘applicant for international protection’ and ‘refugee’. Apart from ‘applicant for international protection’, there can also be applicants with ‘special needs’, either regarding the procedure or the reception needs. The special reception needs apply only for ‘vulnerable persons’ (such as for example minors, disabled people, elderly people, victims of human trafficking, persons who have subjected to torture, etc.) and can for example pertain to material conditions, such as housing, health care or detention (EP & Council of the EU, 2013b). ‘Applicants in need of special procedural guarantees’ are those “whose ability to benefit from the rights and comply with the obligations… is limited due to individual circumstances.” (EP & Council of the EU, 2013d, Art. 2d). These so-called individual circumstances can refer to an applicant’s age, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, disability, serious illness, mental disorders or to the experience of torture, rape or other serious forms of psychological, physical or sexual violence. In these cases, the applicants should receive adequate support and sufficient time in order to have a fair access to the asylum procedure.

These different ‘types’ of asylum applicants, seem to originate in the first place from humanitarian concerns for the well-being of people who have been through traumatizing experiences, to ensure a fair procedure and sufficient reception conditions for people in a vulnerable position. However, by differentiating between ‘types
of asylum seekers’ these special guarantees might involuntarily create a certain hierarchy. It implies that there is a group of ‘regular’ asylum seekers, who are not in a vulnerable position, and can thus be treated with less caution and less guarantees.

Not only are there different kinds of applicants, there are also different kinds of protection as is evident from the labels ‘(beneficiary of) international protection’, ‘refugee status’, ‘subsidiary protection status’ and ‘temporary protection’. ‘International protection’ is the umbrella term combining ‘refugee status’ and ‘subsidiary protection status’, which, like ‘temporary protection’ are distinct statuses with each different rights and privileges. The Directive 2011/95/EU makes a distinction between ‘refugee status’ and the label ‘refugee’ which is defined according to definition of the Geneva Convention relating to the status of refugees of 28 July 1951, as amended by the Protocol signed in New York on 31 January 1967. The difference between the two is from an administrative nature. A person with refugee status has completed the asylum application procedure and has been granted the recognition that he or she indeed falls within the meaning of a ‘refugee’ as defined in the Geneva Convention. The same is true for ‘subsidiary protection status’ and the label ‘person eligible for subsidiary protection’. It must be noted, that the label ‘refugee’ as defined in the Family Reunification Directive (2003/86/EC) does include the status and is thus defined differently than in the Directive 2011/95/EU.

‘Temporary protection’ is linked to the labels ‘mass influx’ and ‘displaced persons’. This category was called to life in response to the refugee crisis following the conflicts in former Yugoslavia and Kosovo in the 1990s. Temporary protection was created as an exceptional measure to relieve pressure from the standard asylum system in the event of “a mass influx or imminent mass influx of displaced persons from third-countries.” (Council of the EU, 2001, Art. 2b). However, since the activation of the temporary protection system is reliant on several provisions, based on solidarity between EU states, it has not been triggered so far. Nevertheless, the Directive on temporary protection is interesting as it has added a new label to the legal framework, namely ‘displaced persons’.

The overview of the labels in the legal framework has showed that there are many different labels to categorize migrants and refugees. There are labels that seem to refer exclusively to the realm of ‘economic migration’ or ‘labour migration’, such as ‘highly qualified persons’, ‘EU Blue Card holders’, ‘intra-corporate transferees’, ‘seasonal workers’, ‘students’, ‘researchers’, ‘trainees’, ‘au pairs’, etc. and there labels that refer to ‘Asylum’ or in more scholarly terms ‘forced migration’, such as ‘applicant for international protection’, ‘applicant with special reception needs’, ‘applicant in need of special procedural guarantees’, ‘vulnerable persons’, ‘displaced persons’, ‘persons eligible for subsidiary protection’, ‘refugees’ and ‘beneficiaries of international protection’. But there are also labels that float more in between ‘economic migration’ and ‘asylum’ or that encompass both, such as ‘long term residents’, ‘family members’, ‘unaccompanied minors’ and ‘illegally staying third-country nationals’.

