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FOREWORD

Why a Study on Migration in Europe?

Migration and its effects on the changing ecclesial landscape are the core topics of the World Council of Churches’ project developed after the Porto Alegre Assembly in 2006. In developing this project, a closer look into the reality of migration today and exchange on the challenges and chances of migration and its effects on Churches and more generally the ecclesial landscape have been foreseen. In the framework of the WCC project the Churches’ Commission for Migrants in Europe has been requested to undertake a study on migration in Europe. Jointly with the staff team at the WCC, the CCME Executive Committee and staff have identified the scope and objectives of this study. CCME is grateful to the support provided by the WCC to undertake this study and hopes that the study will contribute to fruitful exchange and cooperation on migration.

CCME is grateful to the cooperation of the Nova Research Centre in Gloucester, UK and its Director Darrell Jackson in this study project. His knowledge and research capacity has greatly contributed to undertaking this study together with Alessia Passarelli, Research and Project Assistant with CCME. Both of them have done a tremendous job to compile existing information as well as to contact Churches all over Europe to identify more scattered information in an extremely short time span and under considerable pressure. We owe them thanks also for responding to challenging questions and requests by the reference group of WCC and CCME.

Migration in a globalised world

Migration is high on the political agenda – and yet it is as old as humankind. The challenges related to migration are manifold: As travel and communication have become more accessible and easy, migration today – except for forced migration due to persecution or conflict - is no longer the decision for a life-time, more often persons move to an other country for a period of time, return or move on to an other. These new trends have been well described in the report of the Global Commission on Migration in 2005. And yet, migration policies throughout the globe seem to follow the known paths of “old” migration patterns as if people were migrating for good. The terminology of migration studies still speaks of push and pull factors and migration flows while in many countries diverse societies exist already and people live a rather trans-national life: Brothers and sisters, parents and other family members live in different countries and settings, industry and service providers produce and trade globally – and so highly flexible and adaptable persons move, work and live beyond borders as well.

Migration in Europe

Within Europe, since the mid-80s particularly in the European Union, freedom of movement beyond national borders is of specific value laid down in the Treaty of the European Union for the citizens of European Union Member States, and it has become much easier to reside and work in an other EU Member States, to move back or on to an other1.

And yet, at the same time migration is perceived as a problem in most European countries. There are challenges in societies like language and communication barriers, separation or reunification of families, cultural and religious diversity, habits and traditions of newcomers and settled persons. The challenges of migration are generally better know than the positive sides of migration, fears of migration determine policy development in the field of migration rather than the joys of success stories of persons who improved their lives and contributed to social and economic development of societies. Balancing views on migration, tackling the problems and develop adequate responses are indeed challenges ahead of us in Europe as well as in other regions of the world.

Migration and the Churches

Migration contributes to a more diverse Christian presence in Europe as well as to a more diverse religious landscape in many countries. Through migration minority Churches in some countries grow like the Protestant Churches in Italy and Ireland, the Roman Catholic Church in Sweden or the Orthodox Churches in France. Independent and Pentecostal Churches, different language congregations of various denominations can be found in most of the

1 Restrictions to the right to freedom of movement and residence still apply to 10 new of the 27 EU Member States.
European capitals and bigger cities. Currently no clear overview is available, in some countries fora or structures for black and migrant Churches have been developed, in others there are difficulties to officially register.

The study “Mapping Migration in Europe – Mapping Churches’ Responses” attempts to provide information on actual immigration and emigration figures for 47 European countries, and seeks to identify the diversity of Christian presence. However, as the authors will point out on various places, this study is not complete and cannot give all the indications which would be desirable. A more lengthy and better resourced research project would be necessary – and in our view desirable – to achieve that. However, we would hope that the indications will inspire Churches and related agencies to have a closer look and undertake research themselves. We also hope that the study will inspire Churches across Europe to exchange and cooperate more on the relevant topics on migration.

In many if not all European countries Churches provide services for migrants and refugees following the message of the Bible which insists on the dignity of every human being. The strangers are welcomed, and persons in need of protection are provided with shelter. Many congregations assist migrants in need regardless of and not asking for their status. “And if a stranger dwells with you in your land, you shall not mistreat him. The strangers who dwell among you shall be to you as one born among you.” (Leviticus 19:33-34)

We sincerely hope that this study will contribute to better understanding migration and diversity in European societies and developing adequate responses and finding appropriate structures for ecumenical fellowship.

Doris Peschke
General Secretary of the Churches’ Commission for Migrants in Europe

INTRODUCTION

1. WHAT WE CLAIM FOR THE SCOPE, CONTENT, AND NATURE OF THIS REPORT AND THE RESEARCH IT CONTAINS

The two authors of this report are trained in different academic disciplines. One is a missiologist, the other an anthropologist. These have influenced the way that we have worked together and the different perspectives that we have brought to our common task. Both of us, however, have a commitment to seeing our respective disciplines serve the Churches in Europe in the challenge of better understanding and responding to the contemporary phenomenon of migration in Europe.

In the space of a mere six months we have amassed large amounts of information. The nature of the information varies widely and bringing it together into a coherent pattern has required careful judgment as to relevance and reliability. Some of it is contradictory, even where Governmental Agencies or International Organisations and NGOs are the source(s). Some of it is surprisingly detailed and provides more information than can be accurately presented in the scope of a two-page country profile.

Careful readers will notice that we have relied upon the World Christian Database (WCD) and the related and earlier World Christian Encyclopaedia (WCE) for religious demographics even where in some cases this means that we are using older demographic data. Whilst their figures can certainly be disputed and locally published data, where it exists, is often more reliable, the WCD offers religious demographical data for every country in Europe. No other agency provides this level or scope of coverage. The WCD is published by Brill University in the Netherlands and the WCE was published by Oxford University Press.

Our choice of data source allows for a slightly more careful comparison across the range of countries we
have surveyed and enable a judgment to be made about the accuracy of the data in those instances where we have acknowledged the source. At the end of the country profile section we have mentioned the source from which we have taken our information. In addition we have listed in Appendix One some of the tabulations from which we have drawn our statistical data.

The informed reader is likely to discover in these pages a compilation of material with which they may already be familiar. We are only partially apologetic about this fact. Our attempt has been to write a report that will inform as wide an audience as possible about migration in contemporary Europe. It has often been claimed that migration is one of the most challenging of subjects to research. It is a complex and rapidly changing area of investigation and much of it tends to operate below the so-called ‘radar screen’ of official census and data collecting activity. It has been equally challenging for us in the attempt to collate much of the data we are presenting and representing here. In many instances we are standing on the shoulders of others. Where we do this we acknowledge gladly their contribution to the field of empirical migration studies. We are also modestly aware that some of the information presented here will be unfamiliar even to those with an interest in the themes of migration and migrant people. This is because there are very few other such publications written for a religiously-committed audience that have attempted to offer a European-wide survey.

What then is the benefit of a report such as this one? We believe that this report is unique in certain respects. It collates and presents in a concise form, migration information that is only available across a wide range of Governmental reports, NGO publications, databases, websites, and of course the offices of Church representatives with the responsibility for migration and migrant people. This information is presented in the form of a two-page ‘Country Profile’ for each one of the States in membership of the Council of Europe with the addition of Belarus. There are gaps in our knowledge base and we warmly invite the contribution of others to what we believe is a project that will continue beyond the life of this present publication.

As our work has progressed we have become aware of the fact that a number of the Christian Churches and their respective migration agencies do not have easy access to the type of statistical information that they need in order to make strategic decisions about their response to the migratory movement of human beings across our continent. Our research enquiry has prompted more than one national leader to reply that, “we really do need to do something about that here.” Other, often hard-pressed national officers who may otherwise feel that their careful work is not being taken seriously, have commented, “we’re really glad that you’re doing this work because we’re not sure how to use what we have already discovered in any arena beyond our national setting.” Clearly, there is much more that could be done. If this report signals anything, it shows that there is a need for ongoing work in this area.

The authors of this report are keen to hear from Agencies, Churches, and Church Councils that feel that they are engaged in work that is directly related to the theme of this report, particularly where it helps to build our collective knowledge of the Churches’ responses to migration in Europe. We have tried to be as extensive in our research as possible but there have been limitations to what we have been able to achieve within the scope of this research. You may feel that your programme or work has been overlooked. We are sorry that you may have been left out but we hope you will feel able to contact either the Nova Research Centre or the Churches’ Commission for Migrants in Europe at the addresses given in this report. The Nova Research Centre will shortly be hosting some of this report’s data on its European Mission Database and you are invited to submit further information by email. This will enable us to update an electronic version of the report regularly.

---

2. SOME OF THE METHODOLOGICAL AND IDEOLOGICAL OBSTACLES TO COLLECTING INFORMATION ABOUT MIGRATION

a. Methodological challenges to data collection and analysis

In a few European countries, migration data is simply not available. In other countries where a Governmental agency is providing the data, the sources are not always as reliable as one might expect. The rapidly changing nature of migration is largely responsible for this. In other cases, the methods of sampling, upon which migrant population
projections are made, have not kept pace with more recent developments in migration routes, patterns or trends. In the United Kingdom, the sampling method initially failed to recognize that low-cost airlines were providing many new entry points to the UK. In some instances, the migrant people in question may prefer to remain invisible to official methods of counting them. This leads one academic with an interest in migration studies to suggest, somewhat provocatively, that whatever one reads or hears about migration is a lie! Whether his statement is true or not, it is obvious to anybody with an interest in this area that absolute accuracy and reliability cannot be guaranteed.

For the central, or regional, offices of a national Church, the challenge is even greater. Few Church headquarters have the necessary research resources to conduct full-scale statistical research and even then they are only likely to have an interest in congregations that relate to their own particular tradition. This does not help the fragmented nature of the knowledge and information available to the Churches in Europe. Other practical limitations include limited access to some groups due to suspicion, gender issues, and language differences. Whereas it might be possible to estimate the Christian strength of a particular migrant population in a country, it is quite another thing to translate this into attendance at one congregation or another. In some instances the migrant may choose to join the congregation of an indigenous Church. In other cases, he or she may join or help to establish an independent congregation. In both cases, visibility can be problematic when it comes to trying to quantify the size of the religiously active, migrant Christian population. National Church census counts may overlook migrant members of local congregations or parishes whereas an independent migrant Church may well be overlooked and in fact may not last long enough to be counted in any national census of Churches. In some European countries, registration of Churches is required. For a variety of reasons, some migrant Churches may remain unregistered. Of course, a further point must be made; in some instances the migrant Christian may take the advantage of new-found freedoms in the host country and simply opt out of church attendance altogether.

In other cases, it is clear that deciding who may be described as a ‘migrant’ varies according to country and situation. In countries where migrants may take up residency or citizenship after five years, must these people continue to be counted as ‘migrant Christians’? In some countries the term ‘ethnic minority’ Churches is used to refer to congregations that have had a long-term presence beyond the first or even second generation. Some find this description inaccurate and may prefer to talk of ‘diaspora Churches’. The variety of ways that people use apparently similar definitions and descriptions means that pan-European comparisons become quite difficult to make.

b. Other challenges to statistical data analysis

In addition to methodological challenges, some countries are hesitant about collecting ethnic or religious data. This may be due to real or perceived sensitivities on the part of the target population being sampled. Alternatively, the sensitivity may be on the part of the Government that would prefer that the migrant population remain uncounted (and normally underestimated). The publication of ethnic data may not always be seen to be in the best interests of the Government. In at least one instance the authors were presented with anecdotal evidence of refugee numbers being over-counted in order to generate increased financial support for the authorities running the refugee centre.

In some instances there are examples of non-indigenous Churches whose members worship in a common European language which is not that of the host country and which describe themselves as ‘international’ Churches rather than ‘migrant’ Churches. A decision must then be taken as to whether to include these Churches in a count of migrant congregations in Europe. The challenge is compounded further by the presence of historic Churches located in a country traditionally outside of the usual national or regional territory (the Church of Scotland Presbytery of Europe, for example, or the European Baptist Convention). In these cases, congregations may prefer the term ‘expatriate’ to describe themselves. The variety of ways in which Churches describe themselves makes data collection and comparison all the more challenging.
CHAPTER ONE: DESCRIBING MIGRATION IN EUROPE

1. TALKING ABOUT MIGRANTS: ATTEMPTING TO DEFINE MIGRANT PEOPLE IN EUROPE

a. ‘Migration’ and ‘migrant’

Migration is not a recent phenomenon. For centuries, people have moved across borders for economic, personal, and political reasons. Migration profoundly affects every European country and the lives of its citizens. Migration can be understood as a movement of a person, or persons, from one place to another, from the country where the person is born, or is normally resident, to another country. Migration can also occur within the same country. Throughout this report we understand migration, one of the most significant global issues of the early twenty-first century, to be a neutral word. We have tried to avoid using it either pejoratively or using it to claim elevated status for a particular individual or group of individuals.

Immigration and Emigration

The term ‘migration’ includes both immigration and emigration. Understood in this way, references to ‘migrants’ should more accurately distinguish between emigrants and immigrants. It depends whether migrants are specifically referred to as people who enter into a country or region different from their own, immigrants, or as people who leave their country or region and travel to another region or country, emigrants. We have noticed that too often within Europe, the focus is on immigration without considering or recognising that emigration is still a consistent part of migration within Europe.

The United Nations (UN) defines an international migrant as a person who stays outside their usual country of residence for at least one year. Using this definition, the UN estimated that in 2005 there were about 200 million migrants worldwide, including approximately 9 million refugees. Across a number of European countries, a person may be classified as a ‘migrant’ if they intend to be resident for longer than three months. Standards of definition are currently being looked for but to date they remain elusive.

b. Why do people migrate?

People migrate for many different reasons. These reasons can be classified as any one or more of those listed here: economic, social, political and environmental.

- Economic migration may involve moving to find work or follow a particular career path.
- Social migration may involve moving somewhere for a better quality of life or to be closer to family or friends. Europe is a relatively small continent and there are many examples of families whose members, collectively or individually, hold citizenship, or nationality, in more than one country.
- Refugees may move to escape political persecution, religious persecution or war.
- Environmental causes of migration include natural disasters such as flooding or desertification.

Some people choose to migrate, e.g. someone who moves to another country to enhance their career opportunities. Some people are forced to migrate, e.g. someone who moves away from their home region due to war or famine. Many of those who are forced to migrate are refugees.

Push and pull factors are often used to explain why people migrate:

- **Push factors** are the reasons why people leave an area; those things that push them away from their home, including: lack of services, lack of safety, lack of employment, high crime rate, crop failure, drought, flooding, poverty, or war.
• **Pull factors** are the reasons why people move to a particular area; those things that pull them to a new place. Pull factors include: better employment prospects, more wealth, better services, better climate, safer environment, lower crime rates, increased political stability, land that is more fertile, and lower risk from natural hazards.\(^1\)

The observable increase in migration is undoubtedly related to the growth of global population. However, Globalisation has contributed to the increase of levels of migration. It has led to widening socio-economic disparities which have provided an incentive for people to leave their own countries and seek opportunities elsewhere. The widespread prevalence of information and communication technologies (ICTs) increases the perception that better prospects exist in other countries. In some countries, the impact of globalization has led to increasing social instability and tension; in some instances leading to civil or military conflict which further exacerbates the situation.

Migration in the modern world, in both its forced and voluntary versions, should be understood as the way in which many people must adapt out of necessity to developments that are beyond their individual control. In many instances, people migrate in order to ensure their basic survival; in others, they may migrate because the prospect of living with a degree of dignity, and with the hope for a marginally better future, require travel to another country.

c. **What varieties of migrant and migration are there?**

When we talk about migration it is important to recognise that there are different kinds of migration and very often it is not obvious or evident which category a particular migrant belongs to. It might very well happen that a person has gone through different phases of migration or that she or he can belong to more than one category at the same time. The concept of migration includes among others the following categories:

**Refugees:** A Refugee is a person who, "owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country."\(^2\)

**Durable solutions for the protection of refugees:**

**Voluntary repatriation** to the country of origin occurs when the situation and the factors which forced the refugees to flee and to seek asylum in another country are no longer there, so the refugees can go back home feeling safe and regain their lives. Unfortunately this option is not possible for every refugee; sometimes what they have been through is so deeply rooted in their minds that going back to their country of origin is not an option anymore.

**Local integration** takes place when refugees are able to integrate in the country of asylum. The situation in the country of origin cannot always be solved in the short run, and the foreseeable future might remain so dim, that settling in the country of asylum becomes a better option. In some countries, refugees are able to integrate themselves because the host country provides them with access to services and access to the labour market or to land, while in others they remain confined to camps where they depend on assistance from the international community. This is, for example, true of Kenya, where refugees remain stuck in camps, in some cases for more than 15 years.

Among the durable solutions **Resettlement** is the least known and most misunderstood instrument of protection, especially in Europe. Resettlement is often confused with repatriation or return, while in reality it is the movement of refugees from the country of first asylum, where for several reasons local integration is not possible, to a third country where they can rebuild their lives.

**Asylum Seekers:** The UN defines an asylum seeker as someone who has applied for protection as a refugee and is awaiting a decision about their status. Sometimes the term is also used by the media as a more general definition for any person who has crossed a border in search of safety and protection.

**Internally displaced persons:** Internally displaced persons are, “persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalised violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognised State border.”\(^3\)

**Economic migrant:** Generally speaking an economic migrant is a person migrating for labour or other economic reasons. The concept of economic migrant includes:
**Highly skilled and business migrants**: These are people with qualifications as managers, executives, professionals, technicians or similar, who move within the internal employment structures of transnational corporations and international organisations, or who seek employment through international labour markets for scarce skills. Many countries welcome such migrants and have special ‘skilled and business migration’ programmes to encourage them to come. We are aware that as we write this report, our discussion of the highly skilled migrant worker is of particular relevance to the current political debate within the European Union about the introduction of a ‘Blue Card’, intended to benefit Europe. The EU Commission proposal is a directive on the entry of highly skilled migrants - the so called ‘Blue Card’, which aims to make the EU a more attractive destination by reducing immigration barriers to individuals with desirable skills and expertise.

**Temporary labour migrants**: These are people who migrate for a limited period of time in order to take up temporary employment. In many instances the intention is to remit or send money to home or families. Depending on the length of time that the person intends to stay in the host country, ‘cyclical migration’ may also be used to describe regular patterns of, for example, seasonal or annual agricultural work, where a person spends several months every year working in a country that is not their normal country of residence. Temporary migration is often regional, crossing into neighbouring or relatively close countries.

**Guest workers**: This category may be understood as a sub-category of economic migrant and it has a particular usage in the history of migration in Europe in the middle of the 20th century. A guest worker is a person who has been invited as a temporary resident to a host country for the purposes of the economic benefit of that country, often to take a job for which there is shortage of domestic labour. This was for instance the basis of the German ‘Gästearbeiter’ system of the 1950s and 1960s. The guest worker is usually recruited for fixed terms with a limited extension. The possibility of the guest workers obtaining citizenship was not the intention of the national Governments who created these schemes. In some countries, Germany for example, this has led to many long-term residents who are denied some of the rights that citizens enjoy, political participation, for example.

**Seasonal workers**: These are people coming to a country for several months to work during the harvest period in the agricultural industry, or in hotels and restaurants during the holiday seasons. The European Commission intends to deal with the entry of migrant workers through a gradual and sectorial approach - with the eventual aim of having a comprehensive policy, covering all sectors of immigration across all EU member states. The regulation of seasonal workers will be dealt with by the Commission after the proposed Blue Card scheme has been adopted.

"The experience in Europe with guest-worker programs has been much the same. According to economist Paul Heise, ‘The Swiss tried it with the Italians and Spanish, the Germans tried it with the Turks, and the French with the Algerians. Everywhere it has been a disaster for both the welfare of the workers and the moral character of the country.’" 4

"In Europe, guest workers have failed to defuse the problem of illegal immigration. According to Marc Rosenblum of the Migration Policy Institute, illegal overstay rates are estimated to have been between one-third and one-half."5

**Trade and Services**: As the labour market is changing towards a growing percentage of services and service providers, intra-corporate transfers as well as transnational service provision contribute to the increasing mobility of persons. Intra-corporate transfers in particular are sometimes exempted from immigration rules on the ground that they are short-term and thus not considered as migration. Service providers face different regulations as well, often as self-employed persons. However, this field of trade in services contributes considerably to the transnational lives of people and changing labour markets in many countries. It is a little known and studied phenomenon, particularly with regard to the effects on societies. International regulations in this field are negotiated within the framework of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) of the World Trade Organisation. The European Commission intends to propose a directive regulating intra-corporate transfers for the EU Member States in 2008.

**Irregular migrants (or undocumented migrants)**: The concept of “irregular migrants” covers a wide range of people, principally migrants who enter a country either without documents, or with forged documents, or migrants who enter legally but then stay after their visa or work permit has expired. Human trafficking and migrant smuggling are particular aspects of irregular migration. It is important to highlight the difference between these two concepts. A smuggler will facilitate illegal entry into a country for a fee, but
on arrival at their destination, the smuggled person is free; the trafficked person is enslaved.

“Trafficking in human beings is one of the most serious human rights violations today. According to estimates of the United Nations (UN), the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and the European Commission, some 500,000 to 700,000 women and children are trafficked annually by global criminal networks.”  

“Irregular migration” is a relatively recent term. In order to avoid any negative implications or judgment, the UN General Assembly recommended that all organs of the UN use the term, “migrant workers in an irregular situation or without documentation.” There are other terms used to describe this category of migrants such as “illegal”, “underground”, or “undocumented migrants”. The UN recognised that the term “illegal” is regarded as pejorative, implying that the foreigner is a criminal. Each of these terms try to describe the same phenomenon by emphasising specific aspects of the migrants’ situation: the illegal nature of their residence, the fact that they live on the margins of society, or the lack of personal documents. However, none of them has been felt to be fully satisfactory as a way of describing these migrants. Despite this, ‘illegal’ is still commonly used by politicians and the media, perhaps to underline the view that migrants are not welcome. As an example, it was frequently used by journalists writing for the Economist in its special report on Migration in the 5th January 2008 edition. The Churches in Europe recommend that the UN terminology of irregular or undocumented migrant is used and that the use of the term illegal should only be used with reference to the illegal act of crossing the border or overstaying a visa or permit. The migrant should not be referred to as illegal; they always remain a human being.

Migration for the purposes of family reunification: People with kinship or family ties may join family members who have already entered a country as an immigrant in one of the above mentioned categories. Many countries recognise in principle the right to family reunion for regular migrants whilst some countries, especially those with contract labour systems, deny the right of migration for purposes of family reunion. The EU has regulated family reunion with a directive adopted in 2003.

Returnee migrants: According to the definition recommended by the UN return migrants or returnees are, “Persons returning to their country of citizenship after having been international migrants (whether short-term or long-term) in another country and who are intending to stay in their own country for at least a year.” More specifically returnees are:
- migrants who were formerly residing abroad and who have decided to return individually to their country of origin;
- migrants who have been returned to their country of origin as a result of specific factors and circumstances;
- Refugees who have been repatriated.

“Citizenship is membership in a political community (originally a city or town but now usually a country) and carries with it rights to political participation; a person having such membership is a citizen. It is largely coterminous with nationality, although it is possible to have a nationality without being a citizen (i.e., be legally subject to a state and entitled to its protection without having rights of political participation in it); it is also possible to have political rights without being a national of a state. Citizenship, which is explained above, is the political rights of an individual within a society. Thus, you can have a citizenship from one country and be a national of another country. Nationality most often derives from place of birth (i.e. jus soli) and, in some cases, ethnicity (i.e. jus sanguinis). Citizenship derives from a legal relationship with a state. Citizenship can be lost, as in denaturalization, and gained, as in naturalization.”

Long term residence: Long term residence for third-country nationals (any person who is not a citizen of one of the member States of the European Community) can currently be obtained after 5 years of legal residence in one of the EU Countries. The EU guarantees the equal treatment of long term residents and nationals of its member States, whichever member State the long-term resident normally resides in.

c. Recent developments in the terminology of migration

Transnational and New Diaspora migration communities: Although we have already described a migrant as a person who remains outside their usual country of citizenship for more than a year we have
also indicated the relatively temporary and/or cyclical nature of migration. These factors combine to blur the traditional distinction between countries of origin, countries of transit, and countries of destination for migrants. Many countries fulfil all three functions and some migrants are not necessarily resident in only one country. Many may travel back and forth and maintain business or personal relations and activities in two or more different countries. New information and communication technologies and increasing access to relatively cheaper and more extensive travel networks have increased the possibilities for individuals and communities to develop transnational relations.

Syrian Orthodox Christians leaving the countries of the Middle East – Political or economic migrants?

There are, and have been, historic communities of Syrian Orthodox Christians in a number of countries in the Middle East. When a member of one of these communities loses their job and, unable to find employment elsewhere in a Muslim majority context, subsequently takes the decision to move to another country in search of work, should they be described as a political migrant or an economic migrant? If a Syrian Christian has lost their job as a result of religious convictions, feels there is little prospect of work with another employer, and decides that their only hope of work is to emigrate, the distinction between political migration and economic migration is not an easy one to make.

We understand the term ‘transnational community’ to apply to, “Individuals or groups of people who live and/or work in networks that transcend political borders. These networks allow people to live dual lives. They may be bilingual, trans-cultural, have homes in more than one country, and pursue economic, political and cultural interests in more than one place. This creates networks that view state membership in an instrumental way rather than an emotional way.”10 In addition, we note the use of ‘diaspora’ terminology, often deployed by a migrant community to avoid the negative connotations attached to terms such as ‘refugee’ or ‘migrant’.

“Diasporas tend to constitute a specific type of transnational community. Diasporas frequently include a full cross-section of community members who are dispersed to many diverse regions of the world.”11 “Diasporas can only be called transnational communities if the members also develop some significant social and symbolic ties to the receiving country. If they do not we can speak of exile.”12

Transnational Christianity in Europe?

Pastor Sunday Adelija is the Nigerian Founder and Senior Pastor of The Embassy of the Blessed Kingdom of God for All Nations in Kiev, Ukraine. He relocated to Kiev following completion of a Master’s programme in journalism in Minsk, Belarus. His Church of 25,000 members oversees over 100 congregations throughout the Ukraine and over 200 daughter congregations in 22 different countries. His congregations in the Ukraine are distinct in that his congregations do not simply consist of other Nigerians or Africans. The support of Ukrainian members of his Churches has been essential to his remaining in the Ukraine and among his congregation in Kiev is the Mayor of the City. Typically his travel schedule includes frequent engagements in Nigeria and other countries around the world. With an effective publishing operation supporting his ministry, it is probably fair to say that the Church, if not Pastor Sunday personally, has business interests in selling his publications in the countries in which his congregations are located. Fluent in Russian and English, his ministry and oversight of the many congregations relating to the ‘Embassy of God’ is perhaps best described as transnational.
a. Migration in the discourse of identities (personal and communal)

Despite migration being a daily part of contemporary life, it still evokes negative emotions. This can happen as a result of the language used within national or regional politics or because of the way that the media represents the phenomenon in a particular country.

Migrants are frequently presented as strangers. As far as modernity is concerned, strangers are a major irritant because they destroy the logic of a given society. Bauman explains this concept well, stating that, “there are friends and enemies. And there are strangers.” The presence of strangers interferes with the dichotomy between inside and outside, friends and enemies. Enemies stay on the other side of the battle line, but strangers do not maintain their distance. No one knows if they are friends or foes. Modernity’s response to the disturbing presence of strangers has been typically to adopt one of two strategies: assimilation or exclusion.

In the framework of modernism there was no need to find a solution for a permanent co-existence with strangers as there was still a political project to unite around, a common purpose which would, if not eradicate, make cultural differences unimportant, and offer an incentive for everyone to work side by side towards a common goal. However, modern societies have not succeeded in either assimilating or excluding strangers.

“The point is, however, that no attempt to assimilate, transform, acculturate or absorb the ethnic, religious, linguistic, cultural and other heterogeneity and dissolve it in the homogeneous body of the nation has been thus far unconditionally successful.”

If the ‘stranger’ of modernity were here temporarily, awaiting an optimal solution, the ‘stranger’ in a postmodern society is here to stay. Thus the question of their being friends or foes is more relevant than ever. The central question is no longer how to get rid of them, but how to live with and handle the difference in everyday life. If in previous times the long-term commitment of the ‘stranger’ was doubted – he or she could possibly return to “the place where he belongs” - in today’s world the ‘stranger’ is no more likely to leave than anyone else.

The issue of identity is one of the most discussed and debated in the social sciences. Identity is not a fixed concept, given once for all. On the contrary, it is fluid, multifaceted and also a result of relations with others and otherness. As identity is the product of several dynamics, it is therefore neither monolithic nor uniform.

Identity has been described as “a sense of belonging that helps people to understand and categorise the world around them. It is not a natural state of being; rather is a process of inclusion and exclusion. Individuals are not born with an instinctive identification with a particular group, but they are socialised into specific social, cultural and national identities. (...) In many ways it is a process of community creation. The creation of a community is based on a sense of shared culture, heritage.” In our discussion of identity construction we want to stress the fact that it is impossible to define who we are without clearly stating who we are not. Identity is closely related to the concept of diversity and “otherness”. It might be worthwhile mentioning that since the beginning of humankind when a group of people wanted to identify itself, it usually stressed its “humanity” in relation to other groups defined as the ‘others’, the strangers. The dualist approach, US/ THEM, can be the starting point for the construction of a person’s identity which is then strengthened in the encounter with other people through a recognition of one’s own specific characteristics. I recognise who I am, when I am confronted with someone else and I am always the ‘other’ in the eyes of that person.

On a micro level identity is shaped by our genetics, gender, parents, culture, and the people we have met during the course of our life. Our identity is therefore plural and never defined once for all. As long as we are alive our identity is going to adapt itself according to the circumstances surrounding us at any given moment. The same analysis can be applied at the macro level. In the same way that each person has their own fluid identities, group identity, whether ethnically or nationally composed, is equally fluid and pluriform.
Ethnicity is another word which has been used and misused in the public discourse. It may also be described as a social construction that indicates identification with a particular group which is often descended from common ancestors. Members of the same ethnic group will typically share common cultural traits such as language, customs, religious affiliation, and an appreciation of certain types of food and clothing.

Did you know that….

“The Roma are a European people but of Indian origin, whose ancestors came from the Ganges valley in northern India around 800 years ago. They live today throughout the world, above all in Europe. Arriving in Europe from Asia Minor and the Bosphorus, they settled at first in the Balkans, moved into the Carpathians and from there on some moved further onwards, little by little, from the Balkans to Greece up to Finland and Russia, into western Europe (Spain, Portugal, France, Germany, and the United Kingdom). There are about 10 million Roma in Europe; and the two countries with the highest Romani minority are Rumania and Bulgaria.

The Roma are not an homogeneous ethnic group: 85% of the total are Roma, 4% are Sinté (often called Manouches in France), a further 10% are Kalé (or Gitans) and a mere 0.5% are Romanichals (commonly called Gypsies in Great Britain (where there is also a Kalé community). This leaves uncounted the other diverse groups of Roma (much fewer in number than other Roma groups). In Europe, 80% of the Roma no longer carry out commercial nomadism. This is mainly because from the time of their arrival in Moldavia and Walachia in the 14th century through to 1856, the Roma were oppressed through virtual slavery and thus were forced to become largely sedentary.”

“Although everyone of us participates in an ethnicity, the temptation of reifying ‘ethnic groups’ intertwined with the power of the majority to attribute ethnicity to a minority group, means that very often only certain minority groups are perceived as ‘ethnic’ groups. …the majority has the power to define certain minority groups and can use ethnicity (i.e.: descent in combination with certain cultural traits) to impose their representations of the ‘otherness’ of the ethnic group as a means of power. Here it becomes clear how much ethnicity is a negotiated and interactional concept: ethnic groups are constantly constructed and reconstructed in a dynamic interplay of signification between different groups in society and between different group members amongst themselves.”

There is no definition of culture that is agreed upon by anthropologists and sociologists. This reflects the complexity of the concept of culture. Culture has been defined as all the behaviours, arts, beliefs and institutions of a population that are passed down from generation to generation. For Edward Tylor, one of the first anthropologists, culture is “that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society.” Behind the multiplicity of definitions of culture, Dominique Wolton focused upon three conceptualizations. In his words, “the classical French notion of culture is centred on the idea of creation, of the ‘work’ deriving from the Latin language colere (Colere refers to the cultivation of both land and mind…)”. “The German notion is closer to the idea of civilization and includes values, representations, symbols and patrimony as shared by a community at a moment in its history. The Anglo-Saxon sense, more anthropological, includes modes of living, lifestyles, common knowledge, images and myths…” According to Bhiku Parekh “human beings are culturally embedded in the sense that they grow up and live within a culturally structured world, organize their lives and social relations in terms of its system of meaning and significance, and place considerable value on their cultural identity. This does not mean that they are determined by their culture in the sense of being unable to critically evaluate its beliefs and practices and understand and sympathize with others, but rather that they are deeply shaped by it, can overcome some but not all of its influences and necessarily view the world from within a culture, be it the one they have inherited and uncritically accepted or reflectively revised or, in rare cases, consciously adopted.”

Culture has often been seen as a monolithic structure that each group has inherited which needs to be preserved and maintained as it is. Culture is not an abstraction; it is a living, open totality that evolves by constantly integrating individual and collective choices that are taken in interaction with other, similar wholes. Any culture is the fruit of inter-generational connections and contacts, including contact with other cultures.
We understand the State to be a legal entity with a clearly defined territory. The concept of nation represents the social, cultural and political values of a people living within the territory.

From its emergence during the Enlightenment, the nation has become a powerful agent in national and international politics. A new alliance between nation and State was established: the State possessed legal legitimacy whilst the nation became the unifying ‘soul’ or ‘spirit’ of the State. The outcome was the modern creation of the Nation State.

When culture is associated with the concept of nation it is also granted a geographical and political space. The boundaries of the ‘other’ therefore become social, political and geographical. To follow this argument, culture and nation become a united concept and through this process culture may become fixed and require a mythologized past, a common language and shared values, to legitimize it. Any threatened change to the culture of the community, including the establishment of migrant and transnational communities, can be seen as a threat to the conception of the nation-state. The division between US/THEM is reinforced and creates conflicts between cultures. Racism and xenophobia are two extreme examples of these conflicts.

