

## PANELISTS DEBATE

### Sean CLEARY

Thank you, Jim. Let me circle back with one question to each of you, but please restrict yourself to answering this question because I do want to open the discussion to the floor. Apart from anything else, everyone on the platform is on the receiving end of migrant flows. There are people in the audience who are on the delivery end of migrant flows, and I think it is important to bring that dimension into the discussion as well.

Let me ask you this question. Jean-Francois started, I thought, with a very important observation. From the perspective of Europe – Jim has perhaps broadened that to the perspective of democracies – we have to find a collective solution to the problem. There has to be a *European solution* to the challenge of migration, which challenge will grow for the demographic reasons we've described and the realities of the world. We have to find a European solution that, however, takes account of individual national circumstance within Europe. In the context of the United States, there has to be a US solution that takes account of the reality of its neighbourhood as well. We cannot have polarisation and division destroying the fabric of society and undermining the validity of demographic institutions. What do you think the key elements of a common solution would be to this challenge?

### Jean-Francois COPE

I think the first one could be to see what we can imagine as a European governance. The main problem that we do have to face today is that we have huge difficulties in finding a common path or the interests today of the member states are not aligned on this question. We know that there is a danger for democracies. Of course, we see the rise of the extremists from the right wing and the left wing. Sometimes, as in Italy, they are able to unify themselves as a coalition of interests, not a coalition of ideas, which is why we are all worrying about what is going on in Italy. This is because the traditional governing parties are not able today to find what could be a European governance.

Second, we have to take into account the fact that we cannot always point at the European Union as a scapegoat. Usually, the major part of the decisions could be made by the state members. The reality is here: many of these problems of immigration have to be faced and addressed inside our own countries. My hope is that after the European elections next June, we will be fed up with the opposition between Mr Orbán and Mr Macron and try to come back to a rational analysis. Maybe we can try to convince Mr Macron to get into the popular European party, which would simplify the debate and make sure that we are able to find a common path.

My third point is that there is no solution about immigration issues if we do not increase the contribution to the development of countries that need it today. Of course, we have to monitor it, to share experience with countries from North Africa, even if Morocco is a remarkable model of this kind of cooperation, but also countries in Sub-Saharan Africa. We heard the Prime Minister of the Ivory Coast this morning. There have been remarkable experiences in Africa. We have to be beside them because we have the tradition, the culture, the common points to do it with them and this is a fantastic opportunity.

### Sean CLEARY

Thank you, Jean-Francois. László, how much of that resonates with you?

### László TRÓCSÁNYI

Thank you very much. I think that we need to make a distinction between the words “refugee” and “migrant”. Today, there is confusion between the two, since both are migrating, but as a lawyer, I prefer when migrants are distinguished from refugees. In Europe, there are international treaties that we must comply with: the Geneva Convention, the Dublin Convention - it is clear so far. Migration is another matter. Politicians often talk about these two words together. For me, personally, it is very important to distinguish between the two notions.



As far as refugees are concerned, it is clear that there is a need for a common agreement. We must dialogue, dialogue, dialogue and again dialogue until a solution is found. Of course, we have not managed to turn all the ideas we had into reality. The quota system is dead in fact because we know very well that people prefer to live in Germany or Sweden, rather than in Romania, Bulgaria or Hungary, etc. That is why there were efforts on the part of the Heads of State and Prime Ministers, but in the end their attempts did not succeed.

Is there only one type of solidarity or do Member States show different forms of solidarity? Do we give Member States some flexibility in how they respond, when it comes to migration? I fully agree with Mr Copé that we need to go on-site, we need to help on the ground, and we need to organise different meetings; this is essential, in my view. Let me talk about my personal case: as a university professor, I have 60 students from West Africa, Senegal, Togo, etc., and they speak French perfectly. The different types of solidarity must be organised in different ways.

It is also a matter of solidarity to protect a country which lies on one of the external borders of the European Union, and thus offers protection, and helps to pay for it. I think that's very important.

Let me add two more words about populism. Hungary has often been labelled populist, which is why I think I need to speak out on this subject. When Mr. Giscard d'Estaing told Mr. Mitterrand that he did not have a monopoly on the heart, it means that we must also be very careful when we talk about populism. When someone has another idea, another vision and wants to participate in the dialogue, that person is often labelled populist. That is why I'm very careful, because the notion of populism has become so broad today that everyone can become populist at some point if they don't agree with something. I see dialogue as very important; it is the only thing I believe in: dialogue with the different States, with Hungary, with Poland, and with the other countries.

I think that as regards migration - does a country want to welcome migrants, not refugees, but migrants? - I think we must give freedom to the States.

### **Bogdan KLICH**

The answer to your question is very simple, but also very challenging. The answer is that we need more solidarity. Solidarity and again solidarity is the only idea that by implementing we can defend our values, those values that are not only written and incorporated into the treaties. It is important to remember that the European Union in Article 2 of the Lisbon Treaty, has a list of those values, as well as the Washington Treaty that is still the base of the alliance, has the list of those values in the preamble of that short treaty. This is the rule of law. This is the respect for human rights and civil liberties, democracy and free markets, etc. We know what we should defend, but we need more international solidarity to defend those values in those countries where they are threatened right now and that could be threatened in the future.

As for the European Union, because the answer of the European Union is absolutely crucial for itself and for the future of Europe, I would recommend using existing tools, like PESCO as we were talking about in Marrakech last year. Fortunately, there was a good decision to introduce PESCO as one of the tools of the European Union, which existed for years but was not introduced before. It is also necessary to create a new asylum policy and reinforce the control of the borders of the European Union with much deeper and reinforced involvement of the Frontex agency. It is also absolutely crucial to reinforce the neighbourhood policy, not only in the southern but also the eastern dimension. How could the neighbourhood policy exist for years when it had at its disposal only EUR 10.2 billion? It has to be financially reinforced in the new multi-annual perspective of the European Union.

Finally, I would say we should fight together against those who dismantle the system of checks and balances, as well as the respect for human and civil rights.

### **Sean CLEARY**

Thank you very much indeed. Jim, you have the last word until we turn to the audience.

### **Jim HOAGLAND**



Sean, being a "*francophile notoire*", my answer is divided into three parts. The first part is to begin to treat this migration problem as having important, substantial economic factors involved. In the first place, recognise that shrinking populations mean that immigration is a way to replenish the workforce, rather than pretending that you can make yourself great again without people, by shutting off immigration, which is the primary source of population growth in the United States right now. The economic problem also extends to not messing up the world's trade system, which has brought so many people out of poverty, because the more you can get people to earn their livings where they are now, the less likely they are to leave and try to come to other places. We need an economic approach to this.

We also need to treat migration as a humanitarian crisis, not a problem but a crisis, because it is at crisis stage now. Much of what we hear tends to not treat it with the urgency it demands.

The third and final point I would make is that we need to acknowledge honestly, our politicians need to acknowledge honestly, the cultural differences, the cultural and social problems that immigration or migration creates and to stop exploiting migration for the purpose of dividing people and making people afraid.