4. Labels in the discourse of the European Commission

4.1. Node-sets in Nvivo reflecting the policy categories in the legal framework

In this chapter, I will investigate the use of labels in the discourse of the European Commission. To organise the labels from the discourse of the Commission, I have created several node-sets, reflecting the policy categories in the legal framework which was discussed above.

These node-sets are:

1. “Irregular Migration”: This node-set reflects the second policy category about Irregular Migration and contains all references to ‘illegally staying third country nationals’ and other labels that can be regarded as synonym to irregular migrants. For example: ‘irregular migrant’, ‘undocumented migrant’, ‘unauthorized migrant’, ‘persons not in need of protection’, …
2. "Asylum": This node-set reflects the policy on the CEAS and contains all references to applicants of international protection, recognized refugees, as well as other labels related to forced migration, such as the 'displaced persons' label under Temporary protection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicants</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum applicant(s)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum Application(s)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum claimants</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum claims</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum seekers</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries of international protection</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries of subsidiary protection</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internally Displaced Persons</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People seeking protection</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in need of international protection</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. "Migration": In contrast to node-sets 1 and 2, this node-set does not exactly reflect the first policy category about 'Legal Migration'. Instead this node contains all references to migrants, for whom there have been made no further specifications which would make them fall within node 1 (Irregular Migration) or 2 (Asylum). This means that this node contains all references to legal migration, as well as all references to some kind of movement that can count as migration. For example: 'migrant', 'people arriving in the EU', 'third-country national', 'border crossing', ...
Three general labels describing migrants stand out: ‘Migrants’, with 419 references, ‘Third-Country Nationals’ or Non-EU nationals, with 302 references and ‘People’ with 204 references. Proportionally, the ‘Migrant’ label is used most in the speeches by Commissioner Avramopoulos. In second place come the Communications by the European Commission (2015b; JOIN, 2017; 2015f; 2016a; 2015g; 2015a). ‘Third-country’ national is proportionally and in absolute number most frequently used in the Commission’s proposals (2015i; 2016e; 2106i) and Avramopoulos champions in the use of the word ‘people’, at least in relative numbers. The fact that Avramopoulos uses the terms ‘people’ or ‘migrants’ more often than ‘third country nationals’ might be explained by the fact that his audiences at external speeches are less technical and where the audience might not be as familiar with the term TCN. However, by rather using the labels ‘people’ and ‘migrants’, the language of Avramopoulos does not imply a hierarchy as the label TCN.

### 1.1. A proliferation of labels

The tables containing the different labels for each category (see above) demonstrate quite a proliferation of labels. However, in contrast to the many labels discussed under the legal framework these labels do not all reflect a separate category. Rather, most often they are just different names reflecting the same category. As is for example the case for ‘applicant for international protection’, or ‘applicant’ in short. Applicants are referred to as ‘asylum applicants’, ‘asylum claimants’, ‘asylum seekers’, ‘persons seeking protection’, and many other variations such as ‘those applying for asylum’, ‘those requesting international protection’, and so on. Unfortunately, the time frame of this paper has been too limited to investigate in which context, which wording is used.

As regards the labels pertaining to refugees, there is the general label “refugees”, which sometimes contains a reference to a status and sometimes is used as synonym to ‘forced migrants’. A label that can be considered synonym to refugee in its meaning of ‘forced migrants’, is ‘people in need of international protection’. The label referring to ‘refugee status’ is ‘beneficiaries of international protection’.

### 1.2. The Commission’s use of labels: (con)fusing or separating migrants and refugees?

The analysis in Nvivo showed that there were only a few references to economic migrants (search term “economic migrants”, “workers”), which were all made within the context of a policy on legal migration. Most references referred to highly skilled migrants as is showed in the word cloud.
From the analysis in Nvivo there were only eight references containing both a label related to asylum and the term "economic". However, none of these references pointed to a conflation of economic migrants and refugees. Instead, these references stressed the economic inclusion of refugees (although mostly pertaining to other countries) and even viewed refugees as potential important contributors to the EU's development, as is illustrated in the below citations:

“By contrast, ensuring refugees and internally displaced persons become economic contributors reduces their economic impacts and costs and contributes to growth, beneficial to both the displaced and their hosts. (JOIN, 2015, p.9).”