Nationalism is a movement emerging in conjunction with the development of nation. Nationalism is the assertion of one’s nation above all the others and it is often associated with the struggle of the nation to assert its sovereignty.22

Multicultural and Intercultural societies

“The term ‘multicultural society’ tends to be understood more as descriptive of a social reality, as a social phenomenon” (See the White Paper Consultation of the Council of Europe for its Year of Intercultural Dialogue).23 However, the term ‘multicultural society’ is not unproblematic. In many cases it may imply a particular political programme. For this reason, although remaining open to the possibilities suggested by the use of this term, we want to encourage reflection on alternative descriptions such as ‘heterogeneous’, ‘intercultural’ and ‘transcultural’ society. Often ‘diversity’ is a sufficient and more feasible expression. ‘Intercultural’ may be a better conceptual vision for explaining and predicting the way that cultures as well as individuals experience dynamic change in the encounter with others. However, we are aware that language contains the capacity to shape reality and that a ‘mere’ description of reality will reveal our underlying perceptions of social differentiation and integration.24

Integration

This can be simply described as the process by which immigrants are accepted into society. It has been defined as “a long-term and multi-dimensional process, requiring a commitment on the part of both migrant and non-migrant members of society to respect and adapt to each other, thereby enabling them to interact in a positive and peaceful manner.”25 In other words, “integration is a dynamic two-way process of mutual accommodation where all parties give and receive.” In this sense integration means respect for different cultural identities. This involves a shift in the majority community’s ways of thinking.

Integration also involves reducing socio-economic barriers between people or groups of people, creating equal opportunities and enabling people to participate actively in the public, economic, social, and political as well as church or religious spheres. It is a common effort towards a peaceful and equitable society. While some political rights are rightly associated with citizenship, meaningful ways of participation are important for all residents even if they do not choose or cannot become citizens. The participation in elections of local governments is a good example.

Integration is still widely misunderstood as little more than the assimilation of migrants. While some migrants opt for assimilation, they may still not be integrated if societies are not prepared for integration. Societies in Europe differ tremendously; some are more ethnically homogenous than others are, and yet, with regard to newcomers, they face similar challenges. Faith can be an important factor for integration. For many people religion is an essential part of their identity but often in policy approaches to integration religion is subsumed under culture.26

b. Migration in the discourse of the popular media

As we have already shown above, the way that migration is presented by the media affects the way that readers and viewers gain their impression of migration in general and migrants in particular. Our first observation is therefore that there appears to be a lack of distinction concerning the categories of migrant and least of all between the reasons that people migrate.

Immigration, emigration, integration, asylum, racism and so on are all issues evoking emotion in the public
sphere. These are issues that “sell” and that is why they are also attractive topics for the media. “They are also strategically attractive issues for opposition parties who have used them to generate fear and to criticize the government (generally through the media).” The media has a strong influence on setting the tone around a specific debate and, furthermore, when the media engages in the debate, its power in influencing and shaping it is rarely denied.

It appears to be a general consensus that bad news – disaster, crime, corruption, etc – is easier to sell than good news. Thus, the media will often favour reports, events or opinions which are of an extreme and/or critical nature. One of the results of this policy is helping to create a distorted image of the fact and of the environment around it.

**Perceptions of migrants**

A lot of attention and editorial copy is devoted to pictures and TV news clips that locate specific migrant groups within a narrowly defined range of settings. The image of the small boat full of ‘Africans’ trying to reach our shores has become iconic, giving us the impression of floods of migrants invading our territory. The situation of the so-called ‘boat people’ is indeed a very dramatic and problematic one (see the paragraph below) but it is not enough to reduce the whole of the issue of migration in Europe to such singular instances. Migrants are not just poor people from other continents. Statistics show that immigration from countries neighbouring the EU is still more common. Furthermore migration is not just immigration from other regions into Europe but emigration is equally a reality for Europe today.

**Boat people in the Mediterranean region**

According to the ‘Fortress Europe’ website approximately 9,000 people have died trying to cross Europe’s borders between 1988 and 2006. Among them, 6,108 migrants trying to enter Spain have drowned in the Mediterranean Sea and the Atlantic Ocean. A further 2,815 are lost at sea, presumed drowned, and at least 1,069 are known to have lost their life trying to cross the Sahara desert in the effort to reach Europe.

Only 10% of the entire influx of irregular migrants enters Italy, Greece or Spain as ‘boat people’. Most of them enter at regular entrance points; they either do not need an entrance visa or they have secured a short stay visa. Yet the ‘boat people’ capture the media’s attention at the expense of a more comprehensive and less sensationalist presentation.

**Statistics:**

“Statistics can be used in a variety of ways, to generate positive or negative images. One of the most common criticisms of the use of statistics in the migration debate revolves around ‘foreign’ or ‘ethnic minority’ crime rates. There are a number of problems with the collection and dissemination of statistics on ‘foreigners’ as ‘criminals’. First, one must question whether or not the collection and dissemination of such statistics will lead to increased discrimination against ethnic minorities? Second, are ethnic minorities over-represented as ‘criminals’ (or people who have broken the law) because of discrimination (do they resort to ‘crime’ because of their sense of isolation, or are they targeted by law enforcement officials)? Third, what is included in crime statistics? If a ‘crime’ such as entering a country without the necessary documents (consider asylum seekers) is included, ‘foreigners’ are the only group able to commit such a crime, so they will inevitably be over-represented in that category, distorting the statistics overall.”

The Mediterranean region has some distinctive features. Southern European countries are part of the EU but at the same time they have strong cultural and historical links to the countries of Africa and the Middle East. The plight of the ‘boat people’ is near the top of the EU’s political agenda. Pictures of insecure boats arriving on Italian, Greek, Maltese or Spanish shores and thousands of refugees and migrants trying to cross the sea under unbelievable conditions dominate Europe media coverage of migration. Attention is drawn to the floods of migrants entering Europe rather than setting migration statistics and stories within the bigger picture that exists. Little attention is given to the stories of why these people have had to leave their homes, pay relatively enormous amounts of money, and risk their lives to undertake such hazardous journeys.

Many more migrants enter Europe at the so-called ‘green border’. These people often risk as much as the ‘boat people’ and many of these also lose their lives. Somehow their stories are deemed less newsworthy. Some have died of suffocation in the backs of trucks, some have frozen to death in attempting to cross the Alps, and regularly some drown when trying to cross swollen rivers. At every stretch of Europe’s border there are people who risk their life trying to get into one of the European countries, even at the far northern border between Finland and Russia.
As we have already noted, migration has been a constant characteristic of Europe’s collective historical past and present. Indeed we want to claim that Europe is what it is today precisely because of historical patterns of immigration and emigration. Migration in Europe over the last few decades can be summarised with reference to the fact that countries which were formerly countries of emigration are now countries of immigration, including Greece, Ireland, Italy, Spain, and Portugal. Furthermore in new EU countries such as Bulgaria, Poland, and Romania it is possible to recognize a similar pattern: countries which were characterized by significant emigration are now experiencing immigration from neighboring countries following entry into the EU.

The total recorded stock of foreign nationals living in European countries in 2004 stood at around 24.5 million people, according to the Council of Europe report in 2006. Foreign citizens thus appear to constitute some 5.6% of the population of Europe. The greatest part of this foreign stock was resident in Western Europe. However, these figures typically represent foreign nationals who have successfully obtained residence permits (and do not include data for some ten Council of Europe countries). The total for all migrants, regular and irregular, in all European countries in 2005 was estimated at 63.9 million by the United Nations.

For the populations of most western European countries the current picture is one of relative stability, with either little change or small rises in the most recent statistics. The situation in Central and Eastern Europe is more varied and more difficult to assess because of the inadequacy of the data sources in many cases. Over recent years, Romania has recorded a decline but more recently has begun to show a modest rise. In the case of the Czech Republic, for the period 1999-2001 there has been a recovery. Hungarian numbers have fluctuated, falling from 1999 but increasing from 2003 onwards.

Immigration is popularly seen as ‘a problem caused by people coming here from Africa and Asia’. This is totally inaccurate. In 2001, the total of all non-European immigrants entering EU countries was 34%. By 2004 this had only increased to 37%. The other 63% of immigrants into EU countries in 2004 came from other European countries. Migration for the European Union is on the whole an internal phenomenon and as such this demonstrates the huge success of the open borders policy of the European Union with its citizens migrating from everywhere to everywhere within the EU.

Across all Council of Europe countries the total average increase in population due to immigration between 2002 and 2004 was calculated as 0.25%. The total average natural increase across all countries for the same period was 0.1%.

a. Recent trends

In the first half of the 1970s immigration in Western Europe declined, followed by increases for most countries from the mid-1980s onwards. Between 1995 and 2003 most countries experienced fluctuations in the net annual rate of migration (the difference between immigration and emigration). By 2003 several cases, notably Denmark, Germany and the Netherlands, reported a further decline in what was proving to be a longer-term trend. In other cases a downturn in 2003 followed a period of steady increase; for example in Ireland, Spain, Switzerland and the UK. In Central and Eastern Europe the picture is more varied. There was evidence in 2003 of an increase in the Czech and Slovak Republics, Poland and Slovenia, decreases in Lithuania and Romania, while Croatia and Latvia showed no obvious trend.

For several Western European countries the accession of new EU member states in 2004 resulted in fresh movements of migrant workers, most notably into countries such as the UK and Ireland. In 2006 there were 65,000 Poles in Ireland (although this is only just over half the number of British migrant workers in Ireland) and a further estimated 0.5 to 0.6 million Poles in the UK. The impact upon Central and Eastern European countries is more varied and a little more difficult to assess because of the inadequacy of the data sources in some instances.

Eurostat, the statistical service of the EU, reported in its Yearbook 2006-2007 that net migration in the EU-
25 had increased from 590,000 in 1994 to 1.85 million by the end of 2004. It is likely that these figures are under-estimates of the true extent of migration between countries, as they do not include irregular migrants. With relatively low birth rates in most member States, migration contributes substantially to keeping population levels stable.

Within Europe, employment rates for migrant women are significantly lower than for migrant men. In addition, women who migrate for marriage, or to work as domestic labourers, can experience social isolation and miss out on the opportunity to acquire the language skills that will improve their access to the labour market. Whereas traditionally migrant women have followed their partners, an increasing number of women are migrating in order to become the primary breadwinner for the families they have left behind. This is a noticeable pattern in countries such as Moldova, for example, where the incidence of children left in the care of other family members is attracting attention. The reasons for this include an increase in those jobs requiring women, including those in the healthcare, entertainment, and domestic service sectors as well as lack of opportunities in Moldova.

Female migrants who migrate to take up employment in the entertainment industry are particularly vulnerable to sexual and other forms of exploitation, including violence and trafficking. Women may be lured by the apparently innocent offer of a nice job in a hotel or restaurant only to find out that they have been deceived by somebody posing as a friend, a boyfriend, or an employer. Their ID papers may be taken away by the gangs behind the deception. Women may then be told that they have to work as a sex worker or be paid a tiny salary for very long hours. Often they are told that this is to pay back the expenses of the men who helped them to travel to their country of destination. Due to the stigma attached to the sex industry it is often difficult for these women to have their stories taken seriously by the law enforcement authorities in the countries to which they have been trafficked.

The OECD 2008 report concluded that, ‘In the OECD area as a whole, the share of people with tertiary education is higher for the foreign-born (23.6%) than for the native-born (19.1%). Similarly, the share of people with no or low educational attainment is higher for immigrants than for the native-born.’ The typical foreign-born national is thus either very highly qualified or very poorly qualified.

b. Predicted trends

Intra-EU migration

In the short term internal migration within the EU is likely to slow down, for example, as a result of the downturn in the construction industry in the West. The accompanying demand for labour is likely to slow down in Western Europe and a stronger construction industry in Central and Eastern Europe, coupled with labour shortages due to earlier emigration to the West, is likely to force up salary costs in the East. Consequently there will be fewer reasons to migrate and more reasons to stay at home.

International migration

However, the IOM predicted in 2005 that the growth in international migration is unlikely to slow down in the immediate future. The 2005 report notes that the proportion of migrants within the ‘developed’ world stood at 60% of all international migrants in the year 2000. The largest increase in share of international migrants within Europe between 1901 and 2000 has been experienced by the Russian Federation. However, political changes that led to the demise of the former Soviet Union resulted in many internal migrants being reclassified as international migrants. Across Europe, the increase in the number of international migrants continues to increase significantly.

Christina Boswell reported to the Global Commission on International Migration in 2005 that European countries were likely to continue recruiting international migrants to fill labour and skills vacancies. Labour migration, asylum, multiculturalism, integration, and irregular migration will remain contested politically. The economic pressure urging migration into Europe competes with populist pressure to ‘close the doors’. Governments are showing a lack of creativity in addressing these twin concerns other than moving progressively towards liberalising programmes that ease the entry of highly-skilled migrants. The IOM 2005 reported that in 2001, the labour markets of sixteen EU countries included a minimum of 5% of migrant workers. The domestic labour markets of most European countries could not sustain their current levels of economic productivity if migrant workers were removed from the workplace.

Asylum applications

In 2008, Eurostat reported on the decline in asylum applications over the last four years, from 400,000 in the EU27 countries in 2002 to only 200,000 in 2006.
The figures from 1985 until 2006 are shown graphically below and demonstrate conclusively that the popular perception that asylum seekers are pouring into Europe is far from an accurate portrayal of the actual situation.

The policy of strengthening border controls may or may not be related to the reported fall in asylum applications in the European Union for 2006. In 2006 there were 192,000 applications for asylum in all EU member states compared with a total of over 670,000 in 1992. In particular, significant numbers of persons from Iraq and Russia sought asylum in the EU during 2006.

Since 2001 the number of people seeking asylum has more than halved. A fall in the number of applications lodged has been observed in most EU Member States. Compared with 2005, applications in Slovenia fell by almost 70% from 1,500 to only 500 in 2006. In Latvia the number of asylum seekers dropped by 60% (only 10 claims were lodged in 2006). The biggest fall in 2006 in absolute terms was recorded in France; 16,300 fewer asylum seekers than in 2005. Sweden, however, reported a 38% increase in applications (6,000 up on the previous year).

**Destinations of choice**

Migrant populations continue to show a tendency to gravitate towards several preferred destinations within the EU. There are obvious reasons why this should be so; social and extended family networks provide a level of support, linguistic or cultural similarities lessen the disorientation, and local services are more likely to respond rapidly to a potential new market. Polish language literature, daily newspapers (including translations of English newspapers), and Polish food-stores, are now common in many cities of the UK and Ireland. It seems that the marketplace has a certain blind-spot when it comes to political sensitivities over immigration. More migrants in the marketplace increase the circulation of money. Similarly, most Algerian migrants are in France; most Greeks and Turks are in Germany. Whilst in the year 2000 it was the case that most Poles were in Germany, that has since changed and the majority are now in the United Kingdom. Over half of all Portuguese migrants are in France. Most US migrants are evenly spread between Germany and the United Kingdom. These point to the fact that diversification is still not a reality for international and intra-EU migration.

---

**Labour migration**

The OECD (2004) report shows that the proportion of labour immigrants, among the total number of migrants, has increased substantially between 1995 and 2002. Within Europe this has not been as significant since the accession of the newest EU member states although it remains unclear what the impact is likely to be of the eventual lifting of transitional labour restrictions in some of the ‘old’ EU member states. Boswell (2005), p. 5, comments that restricting the movement of labour seems counter-intuitive, “Today, labour migration fills critical gaps in the IT sector, engineering, construction, agriculture and food processing, health care, teaching, catering, tourism, and domestic services.”
Circular, or cyclical, migration

Cyclical (or circular) intra-European migration is likely to become a more significant aspect of migration in Europe. For example, Boswell (2005) notes the reported increase in cyclical migration and suggests that this is often a strategy to supplement family income at home. Additionally, a significant proportion of migrant people from Central and Eastern EU member states working in Western European member states are single males in their twenties and thirties. It should not surprise us if a reasonable proportion of these migrants develop a close relationship with a citizen of that member state, resulting in the citizen moving to live with the migrant in the migrant's country of origin. This is most likely in those countries where younger couples are finding it increasingly difficult to find property to buy at affordable prices. Whereas the ready availability of cheap land may have been a 'pull' factor for migration from Western Europe in former centuries and decades, it is likely that the availability of cheaper property may prove to be the 'pull' factor in the early twenty first century.

The European Citizen Action Service (ECAS) 2008 report Who's afraid of the EU's largest Enlargement? describes the anticipated cyclical nature of Romanian emigration to other EU member states. It anticipated the temporary migration of 1.4 million Romanians over the next few years as a strategy to improve the migrant's economic situation, which included not only the accumulation of finances but also the pursuing of further education.

Remittances

The scale of remittances from European countries is likely to remain undiminished for the foreseeable future. Remittances from one European country to another (the movement is largely eastwards) are estimated at 41.5 billion Euros. The largest single recipient of remittance monies in Europe is Moldova with annual remittances estimated at 31.5% of its GDP. The International Fund for Agricultural Development estimates that 90% of remittances are spent on food, clothes, housing, education, and health. A 2007 World Bank study discovered that the demonstrable benefits also included a gain in the birth-weight of babies born to recipient families, a greater amount spent on education (including that of females), and an increase of jobs stimulated by increased consumption. Critics charge that such findings often overlook, however, the fact that the main beneficiaries are middle-income families. It is rare for the poorest families to receive remittances from another country.

Irregular migration

One of the main challenges in collecting and evaluating data on migration is the inaccuracy of those data related to irregular migration. Irregular migration data that are collected by national governments and international organizations are largely based upon refusals of entry, irregular border crossings, apprehensions, deportations or expulsions, and trafficking data.

Border security

The European Commission is developing policies to increase security at external EU borders, strengthen the efforts of Frontex (the EU's border monitoring and policing service), and distinguishes between ‘welcome’ immigrants and ‘unwelcome’ immigrants on the basis of employability. Controlling access to the job markets of the EU in this way has the inevitable consequence of making it more difficult for those who are seeking asylum for political or religious reasons to find refuge in the EU and, secondly, the fear of failing the more stringent application procedure is likely to increase the number of migrants of irregular status.

2. RESPONSES TO MIGRATION IN RECENT EUROPEAN POLICY

a. The development of migration policies in the EU

Since the 1980s, a common European migration and asylum policy has been envisaged. An underlying principle and value is the freedom of movement for the citizens of the European Union. Every EU citizen, with the members of their family, has the right to travel to, or reside in and to take up employment or self-employed activity in any of the EU member states with some exceptions – or rather restrictions - still in place for the citizens of ten of the twelve new
member states that have joined since 2004 (Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, with no restrictions for Cyprus and Malta) and for Bulgaria and Romania who joined the EU in 2007. Freedom of movement is aimed at increasing the mobility and flexibility of EU citizens within the EU and to open the borders not only for goods but also for people.

Already during the 1980s, when the decisions regarding the freedom of movement of EU citizens were taken, fears were expressed that opening the borders could lead to uncontrollable immigration. Special concern was expressed about persons from third countries outside the EU arriving in one EU country and then moving on to another country. Thus, common rules for issuing visas were agreed. Even today, Ireland and the UK are not part of the Schengen zone that guarantees the free movement of people without border controls. However, the national rules for entry and residence of third country nationals and also the asylum system in the previous fifteen EU member states still remain rather diverse, so persons receive a visa or residence permit in one country who would not receive it in another, and vice versa. To make it worse, refugees are sometimes not recognised and granted refugee status which they would have been accorded in another state with a more thorough asylum procedure in place.

**An area of freedom security and justice**

In the Treaty of Amsterdam (1999) the EU gained competence in the fields of migration and asylum. Since then, the European Parliament and the European Commission have assumed important roles in this respect. Since 2005, migration and asylum legislation has been adopted by qualified majority voting (except for labour immigration).

EU decisions regarding migration and asylum policy taken in 1999 in Tampere, Finland, are regarded as a turning point towards a more realistic migration policy. A common European asylum policy based on the Geneva Refugee Convention was envisaged. Attention was given to common rules for temporary protection, a common definition of ‘refugee’ and of others in need of international protection, common rules for asylum procedures and reception conditions of asylum seekers. Common rules for the entry and residence of migrants were elaborated. An approximation of the rights of third country nationals to the rights of EU citizens was regarded as fundamental to facilitate social integration. However, common measures against irregular migration and for expulsion were also envisaged.

**Migration policy as security policy?**

Since the attacks of 11 September 2001 in the US, the common security policy and “anti-terrorism” policy have gained priority over migration and asylum policy. The issuing of visas and the storage and exchange of data between authorities are vigorously pursued in the Council of Ministers, and it seems that infringements on the rights of personalities are regarded as a necessity. The principle of law that a reasonable suspicion is the basis for controlling persons is increasingly undermined. Under the EURODAC regulation, asylum seekers have to submit their personal data, curriculum vitae, their history of persecution, as well as their finger prints.

Experiments are underway with new technologies and the registration of additional biometric personal data. In addition, the deportation of potentially criminal third country nationals is debated.

The typical European policy response to the migration challenge has been to extend border controls, employ military techniques of surveillance, and increase detentions and expulsions. ‘Frontex’ is the new EU intelligence-led agency for co-ordinating external border security throughout the EU member states. Based in Warsaw, it has been operational since 2005 and by 2007 had a staff of 117. It is one of several EU partners that is developing the concept of ‘Integrated EU Border Management.’ These measures are extremely expensive. EU policies are principally focused on security, border control and voluntary repatriation and less focused on developing methods and programmes to integrate migrants into European societies or on providing legal and welfare provision to those migrants who are seeking asylum in the European member states.

**EU Immigration Policy**

Parallel to the development of control mechanisms some consideration of immigration is continuing in the EU, against the background of the demographic situation in the majority of the 27 EU member states which are experiencing population decline at the same time as populations are becoming increasingly elderly.

In most countries there are economic sectors in need of qualified personnel, particularly in health and care services, crafts, hotels and restaurants as well as in agriculture. Legislation is lagging behind the fact that many migrant workers already fill these positions. Legal entry and employment is often so complicated and decisions sometimes arbitrary, that many third country nationals turn to smugglers to help them with
entering the country, obtaining papers, and finding a job. This entails great risks for the smuggled people who often find themselves in highly vulnerable situations.

It is vital to increase the rights-based security of third country nationals in order to establish trust in authorities and their decisions. An important step on this direction is the regularization of persons in irregular situations, as has been undertaken several times in Italy, France, Belgium, Greece and Spain. The recent regularization in Spain aimed at creating regular jobs and is directed at the shadow economy. It will be important to have a close look at this new approach and evaluate it carefully. We may find that these measures are far more effective than enormous control mechanisms at the borders. Regular jobs entail security for employees as well as participation in the social and the tax system. There may be benefits for the whole of society which are too often neglected in the design of migration policies.

The EU needs to aim for transparent migration legislation if it is to reduce irregular migration. This implies the need for common regulations in addition to new and more effective monitoring and coordination mechanisms for immigration.

**Refugee Protection in the EU**

In 2007, the European Commission issued a Green Paper on the Future Common European Asylum System inviting all relevant stakeholders to express their views and make constructive suggestions to develop this system. The ultimate objective of the Common European Asylum System, as envisaged by the Hague Programme, consists in establishing a common asylum procedure and a uniform status for persons in need of international protection by the end of 2010.

Such a system will guarantee that a person in need of international protection is able to find it throughout the EU in line with the 1951 Refugee Convention. Unfortunately, this is still not the case.

The declining number of asylum seekers in the EU in the last years does not mean that Europe should not share its responsibility towards the protection of refugees worldwide. Despite the situation in Europe the number of refugees and persons in need of protection worldwide, and the increase of protracted refugee situations, is increasing.

A more comprehensive approach towards migration and asylum is needed.

**Refugee Resettlement**

The Hague Programme also encouraged greater EU involvement in refugee resettlement. Resettlement is an important tool for protection and one of three durable solutions for refugees. According to the UNHCR, Europe’s contribution to the global resettlement effort remains modest, with a total of around 5,500 places per year offered by only 8 countries (six of them from the EU). However, more recently, several additional member states including Portugal, the Czech Republic, Hungary and Romania may start a resettlement programme. Additionally, Spain and Italy have undertaken feasibility studies about resettlement in their countries.

A European resettlement scheme could be imagined as soon as half of the EU member states started resettling refugees.

**What is the value of an EU migration and asylum policy?**

Currently, EU migration and asylum policy is contradictory and ambiguous. We observe an increase in the number of expulsions and deportations, the detention of people who have not committed a crime, and the deaths of far too many people at the EU’s borders.

The management of migration is still understood largely as control, visa regulations, and the issuing of permits. This is despite the fact that internal EU migration offers a success story of migration management based on the freedom of movement of people. Internal migration also raises problems of integration, access to the labour market, recognition of certified education and training, and other issues. But these problems are addressed with social and integration programmes, an approach that should be adopted for third country nationals. Migration and integration policy require a diversity of management and services which assist societies to change and to adapt rather than putting the burden of the success or failure of integration solely on the shoulders of third country nationals.

Incorporating this into a common policy and developing a policy which respects the rights of the individual and honours the contribution of migrants to our societies would benefit the EU through greater social stability. If the EU were simultaneously to strengthen relationships with third countries rather than pressing them to control emigration, it would earn greater international respect and solidarity. If it were to adopt lessons learnt from the good management practice of the EU’s internal migration
policy and apply these to third countries and third country nationals, it would also have greater credibility in promoting the Union’s fundamental values in many international forums.

An important building block would be the ratification of the 2003 International Convention for the Rights of Migrant workers and their families. The EU has a crucial role in leading on Union-wide migration policy that welcomes the social and economic benefits of diversity and international migration. In the current political climate that requires tremendous courage, particularly of politicians to consistently pursue a European policy which respects human rights, upholds solidarity, justice and freedom of movement as fundamental values.

d. Freedom of movement and restrictions of EU citizens

Following the entry of Bulgaria and Romania into membership of the EU in 2007, understanding the range of national restrictions to the free movement of people for the purposes of employment between Member States is complicated. Transitional opt-outs to the free movement of people by member states have been granted under the various accession agreements.

Austria: Workers from all EU member states who have joined since 2004 have to apply for work permits, at least until 2009. Like Germany, Austria justifies the restrictions by pointing to its poor employment situation and the fact that it is geographically close to the new members.

Belgium: Belgium imposed restrictions on the eight new member states which joined the EU in 2004, and said in May 2006 it would not be lifting restrictions imminently, but would improve access to some areas of the labour market.

Denmark: Since 2004, Denmark has allowed workers from the eight states concerned to look for a job for six months. If they find one, they can have residence and work permits. It will maintain this system between 2006 and 2009.

Finland: On the 1st May 2006, Finland lifted all restrictions on workers from the eight member states that joined in 2004. Finland was the first of the older EU states to say it would throw open its doors to workers from Bulgaria and Romania.

France: France intends to partially lift restrictions, providing fast-track work permits in certain priority areas where recruitment is a problem.

Germany: Workers from all EU member states who have joined since 2004 will have to apply for work permits until at least 2009. However, the country issued 500,000 of these permits between 2004-2006.

Greece: Greece dropped all restrictions on 2004 entrants, as of 1 May 2006.

Ireland: Ireland opened up its labour markets to all new member states in 2004. Immigrants from all EU countries, except the UK, are ineligible for benefits for two years. Ireland introduced work permits for workers from Bulgaria and Romania.

Italy: Italy initially imposed restrictions on workers from the eight member states that joined in 2004, but has now dropped them all.

Luxembourg: Luxembourg is maintaining restrictions, but will fast-track work permits for workers in certain sectors.

The Netherlands: The Dutch government lifted all restrictions on 1 January 2007 for all new EU member states with the exception of Romania and Bulgaria. The Netherlands allows fast-track work permits in certain sectors.

Portugal: On the 1st May 2006, Portugal dropped all restrictions on workers from the eight member states that joined in 2004.

Spain: On the 1st May 2006, Spain dropped all restrictions on workers from the eight member states that joined in 2004. Spain has applied a work permit system for Bulgaria and Romania, for the first two years after their accession.

Sweden: Sweden applies no restrictions to workers from the new EU member states.

UK: No employment restrictions were imposed on workers from the eight member states that joined in 2004 although workers have to register. The UK restricted Bulgarian and Romanian workers, with the exception of self-employed Romanians and Bulgarians.
In Chapter One we made the obvious point that migration is not a recent phenomenon. Nor has it been limited to the European continent. For this reason we should not be surprised to discover that migration was a common experience throughout the Old and New Testaments. The supreme example of faithful human response to the directing of God is Abram. He is told, “Leave your country, your people and your father’s household and go to the land I will show you.” (Genesis 12:1) The history of the Israelites is traced back to this story of emigration and journeying. God’s promise of a better life and a better future to Abraham (Genesis 12: 2-3) are not so far from the motivations that still prompt many migrant people to make their journey towards Europe or other world regions.

a. Aliens and sojourners

The language of ‘stranger’ and ‘foreigner’, pointed to by Zygmunt Baumann in Chapter One, Section two, would not have been so unfamiliar in the Old Testament period. Their language contains several possible terms for the person who was not Ezrach, literally a ‘native of the Land’ or an Israelite. Each of these terms conveys its own special nuances in meaning. The terms nokrim and zarim are usually translated ‘foreigners’ (sometimes ‘aliens’) and describe foreigners who were feared or loathed by the Israelites. Gerim is usually translated ‘sojourners’ or ‘aliens’. The gerim were expected to keep the Sabbath (Exodus 20:10) and participate in other festivals. They could be employed (Deuteronomy 29:11) and, above all, were to be protected from abuse (Leviticus 19:33-34). The status of the ger contrasts with that of the toshav. Both lived among the Israelites but the ger had voluntarily embraced the religious and community life of the Israelites. This extension of the communal and societal rights enjoyed by the Israelites reflected their own experience of migration and exile. “You shall treat the alien no differently than the natives born among you, have the same love for him as for yourself; for you too were once aliens in the land of Egypt.” (Leviticus 19:33-34)

The ger, no less than other Israelites, occupied a moral category. The welcome and welfare for aliens was laid out in the Levitical law and included gleaning and tithing laws (Leviticus 19:9-10; Deuteronomy 14:28-29). A response towards the alien, other than one of fear and hostility, was expected of the Israelites by God.

Of particular interest may be the manner in which the book of Ruth portrays its central character as a non-Israelite who is prepared to embrace the religious convictions and customs of her mother-in-law, Naomi. The honest reader is left with the distinct feeling that intercultural integration sets the parameters for Ruth's decision. Assimilation is neither sought nor urged. This is the free decision of a young Moabiteess.

Of course, the experience of being a foreigner in Israel has no direct overlap with the contemporary experience of migration in Europe, arguably even less so in the area of detailed policy making, but it offers revealing insights into the manner in which God expected his people to relate to the ‘other’. This attention to the ‘other’ continues in the New Testament. The Prologue of John’s Gospel opens in such a way, “He came unto his own, but his own did not receive him.” (John 1:11) Shortly after his birth, Jesus was taken with some urgency by his parents to Egypt. Fleeing the political violence of Herod, Jesus and his parents became refugees.

The personal experience of ‘otherness’ finds its parallels in the parables of Jesus. This leads Mgr Keith Baltrop, a Roman Catholic leading an agency involved in ministry among migrants in England, to comment that, “The parable of the Good Samaritan invites us to project ourselves imaginatively into the situation of others, as he did with the man who had been robbed, not just patching him up but thinking of all the needs he would have as the situation developed. Many groups who have begun with simple care for homeless people by inviting them into Church and giving them a cup of tea, have gone on to cater for all their needs, such as medical care, drug rehabilitation, alcohol dependency programmes, education, job-finding etc., and the same will be true of our immigrants.”

Baltrop’s words remind us of those of Jesus, once a migrant, recorded in Matthew 25:37, “For I was hungry and you gave me something to eat, I was thirsty and you gave me something to drink. I was a stranger and you invited me in, I needed clothes and you clothed me. I was sick and you looked after me; I was in prison and you came to visit me.”
b. A theological perspective on migration and Pentecost

The reference to Pentecost is impossible to avoid in the context of relations between the different Christian traditions. In the account of Acts 2, the miraculous work of the Spirit enables each person present to hear the word of the apostles in their own mother tongue. The miracle can be understood to have affected either the speakers or the listeners. Either the apostles speak several languages at the same time or each person present hears the word of the apostles in their mother tongue.

If the Gospel is to speak to people with intimacy and more than a veneer of spirituality then it must be spoken in their mother tongue. This stresses the importance and beauty of the language and culture of every person who is addressed. “In a situation of diaspora, maintaining cultural forms of the faith acquired overseas indicates the enormous value attributed to the cultures of the Third World.” We do not believe that the emergence of these Churches was a failure to receive what the European Churches had taken with them in their mission. There are authentic African, Korean, and Chinese spiritual traditions, just as there is a French spiritual tradition, whether Reformed, Baptist or Adventist. Moreover, it is not enough to think that our own European Churches are not equally ethnic. Churches of an African Expression in France offer the possibility for members to live their spirituality in their mother tongue even when abroad. This understanding can lead to a new appreciation of migrant and ethnic minority Churches not as ethnic ghettos but rather as new centres of evangelization. These, drawing on their spiritual vitality, can also enrich the diversity of Europe’s indigenous Churches in the languages which offer the Gospel of life with colour and vibrancy to contemporary Europeans.

When an immigrant arrives in a European country, he or she may decide to learn the language which is spoken there. At a certain point he or she manages to think in the language of the country, finally to dream in the new language. The language of faith is hidden deep inside in the person. In his Epistles, Paul is twice filled with wonder at being able to call God Abba, an expression of a similar form of spiritual intimacy.

The message of Pentecost is that this diversity of language is not lived to the detriment of communion between the Churches. Here and now, the Church is the gathering of women and men who hear the Gospel each in their own mother tongue. We can extend this image to the relation between the Churches and pray for the Spirit to equip us to live in fraternal communion while allowing each of us a special place for the language, spirituality, theology, and cultural assumptions which enable us most to draw close to God in worship. It is not enough to confess that we believe in the universal Church, it is necessary for us to live what we confess.

c. A Portuguese theological perspective on migration and Pentecost

“In John’s Gospel it is written that, “the Spirit (pneuma) blows where it wills; you hear the sound of it, but you do not know where it comes from, or where it is going. So it is with everyone who is born of the Spirit.” (John 3:8). This verse reminds us of the vital significance of the Spirit for the birth of the Christian Church. It was not through a dogma but through the history of a living person, a martyr full of the Spirit: Jesus Christ.