“In the case of Lebanon, those consist of an upgrade of basic services (waste management, water, education and health), as well as increased economic opportunities in Lebanon for both the Syrian refugees and the most vulnerable Lebanese communities. In exchange, the Lebanese government should make efforts on the social and economic inclusion of Syrian refugees (COM, 2016d, p.13)”

The fact that there is no conflation apparent between the categories ‘economic migrant’ and ‘refugee’, or between ‘economic migrant’ and any other label within the category of asylum might be explained by the fact the competences of the European Commission regarding admission of migrants and labour migration remain relatively weak. That said, it seems that the locus of conflation has changed to another set of labels, namely to those under the category ‘irregular migration’ and the category ‘asylum’. In the discourse of the European Commission, irregular migration is continuously linked to labels referring to asylum, such as ‘international protection’, ‘asylum claims’, ‘asylum system’. The following excerpts illustrate this linking of asylum to irregular migration.

“But by the same token, the EU needs to draw the consequences when migrants do not meet the criteria to stay. Unsuccessful asylum claimants who try to avoid return, visa overstayers, and migrants living in a permanent state of irregularity constitute a serious problem. This corrodes confidence in the system. It offers strong arguments for those looking to criticise or stigmatise migration. It makes it harder to integrate those migrants staying in the EU as of right. (COM, 2015a)”
The main criterion in practice for allocating responsibility for asylum claims is irregular entry through one Member State’s territory. Reliance on this criterion was based on the assumption that a linkage should be made between the allocation of responsibility in the field of asylum and the respect by Member States of their obligations in terms of protection of the external border. However, the ability to effectively control irregular inflows at the external border is to some extent dependent on cooperation with third countries. (COM, 2016b)

Returning irregular migrants not in need of international protection is a key component of EU migration policy. (COM, 2016a)

“Coming back to Greece: Greece has made significant progress under very difficult conditions to put in place a fully functioning asylum system over the last months. And I want to commend Greece for this. I am very satisfied to announce that today, we close the infringement procedures against Greece and Italy in relation to Eurodac. Indeed both countries have a near 100% fingerprinting rate for all irregular arrivals. (Avramopoulos, 2016L)"

“According to Frontex data, another important migration route into the EU in 2014 was the Western Balkan route with 43,357 irregular border crossings (15% of the EU total irregular border crossing). However, the majority of migrants using the Balkan route are not prima facie in need of international protection, with Kosovars accounting for 51% of the arrivals (COM, 2015c)"

The fact that irregular migration is so often linked to the category of asylum in the discourse, possibly results from the fact that the legal avenues for migration are very limited, as was mentioned in section 3.2. Therefore, all third-country nationals entering Europe without a prior visa or work-permit can in principle be considered to enter the EU irregularly. However, the danger of continuously pointing out the irregular form in which asylum seekers have to come to Europe, is that the focus turns to migration control instead of to the protection of people in vulnerable positions.

1.3. Elements reflecting a discourse of deservingness

There are several elements in the discourse of the European Commission reflecting a discourse of deservingness. The first is the usage of a label related to international protection that makes a similar moral demarcation as the labels ‘genuine’ and ‘bogus’ asylum seekers in the national discourses. This is the label ‘persons in CLEAR need of international protection’. 

“The proposal will include a temporary distribution scheme for persons in clear need of international protection to ensure a fair and balanced participation of all Member States. (COM, 2015a)"

“Relocation’ means a distribution among Member States of persons in clear need of international protection. (COM, 2015a)"

“None of the other Member States currently appear in an emergency situation like the one experienced by Italy and Greece with similar peaks in the numbers of irregular arrivals with a high proportion of persons in clear need of international protection, coupled with a serious vulnerability of their asylum systems. (COM, 2015b)"

“‘Resettlement’ means the transfer of individual displaced persons in clear need of international protection, on request of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (COM, 2016e)"

“It guarantees that, wherever they are in the EU, asylum seekers are treated in an equal and appropriate manner. It provides for the tools needed to ensure quick identification of persons in
This label is used especially often in context to temporary relocation or resettlement. The usage of the adjective ‘clear’ might be used from a motivation of expressing urgency or to stress the legitimacy of these particular migrants, but at the same time it implies that other people are ‘less’ in need of international protection, thus sowing doubt over their claims for protection. Also in the legal framework, the creation of categories of applicants with ‘special needs’ can foster a negative view on the legitimacy of ‘ordinary’ applicants.