For the Gospel of John the Pentecost related in the book of Acts cannot be a once and for all event like the foundation of the Early Church in and from Jerusalem, but is an event that has been repeated, in Africa, Asia, Europe and throughout the entire world. The German theologian Ebeling has written in his Dogmatics that without enthusiasm, faith cannot exist and the Church will die. The migrant Churches have reintroduced us to such a spiritual movement; this will be good for us. In the context of being Christian Churches together in Portugal there is still a long journey towards closer intercultural dialogue.”

Beyond the experience of Pentecost, the early Church faced persecution and opposition to its new ideas and this prompted migratory patterns that stimulated the spread of the Christian faith throughout the then known world, as well as to the Western coast of what is now India.

d. Biblical and theological approaches to developing a more adequate Christian migration policy

English sociologist and theologian, Nick Spencer, is a respected social researcher and think-tank author. In his book Asylum and Immigration (2004) he discusses whether it is possible for Churches to urge the adoption by a Government of migration policies that will necessarily be short-term, detailed and circumstantial. He cautiously suggests several guiding principles that are reflected in the themes we have been discussing above. These principles, he states, may serve the function of delineating a framework within which policy can be shaped. He expounds what these are at length and we merely list...
them here in a summary form. An appropriate Christian response to policy-makers must therefore pay proper attention to:

- a. The essential unity of the 'one human race' (or humanity).
- b. The reality of nationhood.
- c. The fact that national borders are permeable to people but not necessarily to values.
- d. The loving care and welfare of the alien.
- e. The rights of immigrants.
- f. Reminding immigrants of their responsibilities within the host society.
- g. Urging a willingness to integrate the migrant.
- h. Urging a similar willingness on the part of the migrant to accept integration.
- i. Compassion for the vulnerable.
- j. The Church as a model of cross-cultural community.

We anticipate that Spencer’s language may raise problems in those countries where the term ‘race’ is used to distinguish between different ethnic groups and particularly to explicitly claim, or implicitly demonstrate, that one such ‘racial’ group is superior to another; hence the link between ‘race’ and racism’. Spencer is using the term in the English context in a way that attempts to make the essential link between the unity of humanity and the concept of race. In other words, he is trying to offer a more universalistic understanding of ‘race, free of any ethnic connotation. This also represents the position commonly adopted by the various Racial Justice groups associated with Churches Together in Britain and Ireland. However, the fact that we are required to explain this fact at some length should alert the careful reader to the debate that still focuses upon this usage. In other European countries, the first item might be re-written as, “The essential unity of the one humanity.”

e. God’s option for the vulnerable migrant: the experience of immigration as a theologicus locus

In his contribution to Religion and Social Justice for Migrants (2007), Gioacchino Campese proposes a tentative theology of immigration whilst acknowledging that this awaits a more adequate treatment, both in terms of its methodology and content. Campese imagines a ‘God of the Tent’ who journeys with the migrant person, seeing migration as an “unlikely instrument to bring about unity and solidarity within humankind, a unity often hindered by the rebuilding of walls, the very walls that were torn down by Jesus Christ’s ministry, death, and resurrection.”39 (Ephesians 2:14-16).

He argues that the theological task is rooted in reflective praxis, or of faith seeking intelligent action, the constant concern of the teaching office of the Church, the liberating potential of Christian faith that is given theological expression by the liberation theologians, and the interdisciplinary engagement of theology with the social sciences. He sums up his convictions by insisting that theology is not authentic theology if it does not lead to a praxis that is liberating and concerned for social justice, and if it does not stand in solidarity and harmonious convivencia among and with migrant people.

He offers six elements that might contribute to a theology of immigration that reflect his Roman Catholic perspective but which attempt to describe a universal, or catholic, treatment that is more than merely Roman Catholic.

The first element in his theology is a truth-seeking and truth-telling approach to ‘discerning the times’. Accurate data and narrative is required that dispels media and politically motivated distortions of the realities of migration. One-sided reporting of ‘boat people’ is a denial of the truth, of ‘the Truth’, as Campese might express it.

Theology is concerned with the whole of the human experience in its encounter with the divine. This is the second element. This holistic concern, when brought to bear upon the reality of migration, is further reason to avoid distorted, one-sided, or reductionist versions of migration discourse. To achieve this, Campese argues (after Ellacuría) that a meaningful theology of immigration must get to know the reality of migration as it is, collaborating with data from the social sciences that elaborates the causes and dynamics of international migration. Secondly, a theology of migration must respond to the ethical demands emerging from the reality of migration, namely the concern for social justice, acceptance, inclusiveness, and human dignity. Thirdly, a theology of immigration must seek as its goal the glory of God in the living immigrant. Finally, a theology of immigration will emphasise not only the vulnerability of the migrant but also the hope, resilience, and courage shown. These may be traces of God’s mysterious activity among and with migrants.

A third element is to be found in the ‘option for the irregular migrant’, emphasising their vulnerability and powerlessness. From within this epistemologically privileged perspective (for this is the experience of
Christ) the reality of migration should be viewed in the purposes of God. This will enable proper attention to the situation of migration not merely as one in which people are at risk and pose risks, but also one in which people take risks.

A critical theology of migration then moves the theologian to challenge alternative ways of doing theology that have a blind spot to migrants, often relegating them to the category of ‘enemy’, ‘terrorists’, or ‘job stealers’. Theologies that condone the use of such labels also overlook migration as a crucial source of theology from which to know reality and to know God properly.

Fifthly, a political theology of migration will unmask the structures of inequality that underpin the push and pull factors contributing to international migration. Myths must also be unmasked. The constant movements of people that have characterised Europe throughout the last four hundred years means that its Churches are both post-migrant and newly-migrant Churches. Campese argues from the American context but his analysis of the Church as a centre-edged Church is helpful for Europe as well. Europe’s Churches are at the centre of European social life as well as at the edge. Adapting his quotation from Stephen Warner we might say that, “Non-European migrants to Europe represent not the de-Christianisation of European Society but the de-Europeanisation of the European Christianity.”41 Philip Jenkins has also noted this fact throughout his work on Europe.42 He then underlines the responsibility of migrants who, having gained residence and employment rights, to speak prophetically out of their experience to the authorities that wield power with inequity and injustice.

Finally, a catholic theology of migration will emphasise intercultural solidarity, avoiding theologies of identity rooted in particular cultural or national realities. Equal attention must be paid to the concerns of the local and the global. Migrants today are those whose sheer presence challenges our Churches to be catholic, to be open and inclusive of the diversity, movement and vulnerability that characterises the experience of migration and reveals something of the mysterious presence of God amongst us.
CHAPTER FOUR: CHURCHES RESPONDING TO MIGRANTS AND MIGRATION IN EUROPE

1. CHURCHGOING AND CHRISTIAN FAITH: HOW DOES IT INFLUENCE PERSONAL AND SOCIAL ATTITUDES TOWARDS MIGRANTS AND MIGRATION IN EUROPE?

In 2001 the European Values Survey and the World Values Survey (of which the EVS is a component part) published datasets that reported on the response of a random sample of 2,000 citizens from each of thirty European countries; including countries outside the membership of the EU. An extensive set of questions is asked that are intended to test a wide range of personally expressed attitudes and values as they relate to the social, political, ethical, and religious aspects of life. The standards adopted for these surveys allows for a reasonably high level of confidence when making cross-national comparisons of values and attitudes expressed by individuals in each country in the sample of nations.

The datasets are freely available and online software makes it possible to generate quite complex tabulations. We carried out a range of queries on the datasets and correlated frequency of church (or mosque) attendance with expressed attitudes in response to the question, “To what extent do you feel concerned about the living conditions of immigrants in your country?” The percentage of all respondents from participating European countries who responded that they were ‘very much’ or ‘much concerned’ are shown in the following illustration.

What the illustration shows is that with increasing frequency of church attendance, a respondent is more likely to show a deeper level of concern for the living condition of migrants. A person who attends church once a week is likely to feel twice as concerned about the living conditions of migrants than somebody who never goes to church. This survey question, of course, is unable to test the likely or actual response of the person questioned but it gives some indications of the relative likelihood of each type of person being involved with migrants in
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practical ways. The link with the previous chapter on theology as a call to action is strengthened by this type of survey result. An increasing body of data that demonstrates the concept of social capital also points to the greater likelihood of church members being involved in social, voluntary, and charitable community programmes and activities.

2. HOW DOES RELIGION PLAY A ROLE IN THE LIFE OF A MIGRANT? 43

Religion plays a role at different levels of community life:

- it can simply be a very personal issue connected with the spiritual life of an individual.
- it may be an aspect of community development, or even the raison d’être of community life.
- at the national level, religion can be an instrument for political and social cohesion, or on the contrary, the state might choose to relegate religious issues to the private sphere. It can also aggravate national or civil tensions or conflict.

All three aspects may play a role in the processes of migration. There are individual implications, but the community life and internal cohesion within a country may also be influenced by this factor.

a. Religion and the individual: religion and personal identity

For many people religion is an aspect of their personal identity. A specific creed may determine the life of such people. Religious teachings, traditions, and customs are likely to influence the behaviour of these people, how they approach situations, and how they relate to each other. Their personal value system will be grounded in their religious beliefs and practices. Religion can be an important aspect of an individual’s identity and even if such a person migrates to another country, he or she will carry with them these elements of faith. Even if material possessions are left behind or lost, their religious capital will remain with the migrant.

It is known that religion can become an important part of the identity of a migrant, even if there was only a little interest in religious matters before leaving the home country. In the new situation, having left behind family and social links and feeling the need to defend his or her identity, religion becomes an important factor upon which personal and social stability can be built. It depends on what the migrant finds in the host country whether this part of their identity becomes a positive or negative element in the process of personal integration. Will religion become an isolating force or offer possibilities towards finding a sense of belonging? Faith and religion may become an instrument and opportunity to experience a transnational identity. The migrant may find a way to define for him or herself a new identity comprising components from both societies. Here, religion and culture intersect directly and, for healthy co-existence with others, a simultaneous distinction between culture and religion becomes crucially important. This is not just a summation of two cultures but something new, important for both the migrant and the host communities. A precondition for this is an open and tolerant receiving society, where the local faith communities also practise these values.

b. Religion and the individual: touching the whole of daily life

Religious convictions and rules influence the life of a believer in nearly all parts of daily life, including health and health care. For instance migrant women may find it difficult to access health services because of their religious education. The education of children is widely based on religious values, as does the setup of family life. The well-known conflict between first and second generations in migrant communities is often a consequence of this. Religious laws frequently affect working conditions, the rhythm of the workday and free time; clothing and food rules may not allow people to work in certain places. Discussion around the issue of gender equality is also an issue. It is important to have a better understanding of the links between religion and culture and, moreover, of the way they affect and influence each other.

c. Religion and the community

Often religion is not only a personal conviction; the believer may be requested to participate actively in community life, as a part of his faith that cannot be renounced. If these believers emigrate they are highly likely to put much energy into finding or rebuilding in the host country some kind of faith community where they can live their faith.
Religious migrant communities can play a positive or a negative role within processes of integration. They may give to the migrant in the first phase of integration a feeling of home and belonging which will give him, or her, a sense of security and mutual support. If these communities are closed and/or marginalised by the host society, creating a ghetto-like situation, this could become counter-productive for processes of integration. Parallel societies may develop and communication between the host society and that of the migrants quickly becomes difficult, leading to tension and conflict. On the other hand if such a community is an open or even a mixed community, with migrant and autochthonous members, where a common faith is the binding link, this may become a bridge and allow a smoother integration process.

It is known that migrants often choose a country, or even a town, on the basis of having links to religious communities in that place. They may know that in a certain city there is a community which professes the same creed and where it will be easier to feel at home and to receive support. In this way religion may even become a ‘pull’ factor for migration.

d. Religion and the State

Migration has always existed. Today migration is a structural factor present in every nation state and each of them has to cope with heterogeneous societies. However, the role of religion has become particularly significant since September the 11th, 2001. It is now often perceived by the authorities and many in society to be a threat to security, rather than a contributory factor to integration and social cohesion.

The role of religion within a state’s legal system and how the state functions varies across Europe. There can be total separation between religion and state, whilst there are other states where religion is a dominant factor in the framing and enacting of legislation as well as state functions at all levels. In between these two situations there is significant diversity in approaches taken to the question.

Problems may arise if migrants who come from one system have to cope with a different situation in the host country. An example might be a person or community which comes from a state with Sharia law and which has to live in a secularised state within Europe. The religious needs, the strong convictions, and the values the person brings with him or her may create conflict with the legislation and the way of life in the host country. Social cohesion may be at risk. This becomes even more important if the religious institutions of the country of origin continue to influence the life of migrant communities in a country of immigration. Thus, channels of communication and encounter are necessary.

As already mentioned, religion can be important for all parts of daily life. Legislators and public administrators will need to keep this issue in mind. The public health system may be affected. Employment legislation needs to consider the issue. Problems may arise within the state educational sector. Faith-based schools are of considerable importance for many faith communities and in Europe we can see a range of diverse approaches taken to religious education. Commerce and industry may be influenced by consumer behaviour based on religious rules; the same may be said for cultural and scientific work.

Summarising these reflections it can be stated that:

i. Migrants need to express and live their religious creed. This can be a resource for stability and overcoming marginalisation. A loss of religious identity may eventually lead to a loss of ethical values, with the consequence that these migrants will be even more disoriented and rootless in the host society.

ii. Religious communities that are common to the host society and the migrant community should promote exchange and sharing. They can also become a bridging tool for integration, avoiding marginalisation, and overcoming the frustrations felt by migrant faith communities which may lead to radicalisation of the religious community or individuals within it.

iii. The religious communities of the host society can be enriched by the contributions of migrant religious communities. Intercultural experiences can be encouraged and eventually transferred into other sectors of social life. So-called social capital, basic to social cohesion, is strengthened by the religious components present in migration movements if addressed appropriately. All the stakeholders, societal, ecclesial, and governmental, must work together to pursue this aim.
3. WHAT MIGHT THE ROLE OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCHES BE IN THIS CONTEXT?

a. Why should Churches be active in this field?

Churches are faith communities and, as such, have a religious mandate for action. The basis of the Christian mandate is a book, the Bible, and from this text one can derive a theological process. Out of this, Christians have elaborated codes of conduct. As far as migrants are concerned there are precise rules which Churches should respect. These can be listed here:

- Human dignity must be respected in each case and in any situation.
- Christians should love their neighbours; migrants may be our neighbours.
- Migrants must be welcomed and protected.
- All human beings are, “citizens in the household of God”. This means that they are equal and share the rights and duties of citizens.
- Christians are convinced that absolute Truth exists, but that only God possesses it fully. Human beings have only a partial grasp of this truth. Therefore Christians must respect the conviction of others, even if these do not correspond to their own.
- The Christian faith has at the same time both a universalising approach, believing in the Universal Church, and an individual spirituality that is part of a personal faith. Both aspects are part of our Christian identity.

b. The role of Churches can be looked at from two points of view:

On the basis of their creed Churches may be involved in the field of migration in different ways. Firstly, to protect human dignity, human rights and human freedoms, Churches must become active partners in society, similar to other social actors. Secondly, Churches must also act as faith communities, sharing common beliefs with certain migrant communities.

c. The role of Churches as active players in society defending migrants’ and refugees’ rights:

Churches are faith communities and as such must play responsible roles in the organisation of civil society. They cannot live in a spiritual ghetto. This social responsibility makes them active players as far as social cohesion is concerned. They should strive to be involved in advocating for the respect of Human Rights and the dignity of all human beings. Working for issues of social and economic justice means that they will not distinguish between migrants of their own faith and those belonging to other creeds.

Their work should be directed in two directions:

**Advocacy work on migration and asylum policy and legislation**

As far as migration policy is concerned they will monitor and lobby decision-making processes in order to promote a coherent migration policy which respects values such as human rights, solidarity, responsibility, sharing, and non-discrimination.

Speaking on religious issues, Churches will also have to lobby and to monitor religious freedom; not only freedom for their own communities but also for the freedom of other creeds and faith communities. Churches will insist on appropriate legislation on religious freedom. There must be full respect for religious minorities, even if these are not Christian. In this context the debate on common values and the extent to which faith communities can push their right to promote certain religious rules, which may seem not compatible with values which are held dearly by the host community, requires special attention. A balance must be found between the religious freedom of religious communities and the basic values and freedom of all the residents and communities which the state must protect.

**Solidarity programmes to support individuals**

In Europe Churches promote their own programmes of mutual support for migrants in order to allow them integration and full access to equal rights in all parts of civil life. They run programmes on housing, education, access to the labour market, counselling for migrants and refugees, legal assistance and empowerment by leadership training and support to migrant associations. They promote language schools, courses for vocational training, and support refugees who wish to study at university. They run homes for refugees and for unaccompanied minors, for mothers with small children, and for other vulnerable groups. They protect women who became victims of trafficking and violence.
d. “Uniting in Diversity – Being Church Together”
Indigenous Churches in collaboration with migrant Churches

If we take a quick look at what is happening in Europe’s Churches we see that of the estimated 24 million migrants that were in the EU at the end of 2003, around 48.5% belonged to Christian Churches. A further 30.9% were Muslims, and about 20.5% belonged to other religions. European Churches are approaching this situation in very different ways:

- In some countries the local Churches have opted for separate development: Migrant Churches have grown rapidly in some countries and are sometimes larger than traditional Churches.

- In other countries, relationships with migrant Churches were seen as little more than a question of assistance. Migrant Churches were established and the local Churches often supported them financially without trying to build up any mutual understanding or exchange.

- Where indigenous Churches exist in a minority situation, such as the Protestant Churches in Southern European countries, migrants often play a significant role; they currently represent at least half of the Protestant population in Italy, for example. Migrants worship in all the Protestant Churches of Italy. In many communities migrants are the majority, often over 60% of the worshipping community. The Italian Protestant Churches have found themselves in a totally new situation and are learning to face up to this new challenge. The indigenous Churches are having to face up to the question of how migrant believers can become fully equal members of the Italian Churches. How can cultural and theological differences become a resource, and not a reason for conflict, in a multicultural or intercultural community? Various models of cohabitation, sharing and learning from each other are currently being explored in Italy. However, it may be still too early to judge which approach will achieve the goal of an intercultural community where all parts find their place and have equal rights and where the equal empowerment of all parts has become a reality.

- Many migrant Christians prefer to build their own Churches in which to live their faith as they did at home. They may use their mother tongue and reproduce their religious traditions. This is a model that first generation Christians frequently adopt. It certainly gives a sense of belonging and offers a feeling of home.

- The model of the mixed congregation where local people and migrants worship is another approach, leading to quite different results.

- The local Church may be promoting a process of assimilation and insisting that migrants learn to live their faith exactly in the same way as the local Christians do.

- A final model is where all parts of the congregation try to grow together, learning from each other and developing something new for all its members. This would correspond to the Christian belief in the Universal Church where all are equal, with equal rights and responsibilities. It would be a model of empowerment for all members; of real partnership. This is the model towards which Italian Protestant Churches are aiming. It is a very challenging goal and there is still a long way to go. Nevertheless Christians share this responsibility. To be successful in achieving a faith community where every member has equal rights and potential is doubly important: on the one hand it fulfils the requirements of the Christian faith, which is an important internal question; and on the other hand, looking at the situation from a secular point of view, this approach is important for the integration process of migrants into society. If positive religious integration takes place this could become a resource for the wider integration of migrants. Churches or other faith communities of the receiving countries could become important bridge-builders where a positive exchange of values can take place. The values of secular society, such as democracy, human rights and active participation, could be transformed in this way. The important insights and experiences of migrants could find their way into the receiving society, such as a sense of community, mutual support, solidarity, cultural contributions, and other expressions of social capital.

In summary it can be said that Churches and every faith community in a receiving country have a role to play in the migration process. They can become a resource for bridging between different cultures and communities, but if they shun this responsibility, if they are exclusive or dominant, if they do not share values, power, and goods they may exacerbate
negative experiences of alienation, frustration, and marginalisation on the part of migrants.

In order to allow faith communities to play this important role positively, national governments will have to guarantee appropriate legislation; firstly with respect to migration and asylum issues and, secondly, to religious freedom. A balance must be found between the needs of each faith community, respect for the freedom of every citizen, and the values that are considered fundamental to the dignity of human beings and the orderly functioning of civil society.

4. LIVING FAITH TOGETHER – EXPERIENCES FROM CHURCHES

In this section we offer two Case Studies drawn from the experience of Churches in Europe. The first is that of the Protestant Churches in Portugal. The second is from Sweden. These are countries where the Protestant Churches are respectively a minority Church and the majority Church. These Case Studies illustrate well the variety of situations that Churches are facing in Europe, including the challenges of responding appropriately to the new opportunities posed by migrant Churches.

a. The Spirituality of African Prophetic Churches in Portugal

For more then ten years we have been participating, like a small Christian solidarity group, in the life of migrant Churches and associations in the suburbs of Lisbon, which are constituted by migrants mainly from Angola and Congo. In the beginning, these contacts, visits and dialogues gave me very strong emotional impressions, deeply touching my European background of living faith as an inner speech with God, as a theological-critical study or a socio-political engagement.

In a migrant Church

To be Church together with African people works in a profound way. In a service and also in the houses of the families, you will be integrated with many people, joining together as relations – God’s family. The service proceeds for 3 to 4 hours with a living but strongly organized liturgy. The services have singing and music, often loud, with corporal movement and dancing, used, for example, when collecting the offering at the end of the service. There are bible-lectures, which include testimonies about the foundation and the beginning of the Church (like in the Gospel), speeches from various people including guests, and only a short sermon. In an African service, many people with different functions speak; sometimes you find competitions between singers, choirs or lecturers of poetry. This is solemn in order to express holiness. The participants come in their best clothes, and prefer traditional African or specific church costumes. Participants are intentionally immersed in a strong emotional rhythm, which at rare times can reach to ecstatic phenomena.

We all know the social background of the African migrants. The majority of the women stay home with their children or work in households, and the men work in civil construction. Without the labour of African migrants, Portugal would not be able to continue growing economically. Other migrants work as pastors; the communities always have various pastors which are elected and deposed by an inner circle. The Churches function by a clear hierarchic order, but the functions can be retired much more easily than in European Churches.

In our community in the suburbs of Lisbon, we live together with two African Churches. These are not missionary Churches, but are purely African and I would like to give them the name “Prophetic Churches”, because they were born or founded by a prophetic person without white missionaries. These are the Kimbanguist Church founded in N’kamba Congo by Simon Kimbango in 1921 and the Tocoist Church founded in Luanda/Angola by Simão Toco in 1949.

Kimbanguist Church

Their history is comparable. Simon Kimbango, an evangelist, began to heal and preach in N’Kamba (200 km from Kinshasa), and after six months he was put in jail by Belgian colonialist authorities, condemned by the missionary Churches, and banned in the South of Congo 1500 km away. But the development of the new Church did not stop and about one million people were martyred (the number is not clear). In our theological conversations, the
Kimbanguist national pastor explained to me that God sent Simon Kimbango to demonstrate that "the African does not stand under the level of the dog!" And I could only agree with this theological affirmation, which was equally a strong political affirmation of denied human rights. We ask: what was the dominant culture and social structure that made such a sharp affirmation necessary? To understand, go to the African Museum in Tervuren (Brussels) to see these sentiments of supremacy and the reality of repression, exploration and death in the time of white colonialism.

The religious form of the social protest was only possible through the lived reality of the Spirit of God. The spirit, poured about Simon Kimbango, is the heart of the Kimbanguism. You can touch him when you go to the Holy Place N’Kamba, but also in every service. The official name of the Church is "Church of Jesus Christ about the earth through his special messenger Simon Kimbango." The person of the Founder is fundamental for all, reflecting in the liturgical year and in the legitimation of the actual chief, Simon’s grandson. This is also visible in the tentative divinisation of Simon Kimbango, which creates a strong dogmatic problem for the ecumenical movement in which the Kimbango Church is an important member.

Is Simon Kimbango a divine person like the Holy Spirit? Is he equal to the Holy Spirit? Is he a bearer of the Holy Spirit? These questions are not resolved at the moment and it seems to me that an intensive dialogue will be necessary, especially as their vision of the world is much more “archaic” or spiritual than modern western culture. In the healing stories in the Gospel of Mark or the ecstatic phenomena in the modern western culture. In the healing stories in the Gospel of Mark or the ecstatic phenomena in the apostle Paul’s first letter to the Corinthians, sometimes I feel I touch a vision of the cosmos, touching the deep repression and humiliation of the Africans in the colonial time. In Congo and Angola, the centuries filled with the ambience of war, hunger and illness provoke the daily presence of death, giving rise to an apocalyptic vision to end the unbearable injustice and soliciting the desire that the Spirit and Salvador will come. This is comparable to the social situation of poverty, illness, hunger and slavery in the first century.

On the other hand, there are Churches in Europe like the Lutheran or Calvinist Church which also began with deep liaisons. We know how Martin Luther has refused to attribute his name to a Church, and no Lutheran makes a divinisation of his person. But the human expression of fidelity to the “founder” depends also on cultural patterns, which can be very different in Africa. Is not fidelity an inherent element of faith? Is it not essential that people claim affiliation to the Church as they do to workers’ institutions?

**Tocoist Church**

The Tocoist Church has a more or less parallel history. Her foundation occurred at the end of July 1949. Three years before, at a missionary conference in Kinshasa, the (white) missionaries preached for a floating of the Holy Spirit (following Romans 5:5) about all of Africa. For three years, a group of women and men around Simon Toco asked God and spoke with others about the desire that the Holy Spirit would arrive for Africa in a true Pentecost event. The Spirit came down in such a strong manner that it began a religious movement. It arrived in Luanda, capital of the Portuguese colony of Angola. It seems to me that this immediately became a political struggle and was viewed as a danger to Catholicism, which like the European culture was always a source of colonial spiritual support. So Simon Toco was sent to prison and deported for years by the PIDE (the Salazarist police) to the islands of the Azores, where he stayed together with a communist friend of ours.

This Church is not a member of the World Council of Churches, but she has taken an interest in it anyway. In Portugal and in other European countries, they maintain fidelity to their founder and celebrate the Pentecost event from 1949. This year, they celebrated the Pentecost with 250 participants, including guests of Angola and 5 white people (only!) in a space given by the local State authorities. On the other hand, this Church always searches to be more of a community and Church together, sharing an evangelical understanding of the Gospel and of Jesus Christ as the unique Salvador. This is a complex process, because it takes on questions of modernity. Questions arise about having confidence in scientific medicine or about the absolute power of God in health problems, or in workplaces and with needed qualifications. How should one speak about social problems or initiatives? How should the New Testament be read and what is its relationship to the Old Testament?

**Dialogue and the Spirit**

My question in this article is a question of recognition of the role of the Spirit in the Pentecost events, which are the foundation of these two Churches and probably also others. Prophets arise in Africa and the Middle East much more directly than in the spiritually broken and sceptical Europe. And in situations of socio-politic crises, the Pentecost event always expresses a cry for life and social dignity!
In the Gospel of John, it is written that “the Spirit (pneuma) blows where he will; you hear the sound of it, but you do not know where he comes from, or where he is going. So with everyone who is born from Spirit” (John 3, 8). This verse must remind us about the strong significance of the Spirit when the Christian Church arose – not through a dogma, but through the history of a living person, also a martyr, and also full of Spirit, Jesus Christ. For the Gospel of John, the Pentecost related in the biblical book of Acts cannot be a unique event like the foundation of the (unique?) Catholic Church, but will be repeated, in Africa and in the entire world. The German theologian Ebeling has written in his dogmatics, faith and the Church will die without enthusiasm. The Prophetic Churches have implicated us in such a spiritual movement and their enthusiasm will be good for us. We have a long way of intercultural dialogue ahead, in the context of being Christian Church together.

b. The Spanish ministry of the Church of Sweden

Almost 30 years ago an important stream of political refugees started coming to Sweden. During the fifties and sixties, Czechoslovakians and then a group of South Americans who fled from dictatorship in Chile, Argentina and Uruguay, started arriving to Sweden in the latter part of the seventies and eighties. In the middle of the eighties there were about 50,000 political refugees living in Sweden with their families.

At this time the Church of Sweden assisted with diaconal work, financial aid, counselling etc. but did almost nothing to engage these people into the Church and the parish life. The Church of Sweden labelled all the South Americans as Catholics, assuming they didn’t want to be a part of the Church of Sweden.

Even today there are 50,000 Spanish-speaking people in Sweden, with second and even third generation Latino Swedes growing up and living mostly in the migrant neighbourhoods of the big cities such as Stockholm, Malmö and Gothenburg. South Americans have a western culture that’s not so different from the European. The countries of southern South America have very little influence from their original culture or the African culture. South Americans have a Christian catholic and secularized cultural background, and they came to Sweden as refugees because they were in opposition to the social structure facing them as well as the Catholic Churches in their home countries.

Almost all the criticisms the South Americans had of the Catholic Church were not present in the Church of Sweden; hierarchical structures, celibacy, priesthood only for men, family planning, divorce, sexuality, and homosexuality. The Church of Sweden lost its opportunity to become the new home for South American Swedes who felt themselves to be outside the Catholic Church. The Church of Sweden lost not only a missionary vision of the situation but also an important instrument for the integration of these people into the wider society.

After 25 years of immigration from South America, the Church of Sweden began to work among South Americans. This ministry began in 1998 in one parish of the suburbs of Stockholm. There were two different aspects that the Diocese wanted to show; a genuine interest for the people and a desire to help them practice (or develop) their own spiritual life and spirituality. Secondly, the Canon law of the Church of Sweden states that it has a responsibility for each individual, living in Sweden regardless of their religion, citizenship, or culture. The Church now works and serves people without any kind of differentiation among them. When a South American visits us we try to help him or her to find his or her own religious path. We do exactly the same among the Swedes when they want pastoral care or counselling. When they want to baptize their children, or have a funeral in our Churches that’s what we offer them.

We explain very clearly in every pastoral encounter that we respect the decision of the individual, helping them to find their own way or to make their own decisions. We don’t push the individual to become a member. We don’t proselytise. When a family wants to baptize a child, we explain very clearly who we are, and explain the relationship between baptism and Church membership. And of course we respect someone who says to us, “But I want to baptize my child here” just as we respect him or her when they say, “Oh, ok, I will try to get a Catholic Church instead.”

The Church of Sweden has an open communion. That means that the communion is for each individual, regardless of whether the individual is a member in the Church, or not. Seventy five percent of the South Americans in Sweden are formally or informally outside of the Catholic Church. Even the Catholic bishop says: “I prefer them to attend the Church of Sweden rather than none at all”. If there are people attending our parishes from another culture, a background other than Swedish, we as God’s people and as priest of the Christian Church
have the responsibility to get to know the individual, their culture, and their language.

It’s a very important Lutheran teaching that the people have the right to listen to the Gospel in their own language. Because of that we offer services in “specialised” parishes in different languages: Estonian, Finnish, Amharic from Ethiopia, Swahili or Spanish. In the case of the Spanish ministry, initiated during Christmas 1998, we offer mass on a regular basis in Spanish in one or two parishes in Stockholm and Malmö.

A priest has a calling from God and the priest as a human being has a culture and a mother tongue. In my personal circumstances as a human being, I have also experienced and understood the situation of being a refugee and politically persecuted. My feeling of being an outsider, even my disillusionment in a foreign country, must be of help in serving these people. Work among the South Americans has helped us, personally and collectively, to be more aware of the needs of the people in underprivileged situations in our country. The affliction and sorrow that appears when a relative dies in another country, helps us to understand the need of the requiem mass. The blessing of the homes is also something new among Swedish priests and was brought to us as a gift from the new traditions of the New Swedes. We have also learned how to work more closely with the local people as well as with local organizations. This is not an easy thing for a Church with almost eight million members and a large structure and bureaucracy which, even today, maintains a close relationship to the state system.

The Church fills its function when it serves those who are in need; whether spiritual or material need. The neglected, the oppressed, and the discriminated, help the Church to become more like Christ, to be closer to those who are the brothers and sisters of Jesus Christ (Matthew 25). As a priest of the Lutheran Church, with roots in South America, I am thankful and full of praise to the Lord, as I serve vulnerable people with the liberating message of the grace of God.

5. STORIES OF MIGRANT CHRISTIANITY: FROM MIGRANT CHRISTIANS

In our research for this report we have tried to listen to the voices of a number of individual migrants who have personal experience of what it means to be a migrant, regular and irregular, in Europe. Stories, like any form of personal narrative, are likely to be contested narratives. One can always point to apparent inconsistencies, oversights, omissions, self-justifications, or embellishments. We all tend to be guilty of this when we share our testimony and this is equally likely to be present in the stories that follow. We offer the following three stories with this initial reflection. Nevertheless, the stories, even where these distorting factors may be present, tell us something important about the experience of migration; extreme pressures result in extreme measures and accurate representation of persecution and pilgrimage may be unavailable and inaccessible.

Our three stories represent personal experiences of migration from those who have found a place in a variety of Christian congregations across Europe. In the voices of the migrant, the stories highlight the perceptions of the receiving society of the concept of migrant, tackle the issue of the length of residency during which a person is still considered a migrant, and also show the difficulty of placing migrants in well defined categories. The stories are written in different styles. We have avoided changing them because they reflect the personality of the author. The intent is not to question the reliability and accurateness of the stories told by migrants; on the contrary, their aim is amplify the unfiltered voices of the migrant.

a. Testimony by Zhang Ying : How can we live with cultural diversity?

“I am a former student of the Biblical Institute at Nogent. Why did I decide to enrol at the institute there a little over three years ago? The reason is simple; the Lord has put in my heart the desire to share the reality of Him, proclaiming the Good News. Aware of my shortcomings in my relationship with God and my knowledge of His Word, I considered it necessary to go through a quality theological education. After studying at the Institute, a Chinese Church offered me a full-time position working among the young people. So far I have not accepted this offer. Why did I not say ‘yes’ to this Chinese Church located in the midst of the Paris region with its 800 members among whom are 730 Chinese Christians?”
I was too frightened! I was forced to go through the minefield of rules and customs (or habits and customs) in China every day, before reaching my job. It was too mathematical for me. With us there is a 11th Commandment, which says: "Thou shall not leave your Chinese culture." For Chinese Christians, Scripture and our culture do not contradict each other. So any apparent divergence that we can possibly find in them is only that ... apparent. We believe in Sola Scriptura, Tota Cultura.

The Church, proud and jealous of its doctrines, felt threatened. Thus it set up a vigilant plan to reinforce and protect it from possible terrorist attacks against the teaching of healthy Chinese doctrines. There is a real fear, on the part of church officials, that 'external' persons, I mean people who do not conform to its values, might join the Church and announce that we have a big problem; that we claim in the first place to be primarily Christians whereas in reality we have placed our original [Chinese] identity above all else!

If these people are right, that would mean a huge number of questions. Questioning itself right up to the national challenge about the place where we serve the Lord in His Church, would call into question the methods used to carry out the mission that Christ has entrusted to us as shepherds of His sheepfold, questioning our values and the importance we give to those values and customs that are against the Word of God.

The Church that rolls itself up into an ethnic ball lives in extreme poverty. It needs the assistance and support of other Churches. Please pray for the Church. That its consciousness of the evil that corrodes would be stronger and that it will seek treatment! Let each of us that can, aspire to be a disciple of the Lord Jesus Christ first and foremost.46

b. Rita’s story: What does it mean to be a migrant?

That is a question that I have never thought about for myself. I do not normally think of myself a migrant, but I have to say that I have now had positive and negative experiences.

First of all, I have had to enter a completely different culture, learn a new language, traditions, customs, and try to blend in. But I have discovered that migrants from the eastern part of Europe are not very welcomed or they are seen as temporary occupants who will eventually leave. So, the “the welcome committee” of the community or church does not need to focus on meeting the needs of migrants.

I discovered that it is very difficult to cross the borders and feel a part of the English culture. I am constantly asked how long I plan to stay in this country and perhaps I am ready to leave now. The attitude of local people when they meet migrants from the East has two aspects: firstly, they think that we are leaving behind terrible poverty and taking their jobs and, secondly, they see that we are bringing changes and new ways of living that they are not ready to accept or do not want to accept.

I feel privileged to be a migrant – as a student I am immediately put in another category – not searching for the wealthy life, but bringing "wealth" from a spiritual or educational point of view to local people. I am now treated differently because I am working in an educational institution. For three years the Church that I attended treated me like I was a “leaver” (a foreign student), but since this year I have been seen as a “permanent contributor” and long term “builder or changer”.

I wish I could do something to influence the secular culture here with my love for Christ. It is a foreign culture to me, but people have begun to accept my personality, my ethical views, my life style and, because I am showing a willingness to participate and be part of the British culture, this makes me feel equal to some extent.

Outside the Church I will always be a migrant and this is not something that I regret, although it is not easy when people constantly remind me by pointing to my Baltic accent (and mistakenly calling me ‘Russian’). Otherwise I am privileged to be presenting one of the European cultures in a foreign land and my behaviour and attitude to the local culture influences the way the people view me.

Our daughter goes to a local school and parents that I meet there are friendly and willing to get to know us. One African woman encouraged me as we shared our concerns about Eastern Europeans getting into trouble with the authorities. She pointed out that my migrant status will disappear after years, but that her skin colour will always be a reminder that she is a migrant, even though she is a second generation African living in the United Kingdom.

My husband, Vidas, is involved in the ministry of our local Church as one of the youth workers. He has never been insulted or treated as a migrant and in some ways the local kids show a special interest in him because he is different to them. He has the extra ability to freely talk about his Christian faith and life style because it is less familiar to British culture.
When we go back to visit Lithuania we feel foreigners in our motherland and we realise that we have adopted some elements of British culture without being aware of it.

c. Fahjid’s story: A Farsi speaking Christian in Hungary

One and a half years ago I walked into the building of an English-speaking Church in Budapest because I saw it was open and I needed help. I didn’t know anything about this Church but I knew that they sometimes help people. It was a Sunday morning so I went and sat at the back of the building. Everybody was singing and after about ten minutes they stopped and then they had some cups of tea and coffee. I asked for some coffee – it was weak but it was OK!

When I was drinking my coffee one or two people spoke to me. My English isn’t so good and it was difficult to understand them. Then a man called another person, James, came to talk with me and he told me he was the minister of the Church. He was very friendly.

I told James that I am a Persian refugee. My story is quite simple. My country of origin was Iran and I had been a communist there. My political views got me into trouble as I was also helping to bring communist literature into Iran. Eventually I was imprisoned several times and tortured quite badly – you can still see the marks on my body. Sometimes I wake up at night and it feels like I am back in the cells. It’s horrible!

When I was released from prison I decided to leave Iran and I managed to travel to Bulgaria where I applied for political asylum. When I was staying in Bulgaria I was helped by people from the Baptist Churches in Sofia. I decided when I was staying in Bulgaria that I should become a Christian follower of Jesus. It was the example of the people from that Church that helped me to see the love of God. My family was Muslim, not very religious, but like everybody else in Iran they followed the ways. They were quite successful in business and were disappointed that I had not decided to join the family business. My communist views didn’t really allow me to do that.

After a year I decided that Bulgaria was not a very easy place to live as a refugee and I decided to come to Hungary. I managed to start the application for asylum and I’m now waiting in the refugee camp where I’ve been living since I came to live in Hungary. The camp is not near Budapest so I come to Budapest at the weekends so that I can come to Church. I’ve been coming here for about one and a half years now. There are quite a lot of other Farsi-speaking people in the camp and some of them have started coming with me to the Church. It takes us two hours to get here and the Church asked us if we would like to use their kitchen to make some warm food for our lunch after the Sunday service. We started making lunch for ourselves and then we invited some people from the Church. They started joining us and it was amazing to see so many people from so many backgrounds eating together. I think that is how it must be in heaven!

Since we’ve been coming here, some of my friends have asked to be baptized. Now that they are in a Christian country they want to become Christian. One of the Church members does Bible study, Hungarian and English lessons with us. The Bible study gets quite confusing because some of the people from the refugee don’t speak Farsi and we sometimes have four or five languages at the same time. We all help each other understand what we think is being said by Caroline, our teacher. She got in touch with some Iranian Christians from Berlin and they came down to help us for a weekend. That was really encouraging. They worked for the Presbyterian Churches in the USA, one as a pastor and the other as a social worker. We also managed to get some bibles in Farsi and one of the Church members is from Turkey and we can understand each other quite well.
Demographics
Population 2007: 3.16 million
Population projection for 2050: -
Population density in 2005: 109 persons / km²
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04: 18,600
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04: -5,200
Unemployment for nationals 2006: 13.8%
Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006: -
Expenditure on social protection 2004: -

Migration Indicators
Migrants leaving Albania in 2004: -
Migrants entering Albania in 2004: -
Migrants leaving Albania for EU destinations: -
Net migration rate 2007: -1.7%

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Albania in 2006:
United States, Germany, Canada, United Kingdom, France

Main countries of origin for migrants living in Albania in 2006:
Country Number
r/a -
r/a -
r/a -
r/a -
r/a -

Refugees and Asylum applications
Number of refugees in Albania in 2006: 56
Number of refugees leaving Albania in 2005: 12,722

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Albania in 2006:
Country Number
United States 4,399
Germany 3,036
Canada 1,403
United Kingdom 1,327
France 1,123

Asylum applications in 2006: 36

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Albania in 2004:
Country Number
r/a -
r/a -
r/a -
r/a -
r/a -
Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

- Christian – total 932,438
- Roman Catholics 474,832
- Orthodox 429,100
- Protestants 7,241
- Anglicans 0
- Independents 23,800
- Marginals 2,605

Christian congregations per million population 1,675

Religious Demographics 2001: Other

- Muslim 1,207,737
- Buddhist -
- Jew 299
- Hindu -
- Neo-religious -
- Non-religious 517,962
- Atheist 280,496

Albania is a country of net emigration. The larger part of the migrant community in Albania is made up of NGO workers, business people, and cross-cultural Christian workers.

Many of Albania's top religious leaders come from abroad: one Catholic archbishop is Italian, another was previously from New York, and the head of the Orthodox Church is Greek. The presence of migrant Christian workers is reasonably widespread in Albania, with missionaries from most continents present in the country and working on behalf of the Roman Catholic, Albanian Orthodox, and the Protestant Churches present in Albania.

In Tirana, the capital, the authors know of one International Protestant Assembly and the presence of an English-speaking Anglican Fellowship overseen from Athens. Macedonian and Greek-speaking minorities, religiously Orthodox, worship with the Albanian Orthodox communities.

The ERICarts 2007 Report on Cultural Minorities explains that, “Greeks, Macedonians, Vlachs and Roma are officially recognised cultural groups in Albania. Efforts are being made to add Muslim Bosnians to this list. Some media reports have stressed the fact that there is a growing community of Chinese immigrants.

However, there is no accurate data on their composition and size. The last census in Albania was in 1994, but matters like ethnicity, religion and language were not included.

Article 20 of the Albanian Constitution guarantees the rights of all ethnic minorities in Albania, including the right to preserve and develop their cultural, religious, ethnic and linguistic identity. However, the rights provided by the Albanian Constitution and several international agreements, have not yet translated into cultural policy issues. There is no specific law to support these minority groups, with regard to cultural identity. Like all Albanian citizens, members of minority groups are free to acquire Albanian citizenship, to give it up or to hold dual citizenship.” (ERICarts report 2007)

For Albania, the contribution of remittances to the national economy is almost as large as that of exports. (World Bank 2007)

### Cultural minorities present in Albania (Source: World Christian Database)

#### Christian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural minority</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Christians (est.)</th>
<th>Christian % (est.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>156,484</td>
<td>140,836</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlach</td>
<td>56,960</td>
<td>34,176</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serb</td>
<td>37,556</td>
<td>26,289</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonian</td>
<td>27,228</td>
<td>24,505</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegrin</td>
<td>9,389</td>
<td>6,572</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han Chinese (Mandarin)</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6,259</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Islamic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural minority</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Muslims (est.)</th>
<th>Muslim % (est.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vlach</td>
<td>57,398</td>
<td>14,350</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6,307</td>
<td>2,838</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Armenia

UN 1951: Refugees Convention 1993
CoE 1961: Social Charter -
CoE 1963: Convention on the Legal Status of Migrant Workers -
CoE 2005: Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings -

Demographics
Population 2007 3.23 million
Population projection for 2050 -
Population density in 2005 101 persons / km²
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04 13,800
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04 - 6,200
Unemployment for nationals 2006 7.4 %
Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006 -
Expenditure on social protection 2004 -

Migration Indicators
Migrants leaving Armenia in 2004 -
Migrants entering Armenia in 2004 -
Migrants leaving Armenia for EU destinations -
Net migration rate 2007 -1.9 %
Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Armenia in 2006: United States, Germany, Netherlands, France, Sweden

Citizenship & Nationality
Population (nationals) 2006 -
Population (non-nationals) 2006 -
Citizenship applications 2004 -
Stateless persons 2006 0
Migration Integration Index 2007 -
Internally Displaced Persons 2005 -

Main countries of origin for migrants living in Armenia in 2006:
Country Number
Azerbaijan 219,300
n/a
n/a
n/a
n/a
n/a

Refugees and Asylum applications
Number of refugees in Armenia in 2006 113,714
Number of refugees leaving Armenia in 2005 13,965
Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Armenia in 2006:
Country Number
United States 5,150
Germany 3,943
Netherlands 1,512
France 1,267
Sweden 411
Asylum applications in 2006 78
Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Armenia in 2004:
Country Number
n/a
n/a
n/a
n/a
n/a

Attitudes towards neighbours 2001
Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?
Somebody of a foreign ethnicity -
A Muslim -
An immigrant or foreign worker -
A Jew -
A Roma -
Average response -

Note: The data is as of 2007.
Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

- Christian – total: 2,516,111
- Roman Catholics: 230,000
- Orthodox: 2,251,500
- Protestants: 22,800
- Independents: 24,960
- Marginals: 21,500

Christian congregations per million population: 858

Religious Demographics 2001: Other

- Muslim: 94,325
- Buddhist: -
- Jew: 563
- Hindu: -
- Neo-religious: -
- Non-religious: 295,365
- Atheist: 171,934

The situation of ethnic Armenians around the world has tended to lend definition to the contemporary understanding of the term ‘diaspora’.

In the majority of places to which Armenians have travelled, cultural, social, and religious needs tend to be met by groups that are usually closely involved with the Armenian Apostolic Orthodox Church. The two Catholicates (Etchmiadzin and Cilicia) between them exercise pastoral care over the larger part of the Armenian diaspora. The Armenian Church in a particular location typically also serves as the Armenian cultural centre.

In Yerevan, there are occasional services in the Anglican tradition that are conducted in English, normally at St Zorevor’s Armenian Church. No other international congregation is known to the authors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Christian (est)</th>
<th>Christian% (est)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Kurd</td>
<td>38,006</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>13,875</td>
<td>8,603</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assyrian</td>
<td>12,795</td>
<td>11,260</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurdish</td>
<td>8,144</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>4,244</td>
<td>3,820</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgian</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byelorussian</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldavian</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatar</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mordvinian</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ossete</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>55,018</td>
<td>27,509</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Muslims (est)</th>
<th>Muslim % (est)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Kurd</td>
<td>38,023</td>
<td>35,932</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijani (Azeri Turk)</td>
<td>15,088</td>
<td>12,070</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurdish</td>
<td>8,148</td>
<td>6,111</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgian</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatar</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ossete</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balkar</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbek</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darginian</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chechen</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian Bosha Gypsy</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>55,043</td>
<td>15,412</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographics

Population 2007 8.33 million
Population projection for 2050 8.2 million
Population density in 2005 98 persons / km²
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04 200
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04 28,100
Unemployment for nationals 2006 4.9 %
Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006 12.9 %
Expenditure on social protection 2004 29.1 % of GDP

Migration Indicators

Migrants leaving Austria in 2004 46,100
Migrants entering Austria in 2004 97,200
Migrants leaving Austria for EU destinations 42,453
Net migration rate 2007 3.4 %

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Austria in 2006:
Australia, Canada, Germany, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Main countries of origin for migrants living in Austria in 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FYR</td>
<td>143,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>140,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia HGV</td>
<td>134,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>125,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>54,627</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refugees and Asylum applications

Number of refugees in Austria in 2006 25,486
Number of refugees leaving Austria in 2005 62

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Austria in 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asylum applications in 2006 42,396

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Austria in 2004:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serbia and Montenegro</td>
<td>4,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>4,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>1,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1,067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

Christian – total 6,639,918
Roman Catholics 5,740,400
Orthodox 147,000
Protestants 368,934
Anglicans 3,200
Independents 54,480
Marginals 39,407

Christian congregations per million population 774

Religious Demographics 2001: Other

Muslim 182,797
Buddhist 5,181
Jew 8,604
Hindus 2,463
Neo-religious 920
Non-religious 561,725
Atheist 69,286

Although Austria has a long history of immigration, migration is largely associated with the “guest worker migration” that started in the early 1960s and the “new immigration” of Eastern European, African and Asian migrants that began in the late 1980s. Immigrants from Turkey and the former Yugoslavia, which were the major sources for labour recruitment, still form the majority of immigrants, making up more than two thirds of the total foreign population according to the 2001 Census. However, as a result of the “new immigration” from other European, mostly Eastern European countries as well as from Africa and South Eastern and Central Asia, and, to some extent, Latin America and the Caribbean, the immigrant population is increasingly diversifying.

Since the mid-1990s, the number of naturalizations, in particular of Turkish migrants, who have one of the highest naturalization rates among individual immigrant groups, is rapidly rising, thus also rapidly increasing the number of Austrian citizens with a migrant background. The growing share of Austrian citizens with an immigrant background also led to a visible increase in the interest shown by political parties regarding Austrians of immigrant origin as potential voters. Apart from basic political rights, such as freedom of association and freedom of assembly, third country nationals have no formal political rights.

Austria, a traditional country of emigration has witnessed high levels of immigration and naturalisation in recent years. The former centre-right government's initiatives to restrict migration, such as much tougher income requirements, have reduced the number of people moving to Austria to reunite with their relatives. Similar requirements for international students are expected to reduce their numbers.

The newly-formed grand coalition between the centre-right People’s Party and the Social Democrats has decided to partially open up to labour from all new member states, including Bulgaria and Romania. Workers qualified in technical areas will gain better access to the Austrian labour market. Administrative proof confirming that no Austrian citizen is interested in a particular job will still be required.

More than 60,000 people from new member states currently work in Austria, with Hungarians (14,600) and Poles (12,600) topping the chart.

The authors know of four English-speaking Churches serving the international community in Vienna plus a further four in the cities of Salzburg, Klagenfurt, Mayrhofen, and Innsbruck.

The authors know of three Farsi-speaking Churches in Vienna.

Christian Cultural Minorities in Austria (Source: World Christian Database, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Christians (est.)</th>
<th>Christian % (est)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>286,631</td>
<td>223,572</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swiss</td>
<td>315,294</td>
<td>283,765</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serb</td>
<td>139,221</td>
<td>118,338</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>54,869</td>
<td>43,347</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>41,766</td>
<td>37,589</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croat</td>
<td>39,309</td>
<td>35,771</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>39,309</td>
<td>33,020</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>31,120</td>
<td>25,207</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>26,206</td>
<td>21,751</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovene</td>
<td>21,293</td>
<td>20,228</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td>16,133</td>
<td>12,906</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>12,284</td>
<td>2,038</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Belarus

UN 1951: Refugees Convention
CoE 1961: Social Charter
CoE 1993: Convention on the Legal Status of Migrant Workers
CoE 2005: Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings

Demographics
- Population 2007: 10.0 million
- Population projection for 2050:
- Population density in 2005: 47 persons / km²
- Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04: -29,500
- Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04: 4,300
- Unemployment for nationals 2006: 1.6%
- Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006: -
- Expenditure on social protection 2004: -

Migration Indicators
- Migrants leaving Belarus in 2004: 13,400
- Migrants entering Belarus in 2004: -
- Migrants leaving Belarus for EU destinations: -
- Net migration rate 2007: 0.%

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Belarus in 2006: Kazakhstan, Lithuania, Poland, the Russian Federation, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan.

Main countries of origin for migrants living in Belarus in 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1,141,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>395,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>237,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>10,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>6,387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refugees and Asylum applications
- Number of refugees in Belarus in 2006: 690
- Number of refugees leaving Belarus in 2005: 8,857

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Belarus in 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>4,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep.</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asylum applications in 2006: 23

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Belarus in 2004:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Citizenship & Nationality
- Population (nationals) 2006 -
- Population (non-nationals) 2006 -
- Population (non-nationals) 2006 -
- Citizenship applications 2004 -
- Stateless persons 2006: 8,886
- Migration Integration Index 2007 -
- Internally Displaced Persons 2005 -

Attitudes towards neighbours 2001
- Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?
  - Somebody of a foreign ethnicity: 16.5%
  - A Muslim: 26.6%
  - An immigrant or foreign worker: 17.1%
  - A Jew: 14.8%
  - A Roma: 51.1%
  - Average response: 25.2%

Average percentage of people replying that they would not like any one of the following as a neighbour:
- a person of another race,
- an immigrant or foreign worker,
- a Muslim, a Jew or a Roma
Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian – total</td>
<td>6,931,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholics</td>
<td>1,027,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>5,106,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>204,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicans</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>147,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginals</td>
<td>10,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian congregations per million population</td>
<td>743</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Religious Demographics 2001: Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>25,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>1,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>58,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-religious</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious</td>
<td>2,453,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>505,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Roman Catholic Church is particularly vulnerable as more than half of its approximately 350 clergy in Belarus are foreign citizens, many of them Polish nationals. Leaders in the Full Gospel Union informed Forum 18 in 2007 that there are now very few foreign religious workers in Byelorussian Protestant Churches.

The Nigerian leader of the Embassy of God Church in Kiev, was a university student in Minsk during the late 1980s and left Belarus in the mid-1990s after founding a church there. Nigerian pastors find it increasingly difficult to obtain visas to visit these Churches which are composed of Byelorussian and African members.

The Byelorussian Diaspora

Between 1988 and 1999, about 143,000 people emigrated. There are more than 1 million Byelorussians living in Russia, 400,000 in Ukraine, 110,000 in Kazakhstan, 100,000 in Latvia, 55,000 in Lithuania, and 25,000 in Estonia. It is estimated that approximately 3,500,000 Byelorussians live abroad. In 1994 Byelorussians gained the freedom to travel outside of the former USSR and return without penalty or restriction.

The 1990s can be described as a decade during which:

- Approximately 20,000 immigrants gained work permits from the Labour Ministry. It is estimated by researchers that the number of irregular migrants is several times this figure.
- Byelorussians have taken opportunity of greater entrepreneurial and business opportunities in other countries and emigration has seen talented and able Byelorussians migrate temporarily or permanently. Additionally, significant numbers of Byelorussians have successfully applied for and been granted asylum in countries such as the USA, the Czech Republic, Poland, Belgium and the United Kingdom. Belarus was the first of the former Soviet States to be treated as a country from which people were legitimately leaving for asylum reasons.
- Cultural, religious, and social organisations began to arise within the Byelorussian diaspora communities in places such as the USA, Canada, the United Kingdom, Poland, Australia, Russia, Lithuania, Ukraine, Moldova, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Estonia, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, and Armenia.
Belgium

Demographics
- Population 2007: 10.66 million
- Population projection for 2050: 10.9 million
- Population density in 2005: 341 persons / km²
- Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04: 18,700
- Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04: 57,500
- Unemployment for nationals 2006: 8.3 %
- Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006: -
- Expenditure on social protection 2004: 29.3 % of GDP

Migration Indicators
- Migrants leaving Belgium in 2004: 33,900
- Migrants entering Belgium in 2004: 68,800
- Migrants leaving Belgium for EU destinations: -
- Net migration rate 2007: 5.4 %

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Belgium in 2006:
- France, Germany, the Netherlands, Spain, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Citizenship & Nationality
- Population (nationals) 2006: 9,610,900
- Population (non-nationals) 2006: 900,500
- Population (non-nationals) 2006: 8.6 %
- Citizenship applications 2004: -
- Stateless persons 2006: 426
- Migration Integration Index 2007: 69/100
- Internally Displaced Persons 2005: -

Attitudes towards neighbours 2001
- Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?
  - Somebody of a foreign ethnicity: 14.3
  - A Muslim: 20.1
  - An immigrant or foreign worker: 16.1
  - A Jew: 11.2
  - A Roma: 33.5
- Average response: 19.0

Refugees and Asylum applications
- Number of refugees in Belgium in 2006: 16,820
- Number of refugees leaving Belgium in 2005: 54

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Belgium in 2006
- Germany: 54

Asylum applications in 2006: 15,724

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Belgium in 2004:
- Russia: 1,438
- Congo: 1,272
- Serbia and M.: 1,203
- Iraq: 903
- Slovakia: 773
Due to the large scale recruitment of foreigners as labourers, the 1960s saw a considerable rise in the proportion of foreigners in the total Belgium population. By 1970 the foreign population had increased the total population by 7%. Among the three regions in Belgium (Flanders, Brussels and Wallonia), the region of Brussels-Capital proportionally hosts the largest number of residents. The majority of non-Belgians come from other EU Member states. The federal government is responsible for overall migration policy. The three regions are responsible for determining legal status, policies of citizenship, and social integration. In Flanders, migrants must take an "inburgeringstraject" course or else they face administrative sanctions. In the francophone region, integration is seen as a voluntary and organic process not needing State intervention.

**World Refugee Day, 2006**

Prayer vigils, including Belgian and migrant Christians, were held for undocumented immigrants and asylum seekers in mass sit-ins in more than 30 Churches and public buildings.

Kerkasiel Anders (Church Asylum Differently) organised the June 2006 vigils in 17 locations throughout Flanders, including one Protestant and 10 Roman Catholic.

Many immigrants have been living in Belgium for years in a state of limbo while waiting to receive documents that would allow them to live and work in the country. Legislation before the Belgian parliament would tighten up immigration regulations.

**The EPUB (Federation of Protestant Churches in Belgium)**

The EPUB has about 100 local congregations. There are about 10 to 12 local congregations which are “really” mixed Churches; about 10 to 15% of the local congregations. In these congregations, they seem not to have many problems in integrating the different cultures. There are also a lot of migrants having responsibilities at the level of church boards. It is also very interesting to know that in the French speaking part of Belgium, about 20% of the ministers are of African origin. Globally, we can say that in cities like Antwerp, Gent, Brussels, and Liège, about 30 to 40 % of the church population is of African origin. In towns like Malines, there is also an important presence of migrants coming from Turkey, Iraq and so on. In one of these congregations, they represent more than 50% of the church population.

**Religious Demographics 2006: Christian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian – total</td>
<td>8,680,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholics</td>
<td>7,779,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>48,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>134,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicans</td>
<td>10,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>48,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginals</td>
<td>64,953</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Christian congregations per million population: 643

**Religious Demographics 2001: Other**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>364,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>21,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>21,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-religious</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious</td>
<td>588,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>176,093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Korean Churches in Belgium**

In Belgium there are 2 Protestant Korean Churches and one Korean Roman Catholic Church. In Belgium there are 700 Koreans, of which about 300 are attending services in the Protestant Churches and 40 in the Roman Catholic Church.

The Korean Church of Brussels (KCB) is the biggest Korean church, with 200 members. The majority of Koreans are “temporary migrants”, working for the Institutions or for the larger businesses and companies. They stay in Belgium for 2-3 years and then they return to Korea. In Belgium there are also a number of Korean children adopted by Belgium families. KCB is an affiliated member of the Federation of Protestant Churches in Belgium (EPUB).

www.koreanchurch.be
Bosnia-Herzegovina

Demographics

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population 2007</td>
<td>3.85 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population projection for 2050</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population density in 2005</td>
<td>76 persons / km²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment for nationals 2006</td>
<td>45.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure on social protection 2004</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Migration Indicators

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrants leaving Bosnia-Herzegovina in 2004</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants entering Bosnia-Herzegovina in 2004</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants leaving Bosnia-Herzegovina for EU destinations</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net migration rate 2007</td>
<td>0.1 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Bosnia-HGV in 2006:
Serbia and Montenegro, United States, Germany, Netherlands, Switzerland

Main countries of origin for migrants living in Bosnia-HGV in 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia &amp; Montenegro</td>
<td>3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refugees and Asylum applications

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of refugees in Bosnia-HGV in 2006</td>
<td>10,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of refugees leaving Bosnia-HGV in 2005</td>
<td>109,930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Bosnia-HGV in 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serbia and Montenegro</td>
<td>46,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>20,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>9,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>6,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>6,165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asylum applications in 2006

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asylum applications in 2006</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Bosnia-HGV in 2004:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Citizenship & Nationality

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (nationals) 2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (non-nationals) 2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship applications 2004</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stateless persons 2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internally Displaced Persons 2005</td>
<td>135,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attitudes towards neighbours 2001

Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somebody of a foreign ethnicity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Muslim</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An immigrant or foreign worker</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Jew</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Roma</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average response</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

Christian – total 1,529,304
Roman Catholics 462,446
Orthodox 1,070,000
Protestants 3,660
Anglicans 0
Independents 1,120
Marginals 2,000

Christian congregations per million population 191

Religious Demographics 2001: Other

Muslim 2,384,757
Buddhist -
Jew 396
Hindus -
Neo-religious -
Non-religious 128,953
Atheist 66,905


More than ten years after the signing of the Dayton Peace Agreement, there are still some 180,200 people internally displaced in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Further to a re-registration exercise completed by the authorities in 2005, the number of internally displaced persons (IDPs) dropped from 309,000 at the end of 2004 to 187,000 in spring 2005. This decrease can be explained by the number of returns which had taken place since the previous registration in 2000 and by the fact that many displaced have decided to integrate locally.

Over one million internally displaced persons (IDPs) and refugees have returned to their homes since the end of the conflict in 1995, representing half of those displaced during the war. Return figures however have decreased by two thirds between 2004 and 2005, from 18,000 to 5,100. The 2006 figure is expected to be similar to the previous year. Several factors indicate that return is now a residual process concerning the most vulnerable among the IDPs and areas with a sensitive political and economic environment. The political debate is still dominated by ethnic issues, as illustrated by the 2006 general elections and failure of the constitutional reform. This perpetuates an environment of widespread discrimination in virtually all areas of public life, which in turn constitutes a serious obstacle to return. As a result, the access of IDPs to employment, education, social and economic rights and justice in return areas remains affected by their ethnicity.

Balkan Insight, 31st August 2006

As a result of the 1992-1995 war two million people - about half the population - were displaced and unable to return to their homes in safety. Just under a decade after the conflict ended, the United Nations announced that more than a million of them had done so.

Returning refugees in towns all over Bosnia and Herzegovina have made use of laws enabling them to recover their property. But many then sell or swap their real estate so that they can continue to live among members of their own ethnic group.

The Helsinki Committee for Human Rights, in 2005, conceded the accuracy of UNHCR figures, including the claim that 99% of returnees had regained their former homes, but pointed to local claims that at most about one-third of this number were genuine returnees, with the remaining two-thirds of returnees included many “weekend” or “seasonal” returnees who had regained their properties but were no longer permanent residents.

The biggest problem concerns “minority” returns. This term denotes returnees who have gone back to municipalities where other ethnic groups are now the majority. The UNHCR says about 450,000 minority returns took place by the end of 2005. These returnees often sold or rented out their regained properties.
Citizenship & Nationality
Population (nationals) 2006 -
Population (non-nationals) 2006 -
Population (non-nationals) 2006 -
Citizenship applications 2004 -
 Stateless persons 2006 -
Migration Integration Index 2007 -
Internally Displaced Persons 2005 -

Attitudes towards neighbours 2001
Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?

- Somebody of a foreign ethnicity 28.1
- A Muslim 21.2
- An immigrant or foreign worker 24.6
- A Jew 18.1
- A Roma 53.7
- Average response 29.1

Refugees and Asylum applications
Number of refugees in Bulgaria in 2006 4,504
Number of refugees leaving Bulgaria in 2005 4,254

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Bulgaria in 2006:

- Germany 2,651
- Canada 794
- USA 510
- France 70
- -

Asylum applications in 2006 860

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Bulgaria in 2004:

- Afghanistan 385
- Armenia 60
- India 54
- Iraq 50
- Pakistan 45
Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian – total</td>
<td>6,471,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholics</td>
<td>77,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>6,282,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>109,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicans</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>669,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginals</td>
<td>8,745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Christian congregations per million population: 1,302

Religious Demographics 2001: Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>976,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>3,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-religious</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious</td>
<td>413,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>166,710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Bulgarian Diaspora

Bulgaria has traditionally been a country of emigration but as one of the newest members of the EU it is now at the eastern border with Turkey and increasingly having to deal with the recent preference for overland entries into the EU. Bulgaria is also one of a number of Central European states that are frequently used for human trafficking. Antoaneta Georgieva, director of Face to Face Bulgaria, an organization dedicated to combating forced prostitution, states on her group’s website: “Trafficking in people is the second most lucrative illegal business after arms trade.”

The largest immigrant communities of Bulgarians are located in Greece (200,000), Italy (60,000) and Spain (80,000). The Sofia Echo (25th February 2008) reported that Bulgarian migrant workers send home roughly 800 million euros each year. The average Bulgarian working abroad earns about 800 euros monthly, of which 360 euros is spent on food and shelter and 440 euroa is being repatriated to their relatives. Migrant Bulgarian workers spend an average 13.8 months before returning to the country. Around 384,000 Bulgarians have worked outside the country in 2002-2006, including 280,000 people still working abroad, the equivalent of 14% of Bulgaria’s labour force.

The background of the migrants varied greatly and did not appear to influence their likeness to seek employment abroad, although people with previous experience working outside the country appeared more likely to leave again, the authors said. Their study also showed a decrease in the number of people looking to emigrate, falling to 0.8 per cent in 2007, compared to 2.6 per cent in 2003.

Church Programmes

There are no known formal programmes by any of the Churches in Bulgaria. Several Churches in Sofia are known to provide informal support for migrants. The authors know of English-speaking Anglican (1) and Baptist (1) congregations in Sofia. They also know of several African congregations meeting in Sofia.
Croatia

UN 1951: Refugees Convention 1992
CoE 1983: Convention on the Legal Status of Migrant Workers 2005

Demographics

Population 2007 4.44 million
Population projection for 2050 -
Population density in 2005 81 persons / km²
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04 - 11,700
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04 5,800
Unemployment for nationals 2006 13.6 %
Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006 -
Expenditure on social protection 2004 -

Migration Indicators

Migrants leaving Croatia in 2004 6,800
Migrants entering Croatia in 2004 18,400
Migrants leaving Croatia for EU destinations -
Net migration rate 2007 1.3 %

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Croatia in 2006:
Australia, Austria, Canada, Germany, and the United States.

Main countries of origin for migrants living in Croatia in 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia HGV</td>
<td>456,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia &amp; Montenegro</td>
<td>86,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>21,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>10,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>8,246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refugees and Asylum applications

Number of refugees in Croatia in 2006 2,443
Number of refugees leaving Croatia in 2005 119,148

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Croatia in 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serbia and Montenegro</td>
<td>100,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia HGV</td>
<td>7,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>2,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1,753</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asylum applications in 2006 10

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Croatia in 2004:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia and Montenegro</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYR Macedonia</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Religious Demographics 2006: Christian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian – total</td>
<td>4,158,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholics</td>
<td>3,608,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>257,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>35,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicans</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>21,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginals</td>
<td>15,479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Christian congregations per million population: 597

**Religious Demographics 2001: Other**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>102,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>2,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-religious</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious</td>
<td>80,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>28,683</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Migrant Churches in Croatia**

The authors know of fifteen Churches from the Ukrainian diaspora in Croatia. There are occasional English-language Churches conducted in the Anglican tradition in the Chapel of the Roman Catholic Refugee Centre. The authors know of one Croatian-speaking International Church in Zagreb where simultaneous translation is used.

**International Catholic Migration Commission**

Since 2001 the ICMC has been involved in counter-trafficking programmes, playing a role in the Assistance and Protection working group, which it co-chaired with the International Organisation for Migration.