A second element that can be linked to a discourse of deservingness is the imminent use of plural forms to describe migrants and refugees, and the frequent references to the amount of migrants with prepositions such as ‘numbers’, ‘mass’, ‘thousands’. The use of these prepositions emphasises the feeling of crisis as a constant pressure on our societies. They are used to stress the need for urgent measures but at the same time, the invocation of ‘crisis’ fits within a paradigm of securitization which can legitimate the use of extraordinary measures, measures that in ‘normal’ times would be more scrutinized.

Third, further research has to be on about the usage of ‘un-personal’ labels, conveying a certain action such as ‘arrivals’, ‘entries’, ‘crossings’ which are also redundantly present in the discourse of the Commission.

2. Conclusion

This paper sets out with a reference to the refugee crisis, which is still ongoing and which painfully demonstrates the insufficiency of the common European migration and asylum policy. However, the humanitarian disasters of the crisis have also triggered a sense of urgency creating a window of opportunity for the European Commission to propose further steps towards harmonisation, with a European Agenda on Migration. With this paper, I wanted to contribute to the broader debate about the Europeanisation of migration and the tension between the EU’s human rights commitments and the particular interests of the member states that often tend towards a security dimension. By focusing on the migration-asylum nexus in the policy of the EU and using a discursive approach centred around the use of labels, I wanted to investigate if the European Commission, and by extension the European Union, rather seeks to protect asylum seekers or in contrast tries to prevent their arrival.

The underlying assumption in this paper is that discourse and language not only serve to legitimate certain policies but also construct and transform ideas defining the policy interests. Categories and labels are never just neutral descriptors, they reflect and even exert power relations and serve hidden agendas. The theoretical framework in chapter one about the migration asylum nexus identified two problems related to the use of labels regarding migrants and refugees. The first is that (economic) migrants and refugees are often conflated in discourses of national policy makers. By pointing out the economic motives of a person requesting international protection, claims are being delegitimised. Labels such as ‘bogus’ and ‘genuine’ asylum seekers are used to make a moral distinction between migrants who are presumably only seeking economic gain and those migrants that are ‘really’ seeking protection. A second problem that was identified as part of the migration asylum nexus, is the proliferation and fractioning of labels. Here the issue was not so much that the label refugee was conflated with the label migrant, but rather that the creation and use of so called ‘in-between’ labels sealed off access the more privileged refugee status. Both of these processes regarding the use of labels in the migration-asylum nexus have contributed to the emergence of a so called ‘discourse of deservingness’ in the discourse of national governments.

By investigating the use of labels in both the legal framework of the European migration and asylum policy, as in the discourse of the European Commission in its response to the refugee crisis, I wanted to find out if
this discourse of deservingness has renegaded to the European level. In how far are migrants and refugees distinguished or conflated and what does this teach us about the 'wanted' and 'unwanted' categories of migrants? Is there a moral distinction between certain labels or categories? And does the use of labels place attention on humanitarian considerations or rather on migration control?

The first conclusion that I can draw from my research and analysis is that the conflation of economic migrants and refugees has not yet affected the discourse of the European Commission or the European migration and asylum policy in general. The analysis in Nvivo showed that there were only a few references to economic migrants, and these were all made within the context of a policy on legal migration. There were no mentions of labels such as ‘economic refugees’, ‘economic asylum seekers’. However, while the labels ‘migrants’ and ‘refugees’ are kept neatly separated, conflation has changed its locus to two other categories within the migration and asylum policy. The continuous linking of asylum seekers with irregular migration shifts the focus from the need to protect to migration control.

A second conclusion regards the proliferation of labels in both the legal framework as in the discourse of the Commission. Both the legal framework as the discourse of the Commission demonstrates a considerable amount of labels to describe migrants and refugees. Although, the different labels in the legal framework usually refer to a specifically defined category, the labels in the discourse are often synonyms referring to the same category. The proliferation in the legal framework gives an indication of the wanted and unwanted categories of migrants (the more fractioned, the narrower the categories, the more desired they are). For example, very narrow definitions for ‘highly-skilled persons’ or ‘Intra-corporate transferees’, very broad definition for ‘irregular migrants’ and few labels designating ‘family members. In contrast, the proliferation in the discourse rather demonstrates more vague boundaries certain label such as ‘refugees’ – ‘persons in need of protection’ – ‘asylum seekers’.

Last, I can conclude that there has indeed seeped in some elements of the discourse of deservingness. The label ‘third-country national’ is most prominently reflecting a hierarchy and the inequalities intrinsic to the design of the European migration policy framework. Apart from this general label, there is one particular label related to international protection, present in the discourse of the commission that makes a similar moral demarcation as the labels ‘genuine’ and ‘bogus’ asylum seekers in the national discourses. This is the label ‘persons in CLEAR need of international protection’. The usage of the adjective ‘clear’ might be used from a motivation of expressing urgency or to stress the legitimacy of these particular migrants, but at the same time it implies that other people are ‘less’ in need of international protection, thus sowing doubt over their claims for protection. Also in the legal framework, the creation of categories of applicants with ‘special needs’ can foster a negative view on the legitimacy of ‘ordinary’ applicants. A third element that can be linked to a discourse of deservingness is the imminent use of plural forms to describe migrants and refugees, and the frequent references to the amount of migrants with prepositions such as ‘numbers’, ‘mass’, ‘thousands’. The use of these prepositions emphasises the feeling of crisis as a constant pressure on our societies. They are used to stress the need for urgent measures but at the same time, the invocation of ‘crisis’ fits within a paradigm of securitization which can legitimate the use of extraordinary measures, measures that in ‘normal’ times would be more scrutinized.
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## Annex I. Overview of European Migration & Asylum Policy Categories & Labels

### 1. Legal Migration & Integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy sub-category</th>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour Migration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- High Skilled Migration (EU Blue Card)</td>
<td>Directive 2004/38/EC</td>
<td>Highly qualified person</td>
<td>A person who — in the Member State concerned, is protected as an employee under national employment law and/or in accordance with national practice, irrespective of the legal relationship, for the purpose of exercising genuine and effective work for, or under the direction of, someone else, — is paid, and, — has the required adequate and specific competence, as proven by higher professional qualifications (Art. 2b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EU Blue Card (holder)</td>
<td>The authorisation bearing the term “EU Blue Card” entitling its holder to reside and work in the territory of a Member State under the terms of this Directive. (Art. 2c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Seasonal Work</td>
<td>Directive 2014/32/EU</td>
<td>Seasonal worker</td>
<td>A third-country national who retains his or her principal place of residence in a third country and stays legally and temporarily in the territory of a Member State to carry out an activity dependent on the passing of the seasons, under one or more fixed-term work contracts concluded directly between that third-country national and the employer established in that Member State (Art. 3b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Intra-Corporate Transfers</td>
<td>Directive 2014/32/EU</td>
<td>Intra-corporate transferee (ICT)</td>
<td>Any third-country national who resides outside the territory of the Member States at the time of application for an intra-corporate transferee permit and who is subject to an intra-corporate transfer (Art. 3c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intra-corporate transferee permit (holder)</td>
<td>An authorisation bearing the acronym “ICT” entitling its holder to reside and work in the territory of the first Member State and, where applicable, of second Member States, under the terms of this Directive. (Art. 3i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Single Permit</td>
<td>Directive 2011/95/EU</td>
<td>Third-country worker</td>
<td>A third-country national who has been admitted to the territory of a Member State and who is legally residing and is allowed to work in the context of a paid relationship in that Member State in accordance with national law or practice. (Art. 2b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>A third country national residing lawfully in a Member State and applying or whose family members apply for family reunification to be joined with him/her. (Art. 2c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family members</td>
<td>(a) the sponsor’s spouse; (b) the minor children of the sponsor and of his/her spouse, including children adopted in accordance with a decision taken by the competent authority in the Member State concerned or a decision which is automatically enforceable due to international obligations of that Member State or must be recognised in accordance with international obligations; (c) the minor children including adopted children of the sponsor where the sponsor has custody and the children are dependent on him or her. Member States may authorise the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study &amp; Research</td>
<td>Directive (EU)2016/801</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>'researcher' means a third-country national who holds a doctoral degree or an appropriate higher education qualification which gives that third-country national access to doctoral programmes, who is selected by a research organisation and admitted to the territory of a Member State for carrying out a research activity for which such qualification is normally required. (Art. 3.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>A third-country national who has been accepted by a higher education institution and is admitted to the territory of a Member State to pursue a main activity a full-time course of study leading to a higher education qualification recognised by that Member State, including diplomas, certificates or doctoral degrees in a higher education institution, which may cover a preparatory course prior to such education, in accordance with national law, or compulsory training. (Art. 3.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School pupil</td>
<td>A third-country national who is admitted to the territory of a Member State to follow a recognised, state or regional programme of secondary education equivalent to level 2 or 3 of the International Standard Classification of Education, in the context of a pupil exchange scheme or educational project operated by an education establishment in accordance with national law or administrative practice. (Art. 3.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee</td>
<td>A third-country national who holds a degree of higher education or is pursuing a course of study in a third country that leads to a higher education degree and who is admitted to the territory of a Member State for a training programme for the purpose of gaining knowledge, practice and experience in a professional environment. (Art. 3.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>A third-country national who is admitted to the territory of a Member State to participate in a voluntary service scheme (Art. 3.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Au pair</td>
<td>A third-country national who is admitted to the territory of a Member State to be temporarily received by a family in order to improve his or her linguistic skills and knowledge of the Member State concerned in exchange for light housework and taking care of children. (Art. 3.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Irregular Migration & Return