ICMC has contributed to developing a national referral system, a plan for the formation and implementation of a shelter to provide assistance and protection to victims, a plan for voluntary return of the victims of trafficking, as well as plans for reintegration in collaboration with partner organizations in the victims’ countries of origin.

With funding from USAID, the ICMC coordinated and hosted a series of training events in cooperation with Croatian NGOs and the Rosa Center for Women.
### Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population 2007</td>
<td>0.79 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population projection for 2050</td>
<td>1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population density in 2005</td>
<td>90 persons / km²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04</td>
<td>3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04</td>
<td>14,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment for nationals 2006</td>
<td>5.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006</td>
<td>5.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure on social protection 2004</td>
<td>17.8 % of GDP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Migration Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrants leaving Cyprus in 2004</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants entering Cyprus in 2004</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants leaving Cyprus for EU destinations</td>
<td>15,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net migration rate 2007</td>
<td>18.5 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Cyprus in 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main countries of origin for migrants living in Cyprus in 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Refugees and Asylum applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of refugees in Cyprus in 2006</td>
<td>924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of refugees leaving Cyprus in 2005</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Cyprus in 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asylum applications in 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Cyprus in 2004:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>1,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Citizenship & Nationality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (nationals) 2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (non-nationals) 2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population density in 2005</td>
<td>4,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stateless persons 2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration Integration Index 2007</td>
<td>39/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internally Displaced Persons 2005</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attitudes towards neighbours 2001

Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?

- Somebody of a foreign ethnicity
- A Muslim
- An immigrant or foreign worker
- A Jew
- A Roma
- Average response
Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian – total</td>
<td>592,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholics</td>
<td>12,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>546,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>4,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicans</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginals</td>
<td>3,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian congregations per million population</td>
<td>1,257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Religious Demographics 2001: Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>5,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-religious</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious</td>
<td>23,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>4,690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change of policy meant that Cyprus was transformed almost overnight from a country that traditionally exported migrants to all corners of the earth, to a net recipient of migrants from all over the globe. The policy assumption formulated in the 1990s on the employment of migrant workers was that their stay was to be short-term, temporary and restricted to specific sectors.

Cyprus is one of only five EU Member States where the majority of non-nationals are from other EU countries. 5.7% of the total population is from outside the EU. Asylum seekers and international students make up a large part of the immigration flow.

The Churches in Cyprus

The Greek Evangelical Church in Cyprus has been involved in ministry to migrants since 1990. Its work began with Iraqi Assyrian asylum seekers. In Larnaca the Reformed Presbyterian congregation has been involved in migrant ministry for a similar period, particularly among refugees and asylum seekers. There is also a Farsi speaking Persian congregation meeting in Larnaca. There is an Iranian Church meeting in Limassol.

There are at least eight English-speaking congregations worshipping at various locations in Cyprus.

It is not known whether the Orthodox Church of Cyprus has any programmes among migrants.
Czech Republic

Demographics
Population 2007 10.35 million
Population projection for 2050 8.9 million
Population density in 2005 130 persons / km²
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04 11,200
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04 47,500
Unemployment for nationals 2006 7.3 %
Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006 7.6 %
Expenditure on social protection 2004 19.6 % of GDP

Migration Indicators
Migrants leaving Czech Republic in 2004 34,900
Migrants entering Czech Republic in 2004 53,500
Migrants leaving Czech Republic for EU destinations 14,757
Net migration rate 2007 4.6 %

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Czech Republic in 2006:
Austria, Canada, Germany, Slovakia, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Main countries of origin for migrants living in Czech Republic in 2006:
Country Number
Slovakia 285,372
Ukraine 33,303
Poland 24,707
Vietnam 14,639
Russia 13,334

Refugees and Asylum applications
Number of refugees in Czech Republic in 2006 1,887
Number of refugees leaving Czech Republic in 2005 3,589

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Czech Republic in 2006
Country Number
Germany 3,016
Canada 151
Ireland 125
United Kingdom 120
New Zealand 50

Asylum applications in 2006 2,876

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Czech Republic in 2004:
Country Number
Ukraine 988
Slovakia 711
India 342
China 287
Russia 260
Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian – total</td>
<td>5,841,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholics</td>
<td>3,399,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>238,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicans</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>241,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginals</td>
<td>45,574</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Christian congregations per million population: 721

Religious Demographics 2001: Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>1,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>7,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-religious</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious</td>
<td>3,263,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>513,844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the early 1990s, the Czech Republic along with other countries of Central and Eastern Europe became part of a buffer zone for international migration. Recently, the Czech Republic has increasingly become a target country for immigration rather than a country of transit as it was in the mid-1990s. This development generates a need to create a comprehensive policy for the integration of foreigners. The social inclusion of immigrants has become one of the main issues of migration in the country. Target groups of immigrants are citizens of Ukraine, Slovakia, Vietnam, Poland and Russia. There are also immigrants from countries of the Balkans or Caucasus Regions, as well as from Belarus, Moldova, UK, USA and Germany.

Cross borders mobility is the largest and historic source of migrant workers in the Czech Republic, mostly from Slovakia, Poland, the CIS and Balkan countries. Many Vietnamese were invited out of communist solidarity in the '70s and '80s and now they represent the largest group of permanent residents and migrant entrepreneurs.

The Churches

The relation between the historical/indigenous Churches and migrant/ethnic congregations

In the Roman Catholic Church the lack of priests means that migrant Polish priests are common.

Among the Protestant Churches there are groups of migrants but they do not have their own church. Korean services take place in Prague. Africans especially are joining the charismatic groups, whether registered or not.

The Russian Orthodox Church is a registered Church in the Czech Republic and has a chapel in Prague. Ukrainian migrants are present in Prague and have influenced its services, liturgical calendar, and its community life. They have not established their own Churches, but neither have they joined the Orthodox Church in the Czech lands.

Armenians are also present in the country. The Armenian Orthodox Church is not officially registered. However they conduct services in Prague and other big towns. Relationships between the Armenian Churches and the Orthodox Church in the country are positive.

In the Czech Republic the main migrant Church groups include:

The Russian Orthodox Church, the Armenian Apostolic Orthodox Church, Korean Protestant Churches, and African church groups.

In addition the authors know of approximately six to eight English-language international Churches that meet in Prague.
**Demographics**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population 2007</td>
<td>5.48 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population projection for 2050</td>
<td>5.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population density in 2005</td>
<td>127 persons / km²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04</td>
<td>8,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04</td>
<td>24,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment for nationals 2006</td>
<td>5.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure on social protection 2004</td>
<td>30.7 % of GDP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Migration Indicators**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrants leaving Denmark in 2004</td>
<td>19,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants entering Denmark in 2004</td>
<td>27,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants leaving Denmark for EU destinations</td>
<td>22,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net migration rate 2007</td>
<td>4.5 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Denmark in 2006:
Canada, Germany, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Main countries of origin for migrants living in Denmark in 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>30,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>22,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>19,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia HGV</td>
<td>18,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>13,637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Refugees and Asylum applications**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of refugees in Denmark in 2006</td>
<td>36,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of refugees leaving Denmark in 2005</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Denmark in 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asylum applications in 2006 | 446 |

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Denmark in 2004:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serbia and M.</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Denmark still has one of the smallest migrant/refugee populations in Western Europe despite rapid rises in arrivals over the last twenty years. Until recently refugees, former guest workers and their families formed a relatively small group within an otherwise ethnically homogeneous population.

The history of recent immigration began in the late 1960s and early 1970s when a few thousand people from Turkey, Yugoslavia and Pakistan seeking jobs at the bottom end of the labour market found their way to “the country up North.” After guest worker recruitment came to a halt, the number of immigrants continued to increase due to family reunions. Later, waves of national and international unrest brought groups of refugees to the country, and the foreign population rose considerably. Turks are still the largest immigrant group in Denmark, but over time the number of refugees and asylum seekers from countries such as Iraq, Iran, Somalia and Bosnia has increased as well. The growth of the total foreign population in recent decades (from 3.0% in 1980 to nearly 9% in 2008) is mostly due to increasing numbers of refugees and family reunions from third world countries.

Responses from the churches:

Number of migrant churches:

In 2004 the Inter-Cultural Centre carried out a survey of international churches in Denmark and mapped out approximately 150 migrant congregations. A congregation was defined as a group of 10 persons or more meeting regularly for worship in a language other than Danish.

Relations between indigenous and migrant churches:

Lutheran churches: About 40 churches host migrant congregations, and a number of churches regularly have joint services and meals, international food parties and other events. In 2006 the bishops decided to investigate the needs of the migrant churches and their relations with the established churches.

Other Christian Churches: Until today the majority of churches cooperating with migrant churches are so-called “free churches”. In terms of tradition, culture, denomination and style of worship most migrant churches naturally relate to the Roman Catholic Church, Pentecostal, Baptist, Methodist and Apostolic Churches and the Salvation Army. Sometimes cooperation involves practical help with obtaining missionary visas for pastors, making church buildings available and offering financial support etc. Sometimes it also involves welcoming migrant churches as part of an established denomination, inviting them to annual summer camps and accepting them as official member congregations.

Is there any project in the framework of “Being Church together - Uniting in Diversity”?

The Lutheran bishops’ survey runs from February 2008 to February 2009 and will provide updated information about the migrant churches, their needs and contact with Lutheran churches.

KIT (Churches Integration Services): Offers a complete service on church integration in Denmark with particular emphasis on working among Evangelical and Pentecostal congregations. It is funded by independent Danish churches and works towards the greater co-operation and the integration of migrant churches into the existing churches in Denmark. http://www.kit-danmark.dk/dk

The Inter-Cultural Centre (Tværkulturelt Center): A national network of 150 Lutheran congregations, NGOs and migrant churches founded in 1994, offering multiethnic conferences, training and resources. Provides information and support for local churches and gives Christian refugees/migrants a platform for speaking and writing. Publishes an updated national directory of migrant churches. http://www.tværkulturelt-center.dk
Estonia

UN 1951: Refugees Convention 1997
CoE 1961: Social Charter -
CoE 1983: Convention on the Legal Status of Migrant Workers -
CoE 2005: Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings -

Demographics
Population 2007 1.34 million
Population projection for 2050 1.1 million
Population density in 2005 29 persons / km²
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04 - 1,800
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04 - 2,000
Unemployment for nationals 2006 9.7 %
Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006 -
Expenditure on social protection 2004 13.4 % of GDP

Migration Indicators
Migrants leaving Estonia in 2004 900
Migrants entering Estonia in 2004 1,400
Migrants leaving Estonia for EU destinations -
Net migration rate 2007 -1.5 %
Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Estonia in 2006:
Canada, Finland, Germany, the Russian Federation, Sweden, and the United States.

Main countries of origin for migrants living in Estonia in 2006:
Russia 190,599
Ukraine 25,185
Belarus 14,883
Latvia 4,326
Lithuania 2,101

Refugees and Asylum applications
Number of refugees in Estonia in 2006 5
Number of refugees leaving Estonia in 2005 743
Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Estonia in 2006:
Germany 437
USA 242

Asylum applications in 2006 8
Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Estonia in 2004:
Iraq -
Russia -
Turkey -
Sierra Leone -
Zimbabwe -

Citizenship & Nationality
Population (nationals) 2006 -
Population (non-nationals) 2006 -
Population (non-nationals) 2006 -
Citizenship applications 2004 14
Stateless persons 2006 119,204
Migration Integration Index 2007 46/100
Internally Displaced Persons 2005 -

Attitudes towards neighbours 2001
Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?

Somebody of a foreign ethnicity 15.1
A Muslim 22.2
An immigrant or foreign worker 20.9
A Jew 11.1
A Roma 49.8
Average response 23.8
The present immigration population in Estonia is almost entirely the result of the country’s occupation by the Soviet Union during the Second World War. Upon independence (1991), citizenship status was defined according to whether inhabitants or their parents or grandparents had been citizens of the independent Estonia between 1918 and 1940. In this way the Soviet settlers and their descendants were defined as immigrants. The number of foreign citizens and persons without citizenship currently residing in Estonia is around 270,000 which corresponds to 20% of a total population of 1.37 million.

The Estonian Evangelical Lutheran Church (EELK) reports that the number of migrant people, interpreted as 'people on the move' in Estonia, is quite small and that there are no migrant projects within the EELK. Russian-speaking residents of Estonia generally worship with the Estonian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate and there are also Russian speaking congregations within each of the United Methodist, Union of Free Evangelical, Baptist, and Christian Pentecostal Churches. There are several international, English-speaking Churches in Tallinn, including 'Elava Vee' or Living Water, the Tallinn International Church, and the International Christian Fellowship. There are Swedish and Finnish Lutheran congregations that belong to the Estonian Evangelical Lutheran Church. The Council of Churches in Estonia reported in 2008 that there are no immigrant Churches in Estonia. They pointed out that migrants from the Soviet era are already integrated into the main Church traditions.

### Religious Demographics 2006: Christian
- Christian – total: 862,726
- Roman Catholics: 5,745
- Orthodox: 244,000
- Protestants: 235,501
- Anglicans: 0
- Independents: 40,500
- Marginals: 9,874

Christian congregations per million population: 730

### Religious Demographics 2001: Other
- Muslim: 4,737
- Buddhist: —
- Jew: 2,052
- Hindu: —
- Neo-religious: —
- Non-religious: 349,814
- Atheist: 152,543

### Cultural minority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural minority</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Christian Pop (est.)</th>
<th>Christian % (est.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>340,801</td>
<td>136,320</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>33,641</td>
<td>23,212</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byelorussian</td>
<td>19,547</td>
<td>14,660</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>11,834</td>
<td>10,887</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvian</td>
<td>2,393</td>
<td>2,178</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>2,128</td>
<td>1,936</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>1,995</td>
<td>1,696</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1,995</td>
<td>1,197</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>1,396</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1,197</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldavian</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mordvinian</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karelalian</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrian</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgian</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuvash</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatar</td>
<td>2,925</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Demographics

- **Population 2007**: 5.30 million
- **Population projection for 2050**: 5.2 million
- **Population density in 2005**: 16 persons / km²
- **Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04**: 10,600
- **Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04**: 9,300
- **Unemployment for nationals 2006**: 8.8 %
- **Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006**: 25.3 %
- **Expenditure on social protection 2004**: 26.7 % of GDP

### Migration Indicators

- **Migrants leaving Finland in 2004**: 4,200
- **Migrants entering Finland in 2004**: 11,500
- **Migrants leaving Finland for EU destinations**: 10,890
- **Net migration rate 2007**: 1.7 %

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Finland in 2006:
- Australia, Canada, Germany, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States

Main countries of origin for migrants living in Finland in 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USSR (Former)</td>
<td>36,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>28,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>9,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYR</td>
<td>4,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>4,554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Refugees and Asylum applications

- **Number of refugees in Finland in 2006**: 11,827
- **Number of refugees leaving Finland in 2005**: -

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Finland in 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asylum applications in 2006:

- **1,133**

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Finland in 2004:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia and M.</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Tradition</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian – total</td>
<td>4,731,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholics</td>
<td>8,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>59,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>4,490,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicans</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>94,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginals</td>
<td>39,138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Christian congregations per million population 611

Religious Demographics 2001: Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Tradition</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>9,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>2,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>1,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-religious</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious</td>
<td>280,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>73,299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information from the Churches

All of the main Church traditions, including the Lutheran, Orthodox, Pentecostal and Roman Catholic Churches in the Capital area (Helsinki and Espoo) have some kind of structured migrant work. However, the strategy and the way that this work is conducted differ from one Church to another. The main principle of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland is to build relationships and bridges and to seek cooperation with ethnic congregations.

There are about 20 to 25 migrant and ethnic Christian groups and Bible Study groups that meet regularly around the Capital area. Multilingual Sunday services are also available.

Different Churches, members of the Finnish Ecumenical Council, participate in multilingual and intercultural ecumenical prayer in the capital area during an International Ecumenical prayer week in Finland.

The Lutheran Diocese of Helsinki and Espoo, in cooperation with the International Evangelical Church (IEC) in Helsinki, organises an “Ethnic Christian group leaders meeting” on a regular basis. During these meetings there is an opportunity for the Christian migrant Churches to meet with migration staff from the Lutheran Church. It is an opportunity to get to know each other better, to discuss issues of mutual concern and to share ideas on how to strengthen cooperation among the various groups in the capital area. The IEC’s work as a safety network for immigrants was evaluated by two researchers who concluded in 2007 that the project achieved its goal of being a bridge between immigrants and Finnish society. The social support it offered helped overcome social exclusion and aided integration into Finnish society.

The Roman Catholic Church had 7,000 communicants in 2005. Forty percent of these are non-Finnish and are served by a Polish Bishop. According to 2003 statistics, many Roman Catholics were foreigners resident in Finland. The number of Roman Catholics in Finland is likely to be greater than this, as not every Roman Catholic immigrant has become a communicant member of the Church.

A comprehensive list of migrant congregations belonging to different denominations is available at http://evl.fi/EVLen.nsf/Documents/08C8E12DCF3DF050C22572B400213CD2?OpenDocument&lang=EN

Finland has traditionally been a country of emigration. During the 1960s and the 1970s a lot of people migrated from the country. Traditionally Finnish migration policies have been restrictive and the number of immigrants has been low. The immigrants now amount to approximately 3 percent of the population. As immigrant groups in Finland are generally small and heterogeneous, it is difficult for them to get organised.

“The Finnish Government adopted the new Migration Policy Programme in October 2006. The programme includes a total of 34 policy guidelines and measures. The purpose of the programme is to actively promote labour migration. As the Finnish population ages over the upcoming years, the labour force decreases. In Finland, the availability of employees is expected to become a problem more rapidly than in many other European countries. The programme particularly focuses on immigration to Finland from outside the EU and EEA region.” (OECD Report 2007)
France

Demographics
- Population 2007: 61.91 million
- Population projection for 2050: 65.7 million
- Population density in 2005: 110 persons / km²
- Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04: 270,900
- Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04: 100,000
- Unemployment for nationals 2006: 12.6%
- Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006: 24.5%
- Expenditure on social protection 2004: 31.2% of GDP

Migration Indicators
- Migrants leaving France in 2004: -
- Migrants entering France in 2004: 140,100
- Migrants leaving France for EU destinations: -
- Net migration rate 2007: 1.6%
- Main countries of destination for migrants leaving France in 2006:
  - Belgium
  - Germany
  - Spain
  - Switzerland
  - the United Kingdom
  - the United States

Main countries of origin for migrants living in France in 2006:
- Country
  - Portugal: 553,663
  - Morocco: 504,096
  - Algeria: 477,482
  - Turkey: 208,049
  - Italy: 201,670

Refugees and Asylum applications
- Number of refugees in France in 2006: 145,996
- Number of refugees leaving France in 2005: 286
- Main countries of destination for refugees leaving France in 2006:
  - Germany: 241
  - -
  - -
  - -

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering France in 2004:
- Country
  - Haiti: 4,808
  - Serbia and M.: 3,714
  - Turkey: 3,481
  - Congo: 2,748
  - Russia: 2,723
One out of five residents in France has at least one foreign grandparent. In 1993, individuals born to foreign parents were granted the right to become French citizens. Although this rule was abandoned in 2005, the majority of young people of immigrant origin can currently obtain French nationality without a formal procedure.

The number of migrant/ethnic Churches

In 2005, the number of individual migrant believers was estimated to be 50,000. Current unofficial estimates put this at somewhere between 50-60,000. Local groups or Churches must be between 400 and 500.

The relation between historical/indigenous and migrant/ethnic Churches

Two migrant denominations are full members of the French Protestant Federation (FPF):
- the CEAF (Churches of African Expression)
- and the FPMA (Lutheran and Reformed together)

The CEAF has evolved from being a Zairean Church to an open African style church. They are now making close links with Evangelicals and with the French Reformed Church (ERF) for training and active partnership. It has an evangelical and pentecostal spirituality. See http://www.ceaf.fr/

The FPMA gathers mostly Malagasy people but is slowly integrating French as a possibility in their worship services and is very open to collaboration with indigenous Churches, mostly Reformed/Lutheran and classical Evangelicals.

Many indigenous Churches have now a significant number of foreign members. It is not easy to make room for them, to accept changes and to share responsibilities, especially when the foreigners are more numerous and/or more active than the indigenous members.

Projects in the framework of “Being Church together – Uniting in diversity”

The most concrete one is the Mosaic Project that started in September 2006. Indigenous Churches are very interested in it and the indigenous Churches appreciate being contacted.

Monthly meetings are taking place in Lyon, regular and diversified activities began in Marseille and there was a meeting between indigenous and migrant church leaders in January 2008. Things are also taking place in Paris, but without an organised group. Key points of the Mosaic project are mutual discovery, integration, training and concrete actions. This project is an initiative of the FPF, in cooperation with the Mission Department (DEFAP), and with the CEVAA. More info on the Mozaik project is available at http://www.defap.fr/rubrique.php?id_rubrique=74

The Evangelicals are also active with migrant Churches, mostly African and Caribbean, for training. The Bible Institute of Nogent-sur-Marne near Paris has a department of urban missiology (DMU) working on these questions.

It was estimated by the FPF in 2005 that in the Paris region there were approximately 250 Black Christian congregations from overseas (Africa & the Antilles) and a further 19 Chinese congregations.
Demographics

Population 2007 4.89 million
Population projection for 2050 -
Population density in 2005 64 persons / km²
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04 -
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04 -
Unemployment for nationals 2006 12.6 %
Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006 -
Expenditure on social protection 2004 -

Migration Indicators

Migrants leaving Georgia in 2004 -
Migrants entering Georgia in 2004 -
Migrants leaving Georgia for EU destinations -
Net migration rate 2007 -

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Georgia in 2006:

Main countries of origin for migrants living in Georgia in 2006:

Refugees and Asylum applications

Number of refugees in Georgia in 2006 1,373
Number of refugees leaving Georgia in 2005 7,301

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Georgia in 2006

Asylum applications in 2006 8

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Georgia in 2004:

Citizenship & Nationality

Population (nationals) 2006 -
Population (non-nationals) 2006 -
 Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04 -
Unemployment for nationals 2006 12.6 %

Refugees and Asylum applications

Number of refugees in Georgia in 2006 1,373
Number of refugees leaving Georgia in 2005 7,301

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Georgia in 2006

Asylum applications in 2006 8

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Georgia in 2004:

Attitudes towards neighbours 2001

Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?

Somebody of a foreign ethnicity -
A Muslim -
An immigrant or foreign worker -
A Jew -
A Roma -
Average response -

Citizenship & Nationality

Population (nationals) 2006 -
Population (non-nationals) 2006 -
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04 -
Unemployment for nationals 2006 12.6 %

Refugees and Asylum applications

Number of refugees in Georgia in 2006 1,373
Number of refugees leaving Georgia in 2005 7,301

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Georgia in 2006

Asylum applications in 2006 8

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Georgia in 2004:

Citizenship & Nationality

Population (nationals) 2006 -
Population (non-nationals) 2006 -
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04 -
Unemployment for nationals 2006 12.6 %

Refugees and Asylum applications

Number of refugees in Georgia in 2006 1,373
Number of refugees leaving Georgia in 2005 7,301

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Georgia in 2006

Asylum applications in 2006 8

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Georgia in 2004:

Attitudes towards neighbours 2001

Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?

Somebody of a foreign ethnicity -
A Muslim -
An immigrant or foreign worker -
A Jew -
A Roma -
Average response -
Religious Demographics 2006: Christian
- Christian – total: 3,753,896
- Roman Catholics: 40,050
- Orthodox: 3,628,800
- Protestants: 11,670
- Anglicans: 0
- Independents: 35,700
- Marginals: 40,000

Christian congregations per million population: 637

Religious Demographics 2001: Other
- Muslim: 958,475
- Buddhist: -
- Jew: 22,078
- Hindu: -
- Neo-religious: -
- Non-religious: 760,065
- Atheist: 134,738

Georgia is still a country of emigration. Remittances from overseas are a major source of income. The internal displacement of some people is a consequence of the disputed ‘semi-autonomous regions’ of Abkhazia and South Ossetia where large numbers of ethnically Russian people live.

The conflict-torn region of Chechnya is located close to the southern borders of the Russian Federation. This places it very close to the country of Georgia. Significant numbers of Chechen refugees are located in the northern valleys of Georgia. These are majority Muslim people, displaced by the conflict and the severe difficulties that this poses to normal life in the towns and cities of Chechnya.

The Evangelical Baptist Church of Georgia was one of the first to respond to the human crisis. Chechen refugees began crossing the border into the Pankisi Valley region of Georgia immediately prior to Christmas 1999. As traditional enemies, the Chechens could not expect to find easy haven in Georgia, even among the inhabitants of the valley who were their ethnic cousins.

During the Soviet era the Church had been forbidden to engage in social ministry, other than among its own members.

The authors are aware that occasional English-language services are conducted in Tbilisi. They are not aware of any other international congregation or of any other ministry to the relatively small numbers of migrants outside of the Pankesi valley.
Germany

**UN 1951: Refugees Convention** 1953
**CoE 1953: Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms** 1953
**CoE 1961: Social Charter** 1965
**CoE 1983: Convention on the Legal Status of Migrant Workers** -
**CoE 2005: Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings**

### Demographics
- **Population 2007**: 82.25 million
- **Population projection for 2050**: 74.6 million
- **Population density in 2005**: 232 persons / km²
- **Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04**: -151,800
- **Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04**: 37,000
- **Unemployment for nationals 2006**: 9.3 %
- **Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006**: 22.8 %
- **Expenditure on social protection 2004**: 29.5 % of GDP

### Migration Indicators
- **Migrants leaving Germany in 2004**: 697,600
- **Migrants entering Germany in 2004**: 780,100
- **Migrants leaving Germany for EU destinations**: 334,900
- **Net migration rate 2007**: 0.4 %

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Germany in 2006:
- Canada, France, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Main countries of origin for migrants living in Germany in 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1,912,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>609,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYR</td>
<td>591,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>359,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>317,603</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Refugees and Asylum applications
- **Number of refugees in Germany in 2006**: 605,406
- **Number of refugees leaving Germany in 2005**: -

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Germany in 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asylum applications in 2006: 52,807

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Germany in 2004:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serbia and M.</td>
<td>4,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>2,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>1,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>1,212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attitudes towards neighbours 2001
Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?

- Somebody of a foreign ethnicity: 4.8
- A Muslim: 11.0
- An immigrant or foreign worker: 8.6
- A Jew: 5.2
- A Roma: 32.4
- Average response: 12.4

- Average percentage of people replying that they would not like anyone of the following as a neighbour:
  - a person of another race
  - an immigrant or foreign worker
  - a Muslim, a Jew or a Roma

### Citizenship & Nationality
- **Population (nationals) 2006**: -
- **Population (non-nationals) 2006**: -
- **Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04**: 37,000
- **Citizenship applications 2004**: -
- **Stateless persons 2006**: 10,013
- **Migration Integration Index 2007**: 53/100
- **Internally Displaced Persons 2005**: -
**Religious Demographics 2006: Christian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian – total</td>
<td>59,382,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholics</td>
<td>26,246,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>996,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>26,332,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicans</td>
<td>28,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>784,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginals</td>
<td>567,818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Christian congregations per million population | 584 |

**Religious Demographics 2001: Other**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>3,653,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>84,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>96,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>51,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-religious</td>
<td>18,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious</td>
<td>14,131,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>1,793,457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experts estimate that about 30% of the population residing in Germany have been born abroad or have ancestors who immigrated to Germany after 1945. It is noteworthy that temporarily admitted migrant workers contribute to a high turnover of arrivals and departures.

Anybody not possessing German citizenship is defined as a foreign national: 7.3 million people in 2004 (8.9% of the population)

Residence registers provide migration statistics, including foreign residents and seasonal workers. An average of 800,000 immigrants includes 25% who are ethnic Germans that possess or receive German citizenship on arrival and enter with the intention of staying permanently.

The number of asylum seekers, temporary workers and family members moving to Germany continues to fall. Migrants from the EU-10 still face "transitional measures" restricting their work in Germany, though Poles form the largest group of seasonal workers. Although migration for work increased from 2004 to 2006, most third country nationals come to Germany for family reunification.

**Migrants and the German Churches**

Like in many countries there are many more activities with migrant churches taking place than can be described in this brief report. A number of regional examples of work with and among migrant churches are offered here. In August 1999, United Evangelical Mission (VEM) called a meeting at which more than 40 representatives of immigrant communities, as well as representatives of the Evangelical Church in the Rhineland (EKiR) and the Evangelical Church of Westphalia (EKvW) participated. From that meeting came the idea of a list of recognised migrant communities. At the meeting a committee was elected, the representatives of various immigrant communities as well as a representative of the EKiR and EKvW. They presented the criteria for inclusion on the list in 1999 at an open meeting of 140 representatives from migrant congregations. Some 60 immigrant congregations have been included.

The Protestant Church of Germany (EKD) attempts to facilitate exchanges between various regional activities including, for example, a conference organised with VEM in Wuppertal in January 2007.

On Pentecost Monday, May 2007, the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Württemburg organised a ‘Day of the Worldwide Church’. Congregations from twenty one different migrant groups were present. EL Württemburg helped set up a Conference of Foreign-speaking Pastors (mini-KAP Württemburg) in 2003. There are currently 34 pastors, male and female, who belong to mini-KAP.

There are known to be at least sixteen Farsi speaking congregations throughout Germany. The Iranian Presbyterian Fellowship in Europe (IPF) enjoys cordial relationships with the German Churches and the Presbyterian Church USA. The IPF has been supporting Iranian and other Farsi speaking Church services in Marburg, Hamm, Aachen, and Berlin and providing social services for people in these areas since 1991.

There are known to be at least 56 English-speaking congregations across Germany, excluding Army chaplaincies.

The Celestial Church of Christ (CCC) from Nigeria was the first genuine African Church in Germany. It started out in Munich as early as 1974. Since then, the number of African Initiated Churches (AIC) has grown rapidly, especially among students, migrant workers and people who have asked for asylum. At the moment there are an estimated 200 AICs. In cities like Berlin or Frankfurt there are more than 20 Churches and in Hamburg over 40. In the Rhine-Ruhr-Valley there are estimated to be over 100 Churches. Examples of intra-religious networks include the African Christian Council (ACC) in Hamburg, and the Council of African Churches in Germany (CACG). Most migrant African Christians in Berlin come from Ghana, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Ethiopia, and the Democratic Republic of Congo. Many are multi-linguistic, conducting worship in both the vernacular and former colonial languages.
Demographics

Population 2007: 11.22 million
Population projection for 2050: 10.6 million
Population density in 2005: 84 persons / km²
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04: 4,500
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04: 40,500
Unemployment for nationals 2006: 10.5 %
Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006: 8.9 %
Expenditure on social protection 2004: 26 % of GDP

Migration Indicators

Migrants leaving Greece in 2004: -
Migrants entering Greece in 2004: 12,600
Migrants leaving Greece for EU destinations: -
Net migration rate 2007: 3.6 %

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Greece in 2006:
Australia, Canada, Germany, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Main countries of origin for migrants living in Greece in 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>443,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>37,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>23,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>23,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>22,507</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refugees and Asylum applications

Number of refugees in Greece in 2006: 2,289
Number of refugees leaving Greece in 2005: 351

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Greece in 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asylum applications in 2006: 13,504

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Greece in 2004:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Greece’s immigrant population, including aliens and co-ethnic returnees such as Pontic Greeks and Greek Albanians, includes just over one million people. This represents about 9% of the total resident population, a strikingly high percentage for a country that until only twenty years ago was a migration sender rather than a migration host.

In 2001, 57% of all foreigners were Albanian citizens (438,000). There were 35,000 Bulgarian citizens. Pontic Greeks returning to Greece accounted for 152,204 migrants in the year 2000. More than half of these (80,000) came from Georgia, 31,000 came from Kazakhstan, 23,000 from Russia and about 9,000 from Armenia.

The Greek Diaspora has retained a strong sense of Greek ethnic identity and the strong attachment of the Greek people to the Orthodox Church has been instrumental in introducing the Greek Orthodox Church in many places around the world. There are an estimated 320,000 Greek migrants living in Germany with a further 112,000 resident in the UK (in addition to a further 200,000 British-born Greeks). Important urban centres of the Greek Diaspora today are Chicago, London, New York, Melbourne and Toronto.

The ‘General Secretariat for Greeks Abroad’ is a department of the Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Where census figures are available they show around 3 million Greeks outside of Greece and Cyprus. Estimates provided by the Council of overseas Greeks put the figure at around 7 million worldwide. Integration, intermarriage and loss of the Greek language also influence the definition and self-definition of Greeks of the Diaspora.

The Reintegration Centre for Migrant Workers (KSPM)-Ecumenical Refugee Programme (ERP) of the Holy Synod of the Church of Greece was established in 1978 to serve returning migrants from Western Europe. Since the 1990s it has extended its scope to include foreign immigrants, asylum seekers and refugees. The latter two categories are served through the ERP. It is composed of three main departments:

a. The study and research department
b. The social service department
c. The legal services department

It has offices in Athens and Thessaloniki.

It aims to contribute to the improvement of the situation of migrants of all categories in Greece, pursuing this through assisting individuals, researching, lobbying, collaborating with immigrant communities, and informing and sensitizing the Church in Greece to migration issues.

Specific fields of interest include: trafficking, Muslim migrants in Greece, second generation migrants, and asylum seekers in Athens and the border areas. Concerning Muslim migrants, the KSPM in recent years has mapped places of worship; has undertaken field research concerning religious discrimination in collaboration with migrant communities and migrant religious leaders; has organised events at parish level involving the participation and collaboration of Imams; and has a website at [www.kspm.gr](http://www.kspm.gr)

The small Greek Evangelical Church is also home to migrants, particularly those with a pentecostal and evangelical spirituality. The Athens Refugee Center’s (ARC) Helping Hands [www.helpinghands.gr/en](http://www.helpinghands.gr/en) provides showers, housing, food, clothing, outings and games, language classes, medical and legal help to migrants and refugees. The Centre offers Christian compassion and the love of Jesus Christ in a practical way to significant numbers of Muslim refugees.

The authors know of two Farsi congregations in Greece, the first in Athens and the second in Thessaloniki. The authors know of two Armenian Churches serving the migrant and Greek-born Armenian population in Greece.

There are at least fifteen English-speaking Churches in Greece plus one on Crete.
Hungary

Demographics
Population 2007 10.05 million
Population projection for 2050 8.9 million
Population density in 2005 109 persons / km²
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04 -36,900
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04 17,000
Unemployment for nationals 2006 6.1 %
Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006 -
Expenditure on social protection 2004 20.7 % of GDP

Migration Indicators
Migrants leaving Hungary in 2004 3,100
Migrants entering Hungary in 2004 21,300
Migrants leaving Hungary for EU destinations -
Net migration rate 2007 1.7 %
Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Hungary in 2006:
Australia, Austria, Canada, Germany, Romania, and the United States.

Refugees and Asylum applications
Number of refugees in Hungary in 2006 8,075
Number of refugees leaving Hungary in 2005 3,519
Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Hungary in 2006:
Country Number
Germany 2,398
Canada 829
Belgium 147
France 58
-
Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Hungary in 2004:
Country Number
Viet Nam 319
Serbia and Montenegro 243
China 172
Georgia 114
Bangladesh 90

Attitudes towards neighbours 2001
Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?
Somebody of a foreign ethnicity 52.0
A Muslim 60.3
An immigrant or foreign worker 62.0
A Jew 44.4
A Roma 68.6
Average response 57.5

Citizenship & Nationality
Population (nationals) 2006 9,920,421
Population (non-nationals) 2006 156,160
Population (non-nationals) 2006 1.5 %
Citizenship applications 2004 2,401
Stateless persons 2006 53
Migration Integration Index 2007 48/100
Internally Displaced Persons 2005 -
### Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religions</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian – total</td>
<td>8,760,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholics</td>
<td>6,034,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>151,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>2,459,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicans</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>147,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginals</td>
<td>59,253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Christian congregations per million population: 870

### Religious Demographics 2001: Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religions</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>56,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>1,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>44,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-religious</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious</td>
<td>743,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>425,327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The population of immigrant origin is relatively small in Hungary compared to many other EU countries. The number of foreign citizens legally residing in Hungary was approximately 140,000 in December 2004, of which 112,000 had long term settlement permits. Persons with a settlement permit may vote in municipal elections. The public discourse is characterised by xenophobia and diaspora politics. The two largest immigrant groups are ethnic Hungarians from neighbouring countries and Chinese.

### Response from the Churches

In Hungary, a Mongolian community is hosted by the Baptist Union. Hungarian Interchurch Aid has been contracted to organise a Government programme for unaccompanied migrant young people.

A congregation from the Church of Scotland is also a member of the Reformed Church in Hungary. A German Lutheran congregation pre-dates the Church of Scotland. The Anglican Church also ministers to English-speaking Christians in Budapest.

There is an Ethiopian Fellowship hosted by the Lutheran Church in Hungary but ministry to refugees is not a part of the ministry of the Lutheran Church.

There are two or three Independent Churches among the Chinese (the largest group of migrants in Hungary) but these are very isolated from the wider Christian Community in Hungary.

There are approximately ten independent Korean congregations in Budapest that rent church buildings from the Reformed Church. There are eleven Korean missionaries representing a variety of Reformed Churches. They are characterised by competitiveness although the Synod of the Reformed Church in Hungary does have an official relationship with the Presbyterian Church of Korea.

There is an increasing number of Iraqi Christians in Budapest.

An Egyptian Coptic Church has been active in Budapest since 2005, renting space from the Roman Catholic Church. Other Iraqi Christians are spread across the other International Churches that exist in Budapest, and of which there are between eight to twelve.

There are also some Albanians present but little effective contact has been established with them yet. The New Covenant Church is an English-speaking congregation serving Africans from many national backgrounds.

### The Refugee ministry of the Reformed Church in Hungary

This began informally during the 1980s upon the immigration into Hungary of ethnic Hungarians from the countries bordering Hungary. Help was given with shelter, social assistance and access to employment. During the mid 1990s, refugees fleeing conflict in Afghanistan and the Former Yugoslavia were offered similar assistance. A PC-USA partnership enabled personnel to be appointed to refugee work. These prompted the Church to begin planning a formal response and in 2003 the Refugee ministry was established. In 2005 the Reformed Church received assistance from the EU for its ‘Integration Programme’ which includes educational work among the children of migrants. The grant has been recently renewed and effective working relationships exist with various Government Departments.
Iceland

UN 1951: Refugees Convention 1955
CoE 1989: Convention on the Legal Status of Migrant Workers
CoE 2005: Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings

Demographics

Population 2007 0.31 million
Population projection for 2050 n/a million
Population density in 2005 3 persons / km²
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04 2,600
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04 4,000
Unemployment for nationals 2006 -
Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006 -
Expenditure on social protection 2004 23 % of GDP

Migration Indicators

Migrants leaving Iceland in 2004 33,900
Migrants entering Iceland in 2004 1,400
Migrants leaving Iceland for EU destinations -
Net migration rate 2007 13.0 %

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Iceland in 2006:
Denmark, Germany, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Main countries of origin for migrants living in Iceland in 2006:
Country Number
Denmark 2,476
Poland 1,784
Sweden 1,679
USA 1,513
Germany 1,220

Refugees and Asylum applications

Number of refugees in Iceland in 2006 267
Number of refugees leaving Iceland in 2005 -

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Iceland in 2006
Country Number
- -
- -
- -
- -
- -

Asylum applications in 2006 30
Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Iceland in 2004:
Country Number
Romania 22
Russia 10
Afghanistan 6
Moldova 5
Bulgaria 5

Citizenship & Nationality

Population (nationals) 2006 286,113
Population (non-nationals) 2006 13,778
Population (non-nationals) 2006 4.6 %
Citizenship applications 2004 -
Stateless persons 2006 1
Migration Integration Index 2007 -
Internally Displaced Persons 2005 -

Attitudes towards neighbours 2001

Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somebody of a foreign ethnicity</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Muslim</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An immigrant or foreign worker</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Jew</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Roma</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average response</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian – total</td>
<td>282,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholics</td>
<td>5,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>255,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicans</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>16,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginals</td>
<td>994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian congregations per million population</td>
<td>1,418</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Religious Demographics 2001: Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-religious</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious</td>
<td>3,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>1,071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Iceland there are no migrant or ethnic Churches as they are known in other European countries. But over the last two years, following the enlargement of the EU, the number of Polish and Baltic migrant workers has grown in Iceland. There has been a more than 170% increase. The government of Iceland decided to postpone accepting Romanian and Bulgarian workers until 2010 at the earliest. Icelandic society has not yet adjusted itself to this new wave of immigration from EU nationals.

As a result of immigration:

a. There is an increase in mass attendance in the Roman Catholic Church in Iceland. The Roman Catholic church is gaining the appearance of being a “migrant” church, with many Polish and Philipinos attending Sunday Mass.

b. A Russian Orthodox parish has been established in Reykjavik. One priest has been sent from Moscow in 2005 and he is in charge of building up a congregation here for all Orthodox believers.

In 2006 a “Forum for religious diversity” was established with 13 different religious associations as official members. The national church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Iceland, is part of it, as well as the Roman Catholic and the Orthodox Churches.

It is hoped that the network will be active in the coming years. An emergency network is envisaged that will help to find pastoral care for newly arrived immigrants or tourists who are not members of the National church.

The Evangelical Lutheran Church of Iceland is offering considerable support to the emerging Orthodox Church. It is making church buildings available for the celebration of the Orthodox liturgy and maintaining contact with the Orthodox priest to overcome isolation. The national Church counts some 85% of the population, the Orthodox an estimated 0.3%. The Roman Catholic is about 4-5% at most.
Ireland

UN 1951: Refugees Convention 1956
CoE 1953: Social Charter 1956
CoE 2005: Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings 2005

Demographics
Population 2007: 4.41 million
Population projection for 2050: 5.5 million
Population density in 2005: 59 persons / km²
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04: 37,900
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04: 62,200
Unemployment for nationals 2006: 4.5 %
Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006: -
Expenditure on social protection 2004: 17 % of GDP

Citizenship & Nationality
Population (nationals) 2006: 3,920,800
Population (non-nationals) 2006: 314,100
Population (non-nationals) 2006: 7.4 %
Citizenship applications 2004: 3,784
Stateless persons 2006: -
Migration Integration Index 2007: 53/100
Internally Displaced Persons 2005: -

Migration Indicators
Migrants leaving Ireland in 2004: 16,600
Migrants entering Ireland in 2004: 700
Migrants leaving Ireland for EU destinations: 63,600
Net migration rate 2007: 14.3 %

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Ireland in 2006:
Australia, Canada, Germany, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Asylum applications in 2006
Number of refugees in Ireland in 2006: 7,917
Number of refugees leaving Ireland in 2005: -

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Ireland in 2004:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>1,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refugees and Asylum applications
Number of refugees in Ireland in 2006: 7,917
Number of refugees leaving Ireland in 2005: -

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Ireland in 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asylum applications in 2006: 3,424

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Ireland in 2004:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>1,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attitudes towards neighbours 2001
Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somebody of a foreign ethnicity</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Muslim</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An immigrant or foreign worker</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Jew</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Roma</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average response</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average percentage of people replying that they would not like anyone of the following as a neighbour: a person of another race, an immigrant or foreign worker, a Muslim, a Jew or a Roma.
Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

- Christian – total: 3,964,258
- Roman Catholics: 3,281,493
- Orthodox: 1,600
- Protestants: 45,977
- Anglicans: 90,700
- Independents: 33,780
- Marginals: 13,090

Christian congregations per million population: 850

Religious Demographics 2001: Other

- Muslim: 8,438
- Buddhist: –
- Jew: 1,701
- Hindus: –
- Neo-religious: –
- Non-religious: 89,647
- Atheist: 5,150

It is difficult to find up-to-date and comparable statistics on immigration to Ireland as it reaches new record-breaking levels every year. Fortunately, the 2006 Census introduced a question on ethnic and cultural identity and encouraged members of minority groups to participate. Ireland is one of five EU countries where most non-Irish residents are EU citizens. Indeed, only a third of non-Irish residents are from outside the EU, mostly from English-speaking countries.

Edgehill College has been engaged in a programme working with the Irish Council of Churches. A Directory is being attempted but other than reporting on a reasonable level of activity by Irish Churches among migrant groups, there is little by way of resources or data sources that list the Church project.

EMBRACE is a group of Christians drawn from different denominations, working together to promote a positive response to people seeking asylum, refugees, migrant workers and people from minority ethnic backgrounds in Northern Ireland. EMBRACE seeks to reflect Gospel values and equip the Church to fulfill its call to welcome the stranger by providing information, training and resource materials, and acting as a channel for practical help to those in need.

Info can be found at [www.embraceni.org](http://www.embraceni.org)

**The Irish Council of Churches**

The ICC carried out research in 2002, identifying up to 10,000 worshipping Africans, 1,500 worshipping Romanians, an estimated 6,000 in the Russian Orthodox community, 400 in the Greek Orthodox community, and 150 Copts.

Fewer than twenty Irish Churches belonging to the ICC have a ‘significant presence’ of non-Irish attending worship regularly. Most of those that have a more multicultural congregation are to be found in the larger cities and towns, especially in Dublin.

In Ireland, the Parish-based integration project is now in operation and available to local Churches and/or church groups as a resource and networking opportunity. The project is based in Dublin.

The project is part of the work of the Inter-Church Committee on Social Issues (ICCSI) and will provide a resource for those already involved in working with newcomers to the island of Ireland. It is also available to those who could and should be involved but may not know where and how to start. It is now in the process of promoting the project to local parishes and church congregations, and as a starting point it is looking to establish contacts within various Churches and other agencies involved in working with immigrants.

**The Evangelical Alliance of Ireland**

The EA called together a small consultation during 2007 of some fifty Pastors and leaders of indigenous migrant congregations in Dublin and further afield. A continuing schedule of interaction was planned that will include a further consultation with an anticipated list of 150 invitees at some point during 2008.

**Polish chaplaincy in Ireland**

With some 30,000 people from Poland living in Northern Ireland and an estimated 150,000 living in the Republic of Ireland, a Polish chaplaincy has been set up in Dublin and a regular Polish section included in the Irish Catholic newspaper. sacramental services (baptism, confirmation, masses) and pre-marriage classes are offered across Ireland through the chaplaincy.
**Italy**

UN 1951: Refugees Convention 1954
CoE 2005: Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings -

---

**Demographics**

Population 2007 59.58 million  
Population projection for 2050 52.7 million  
Population density in 2005 193 persons / km²  
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04 -7,400  
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04 454,400  
Unemployment for nationals 2006 8.0 %  
Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006 -  
Expenditure on social protection 2004 26.1 % of GDP  

**Migration Indicators**

Migrants leaving Italy in 2004 7,700  
Migrants entering Italy in 2004 388,100  
Migrants leaving Italy for EU destinations -  
Net migration rate 2007 7.7 %  
Main countries of migration leaving Italy in 2006:  
Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Switzerland, and the United States.  
Main countries of origin for migrants living in Italy in 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>171,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>170,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>94,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>65,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>64,010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Refugees and Asylum applications**

Number of refugees in Italy in 2006 26,875  
Number of refugees leaving Italy in 2005 217  
Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Italy in 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Italy in 2004:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r/va</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r/va</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r/va</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r/va</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Citizenship & Nationality**

Population (nationals) 2006 56,081,197  
Population (non-nationals) 2006 2,670,514  
Population (non-nationals) 2006 4.5 %  
Citizenship applications 2004 13,705  
Stateless persons 2006 886  
Migration Integration Index 2007 65/100  
Internally Displaced Persons 2005 -  

**Attitudes towards neighbours 2001**

Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somebody of a foreign ethnicity</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Muslim</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An immigrant or foreign worker</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Jew</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Roma</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average response</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Graphs**

- Average percentage of people replying that they would not like any one of the following as a neighbour:
  - a person of another race, an immigrant or foreign worker, a Muslim, a Jew or a Roma

---
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Italy has, in the course of less than two decades, rapidly and unexpectedly changed from a country of emigration to a country of immigration. Italy witnessed a steady increase in the number of foreign nationals from 1986 to 2002. As of January, 2004, there were an estimated 2.6 million foreigners present in Italy, accounting for approximately 4.2 percent of the total resident population. Most of these immigrants are young people (aged between 20 and 40 years) who emigrated mainly for economic reasons. As early as 2001, more than half (about 59 percent) of the immigrant population had lived in Italy for more than five years. Acquisition of Italian citizenship, given the difficulties posed by the law currently in force, is still infrequent, with a high rejection rate. Immigration towards Italy did not begin in a period of reconstruction and economic development, as it did in North-Western European nations, but rather during a time of severe economic crisis, characterised, among others, by growing unemployment. Italy has developed a piecemeal approach to immigration, lacking until recently a comprehensive and consistent policy framework.

Data from the Federation of Protestant Churches (FCEI)

The Protestant Churches in Italy are a long established minority within Italian society. Nowadays potentially two thirds of all protestants in Italy are foreigners, one third Italians.

FCEI has, therefore, launched the programme "Essere Chiesa Insieme" (Uniting in Diversity). The Federation and its member Churches are well aware that the process may take considerable time and must respectfully incorporate many different situations. To provide a more comprehensive understanding, the Churches are not working with only one model but are trying to utilise various forms of collaboration and exchange. The basic principle is that all partners must be equal and all will have to cooperate. There will be different needs, different timing, and different approaches.

In 2004 a survey was undertaken on a national and regional base; below it is possible to see the national average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Demographics 2006: Christian</th>
<th>Religious Demographics 2001: Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian – total: 47,131,026</td>
<td>Muslim: 673,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholics: 55,846,749</td>
<td>Buddhist: 4,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox: 127,500</td>
<td>Jew: 33,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants: 376,790</td>
<td>Hindus: 2,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicans: 10,400</td>
<td>Neo-religious: 12,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents: 680,350</td>
<td>Non-religious: 7,535,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginals: 481,312</td>
<td>Atheist: 1,965,060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Christian congregations per million population: 834 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodists &amp; Waldensian</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baptists</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to say that these figures have increased enormously since then.
Latvia

Demographics
Population 2007 2.27 million
Population projection for 2050 1.9 million
Population density in 2005 36 persons / km²
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04 - 10,300
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04 - 1,900
Unemployment for nationals 2006 10.4 %
Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006 -
Expenditure on social protection 2004 12.6 % of GDP

Migration Indicators
Migrants leaving Latvia in 2004 2,700
Migrants entering Latvia in 2004 1,700
Migrants leaving Latvia for EU destinations 1,139
Net migration rate 2007 -0.8 %
Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Latvia in 2006:
Germany, Israel, Lithuania, Ukraine, and the United States.

Refugees and Asylum applications
Number of refugees in Latvia in 2006 21
Number of refugees leaving Latvia in 2005 2,430
Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Latvia in 2006:
Germany, USA, -
Number of asylum applications in 2006 3
Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Latvia in 2004:
Somalia, Iraq, Russia, Belarus, Moldova, -

Citizenship & Nationality
Population (nationals) 2006 2,256,518
Population (non-nationals) 2006 38,072
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04 - 10,300
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04 - 1,900
Unemployment for nationals 2006 10.4 %
Expenditure on social protection 2004 12.6 % of GDP

Attitudes towards neighbours 2001
Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?
- Somebody of a foreign ethnicity 4.8
- A Muslim 14.5
- An immigrant or foreign worker 9.8
- A Jew 5.2
- A Roma 27.2
Average response 12.3

Average percentage of people replying that they would not like anyone of the following as a neighbour:
- a person of another race,
- an immigrant or foreign worker,
- a Muslim,
- a Jew or a Roma.
### Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian - total</td>
<td>1,568,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholics</td>
<td>429,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>720,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>307,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicans</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>123,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginals</td>
<td>6,220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Christian congregations per million population: 754

### Religious Demographics 2001: Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>8,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>13,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-religious</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious</td>
<td>613,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>142,308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the analysis of Latvia’s migration history, the biggest immigration flows occurred during the Soviet era. As the main migratory flows from 1951 to 1990 came from the nearby Soviet Republics of Russia, Belarus, and Ukraine, the percentage of ethnic Latvians decreased from 77 percent in 1935 to 52 percent in 1989, while the percentage of Russians, Belarussians, and Ukrainians increased. Since 1991, the net migration in Latvia has been negative: in general, more people leave Latvia than arrive.

The main long-term migratory flows are still to and from CIS countries, with which the local people have maintained family relations and acquaintances and do not face language problems.

Newcomers to Latvia are mostly the family members of Latvian nonnationals who come from CIS countries. In the light of a shrinking population and labour market shortages, a handful of studies and conferences have looked to the experience of Latvian emigrants in Ireland to learn from its transformation into a country of labour immigration. The Programme for Development of a Comprehensive Migration and Asylum Management System 2005-9 aimed to align EC migration requirements with Latvia’s national interests.

In August 2006, Latvia introduced stricter laws for granting citizenship, refusing to grant it to those failing a Latvian language test three times. Some 450,000 ethnic Russians, Belorussians and Ukrainians currently live in Latvia, many of whom were born in the country. To acquire citizenship they are required to pass these tests. The group, which represents almost 20% of the country’s population, cannot vote, cannot hold most types of public posts and requires a visa to visit other EU countries, except for Estonia, Lithuania and Denmark.

Registered immigrants to Latvia in 2005: Russia (282), Lithuania (264), and Germany (189).

Registered emigrants from Latvia in 2005: Russia (764), Germany (261), and the UK (189).

The Evangelical Lutheran Church of Latvia has no special or formal provision for migrant congregations or individuals.

There is one Anglican, English-language church in Riga.
Lithuania

UN 1951: Refugees Convention 1997
CoE 1961: Social Charter -
CoE 1995: Convention on the Legal Status of Migrant Workers -
CoE 2005: Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings -

Demographics
Population 2007: 3.37 million
Population projection for 2050: 2.9 million
Population density in 2005: 52 persons / km²
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04: -13,700
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04: -5,700
Unemployment for nationals 2006: 11.4 %
Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006: 21.2 %
Expenditure on social protection 2004: 13.3 % of GDP

Migration Indicators
Migrants leaving Lithuania in 2004: 15,200
Migrants entering Lithuania in 2004: 5,600
Migrants leaving Lithuania for EU destinations: 3,691
Net migration rate 2007: -1.7 %

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Lithuania in 2006:
Germany, Israel, Latvia, Poland, the Russian Federation, and the United States.

Citizenship & Nationality
Population (nationals) 2006: 3,370,422
Population (non-nationals) 2006: 32,862
Population (non-nationals) 2006: 1.0 %
Citizenship applications 2004: 394
Stateless persons 2006: 7,215
Migration Integration Index 2007: 45/100
Internally Displaced Persons 2005: -

Main countries of origin for migrants living in Lithuania in 2006:
Russia: 95,514
Belarus: 56,232
Ukraine: 20,103
Latvia: 8,354
Kazakhstan: 6,561

Refugees and Asylum applications
Number of refugees in Lithuania in 2006: 531
Number of refugees leaving Lithuania in 2005: 1,448

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Lithuania in 2006:
Germany: 1,129
USA: 147
Canada: 76
-
-
Asylum applications in 2006: 50

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Lithuania in 2004:
Russia: 86
Nigeria: 10
Georgia: -
Belarus: -
Iraq: -

Attitudes towards neighbours 2001
Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?

Somebody of a foreign ethnicity: 9.7
A Muslim: 33.1
An immigrant or foreign worker: 23.6
A Jew: 23.0
A Roma: 63.3
Average response: 30.5

Average percentage of people replying that they would not like any one of the following as a neighbour:
- a person of another race,
- an immigrant or foreign worker,
- a Muslim, a Jew or a Roma
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### Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian – total</td>
<td>3,018,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholics</td>
<td>2,666,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>132,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>39,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicans</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>46,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginals</td>
<td>4,623</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Christian congregations per million population: 396

### Religious Demographics 2001: Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>8,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>6,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-religious</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious</td>
<td>401,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>40,013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The migration situation in Lithuania differs from most other Central-East European countries. Until the late 1980s, international migration into Lithuania was both intensive and stable. Since the end of World War II, Lithuania has undergone rapid, large-scale industrialisation, urbanisation and colonisation, due to the fact that in 1940 the Soviet Union occupied and annexed Lithuania. The migration of the labour force formed the ethnic groups of first generation immigrants. At that time, there were almost no migration relations with other foreign countries.

However, since 1989, as a result of political, social and economic changes in Lithuania, the migration situation has started to change, with some migration flows even reversing their direction. Until present, Lithuania has had a negative migration balance. This has been the prevailing trend in Lithuania for several years. The current immigrant waves to Lithuania mainly consist of the following three categories of persons: returning citizens (i.e., Lithuanians whose arrival is unrestricted), reunion of family members (limited, although the priority is given to their arrival) and migration on business (the number is not high). The majority of immigrants come from Russia and the CIS countries.

The number of illegal transit migrants and refugees is relatively low. Recent trends place Lithuania as a significant country of emigration, with rates that are the highest in the EU-25. In 2005, the number of Lithuanian citizens returning from abroad was double the number of incoming third country nationals (largely Russians, Byelarussians, Ukrainians and stateless persons).

Immigrants to Lithuania in 2006: UK – 1500, Germany – 700 and Ireland – 800.

Emigrants from Lithuania in 2006: UK – 3200, Germany – 1000 and Ireland 1300.

There is an English-speaking International Lutheran Church in Vilnius.
Demographics

Population 2007: 0.48 million
Population projection for 2050: 0.6 million
Population density in 2005: 180 persons / km²
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04: 1,700
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04: 4,300
Unemployment for nationals 2006: 5.1 %
Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006: -
Expenditure on social protection 2004: 22.6 % of GDP

Migration Indicators

Migrants leaving Luxembourg in 2004: 9,600
Migrants entering Luxembourg in 2004: 11,300
Migrants leaving Luxembourg for EU destinations: -
Net migration rate 2007: 9.0 %

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Luxembourg in 2006: Belgium, France, Germany, Portugal, Switzerland, and the United States.

Main countries of origin for migrants living in Luxembourg in 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>41,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>18,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>14,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>12,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>12,254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refugees and Asylum applications

Number of refugees in Luxembourg in 2006: 2,206
Number of refugees leaving Luxembourg in 2005: -

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Luxembourg in 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asylum applications in 2006: 50

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Luxembourg in 2004:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serbia and M.</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Citizenship & Nationality

Population (nationals) 2006: 277,700
Population (non-nationals) 2006: 181,800
Population (non-nationals) 2006: 39.6 %
Citizenship applications 2004: 1,549
Stateless persons 2006: -
Migration Integration Index 2007: 55/100
Internally Displaced Persons 2005: -

Attitudes towards neighbours 2001

Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somebody of a foreign ethnicity</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Muslim</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An immigrant or foreign worker</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Jew</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Roma</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average response</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Currently about 38 percent of the population in Luxembourg is of foreign nationality, mainly from EU-member states. The number of citizens from non-EU countries is small and they are statistically grouped together and represented and by the category of ‘other’. The economic and labour market situation is characterised by a particular feature of the labour force composition: one third of the labour force consists of immigrant workers with permanent residence status.

Over the course of the last three decades, the debate on immigration and the integration of immigrants has gained little relevance in Luxembourg. Only recently have immigration issues become more politically important due to the arrival of asylum seekers and refugees, mainly from Bosnia and Africa, the consequent public attempts to deport them, and the protests of immigrant organisations against this practice. A generalised regularisation programme in 2001 delivered regular status to some irregular immigrants without much public attention.

The majority of Luxembourg’s foreign residents are young, female migrant workers from other EU Member States (especially Portugal, Italy, and France). Third-country nationals (hereafter, ‘migrants’), only 5.5% of the population, are a mixture of high-skilled workers from North America, recognised refugees from the Balkan wars, former guest-workers, and their family members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Demographics 2006: Christian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian – total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian congregations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per million population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Demographics 2001: Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Macedonia, FYRO

UN 1951: Refugees Convention 1994
CoE 1983: Convention on the Legal Status of Migrant Workers -
CoE 2005: Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings -

Demographics
Population 2007 2.04 million
Population projection for 2050 -
Population density in 2005 79 persons / km²
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04 2,500
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04 - 5,300
Unemployment for nationals 2006 -
Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006 -
Expenditure on social protection 2004 -

Migration Indicators
Migrants leaving Macedonia in 2004 700
Migrants entering Macedonia in 2004 1,700
Migrants leaving Macedonia for EU destinations 216
Net migration rate 2007 -2.6 %

Citizenship & Nationality
Population (nationals) 2006 -
Population (non-nationals) 2006 -
Population (non-nationals) 2006 -
Citizenship applications 2004 -
Stateless persons 2006 -
Migration Integration Index 2007 -
Internally Displaced Persons 2005 -

Attitudes towards neighbours 2001
Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?
Somebody of a foreign ethnicity -
A Muslim -
An immigrant or foreign worker -
A Jew -
A Roma -
Average response -

Refugees and Asylum applications
Number of refugees in Macedonia in 2006 -
Number of refugees leaving Macedonia in 2005 8,600
Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Macedonia in 2006:

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Macedonia in 2004:

84
### Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian - total</td>
<td>1,301,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholics</td>
<td>15,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>1,274,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>14,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicans</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>15,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginals</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Christian congregations per million population: 714

### Religious Demographics 2001: Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>572,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-religious</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious</td>
<td>133,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>28,308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Insufficient data exists to offer a meaningful commentary for the country of Macedonia.

The authors know of one migrant African pastor, Pentecostal in theology and practice, who has established two or three new congregations among Africans in Skopje. A second African is believed to be more actively involved in working among Macedonians in the more rural areas of the country.
Malta

**Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population 2007</td>
<td>0.41 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population projection for 2050</td>
<td>0.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population density in 2005</td>
<td>1,272 persons / km²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment for nationals 2006</td>
<td>7.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure on social protection 2004</td>
<td>18.8 % of GDP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Migration Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrants leaving Malta in 2004</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants entering Malta in 2004</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants leaving Malta for EU destinations</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net migration rate 2007</td>
<td>4.6 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Malta in 2006:
- Australia, Canada, Germany, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

**Refugees and Asylum applications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of refugees in Malta in 2006</td>
<td>2,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of refugees leaving Malta in 2005</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Malta in 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asylum applications in 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Malta in 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR Congo</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Citizenship & Nationality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (nationals) 2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (non-nationals) 2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (non-nationals) 2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship applications 2004</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stateless persons 2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration Integration Index 2007</td>
<td>41/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internally Displaced Persons 2005</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attitudes towards neighbours 2001**

Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?

- Somebody of a foreign ethnicity 19.0
- A Muslim 28.0
- An immigrant or foreign worker 15.7
- A Jew 21.0
- A Roma 30.2

Average response 22.8
Malta has been a country of emigration since the days of British colonial rule. With an area of just over 300 square Kilometers and a total population of 399,867 inhabitants, the Maltese Islands have been one of the most densely populated countries in the world for several decades. So far, the political approach to immigration has been grounded on the assumption that a densely populated country with limited resources has no space for newcomers. As a result, the issue of immigration has been seen as a question of border control, in both discussions of accession to the EU and the illegal immigration phenomenon. In fact, the increasing number of "illegal" immigrants reaching the Maltese Islands since 2002 and the recurrent episodes of immigrants losing their lives at sea, either when trying to reach Malta or when leaving the island to reach the coast of Sicily, have put the country’s administration under enormous political pressure. The issue currently dominates the political debate and attracts the full attention of the national media.

The majority of the Maltese population is Roman Catholic and this has a significant influence on the range of agencies working among the migrant population on the two islands.

### Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian – total</td>
<td>393,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholics</td>
<td>374,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>1,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicans</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginals</td>
<td>1,157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Christian congregations per million population:** 491

### Religious Demographics 2001: Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>1,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-religious</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious</td>
<td>3,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moldova

Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population 2007</td>
<td>3.57 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population projection for 2050</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population density in 2005</td>
<td>122 persons / km²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04</td>
<td>-3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04</td>
<td>-4,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Migration Indicators

- Migrants leaving Moldova in 2004
- Migrants entering Moldova in 2004
- Migrants leaving Moldova for EU destinations
- Net migration rate 2007: -1.2%

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Moldova in 2006:
Germany, Israel, the Russian Federation, Ukraine, the United States, and Uzbekistan.

Main countries of origin for migrants living in Moldova in 2006:
- Country: Number
  - Ukraine: 1,732
  - Russia: 1,348
  - Bulgaria: 391
  - Belarus: 24

Refugees and Asylum applications

- Number of refugees in Moldova in 2006: 161
- Number of refugees leaving Moldova in 2005: 12,064

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Moldova in 2006:
- Country: Number
  - USA: 5,534
  - Germany: 5,466
  - France: 285
  - United Kingdom: 264
  - Ireland: 190

Asylum applications in 2006: 78

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Moldova in 2004:
- Country: Number
  - Armenia: -
  - Turkey: -
The economic effects of migration are considerable: according to the National Bank of Moldova, migrants’ remittances in 2005 contributed to a third of national gross domestic product.

Migration from Moldova often involves irregular patterns, either of irregular border crossing, irregular residence or irregular employment. The aforementioned CBS-AXA study indicates that around 35% of Moldovan migrants experience irregular residence abroad, 35% irregular employment and some 25% make their migratory movements irregularly. Studies also indicate a high percentage of Moldovan migrants experiencing exploitation in migratory process.

Churches in Moldova have shown a strong preoccupation with the social consequences associated with emigration. These include the neglect of children who have been left without their parents who have migrated abroad or who have experienced the consequences of human trafficking. The ecumenical Moldova Partnership Programme of WCC has, since 2004, supported Church initiatives that address the undesired consequences of migration. Theological and pastoral reflections on emigration have been undertaken by different Churches. An interdenominational coalition on the 2nd December 2007 organised a national day of prayer for those who are far away from home, for those who stayed behind, for those who have suffered, and for those who are the victims of human trafficking.

(http://www.iom.md/materials/press_060632.html)

The Orthodox, Lutheran, and Baptist Churches participated in the activity and on this occasion compiled a collection of sermons on the issue of immigration and trafficking.
Montenegro

UN 1951: Refugees Convention -
CoE 1953: Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms -
CoE 1961: Social Charter -
CoE 1968: Convention on the Legal Status of Migrant Workers -
CoE 2005: Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings -

Demographics
Population 2007 0.33 million
Population projection for 2050 -
Population density in 2005 45 persons / km²
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04 -
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04 -
Unemployment for nationals 2006 -
Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006 -
Expenditure on social protection 2004 -

Migration Indicators
Migrants leaving Montenegro in 2004 -
Migrants entering Montenegro in 2004 -
Migrants leaving Montenegro for EU destinations -
Net migration rate 2007 -

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Montenegro in 2006:

Main countries of origin for migrants living in Montenegro in 2006:

Internally Displaced Persons 2005 16,196

Citizenship & Nationality
Population (nationals) 2006 -
Population (non-nationals) 2006 -
Population (non-nationals) 2006 -
Citizenship applications 2004 -
Stateless persons 2006 -
Migration Integration Index 2007 -

Attitudes towards neighbours 2001
Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?
Somebody of a foreign ethnicity -
A Muslim -
An immigrant or foreign worker -
A Jew -
A Roma -
Average response -

Refugees and Asylum applications
Number of refugees in Montenegro in 2006 6,926
Number of refugees leaving Montenegro in 2005 -

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Montenegro in 2006:

Asylum applications in 2006 10

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Montenegro in 2004:

Citizenship & Nationality
Population (nationals) 2006 -
Population (non-nationals) 2006 -
Population (non-nationals) 2006 -
Citizenship applications 2004 -
Stateless persons 2006 -
Migration Integration Index 2007 -

Attitudes towards neighbours 2001
Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?
Somebody of a foreign ethnicity -
A Muslim -
An immigrant or foreign worker -
A Jew -
A Roma -
Average response -

Refugees and Asylum applications
Number of refugees in Montenegro in 2006 6,926
Number of refugees leaving Montenegro in 2005 -

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Montenegro in 2006:

Asylum applications in 2006 10

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Montenegro in 2004:
### Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian – total</td>
<td>474,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholics</td>
<td>21,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>420,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>9,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicans</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>21,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginals</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Christian congregations per million population: 3,244

### Religious Demographics 2001: Other

- Muslim: -
- Buddhist: -
- Jew: -
- Hindus: -
- Neo-religious: -
- Non-religious: -
- Atheist: -
### Demographics

- **Population 2007**: 16.40 million
- **Population projection for 2050**: 17.4 million
- **Population density in 2005**: 392 persons / km²
- **Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04**: 49,900
- **Unemployment for nationals 2006**: 4.7 %
- **Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006**: 12.7 %
- **Expenditure on social protection 2004**: 28.5 % of GDP

### Migration Indicators

- **Migrants leaving Netherlands in 2004**: 23,500
- **Migrants entering Netherlands in 2004**: 65,100
- **Migrants leaving Netherlands for EU destinations**: 41,331
- **Net migration rate 2007**: -0.4 %

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Netherlands in 2006:

- Australia, Belgium, Canada, Germany, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Main countries of origin for migrants living in Netherlands in 2006:

- **Country**  |  **Number**
- Turkey        | 190,488
- Surinam       | 189,007
- Morocco       | 163,407
- Indonesia     | 161,443
- Germany       | 120,573

### Refugees and Asylum applications

- **Number of refugees in Netherlands in 2006**: 100,574
- **Number of refugees leaving Netherlands in 2005**: 159

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Netherlands in 2006

- **Country**  |  **Number**
- Germany       | 150
- -             | -
- -             | -
- -             | -

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Netherlands in 2006:

- **Country**  |  **Number**
- Iraq          | 1,620
- Somalia       | 1,315
- Afghanistan   | 902
- Iran          | 557
- Burundi       | 419
**Religious Demographics 2006: Christian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian – total</td>
<td>10,774,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholics</td>
<td>4,801,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>9,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>3,135,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicans</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>442,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginals</td>
<td>89,728</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Christian congregations per million population: 679

**Religious Demographics 2001: Other**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>594,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>76,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>24,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>92,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-religious</td>
<td>22,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious</td>
<td>2,031,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>204,978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current Dutch migrant population is characterised by a growing number of descendants of immigrants from former recruitment countries and post-colonial minorities, as well as a new migration based on family reunification, asylum and family formation. First generation immigrants, or ‘foreign-born’, make up 10% of the Dutch population; another 9% are descendants of immigrants or ‘second generation migrants’ who have at least one foreign-born parent. The largest groups are those of Turkish, Moroccan, Surinamese and Indonesian origin.