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy sub-category</th>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Smuggling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
--- (Defining Migrant Smuggling) Directive 2002/58/EC
--- (Strengthening the penal framework) Directive 2002/94/EC/4A
--- Sanctions against employers of illegally staying TCN’s Directive 2009/52/EC Illegally staying third-country national A third-country national present on the territory of a Member State, who does not fulfil, or no longer fulfils, the conditions for stay or residence in that Member State. (Art. 2b)
--- Council decisions on the conclusion of the UN Protocol against migrant smuggling 2006/519/EC 2008/170/EC Illegal entry Crossing borders without complying with the necessary requirements for legal entry into the receiving State: (Annex I, Art. 3b)

Return & Readmission
--- Return Directive 2008/115/EC Illegal stay The presence on the territory of a Member State, of a third-country national who does not fulfil, or no longer fulfils the conditions of entry as set out in Article 5 of the Schengen Borders Code or other conditions for entry, stay or residence in that Member State: (Art. 3.2)
Vulnerable persons minors, unaccompanied minors, disabled people, elderly people, pregnant women, single parents with minor children and persons who have been subjected to torture, rape or other serious forms of psychological, physical or sexual violence. (Art. 3.3)

--- Readmission

### 3. Common European Asylum System (CEAS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy sub-category</th>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identification of applicants (EURODAC)</strong></td>
<td>Regulation No 563/2013</td>
<td>Applicant for international protection</td>
<td>A third country national or a stateless person who has made an application for international protection as defined in Article 2(h) of Directive 2011/95/EU in respect of which a final decision has not yet been taken. (Art. 2a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beneficiary of international protection</strong></td>
<td>Regulation No 564/2013 (Dublin III)</td>
<td>Beneficiary of international protection</td>
<td>A third country national or a stateless person who has been granted international protection as defined in Article 2(a) of Directive 2011/95/EU. (Art. 2c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country responsible for asylum application (Dublin)</strong></td>
<td>Regulation No 564/2013 (Dublin III)</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>A third-country national or a stateless person who has made an application for international protection in respect of which a final decision has not yet been taken. (Art. 2c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application for international protection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Application for international protection</td>
<td>An application for international protection as defined in Article 2(h) of Directive 2011/95/EU. (Art. 2b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beneficiary of international protection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A third country national or a stateless person who has been granted international protection as defined in Article 2(a) of Directive 2011/95/EU. (Art. 2f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Insofar as the family already existed in the country of origin, the following members of the applicant’s family who are present on the territory of the Member States: — the spouse of the applicant or his or her unmarried partner in a stable relationship, where the law or practice of the Member State concerned treats unmarried couples in a way comparable to married couples under its law relating to third-country nationals, — the minor children of couples referred to in the first indent or of the applicant, on condition that they are unmarried and regardless of whether they were born in or out of wedlock or adopted as defined under national law, — when the applicant is a minor and unmarried, the father, mother or another adult responsible for the applicant, whether by law or by the practice of the Member State where the adult is present,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception conditions</td>
<td>Directive 2013/33/EU</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>A third-country national or a stateless person who has made an application for international protection in respect of which a final decision has not yet been taken. (Art. 2b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application for international protection</td>
<td>Directive 2013/33/EU</td>
<td>Application for international protection</td>
<td>An application for international protection as defined in Article 2(h) of Directive 2011/95/EU. (Art. 2a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Family members | | Family members | In so far as the family already existed in the country of origin, the following members of the applicant's family who are present in the same Member State in relation to the application for international protection:
— the spouse of the applicant or his or her unmarried partner in a stable relationship, where the law or practice of the Member State concerned treats unmarried couples in a way comparable to married couples under its law relating to third-country nationals;