According to Statistics Netherlands, an expected increase in immigrants from the non-Western world will be greater than that from Western world. New forms of Christian communities from the non-Western world, however, suggest that the identity and involvement of Christian communities in the Netherlands will change but not necessarily diminish.

**The City of Rotterdam**

Of the estimated 140 migrant Churches in the Rotterdam area, there are an estimated 21,000 immigrant people who are in their first or second generation. In the port of Delfshaven in Rotterdam-West, the Reformed Church has a part-time worker among Migrant Christian Communities. The Ethiopian Evangelical Church has a relationship with this congregation. The Reformed Church in Kralingen is in contact with at least 17 migrant congregations. Occasional choral events and Bible study are jointly organised. The International Christian Fellowship in Rotterdam has 50% Dutch members worshipping alongside African, Arabic, Chinese, Turkish, Iranian, Kurdish, Farsi, and various Eastern Europeans. Monthly input is offered in Arabic, Farsi, Chinese, African, and Slavic. The Holy Trinity Parish has 20 different cultural or ethnic groups present in its congregation on a typical Sunday. Mass is celebrated in Dutch only, with 400-500 hundred people present. Migrant Churches such as the Kroatische RK Parish, the Scots International Church and the Russian Orthodox Church have the function of serving people from particular regions.

**Directory of migrant Churches**

Called ‘ieder hoorde in zijn eigen taal’, the inventory features all the migrant Churches in the Netherlands, and gives information about times and places of church meetings where the sermon is held in a foreign language. There are at least thirty five English-language congregations in the Netherlands.

**SKIN**

Samen kerk in Nederland was created in 1995 and is currently based in Amersfoort. There are 56 migrant church members of SKIN which exists for and on behalf of its members but serves the purpose of fostering greater participation alongside and with the indigenous Churches of the Netherlands. http://skinkerken.nl/

**Encounter**

This is an ongoing programme of the Netherlands Missionary Council, NZR. An annual calendar offers the opportunity to broaden the appeal of the encounter with indigenous Churches in the Netherlands.

**GAVE**

This is a member organisation of the Dutch Evangelical Alliance and a partner within the Refugee Highway of the World Evangelical Alliance. GAVE offers support to indigenous Churches in the Netherlands by providing training and resources, including a multi-lingual songbook www.gave.nl

**Raad van Kerken (Dutch Council of Churches)**

The RVK has several ‘migrant’ Churches in its membership, most notably the Syrian Orthodox Church, the Anglican Church, and the Moluccan Reformed Church. A special Migrant week first took place during November 2004 promoting "LIVING Together In Diversity: Make it WORK!" A website was subsequently set up www.migrantenweek.nl
Norway

UN 1951: Refugees Convention 1953
CoE 1993: Convention on the Legal Status of Migrant Workers 1999
CoE 2005: Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings -

Demographics
Population 2007 4.73 million
Population projection for 2050 -
Population density in 2005 12 persons / km²
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04 16,500
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04 35,900
Unemployment for nationals 2006 4.4 %
Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006 -
Expenditure on social protection 2004 26.3 % of GDP

Migration Indicators
Migrants leaving Norway in 2004 13,800
Migrants entering Norway in 2004 27,900
Migrants leaving Norway for EU destinations 19,572
Net migration rate 2007 7.6 %
Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Norway in 2006:
Canada, Denmark, Germany, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States.
Main countries of origin for migrants living in Norway in 2006:
Country Number
Sweden 3,3013
Denmark 22,108
USA 14,559
United Kingdom 14,114
Pakistan 14,098

Refugees and Asylum applications
Number of refugees in Norway in 2006 43,336
Number of refugees leaving Norway in 2005 -
Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Norway in 2006:
Country Number
- -
- -
- -
- -
- -
- -
Asylum applications in 2006 4,284
Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Norway in 2004:
Country Number
- -
- -
- -
- -
- -
- -
Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian – total</td>
<td>4,259,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholics</td>
<td>57,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>4,069,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicans</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>47,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginals</td>
<td>18,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian congregations per million population</td>
<td>787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Religious Demographics 2001: Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>45,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>67,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-religious</td>
<td>21,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious</td>
<td>84,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>24,988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Norway’s migration policies are partly aligned to the EU through its membership of the European Economic Area, the Schengen Agreement on free movement and the Dublin Convention on asylum. Norway also has much in common with its Nordic peers: dynamic labour markets, strong commitments to humanitarian protection and equal social rights for foreigners. Non-EU migrants tend to arrive as family members of migrant workers, high-skilled workers and asylum seekers, though the latter continues to decline. The employment rate for migrants from outside the EU is 18.6 percentage points less than for Norwegians. Recent legislation focused on comprehensive introduction programmes, curbing forced marriages, reforming nationality law and bolstering antidiscrimination and equality laws.

Indigenous Churches and migrant congregations

The following Churches, with a majority of immigrants, are members of The Christian Council of Norway:

- The Swedish Church
- The German Church
- The Anglican Church
- The Greek Orthodox Church
- The Serbian Orthodox Church of Norway
- The Finnish Church is an associate member
- The Ethiopian Orthodox Church has applied for membership (to be be handled in 2009).

Some national Churches have a lot of member Churches/ congregations organised by ethnicity.

The Baptist Union in Norway has been very active in this regard. They organise different networks for different ethnic Churches. For example they facilitate a network of Ethiopian Churches consisting of about 13 Churches nationally. Probably the numbers are at least as high for Tamils and a few other nationalities.

The Pentecostal Church also has many ethnic groups within its structure.

The Churches Network for Integration of Refugees and Immigrants is a project within The Christian Council of Norway. One of the tasks of the network is to make contacts with migrant Churches and to create meeting places with Norwegian Churches and Ecumenical Organisations. This to build bridges and relationships between the national Churches and the new migrant Churches.

The network has also served as the official link between the Church of Norway as well as other Churches in the council and the migrant Churches. The Church of Norway has its main focus on interfaith dialogue and its most direct contacts are with Muslim mosques rather than with migrant Churches.

Is there any project in the framework of ‘Being Church together – Uniting in diversity’?

The Christian Council is planning to arrange a Nordic conference in November 2008, on Church and integration hoping to link this more closely to the ‘Being Church Together’ framework.

The authors know of 3 Farsi-speaking congregations, and 13 English-speaking congregations.

The Roman Catholic Church was praised in 2008 for its role in supporting over 100,000 Polish and other Roman Catholic migrants. Four masses in Polish are celebrated in Oslo every Sunday.
Poland

UN 1951: Refugees Convention 1991
CoE 1993: Convention on the Legal Status of Migrant Workers -
CoE 2005: Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings -

Demographics
Population 2007 38.00 million
Population projection for 2050 33.7 million
Population density in 2005 123 persons / km²
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04 8,800
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04 - 138,100
Unemployment for nationals 2006 19.0 %
Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006 -
Expenditure on social protection 2004 20 % of GDP

Migration Indicators
Migrants leaving Poland in 2004 20,800
Migrants entering Poland in 2004 700
Migrants leaving Poland for EU destinations 4,892
Net migration rate 2007 -3.6 %

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Poland in 2006:
Belarus, Canada, France, Germany, the Russian Federation, and the United States.

Main countries of origin for migrants living in Poland in 2006:

Refugees and Asylum applications
Number of refugees in Poland in 2006 6,790
Number of refugees leaving Poland in 2005 19,641

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Poland in 2006

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Poland in 2004:

Citizenship & Nationality
Population (nationals) 2006 -
Population (non-nationals) 2006 -
Population (non-nationals) 2006 -
Citizenship applications 2004 6,825
Stateless persons 2006 74
Migration Integration Index 2007 44/100
Internally Displaced Persons 2005 -

Attitudes towards neighbours 2001
Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?

Somebody of a foreign ethnicity 17.3
A Muslim 23.8
An immigrant or foreign worker 23.6
A Jew 25.1
A Roma 38.7
Average response 25.7

Average percentage of people replying that they would not like any one of the following as a neighbour:
- a person of another race,
- an immigrant or foreign worker,
- a Muslim, a Jew or a Roma

Attitudes towards neighbours 2001

Average percentage of people replying that they would not like any one of the following as a neighbour:

Country
Ukraine 309,131
Belarus 104,463
Germany 101,633
Lithuania 79,769
Russia 54,226

Refugees and Asylum applications
Number of refugees in Poland in 2006 6,790
Number of refugees leaving Poland in 2005 19,641

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Poland in 2006

Country
Germany 18,265
Belgium 484
Canada 365
France 181
United Kingdom 171

Asylum applications in 2006 2,057

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Poland in 2004:

Country
Russia 5,015
Belarus 62
Ukraine 49
Georgia 40
Pakistan 36

Demographics
Population 2007 38.00 million
Population projection for 2050 33.7 million
Population density in 2005 123 persons / km²
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04 8,800
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04 - 138,100
Unemployment for nationals 2006 19.0 %
Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006 -
Expenditure on social protection 2004 20 % of GDP

Migration Indicators
Migrants leaving Poland in 2004 20,800
Migrants entering Poland in 2004 700
Migrants leaving Poland for EU destinations 4,892
Net migration rate 2007 -3.6 %

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Poland in 2006:
Belarus, Canada, France, Germany, the Russian Federation, and the United States.

Main countries of origin for migrants living in Poland in 2006:

Refugees and Asylum applications
Number of refugees in Poland in 2006 6,790
Number of refugees leaving Poland in 2005 19,641

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Poland in 2006

Country
Germany 18,265
Belgium 484
Canada 365
France 181
United Kingdom 171

Asylum applications in 2006 2,057

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Poland in 2004:

Country
Russia 5,015
Belarus 62
Ukraine 49
Georgia 40
Pakistan 36
Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

- Christian – total 37,087,317
- Roman Catholics 34,976,911
- Orthodox 571,200
- Protestants 147,800
- Anglicans 0
- Independents 150,840
- Marginals 240,795

- Christian congregations per million population 429

Religious Demographics 2001: Other

- Muslim 5,094
- Buddhist 1,008
- Jew 6377
- Hindu 0
- Neo-religious 0
- Non-religious 864,235
- Atheist 115,452

Along with the political, social and economic transition which occurred in the Central and Eastern European region after 1989, the mechanisms and patterns of migration have also changed.

Although Poland is still a country of emigration, it has recently experienced an inflow of asylum seekers, a movement of transit migrants and permanent immigration both from the East and the West. Indeed, a new ethnic diversity and the creation of a new ethnic consciousness can now be observed.

According to the population census of 2002, 775,300 persons or two percent of the total Polish population were born abroad (including in territories that belonged to Poland before World War II). More than 98 percent of permanent residents of Poland were of Polish citizenship, of which 1.2 percent (444,900 persons) held citizenship in both Poland and another country. The category of dual citizenship holders covered 279,600 German citizens (62.9 percent), 30,100 US citizens (6.8 per cent), 14,500 Canadian citizens (3.3 per cent), 7,300 French citizens and approximately one thousand citizens of the Ukraine. 40,200 persons held only foreign citizenship. In this category, Germans (7,900), Ukrainians (5,400) and Russians (3,200) were predominant.

The immigration of third-country nationals to Poland is low but growing in size and importance. The emigration of young workers following EU accession has preoccupied policy debates on migration and intensified labour market shortages. Some restrictions have been eased for migrant workers from neighbouring Belarus, Russia and Ukraine. Poland receives only a few asylum seekers, mostly Chechens.

There are an estimated 850,000 Polish migrant workers in the UK. During the recent general elections in Poland, more than forty polling booths were erected across the UK with the aim of having a polling booth within 35 kilometres of every significant Polish community.

The authors know of at least four English-language congregations in Poland.

The Polish diaspora is 20 million, almost half the size of the Polish population in Poland. The Polish diaspora lives in over 90 countries of the world.
Demographics
Population 2007 10.63 million
Population projection for 2050 10 million
Population density in 2005 114 persons / km²
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04 - 500
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04 34,500
Unemployment for nationals 2006 6.7 %
Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006 11.6 %
Expenditure on social protection 2004 24.9 % of GDP

Migration Indicators
Migrants leaving Portugal in 2004 10,000
Migrants entering Portugal in 2004 13,800
Migrants leaving Portugal for EU destinations -
Net migration rate 2007 3.2 %
Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Portugal in 2006:
Brazil, Canada, France, Germany, Switzerland, and the United States.

Main countries of origin for migrants living in Portugal in 2006:
Country Number
Angola 174,210
France 95,282
Mozambique 76,017
Brazil 49,891
Cape Verde 44,964

Refugees and Asylum applications
Number of refugees in Portugal in 2006 333
Number of refugees leaving Portugal in 2005 74
Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Portugal in 2006
Country Number
Germany 63
France -
Mozambique -
Brazil -
Cape Verde -

Asylum applications in 2006 130
Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Portugal in 2004:
Country Number
Colombia 26
Angola 9
Russia 7
DR Congo 7
India 6
Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian – total</td>
<td>9,465,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholics</td>
<td>9,040,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>124,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicans</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>225,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginals</td>
<td>129,130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Christian congregations per million population: 1,035

Religious Demographics 2001: Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>24,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>55,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-religious</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious</td>
<td>536,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>110,075</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portugal’s historical past has strongly influenced the composition of the country’s immigrant population. The main third-country foreign nationals in Portugal originate traditionally from Portuguese-speaking African countries (Cape Verde, Angola, Guinea Bissau and S. Tomé e Príncipe) and Brazil. In 2001, a newly created immigrant status of “permanence” authorisation uncovered a quantitative and qualitative change in the structure of the immigrant population in Portugal. First, there was a quantitative jump from 223,602 foreigners in 2001 to 364,203 regularised foreigners in 2003.

Secondly, there was a substantial qualitative shift in the composition of the immigrant population. The majority of the new immigrants come from Eastern European countries, such as Ukraine, Moldova, Romania and the Russian Federation.

While the traditional flows would congregate around the metropolitan area of Lisbon and in the Algarve, the new migratory flows tend to be more geographically dispersed and present in less urbanized areas of Portugal.

Information from the Churches

The Lusitanian (Anglican), Presbyterian, and Methodist Churches form the Council of Ecumenical Churches. These small communities have about 5000 members. They have always had contacts with the Protestant Churches in Portuguese speaking African countries.

About 80 years ago the Liga Evangélica was founded in Lisbon to support missionaries and receive African Protestant students in Portugal. Although the Liga is independent, it is linked to the Presbyterian Church. A process of merging with the Methodist Church has now been initiated. Recently the Liga has changed its scope and is now working with migrants.

Since 1995 the ‘Ecumenical group for Church and Society’ was established to work with African Prophetic Churches in the suburbs of Lisbon. These Churches were founded by African spiritual leaders that suffered persecution during the colonial era and include the Tocoist Church, the Kimbanguist Church, and others. It will join the new structure of Liga Evangélica to strengthen joint efforts and link the migrant Churches with the Protestant Churches.

There are also different foreign Protestant Churches, including the German Evangelical Lutheran Church (since the 18th Century) and the Church of Scotland. Recently the Orthodox Church is emerging among the various communities formed by Ukrainian migrants. Orthodox priests are now arriving from Ukraine.

Other information

There are estimated to be 129 Ibero-American missionaries working in Portugal.

The Universal Church of the Kingdom of God has 320 congregations, 90,000 members and 170,000 in the community. It is a mission affiliate of The Universal Church of the Kingdom of God in Brazil.

The Brazilian Christian Congregations in Portugal have 102 congregations, 3,000 members and a community of 5,000. They are composed of Brazilians from a Church based in São Paulo.

The Anglican Church has 18 congregations, 1,500 members and a community of 3,190. There are English speaking Anglican chaplaincies, including one on Madeira.

The John Wesley Centre is located in the premises of the Methodist Church in Braga. It was built before any housing arrived in the area but it is now surrounded by high-rise apartments and is an area in which many immigrants and Roma live. It works with about 80-90 migrant and Roma children between the ages of 2 to 10 throughout the week whilst parents are at work.

Intercultural Connection is an organisation created to assist people in different multicultural experiences. It is part of the Refugee Highway and related to the Evangelical Alliance in Portugal.
Demographics

Population 2007: 21.42 million
Population projection for 2050: 17.1 million
Population density in 2005: 91 persons / km²
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04: -41,800
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04: -100,000
Unemployment for nationals: 7.6 %
Unemployment for third-country nationals: -
Expenditure on social protection 2004: 14.9 % of GDP

Migration Indicators

Migrants leaving Romania in 2004: 13,100
Migrants entering Romania in 2004: 300
Migrants leaving Romania for EU destinations: 0
Net migration rate 2007: -4.7 %

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Romania in 2006: Canada, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Italy, and the United States.

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Romania in 2004:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Atitudes towards neighbours 2001

Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?

- Somebody of a foreign ethnicity: 24.2%
- A Muslim: 31.4%
- An immigrant or foreign worker: 21.1%
- A Jew: 23.2%
- A Roma: 51.5%

Average response: 30.3%
Romania in the 20th century has been mainly a country of emigration. Until 1989, emigration was mainly related to the issues of ethnic minorities that have been historically present in Romania. Migration since 1990 has included all ethnic groups. While specific minorities, and in particular the group of Romanian Roma, have drawn most attention in public debates, migration is widespread in all groups and sectors of society. Migrants come from all regions of the country. Regions such as Moldova which have no previous history of international migration generate substantial emigration. Italy and Spain in recent years are the main countries of destination, but there are substantial Romanian communities in other countries, such as Germany or France.

Data on Romanian emigration is fragmented, partly as a substantial part of emigration is informal or irregular. Inconsistent data is also likely to be a result of seasonal migration and internal-EU migration, which is often not formally registered. While official estimates by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 2007 mentioned 1.2 million Romanian emigrants, the national group of Trade Unions estimated the number to be 3.4 million (Cotidianul of 18.6.2007). A study of the Open Society Institute, which researched temporary migration in 2006 concluded that “12% of 18 to 59 year old Romanians have worked abroad after 1989”. (OSI 2006: “Living abroad on a temporary basis”)

Immigration to Romania is a fairly new and so far small-scale phenomenon: a limited number of refugees arrived since the 1990s, many of whom were initially intending to transit Romania to other countries, but found themselves “stuck” in Romania. As a result of labour market shortages in some sectors of the Romanian economy (which are a result of the significant emigration of the Romanian workforce), immigrant labour has become increasingly important. Reports for the year 2007 speak of 12,000 immigrant workers from Turkey, Republic of Moldova and China. A substantial part of the immigrants from the Republic of Moldova are not formally registered as they have acquired Romanian citizenship.

Churches have responded to the issue of migration, both to its pastoral and social challenges. The Evangelical Church of the Augsburg confession, for example, has reflected carefully on its changing experience as a minority church – resulting from the loss of 85% of its members through emigration since 1990.

The Orthodox Church takes very seriously the importance of the Romanian Orthodox diasporas. While the organisation of pastoral care for Romanians abroad had been challenging before 1989, the 1990s saw a significant flourishing of the life of Romanian Orthodoxy abroad, notably in the Metropolies of Western, Mediterranean, Central, and Northern Europe. In a radio interview of 13th September 2007, the newly elected Patriarch of the Romanian Orthodox Church, H.B. Daniel, highlighted the presence of millions of Romanian Orthodox Christians outside Romania as an important motivation for ecumenical dialogue and exchange. Activities in Romania included a conference on “The migration phenomenon in the parish – opportunities, problems and pastoral perspectives” which in August 2005 brought together some 900 priests from the Archbishopric of Iasi.

The Ecumenical Forum for Refugees and Migrants, ARCA, was founded in 1998 and is one of the few organizations assisting refugees and migrants in Romania. The Romanian ecumenical association of churches AIDRom has been addressing the issue of migration in the context of its women’s programme and human rights education. It has particularly focused on the prevention of trafficking in the migratory process.
Demographics
Population 2007 141.98 million
Population projection for 2050 -
Population density in 2005 8 persons / km²
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04 -479,200
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04 238,800
Unemployment for nationals 2006 -
Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006 -
Expenditure on social protection 2004 -

Migration Indicators
Migrants leaving Russian Federation in 2004 79,800
Migrants entering Russian Federation in 2004 119,200
Migrants leaving Russian Federation for EU destinations -
Net migration rate 2007 1.7%

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Russian Fed. in 2006:
Belarus, Israel, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan.

Main countries of origin for migrants living in Russian Federation in 2006:
Country Number
Ukraine 230,558
Azerbaijan 154,911
Armenia 136,841
Uzbekistan 70,871
Kazakhstan 69,472

Refugees and Asylum applications
Number of refugees in Russian Fed. in 2006 1,425
Number of refugees leaving Russian Fed. in 2005 103,037

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Russian Fed. in 2006:
Country Number
Germany 41,732
USA 18,812
Austria 6,438
France 5,292
Kazakhstan 5,000

Asylum applications in 2006 291

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Russian Fed. in 2004:
Country Number
Afghanistan -
Georgia -
- -
- -
- -

Attitudes towards neighbours 2001
Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?
Somebody of a foreign ethnicity 8.1
A Muslim 13.8
An immigrant or foreign worker 11.0
A Jew 11.4
A Roma 45.6
Average response 18.0
Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Denomination</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian – total</td>
<td>113,269,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholics</td>
<td>799,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>106,637,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>1,270,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicans</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>4,275,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginals</td>
<td>428,480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Christian congregations per million population: 281

Religious Demographics 2001: Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Denomination</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>11,137,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>582,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>951,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>766,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-religious</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious</td>
<td>40,409,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>7,633,658</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The European Council for Refugees and Exiles reported in 2006 that the migration situation in Russia remained difficult with little sign of improvement to the migration services towards migrants. Migration flows during 2006 fell across all regions of the Russian Federation.

In January 2007, a new law ‘On Migration of foreign citizens and stateless persons in the Russian Federation’ introduced a system where foreign citizens can register as residents and it removes the power of the authorities to refuse registration. A simple Post Office application form must be sent within three days of arrival in the country.

A person entering the Russian Federation in order to gain refugee status faces immense obstacles. ECRE noted in 2006 that, “In some of the regions of the Russian Federation the emigration authorities do not work at all with foreign citizens, meaning that they do not accept applications for asylum from them.” There have been no recorded instances of asylum seekers arriving at Moscow’s Sheremetyevo-2 airport being accepted into the asylum procedure since 1999. There is no Russian law preventing the expulsion of a person considered at risk of torture in the country to which they are being deported.

Migration patterns

In 1992 an estimated 30,000 to 50,000 Afghans fled to Russia, according to Afghani Business Centre. Today, there are approximately 100,000 Afghans throughout Russia with 25,000 or 30,000 of them concentrated in Moscow.

Indian students arrived in Russia to enter higher education during the 1950s. They are a visible minority and about 40,000 people of Indian origin live in Russia.

Russia’s State Statistics Committee estimates that some 4.3 million ethnic Ukrainians live in Russia. However, unofficial estimates put their number at closer to 5.6 million. They are the second largest ethnic group in Russia after the Tatars.

Approximately 500,000 Armenians are living in Moscow. Between 600,000 and 700,000 Armenians live in the southern Russian region of Krasnodar. More than 400,000 Armenians live in the Stavropol region.

Russia’s Far East region has about 100,000 permanent Chinese residents. The Chinese are perceived as a threat, with Russia fearing a creeping annexation of Russian territory. Pressure grows for the Government to introduce immigration restrictions even though economists recognise that the development of this region requires Chinese labour and expertise. The Missionary Document (2005-2010) of the Russian Orthodox Church refers to the importance of missionary work among these people.

Migrant Church information

The authors know of three English-speaking Churches in Moscow, three in St Petersburg, one in Novosibirsk, and one in Vladivostock.

Swedish and German language services are available in St Petersburg.

The Finnish communities in Moscow and St Petersburg shrank considerably between 1990 and 2002. Since 2003 new ministries have been developed to Finnish expatriates living in St Petersburg, in partnership with the Ingrian Church.
Serbia

UN 1951: Refugees Convention 0
CoE 1953: Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms 0 2004
CoE 1961: Social Charter -
CoE 1980: Convention on the Legal Status of Migrant Workers -
CoE 2005: Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings -

Demographics
Population 2007 7.37 million
Population projection for 2050 -
Population density in 2005 100 persons / km²
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04 - 35,500
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04 11,900
Unemployment for nationals 2006 -
Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006 -
Expenditure on social protection 2004 -

Migration Indicators
Migrants leaving Serbia in 2004 -
Migrants entering Serbia in 2004 -
Migrants leaving Serbia for EU destinations -
Net migration rate 2007 1.6 %

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Serbia in 2006:

Country Number
Croatia 100,700
Bosnia HGV 47,000
Macedonia 600
n/a -
n/a -

Refugees and Asylum applications
Number of refugees in Serbia in 2006 98,997
Number of refugees leaving Serbia in 2005 189,989

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Serbia in 2006:

Country Number
Germany 99,789
United Kingdom 19,717
Sweden 11,953
Switzerland 10,586
France 6,988

Asylum applications in 2006 5

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Serbia in 2004:

Country Number
- -

Citizenship & Nationality
Population (nationals) 2006 -
Population (non-nationals) 2006 -
Population (non-nationals) 2006 -
Citizenship applications 2004 -
Stateless persons 2006 -
Migration Integration Index 2007 -
Internally Displaced Persons 2005 227,590

Attitudes towards neighbours 2001
Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?
Somebody of a foreign ethnicity -
A Muslim -
An immigrant or foreign worker -
A Jew -
A Roma -
Average response -
### Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian – total</td>
<td>6,595,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholics</td>
<td>447,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>5,777,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>93,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicans</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>131,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginals</td>
<td>5,865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Christian congregations per million population: 326

### Religious Demographics 2001: Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Insufficient information was obtained to permit an accurate report on Serbia.

It remains the case that Serbia is seen as a country of emigration. However, continuing tensions in the region, including the proclamation of independence by Kosovo, continues to generate a constant movement of migrant people into Serbia. Many of these are ethnic Serbs from neighbouring countries and regions.

The authors know of one English-speaking Anglican congregation in Belgrade.
Slovak Republic

- UN 1951: Refugees Convention 1993
- CoE 1983: Convention on the Legal Status of Migrant Workers

Demographics
- Population 2007: 5.40 million
- Population projection for 2050: 4.7 million
- Population density in 2005: 110 persons / km²
- Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04: - 500
- Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04: 5,600
- Unemployment for nationals 2006: 18.2 %
- Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006: -
- Expenditure on social protection 2004: 17.2 % of GDP

Migration Indicators
- Migrants leaving Slovak Republic in 2004: 1,600
- Migrants entering Slovak Republic in 2004: 4,400
- Migrants leaving Slovak Republic for EU destinations: 3,484
- Net migration rate 2007: 1.0 %

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Slovak Republic in 2006: Austria, Canada, the Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, and the United States.

Main countries of origin for migrants living in Slovak Republic in 2006:
- Czech Rep: 75,585
- Hungary: 17,293
- Ukraine: 7,535
- Poland: 3,473
- Romania: 3,207

Refugees and Asylum applications
- Number of refugees in Slovak Republic in 2006: 248
- Number of refugees leaving Slovak Republic in 2005: 791

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Slovak Republic in 2006:
- Germany: 511
- France: 96
- Netherlands: 57
- -: -
- -: -

Asylum applications in 2006: 2,744

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Slovak Republic in 2004:
- Russia: 1,031
- India: 564
- Moldova: 310
- Bangladesh: 270
- Georgia: 244

Citizenship & Nationality
- Population (nationals) 2006: 5,363,617
- Population (non-nationals) 2006: 25,563
- Population (non-nationals) 2006: 0.5 %
- Citizenship applications 2004: 4,016
- Stateless persons 2006: -
- Migration Integration Index 2007: 40/100
- Internally Displaced Persons 2005: -

Attitudes towards neighbours 2001
Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?

- Somebody of a foreign ethnicity: 17.0%
- A Muslim: 24.5%
- An immigrant or foreign worker: 22.9%
- A Jew: 9.9%
- A Roma: 77.2%
- Average response: 30.3%

Average percentage of people replying that they would not like any one of the following as a neighbour:
- a person of another race,
- an immigrant or foreign worker,
- a Muslim, a Jew or a Roma
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At the beginning of the 1990s, migration trends in Slovakia underwent a radical change. Slovakia had been a country of emigration but rapidly became a country of immigration. Few were prepared for the changes and Government policy for dealing with the new situation was not framed until 2005. Numbers of asylum seekers and irregular migrants arrived in unexpected numbers. The largest group of non-EU citizens have arrived from neighbouring Ukraine. There are reasonably large numbers of ethnic Russians and Bulgarians and some migrants from the communist era remain in the country, including Arabs, Portuguese and Vietnamese.

Slovakia considers itself as primarily a country of transit and cross-border mobility. Following Slovakia’s accession to the EU in 2004, emigration has not matched that of other EU accession countries. Immigration flows have doubled since 2003 but these remain small in numerical terms. The major country of both origin and destination remains the Czech Republic.

**Information from the Churches**

The Evangelical Church (AC) in Slovakia established an English Language International Congregation in 1994 for outreach to business people, diplomats and students from abroad. This is located in Bratislava. There are also English language Churches in Kosice. The Evangelical Church (AC) in Slovakia reports that there are no special services for migrants in Slovakia. It comments that Slovakia is mostly experiencing emigration of its young people at the moment.

The Slovak Ecumenical Institute works with migrant refugees in Gabcikovo.

### Christian populations among the migrant minorities in Slovakia (Source: WCD 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural minority</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Christians (est)</th>
<th>Christian % (est)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>44,828</td>
<td>32,276</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byelorussian</td>
<td>10,802</td>
<td>8,642</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>10,802</td>
<td>7,453</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>5,401</td>
<td>4,213</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>1,231</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croat</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>21,604</td>
<td>17,499</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Slovenia

Demographics
Population 2007 2.02 million
Population projection for 2050 1.9 million
Population density in 2005 97 persons / km²
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04 500
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04 11,700
Unemployment for nationals 2006 6.3 %
Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006 -
Expenditure on social protection 2004 24.3 % of GDP

Migration Indicators
Migrants leaving Slovenia in 2004 8,300
Migrants entering Slovenia in 2004 10,200
Migrants leaving Slovenia for EU destinations 641
Net migration rate 2007 5.8 %
Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Slovenia in 2006:
Australia, Austria, Canada, Croatia, France, and Germany.
Main countries of origin for migrants living in Slovenia in 2006:
Country Number
Bosnia HGV 22,836
Croatia 7,221
Serbia & Montenegro 6,911
Macedonia 4,323
Ukraine 653

Refugees and Asylum applications
Number of refugees in Slovenia in 2006 254
Number of refugees leaving Slovenia in 2005 155
Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Slovenia in 2006:
Country Number
Germany 125
-
-
-
Asylum applications in 2006 180
Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Slovenia in 2004:
Country Number
Serbia and M. 520
Turkey 230
Bosnia HGV 222
Bangladesh 159
Albania 143
In the late 1980s and especially during the 1990s, with the intensification of ethnic conflicts throughout Yugoslavia, many new minorities came to Slovenia. Situated on important “migration routes” from East to West and North to South, Slovenia also started to attract immigrants from countries outside of Europe. Following EU accession in 2004, this has increased and the presence of migrant workers from other EU countries is increasingly significant.

Three minority groups in Slovenia are officially recognised, Hungarian, Italian and the Roma. Other ‘new minorities’ do not share the official minority status of these three but their cultural rights are guaranteed: Croats, Serbs, Bosnians, Macedonians, Albanians, and Montenegrins.

Article 61 of the Slovenian Constitution guarantees the freedom of every individual to freely identify with his or her national grouping or ethnic community, to foster and give expression to his or her culture and to use his or her own language and scripts.

Article 64 guarantees collective rights to the Hungarians and Italians; bilingual education, administration, and parliamentary representation, for example.