— the minor children of couples referred to in the first indent or of the applicant, on condition that they are unmarried and regardless of whether they were born in or out of wedlock or adopted as defined under national law;
— the father, mother or another adult responsible for the applicant whether by law or by the practice of the Member State concerned, when that applicant is a minor and unmarried. (Art. 2c) |
<p>| Minor | | Minor | A third-country national or stateless person below the age of 18 years. (Art. 2d) |
| Unaccompanied minor | | Application with special reception needs | A vulnerable person, in accordance with Article 21, who is in need of special guarantees in order to benefit from the rights and comply with the obligations provided for in this Directive. (Art. 2e) |
| Vulnerable persons | | Vulnerable persons | Minors, unaccompanied minors, disabled people, elderly people, pregnant women, single parents with minor children, victims of human trafficking, persons with serious illnesses, persons with mental disorders and persons who have been subjected to torture, rape or other serious forms of psychological, physical or sexual violence, such as victims of female genital mutilation. (Art. 2f) |
| Asylum Procedures | Directive 2013/32/EU | Application for international protection | A request made by a third-country national or a stateless person for protection from a Member State, who can be understood to seek refugee status or subsidiary protection status, and who does not explicitly request another kind of protection outside the scope of Directive 2011/95/EU, that can be applied for separately. (Art. 2b) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who qualifies for international protection</th>
<th>Directive 2011/95/EU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant</strong></td>
<td>A third-country national or stateless person who has made an application for international protection in respect of which a final decision has not yet been taken. (Art. 2c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant in need of special procedural guarantees</strong></td>
<td>An applicant whose ability to benefit from the rights and comply with the obligations provided for in this Directive is limited due to individual circumstances. (Art. 2d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refugee</strong></td>
<td>A third-country national or a stateless person who fulfills the requirements of Article 2(d) of Directive 2011/95/EU. (Art. 2g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Person eligible for subsidiary protection</strong></td>
<td>A third-country national or a stateless person who fulfills the requirements of Article 2(f) of Directive 2011/95/EU (Art. 2h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International protection</strong></td>
<td>Refugee status and subsidiary protection status as defined in points (j) and (k). (Art. 2l)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refugee status</strong></td>
<td>The recognition by a Member State of a third-country national or a stateless person as a refugee. (Art. 2j)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subsidiary protection status</strong></td>
<td>The recognition by a Member State of a third-country national or a stateless person as a person eligible for subsidiary protection. (Art. 2k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minor</strong></td>
<td>A third-country national or a stateless person below the age of 18 years. (Art. 2l)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unaccompanied minor</strong></td>
<td>An unaccompanied minor as defined in Article 2(l) of Directive 2011/95/EU. (Art. 2m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beneficiary of international protection</strong></td>
<td>Refugee status and subsidiary protection status as defined in points (e) and (g). (Art. 2a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refugee</strong></td>
<td>A person who has been granted refugee status or subsidiary protection status as defined in points (e) and (g). (Art. 2b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refugee status</strong></td>
<td>The recognition by a Member State of a third-country national or a stateless person as a refugee. (Art. 2e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Person eligible for subsidiary protection</strong></td>
<td>A third-country national or a stateless person who does not qualify as a refugee but in respect of whom substantial grounds have been shown for believing that the person concerned, if returned to his or her country of origin, or in the case of a stateless person, to his or her country of former habitual residence, would face a real risk of suffering serious harm as defined in Article 15, and to whom Article 17(1) and (2) does not apply, is unable or, owing to such fear, unwilling to avail himself or herself of the protection of that country. (Art. 2f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subsidiary protection status</strong></td>
<td>The recognition by a Member State of a third-country national or a stateless person as a person eligible for subsidiary protection. (Art. 2g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application for international protection</td>
<td>A request made by a third-country national or a stateless person for protection from a Member State, who can be understood to seek refugee status or subsidiary protection status, and who does not explicitly request another kind of protection, outside the scope of this Directive, that can be applied for separately. (Art. 2h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>A third-country national or a stateless person who has made an application for international protection in respect of which a final decision has not yet been taken. (Art. 2i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members</td>
<td>In so far as the family already existed in the country of origin, the following members of the family of the beneficiary of international protection who are present in the same Member State in relation to the application for international protection: — the spouse of the beneficiary of international protection or his or her unmarried partner in a stable relationship, where the law or practice of the Member State concerned treats unmarried couples in a way comparable to married couples under its law relating to third-country nationals, — the minor children of the couples referred to in the first indent or of the beneficiary of international protection, on condition that they are unmarried and regardless of whether they were born in or out of wedlock or adopted as defined under national law, — the father, mother or another adult responsible for the beneficiary of international protection whether by law or by the practice of the Member State concerned, when that beneficiary is a minor and unmarried; (Art. 2j)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>A third-country national or stateless person below the age of 18 year. (Art. 2k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaccompanied minor</td>
<td>A minor who arrives on the territory of the Member States unaccompanied by an adult responsible for him or her whether by law or by the practice of the Member State concerned, and for as long as he or she is not effectively taken into the care of such a person; it includes a minor who is left unaccompanied after he or she has entered the territory of the Member States. (Art. 2l)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary protection</td>
<td>A procedure of exceptional character to provide, in the event of a mass influx or imminent mass influx of displaced persons from third countries who are unable to return to their country of origin, immediate and temporary protection to such persons, in particular if there is also a risk that the asylum system will be unable to process this influx without adverse effects for its efficient operation, in the interests of the persons concerned and other persons requesting protection. (Art. 2a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displaced persons</td>
<td>Third-country nationals or stateless persons who have had to leave their country or region of origin, or have been evacuated, in particular in response to an appeal by international organisations, and are unable to return in safe and durable conditions because of the situation prevailing in that country, who may fall within the scope of Article 1A of the Geneva Convention or other international or national instruments giving international protection, in particular: (i) persons who have fled areas of armed conflict or endemic violence; (ii) persons at serious risk of, or who have been the victims of, systematic or generalised violations of their human rights; (Art. 2c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass influx</td>
<td>Arrival in the Community of a large number of displaced persons, who come from a specific country or geographical area, whether their arrival in the Community was spontaneous or aided, for example through an evacuation programme. (Art. 2d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees</td>
<td>Third-country nationals or stateless persons within the meaning of Article 1A of the Geneva Convention. (Art. 2e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unaccompanied minors</strong></td>
<td>Third-country nationals or stateless persons below the age of eighteen, who arrive on the territory of the Member States unaccompanied by an adult responsible for them whether by law or custom, and for as long as they are not effectively taken into the care of such a person, or minors who are left unaccompanied after they have entered the territory of the Member States. (Art. 2f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sponsor</strong></td>
<td>A third-country national enjoying temporary protection in a Member State in accordance with a decision taken under Article 5 and who wants to be joined by members of his or her family. (Art. 2h)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Schengen, Borders & Visas**

- (Schengen area)
- (Border crossing)
- (Smart borders)
- (Visa policy)
- (Visa Information System (VIS))
- (Schengen Information System (SIS))
- (Document Security)

* This overview is not exhaustive, but a selection of in force legislation that contains references to migrants & refugees.
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