### Christian populations among the migrant minorities in Slovenia (Source: WCD 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Migrant minority</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Christians (est)</th>
<th>Christian % (est)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serb</td>
<td>70,805</td>
<td>56,644</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croat</td>
<td>35,599</td>
<td>31,292</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austrian</td>
<td>24,585</td>
<td>21,635</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>6,294</td>
<td>4,783</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>4,602</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonian</td>
<td>3,934</td>
<td>3,541</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegrin</td>
<td>2,754</td>
<td>1,928</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>2,163</td>
<td>1,795</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>6,097</td>
<td>1,573</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3,934</td>
<td>2,006</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spain

Demographics
Population 2007: 45.25 million
Population projection for 2050: 42.8 million
Population density in 2005: 89 persons / km²
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04: 98,200
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04: 864,900
Unemployment for nationals 2006: 10.7%
Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006: 12.4%
Expenditure on social protection 2004: 20 % of GDP

Migration Indicators
Migrants leaving Spain in 2004: 55,100
Migrants entering Spain in 2004: 645,800
Migrants leaving Spain for EU destinations: 124,410
Net migration rate 2007: 15.3%

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Spain in 2006:
Argentina, France, Germany, Switzerland, the United States, and Venezuela.

Main countries of origin for migrants living in Spain in 2006:
Country Number
Morocco 313,739
Ecuador 218,367
Colombia 174,418
France 156,681
Germany 135,638

Refugees and Asylum applications
Number of refugees in Spain in 2006: 5,275
Number of refugees leaving Spain in 2005: -

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Spain in 2006:
Country Number
- -
- -
- -
- -
- -
- -

Asylum applications in 2006: 5,295

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Spain in 2004:
Country Number
Colombia 1,655
Nigeria 726
Algeria 406
Mali 273
Guinea 173
### Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian – total</td>
<td>39,073,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholics</td>
<td>40,168,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>109,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicans</td>
<td>11,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>300,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginals</td>
<td>207,458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Christian congregations per million population: **786**

### Religious Demographics 2001: Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>200,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>17,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>13,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-religious</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious</td>
<td>1,836,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>441,188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Immigration policy aims to maximize the benefit to Spanish society and extends to all foreigners with regular residency status in Spain.

Spain was previously a country of emigration, but experienced a period of continuous immigration after its entry into the European Union in 1985. This growth accelerated sharply in the first few years of the new century. In fact, the number of immigrants quadrupled between 2005 and 2004. At the beginning of 2005, migrants represented 9% of the total population of Spain. Although Moroccans were the biggest group of non-EU immigrants in the 1990s, they have been overtaken in number by the rapid influx of immigrants from Latin America during this century. Romanians have been the largest group of recent arrivals.

In July 2006, Spain announced a three-year diplomatic drive in West Africa to try to halt the flow of African migrants to Europe. During 2006 it is estimated that about 1,000 Africans died attempting dangerous voyages in the Atlantic to reach the Canary Islands.

**Churches Information**

In January of 2008 the Federation of Evangelical Organisations calculated that there were a further 800,000 foreign Protestants who live in Spain for at least six months a year, most of them from northern Europe. With the 400,000 national Protestants, boosted by waves of immigrants in recent years, this represents a total Protestant community of 1.2 million in Spain.

These figures should be considered carefully as research among 500 immigrants from 30 countries carried out by researchers from Vitoria University in 2006 showed that immigrants who had entered in Spain in the previous five years were less happy than they were in their home countries. 85% believed in God, but this is down from a figure of 99% who had religious convictions when they had first arrived in Spain. Almost 15% had lost their faith, and a further 10% were in the process of losing it. A small percentage, 5.8%, had seen their faith grow, while the rest still believe in God more or less as they did before. The research also showed that over half had acquired the necessary papers to remain in Spain and after five years a reasonable 38% felt as much Spanish as they did their nationality of birth.

In 2002, there were 350 Ibero-American missionaries working in Spain.

In March of 2007 the evangelical Churches in Vigo (fifteen in total) reported that immigrants had boosted their worshipping numbers to over 2,000.

In July of 2007, a Government Trust demonstrated that Evangelical Churches were benefiting from immigration. The social, educational and cultural networks of over three hundred and fifty evangelical organisations in the Valencia region were assessed by the Government’s Pluralism and Co-existence Trust in an exercise prior to allocating State funding to religious bodies.

At around the same time, the Government dropped the requirement for a non-Roman Catholic religious minority to demonstrate ‘historic roots’ in order for it to gain access to State funding.
Sweden

Citizenship & Nationality
Population (nationals) 2006 8,567,853
Population (non-nationals) 2006 479,899
Population (non-nationals) 2006 5.3 %
Citizenship applications 2004 31,355
Stateless persons 2006 5,571
Migration Integration Index 2007 88/100
Internally Displaced Persons 2005 -

Demographics
Population 2007 9.18 million
Population projection for 2050 10.2 million
Population density in 2005 20 persons / km²
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04 15,900
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04 52,500
Unemployment for nationals 2006 6.3 %
Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006 19.8 %
Expenditure on social protection 2004 32.9 % of GDP

Migration Indicators
Migrants leaving Sweden in 2004 16,000
Migrants entering Sweden in 2004 47,600
Migrants leaving Sweden for EU destinations 24,962
Net migration rate 2007 5.7 %

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Sweden in 2006:
Denmark, Finland, Germany, Norway, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Refugees and Asylum applications
Number of refugees in Sweden in 2006 79,913
Number of refugees leaving Sweden in 2005 -

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Sweden in 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>193,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYR</td>
<td>73,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>55,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia HGV</td>
<td>52,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>51,844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Sweden in 2004:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serbia and M.</td>
<td>2,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>2,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stateless</td>
<td>806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attitudes towards neighbours 2001
Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somebody of a foreign ethnicity</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Muslim</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An immigrant or foreign worker</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Jew</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Roma</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average response</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

Christian – total 6,004,283
Roman Catholics 144,000
Orthodox 143,900
Protestants 7,524,500
Anglicans 3,100
Independents 59,520
Marginals 58,547

Christian congregations per million population 689

Religious Demographics 2001: Other

Muslim 201,526
Buddhist 1,061
Jew 16,110
Hindus 179
Neo-religious -
Non-religious 1,562,389
Atheist 1,058,973

For the Church of Sweden the main work with immigrants is with the Finnish people living in Sweden since most of them have Lutheran origin. Finnish is also a minority language in Sweden and has long historical roots here although most Finnish-speaking people in Sweden came as labour immigrants in the sixties, seventies and even eighties.

The overwhelming majority of the immigrants coming to Sweden are not Lutherans. The Church of Sweden has extensive contacts with other congregations and Christian traditions and in many places it provides the “Christian infrastructure” to these groups – it could be to rent or lend the church or to help out with other issues. There is also a responsibility in the diaconal work to care not just for the church members but for everyone living in the parish area.

Sometimes non-Lutheran immigrants find their spiritual home in the Church of Sweden. Some become members in the Church of Sweden as a step towards a greater integration into Swedish society and others just because of practical reasons – the church from their own tradition might be too far away.

There is also an increase in “double belonging” where people remain members in the Syrian-Orthodox Church, for example, but also send their children to the Church of Sweden or participate in other ways.

The statistics say that half of the people that seek membership in the Church of Sweden have a foreign background.

In 2006 there was a “Multicultural Symposium” in the Church of Sweden discussing how we welcome people with other ethnic backgrounds than Swedish in our parishes. It was also preceded by a project in the dioceses of Stockholm on multicultural worship. On the basis of the symposium we arrived at four challenges for the Church of Sweden that appear in a leaflet – identity, power, participation and crossing boundaries.

The authors know of three Farsi-speaking Churches in Stockholm and one in Uppsala. The authors know of five English-speaking Churches in Stockholm and a further seven that meet in other Swedish cities and towns. In Stockholm the authors know of one Spanish-speaking church.
Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population 2007</td>
<td>7.56 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population projection for 2050</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population density in 2005</td>
<td>176 persons / km²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04</td>
<td>13,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04</td>
<td>39,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment for nationals 2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006</td>
<td>14.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure on social protection 2004</td>
<td>29.5 % of GDP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Migration Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrants leaving Switzerland in 2004</td>
<td>47,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants entering Switzerland in 2004</td>
<td>96,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants leaving Switzerland for EU destinations</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net migration rate 2007</td>
<td>5.3 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Switzerland in 2006: Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Spain, and the United States.

Main countries of origin for migrants living in Switzerland in 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>321,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia &amp; Montenegro</td>
<td>190,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>140,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>110,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>83,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refugees and Asylum applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of refugees in Switzerland in 2006</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of refugees leaving Switzerland in 2005</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Switzerland in 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum applications in 2006</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Switzerland in 2004:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serbia and M.</td>
<td>1,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

Christian – total 6,166,998
Roman Catholics 3,257,387
Orthodox 102,500
Protestants 2,441,743
Anglicans 13,700
Independents 158,290
Marginals 118,820

Christian congregations per million population 856

Religious Demographics 2001: Other

Muslim 201,870
Buddhist 7,863
Jew 17,711
Hindus 22,754
Neo-religious -
Non-religious 521,979
Atheist 79,834

Though Switzerland develops its migration policies independently of the EU, referendums approved joining the Schengen zone and Dublin Convention on asylum. The number of asylum seekers continues to fall. Voters approved an Aliens Bill that has worsened the eligibility, conditions, and security of long term residence and family reunion permits. The current debate, sustained by parties of the right, is focussing on the rights to naturalisation.

Migrant Churches in Switzerland

There are three different types of migrant Churches in Switzerland:

1. “First generation Churches”.

These church members have usually been in Switzerland for a short time and have come for example from Africa, Asia and Latin America. In particular the members of African and Latino Churches often don’t have secure legal residence titles or are, in the worst case, irregular migrants.

Due to the fact that these new migrant Churches have a very fluid form of organisation and split all the time, we cannot say how many of them we have in Switzerland, but there are many hundreds. The access to these Churches isn't trouble-free (knowing where to find them, language and so on). More fieldwork is required. In Geneva there about 70 migrant Churches.

2. “Second (or further) generation Churches”.

We have the “classic” Churches which are quite similar to the indigenous Churches. These include the German or English Lutheran Churches and the Hungarian Churches, which are quite established and sometimes also financed by the official church.

3. “The established migration Churches”

French speaking Churches in the German speaking part of Switzerland belong to this type of Church.

Some indigenous Churches have programs to support and to deal with the first type of migrant church. In particular, the urban Protestant Churches promote projects to deal with these new migrant Churches. It's interesting to see that the subject “migrant Churches” has become prominent in recent years. Due to the newness of the subject, there is no profound experience with migrant Churches from Africa, Latin America or Asia. Some indigenous Churches now acknowledge this as an important issue.

The other two forms of migrant Churches are quite integrated into the “normal and official” church-structure and they have good relationships with the official protestant Churches.

Within the framework of the ‘Being Church together –Uniting in diversity?’ the Swiss Federation of Protestant Churches is working on a study project about these new forms of migrant Churches, the first type of Church. It is an exploratory field study and will attempt to work out examples of best practices for dealing with new migrant Churches as well as making recommendations. The final report of this project will be available during 2008.

The Swiss Evangelical Alliance (EAS) reports that they are aware of xenophobic attitudes in Switzerland, even among their evangelical Churches. MEOS is an EAS linked mission agency with 10 workers engaged with Italian, Turkish, Arabic, Balkan, Tamil, and Vietnamese asylum seekers. The EAS has a list of migrant Churches in Switzerland although they acknowledge that it is a transient phenomena and difficult to keep up to date.

www.meos.ch
www.agik.ch contains details of Christian work among migrants.

In late 2005 it was reported that the Swiss Evangelical Missionary Alliance was meeting occasionally with the Swiss Missionary Council. Both recognise shared concerns relating to questions of ethnic migrant Churches. Both are re-considering missiological questions relating to the Churches.

The authors know of thirty-eight English-speaking Churches in Switzerland.
Turkey
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Demographics
Population 2007: 71.32 million
Population projection for 2050: -
Population density in 2005: 93 persons / km²
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04: -
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04: -
Unemployment for nationals 2006: 10.3 %
Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006: -
Expenditure on social protection 2004: -

Migration Indicators
Migrants leaving Turkey in 2004: -
Migrants entering Turkey in 2004: -
Migrants leaving Turkey for EU destinations: -
Net migration rate 2007: -
Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Turkey in 2006:

Main countries of origin for migrants living in Turkey in 2006:

Refugees and Asylum applications
Number of refugees in Turkey in 2006: 2,633
Number of refugees leaving Turkey in 2005: 170,567
Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Turkey in 2006:

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Turkey in 2004:

Citizenship & Nationality
Population (nationals) 2006: -
Population (non-nationals) 2006: -
Population (non-nationals) 2006: -
Citizenship applications 2004: 8,238
Stateless persons 2006: -
Migration Integration Index 2007: -
Internally Displaced Persons 2005: -

Attitudes towards neighbours 2001
Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?
Somebody of a foreign ethnicity: -
A Muslim: -
An immigrant or foreign worker: -
A Jew: -
A Roma: -
Average response: -

Governments
UN 1951: Refugees Convention 1962
CoE 1953: Convention on the Legal Status of Migrant Workers 1993
CoE 2005: Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings -
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Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian – total</td>
<td>229,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholics</td>
<td>31,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>121,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>16,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicans</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>35,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginals</td>
<td>3,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian congregations per million population</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Religious Demographics 2001: Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>64,713,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>38,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>21,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-religious</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious</td>
<td>1,348,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>68,099</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turkish emigrants have traditionally been resident ‘Guest workers’ in places such as Germany and Austria. Remittances from overseas continue to be significant.

It has not been possible to obtain sufficient information from Turkey to offer an accurate description of migration there.

The authors know of Iranian Churches in the following places: Istanbul, Ankara, Afron, Amasya, Hakari, Isparta, Kastamonu, Konya, and Van.

The authors know of six English-speaking Churches in Turkey, one in each of Ankara, Izmir, Bornova, and Moda, and two in Istanbul.
### Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population 2007</td>
<td>46.20 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population projection for 2050</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population density in 2005</td>
<td>77 persons / km²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04</td>
<td>- 274,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment for nationals 2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure on social protection 2004</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Migration Indicators

- Migrants leaving Ukraine in 2004: 46,200
- Migrants entering Ukraine in 2004: 38,600
- Migrants leaving Ukraine for EU destinations: -
- Net migration rate 2007: 0.3 %

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving Ukraine in 2006: Israel, Kazakhstan, Moldova, Poland, the Russian Federation, and the USA.

### Citizenship & Nationality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (nationals) 2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (non-nationals) 2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship applications 2004</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stateless persons 2006</td>
<td>64,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration Integration Index 2007</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internally Displaced Persons 2005</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attitudes towards neighbours 2001

Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?

- Somebody of a foreign ethnicity: 10.5%
- A Muslim: 24.0%
- An immigrant or foreign worker: 14.9%
- A Jew: 10.4%
- A Roma: 52.7%

Average response: 22.5%

### Refugees and Asylum applications

- Number of refugees in Ukraine in 2006: 2,275
- Number of refugees leaving Ukraine in 2005: 84,228

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving Ukraine in 2006:

- Germany: 56,276
- USA: 24,256
- Canada: 1,100
- France: 643
- United Kingdom: 484

Asylum applications in 2006: 1,183

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering Ukraine in 2004:

- Russia: 24,622
- Belarus: 2,400
- Pakistan: 111
- Bangladesh: 70
- India: 25
- USA: 6
- Canada: 6
- The UK: 5
- Iceland: 1

Average percentage of people replying that they would not like any one of the following as a neighbour:

- A person of another race
- An immigrant or foreign worker
- A Muslim
- A Jew
- A Roma

Chart showing the percentage of people from different countries who would not like any one of these groups as a neighbour.
Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Christian</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholics</td>
<td>4,624,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>26,299,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>900,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicans</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>7,104,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginals</td>
<td>330,214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Christian congregations per million population: 926

Religious Demographics 2001: Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>862,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>2,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>220,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-religious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious</td>
<td>5,480,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>2,012,368</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Christian Migrant Minority Groups (Source: WCD 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Christians</th>
<th>Christian%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>8,041,162</td>
<td>5,628,813</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byelorussian</td>
<td>278,884</td>
<td>181,275</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldavian</td>
<td>232,404</td>
<td>192,895</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>195,219</td>
<td>140,558</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>144,090</td>
<td>126,799</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>148,738</td>
<td>118,990</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>92,961</td>
<td>79,017</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>88,313</td>
<td>79,482</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>34,861</td>
<td>27,192</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagauzi Turk</td>
<td>14,293</td>
<td>21,962</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgian</td>
<td>37,185</td>
<td>14,874</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>8,972</td>
<td>6,345</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakian</td>
<td>6,182</td>
<td>4,822</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvian</td>
<td>4,880</td>
<td>4,343</td>
<td>89.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>5,717</td>
<td>4,288</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assyrian</td>
<td>3,021</td>
<td>2,628</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>12,550</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ossetian</td>
<td>4,648</td>
<td>2,138</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonian</td>
<td>2,789</td>
<td>1,869</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>6,321</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>3,811</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abkhazian</td>
<td>1,394</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>3,161</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjabi</td>
<td>16,268</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>46,481</td>
<td>31,375</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ukrainian Church leaders appear unaware of any national statistics regarding migrant congregations or migrant Christians.

There are significant Armenian Apostolic communities in Ukraine in Lviv, Donetsk, Kiev, Odessa, Kharkiv, Dnipropetrovsk, and some cities of the Crimea. The authors are aware of two English-speaking congregations meeting in Kiev, and one Farsi-speaking Church in Kiev. The authors are aware of eleven Ukrainian diaspora Churches in Serbia & Montenegro, fifteen in Croatia, one in Poland, two in the Czech Republic, two in Germany and five in Bosnia.

Cultural Minorities Report 2007 (ERICarts)

The existing legislation defines all Ukrainian citizens as belonging to two major categories: either the ethnic Ukrainian majority "Ukrainian nation" or one of "national minorities", without distinguishing indigenous nations (for example, Crimean Tatars), autochthonous groups or "classical" national minorities (Russians, Jews, Romanians, Hungarians, Roma, Greeks etc.), and Diaspora groups, or ethnic minorities that have arrived in the Ukraine following recent migration processes.

In the early 1990s, Ukraine was a multiethnic state comprising over 130 ethnic groups and nationalities. At the present time, the Russian population in the Ukraine is shrinking. Emigration to Russia is a key contributor to a reported decline of some three million between the 1989 and 2001 censuses. Ethnic Russians accounted for more than 91 percent of the total decline in Ukraine’s population.
United Kingdom

Demographics

Population 2007: 61.27 million
Population projection for 2050: 64.3 million
Population density in 2005: 246 persons / km²
Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04: 170,400
Population change (Net Migration) 2002-04: 247,000
Unemployment for nationals 2006: 4.7%
Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006: 9.8%
Expenditure on social protection 2004: 26.3 % of GDP

Migration Indicators

Migrants leaving United Kingdom in 2004: 310,400
Migrants entering United Kingdom in 2004: 518,100
Migrants leaving United Kingdom for EU destinations: 159,184
Net migration rate 2007: 4.0%

Main countries of destination for migrants leaving United Kingdom in 2006:
Australia, Canada, Germany, Ireland, New Zealand, and the United States.

Main countries of origin for migrants living in United Kingdom in 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>533,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>467,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>321,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>266,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>158,424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refugees and Asylum applications

Number of refugees in the UK in 2006: 301,556
Number of refugees leaving the UK in 2005: -

Main countries of destination for refugees leaving United Kingdom in 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asylum applications in 2006: 12,300

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering United Kingdom in 2004:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>3,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>2,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>1,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>1,775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Citizenship & Nationality

Population (nationals) 2006: -
Population (non-nationals) 2006: -
Citizenship applications 2004: 140,740
Stateless persons 2006: 205
Migration Integration Index 2007: 63/100
Internally Displaced Persons 2005: -

Attitudes towards neighbours 2001

Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somebody of a foreign ethnicity</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Muslim</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An immigrant or foreign worker</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Jew</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Roma</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average response</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average percentage of people replying that they would not like any one of the following as a neighbour:
- a person of another race,
- an immigrant or foreign worker,
- a Muslim,
- a Jew,
- a Roma.
Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

Christian – total 48,357,974
Roman Catholics 5,525,078
Orthodox 376,220
Protestants 4,183,533
Anglicans 25,823,000
Independents 2,671,570
Marginals 597,108
Christian congregations 1,407
per million population

Religious Demographics 2001: Other

Muslim 1,197,316
Buddhist 164,571
Jew 794,203
Hindus 429,113
Neo-religious 16,002
Non-religious 6,920,719
Atheist 794,203

Migrant Christianity in the United Kingdom

The United Kingdom has long been a country of immigration and many migrant congregations are actually second and third generation congregations, with a large number dating back to the arrival of migrant workers in 1953 from Jamaica and other Caribbean islands. Many of these congregations relate to either the African and Caribbean Evangelical Alliance (ACEA), established in 1984, or the Alliance of Asian Christians. ACEA estimated in 2003 that there were approximately 3,000 Churches where a majority of the congregation were people of an African or African-Caribbean heritage. Other congregations feel more at home in the Council of African and Caribbean Churches (CACC). In 2005, Christian Research estimated that there were over 330,000 members in these Churches, 60,000 church members from the Indian sub-continent, 101,000 church members from other Asian countries, and a further 33,500 who were identified as non-white. Their research in London indicates that in central London, over 51% of church attendance is made up of migrant and ethnic minority Christians. 54 ethnic or migrant groups larger than 10,000 individuals have been identified in the UK. However, Britain is also currently considered to have the third largest diaspora in the world, ranked after those of India and China.

What has been the response of the Churches to migration?

Each of the four nations of the United Kingdom and Ireland has their own Council of Churches or Churches Together at national level. Additionally, several areas of operation are partially delegated to Churches Together in Britain and Ireland, including the area of migration and the Churches’ responses.

Informal migration hearings have been initiated by CTBI and the ecumenical instruments in the four nations. One has so far been held, two more are scheduled, and more are expected. Churches with experience of, or questions about, migration and their response are being invited to go and share their stories and experiences. The main findings to have emerged so far reveal a surprisingly high level of awareness concerning migration, particularly migration from other European Union countries. The chief concerns of the Churches relate to how they can adequately work towards ensuring that migrants have access to language-training and proper social protection in the workplace. Across the nations of the UK there are degrees of openness to migrants and migration and this is often reflected in Church responses. Churches in the UK are aware that issues of cohesion within the church community remain sensitive and unresolved. This is true for both the longer established ethnic minority congregations as well as the recently arrived migrants.

In Wales, the Churches Together Group (CYTUN) continues to take an active interest in issues of irregular migration, asylum, and deportation.

In England it has been noticeable that the antipathy often expressed towards other, non-white ethnic migrants is not expressed as strongly towards European migrants. CTBI is seeking to develop educational programmes that probe and challenge these from the perspective of racial justice. Many of the Church denominations in England now have experience of appointing migrant pastors, in ministers and priests to the charge of a parish or local congregation. For example, Korean, Brazilian, Chilean, Ugandan, Philippine, and Ukrainian nationals have all been appointed by the larger indigenous Churches in the United Kingdom.

Also in England, the Churches Together Group (CTE) has established a dedicated section of its website as a permanent ‘Migration Enquiry’. There are four areas to the Enquiry: Church Life, Social Concern, Evangelisation, and Theology. Comments can be posted on-line and it is intended that these will contribute to a growing bank of awareness, knowledge, and experience.

The data we have compiled for these country profiles is drawn from a range of sources, all of which we gladly acknowledge here and elsewhere. Caution is necessary when trying to compare one item of data with another as they may be taken from different years.

Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population 2007 (Estimated)</td>
<td>Eurostat Feb 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population for 2050 (projected)</td>
<td>Eurostat 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population change (Natural increase) 2002-04</td>
<td>New Cronos 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment for nationals 2006</td>
<td>Eurostat &amp; CIA 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment for third-country nationals 2006</td>
<td>Eurostat 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure on social protection 2004</td>
<td>Eurostat 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure on social protection 2004</td>
<td>ESSPROS 2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Migration Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrants leaving country in 2004</td>
<td>Eurostat 2006, CIA 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants entering country in 2004</td>
<td>COE, OECD, SOPEMI 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants leaving country: for EU destinations</td>
<td>OECD 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net migration rate 2007</td>
<td>Eurostat 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refugees and Asylum applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of refugees in country in 2006</td>
<td>UNHCR 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of refugees leaving country in 2005</td>
<td>UNHCR 2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attitudes towards neighbours 2001

Which of the following would you NOT like to have as neighbours?

Source: European Values Survey 2001

Religious Demographics 2006: Christian

World Christian Database 2007

Religious Demographics 2000: Other

World Christian Encyclopedia 2001

Country Reports

We gratefully acknowledge POLITIS and Migration Integration Policy for those places where our text relies upon work done by these two agencies, particularly when reporting on current national migration policy.

Citizenship & Nationality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (nationals) 2006</td>
<td>OECD 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (non-nationals) 2006</td>
<td>OECD 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship applications 2004</td>
<td>Eurostat 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stateless persons 2006</td>
<td>UNHCR 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Migration Integration Index 2007: MIP 2007

(MIPEX is an average calculated from indices measuring national policies regarding labour market access, family reunion, long term residency, political participation, access to nationality, and anti-discrimination. The results are measured out of a possible maximum average of 100)

Internally Displaced Persons 2005: UNHCR 2006

Refugees and Asylum applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of refugees in country in 2006</td>
<td>UNHCR 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of refugees leaving country in 2005</td>
<td>UNHCR 2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main countries of destination and main countries of origin for refugees leaving and entering country in 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Asylum applications in 2006: UNHCR 2006 / Eurostats 2006

Main countries of origin for asylum seekers entering country in 2004:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR 2005</td>
<td>UNHCR 2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Glossary

- **COE**: Council of Europe
- **OECD**: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
- **ESSPROS**: European System of integrated Social Protection Statistics
- **SOPEMI**: Continuous Reporting System on Migration of the OECD
- **MIP(EX)**: Migrant Integration Policy (Index)
- **IOM**: International Organisation for Migration
- **UNHCR**: United Nations High Commission for Refugees

New Cronos is the principal database of Eurostats, the statistical service of the European Union.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Austria</th>
<th>Belgium</th>
<th>Bulgaria</th>
<th>Cyprus</th>
<th>Czech Rep,</th>
<th>Denmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>4,409</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1,438</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>4,362</td>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>Serbia &amp; M,</td>
<td>1,203</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1,067</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Finland</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Greece</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>4,858</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>4,818</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia &amp; M,</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>3,714</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>2,767</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>3,481</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>1,866</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>2,748</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>2,723</td>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>2,446</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>Bosnia &amp; H</td>
<td>2,248</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>1,870</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Ireland</th>
<th>Iceland</th>
<th>Liechtenstein</th>
<th>Lithuania</th>
<th>Luxembourg</th>
<th>Latvia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanist</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>Senegal &amp; M,</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Belarus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>DR Congo</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Bosnia &amp; H</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Malta</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Poland</th>
<th>Portugal</th>
<th>Romania</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>Belarus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d'Ivoire</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>Senegal &amp; M,</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR Congo</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stateless</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>Stateless</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Senegal &amp; M</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Guinea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Spain</th>
<th>Slovakia</th>
<th>Slovenia</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
<th>Switzerland</th>
<th>UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>1,658</td>
<td>Russian Fed</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>2,944</td>
<td>Serbia &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>Bosnia &amp; H</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>Stateless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR Congo</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d'Ivoire</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Libya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Viit Nam</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Palaestinian Terr</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Levels of concern for the living condition of migrants cross-tabulated against frequency with which the respondent attended a religious service

Source: European Values Survey 2001

These are the tabulated responses of 44,654 individuals from 32 European countries in which the question was asked; “To what extent do you feel concerned about the living conditions of immigrants in your country?” cross-tabulated with responses to the question, “Apart from weddings, funerals and christenings, how often do you attend religious services these days?”

The results are displayed as percentages.

Both questions were asked as part of the European Values Survey 2001.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>More than weekly</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>Once a month</th>
<th>Only at Christmas Or Easter</th>
<th>Other holy days</th>
<th>Once a year</th>
<th>Less often</th>
<th>Never/ practically never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a certain extent</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not so much</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35,737</td>
<td>1,751</td>
<td>5,336</td>
<td>3,719</td>
<td>5,616 (100%)</td>
<td>2,205 (100%)</td>
<td>2,783 (100%)</td>
<td>2,941 (100%)</td>
<td>11,385 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of interviews = 44,654
APPENDIX 2: AN OVERVIEW OF THE STUDIES AND RESEARCH UNDERTAKEN IN THE FIELD OF MIGRANT CHRISTIANITY


Council of Europe, Religion and the integration of immigrants, Council of Europe, Brussels, 1999.
Martinez-Herrera E., Moualhi D., Predispositions to discriminatory immigration policies in Western Europe: An exploration of political causes, Portuguese Journal of Social Science Volume 5 Number 3, 2006.


INTEGRATING MIGRANTS – INTEGRATING SOCIETIES:
ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS FOR AN EU MIGRATION POLICY

Migrants’ Rights Key to Respect and Integration

1. On the occasion of International Migrants’ Day 2004, we would like to express our solidarity with the migrants arriving and living in Europe, and to recall our positions on the integration of migrants in Europe (For further details, see: Comments on the Communication from the European Commission on Immigration, Integration and Employment (COM (2003) 336 final).

2. Integration requires a holistic approach and is a continuous two way process. In this process, efforts should be expected from migrants to integrate but at the same time efforts are needed from society at large. Migrants’ rights need to be guaranteed. EU and national legislation must recognise that universal human rights apply to migrants.

3. The International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of their Families which entered into force mid-2003 provides a legal framework to protect migrants' rights. Churches and Christian organisations are convinced that such an international framework is necessary to cope with the challenges of international migration. Therefore, EU Member States and other European countries are called upon to ratify this Convention and adapt their national legislation to these standards. The Economic and Social Committee of the EU and the European Commission have expressed their readiness to pursue ratification of the Convention. We wish to encourage the European Commission and the EU Council to ratify this Convention when the new EU Constitution has been ratified and entered into force.

Integration - a process of change

4. Integration of migrants has become a top theme of EU migration policies in the recent period. This is both encouraging and surprising. It is encouraging, because it recognises that migration is a permanent reality throughout Europe; it is surprising because so far integration of migrants falls into policy fields which are the competence of national, regional and local authorities. We wish to express our hope that coordination and exchange with regard to integration policies will improve the quality and understanding of integration as a process for changing societies.

5. Successful integration requires skills to access the labour market and material conditions such as adequate housing, as well as opportunities to acquire sufficient linguistic competence. The Commission has outlined how existing schemes at national and EU level, such as the European Employment Strategy, National Action Plans for Social Inclusion, ESF and EQUAL could be used to facilitate integration. With regard to access to the labour market, measures for recognition and assessment of qualifications should be more developed.


7. Measures promoting integration should start as early as possible, before or upon arrival, to give migrants, and especially refugees and persons under international protection, the best opportunities to start and enjoy a new life. The more time passes without access to training, employment and social participation, the more
difficult it becomes for the person – such dynamics are similar to those for long-term unemployed persons.

8. Integration in society works best when family life is facilitated. Thus, protection of family life ought to be a priority for integration policies. To achieve integration, the right to family life of third country nationals needs to be protected. The Council Directive on Family Reunification of 2003, which limits the right of living in family unity falls short of the Member States’ obligation to protect the family. We would urge EU Member States not to use the discretionary possibilities to limit family reunification in the transposition of this directive, as this might harm integration policies as well.

9. Inter-cultural exchanges and inter-religious dialogue are important factors for integration which need to be developed. In these dialogues, newcomers and citizens can exchange views on values in community and society, learn from each other, and discover commonalities and differences. For cherishing diversity in society, mediation instruments will have to be developed to prevent or resolve conflicts between communities or between sectors of communities.

10. In the current debate about integration, we are concerned that more attention is given to “failed” integration while successful integration is hardly recognised. Most of the examples for failed integration are related to social problems in society, discrimination and racism. E.g., problems in schools for migrant children are dealt with as an integration problem, whereas the social status of the family might be more the reason than the migrant status. Similarly the debate about crimes committed by third country nationals, to which authorities tend to react with special clauses in the law on aliens rather than using the criminal law, thus leading to double penalties for the same crime. Integration would require equality of treatment also for criminals.

11. We appreciate the efforts by the European Union since the Thessalonica Summit to promote cooperation and exchange of information in the field of integration. The Annual Report on Migration and Integration of the Commission (COM (2004) 508 final) and the Handbook on Integration are further steps along that way by promoting the exchange of good practices between Member States.

12. However, we still repeat our great concern about the tendency among Member States to agree on common standards at the lowest possible level rather than deriving standards from best practice examples. Moreover, civil society, migrants’ associations, NGOs and social organisations should be more involved in the development of policies for integration processes. NGOs, social organisations and authorities should contribute to give more visibility to the multi-cultural realities of European societies by employing migrants at various levels of the organisations and cooperating with associations of migrants.

Caritas Europa, Churches’ Commission for Migrants in Europe (CCME), COMECE, ICMC, JRS Europe, Quaker Council on European Affairs
ENSURE POLICY COHERENCE FOR MIGRANTS’ RIGHTS

1. Migration and Asylum policy must respect the inalienable dignity of each human being and thus ensure respect for human rights. These crucial principles have to be upheld and defended – even in the framework of security concerns - and must not be undermined. The full compliance of European Union policy with international human rights obligations of the EU and its Member States must be ensured in shaping as well as in the transposition and application of EU law on migration and asylum.

2. When developing a global approach to migration, the European Union ought not to limit itself to restrictive measures against migration at and beyond EU borders but take into account the comprehensive external dimension of migration. We encourage the EU and its Member States to commit to the Policy Coherence for Development process, including the links between migration and development.

3. A European policy approach to the multifaceted phenomenon of migration needs to take into account the potential economic, social and cultural benefits and challenges of migration for European societies as well as for the countries of origin and transit. To ensure coherence between EU policies, home affairs, social affairs and education as well as foreign and development policies are of equal importance. Coordination and cooperation between these policy fields need to be improved and enhanced.

DEVELOP A PROACTIVE AND HOLISTIC EU MIGRATION POLICY

4. The EU needs to develop an efficient and effective labour migration policy. This requires an approach that takes into account the demand on the EU labour market for a qualified as well as unqualified labour force and protects the rights of all migrant workers. Therefore we urge the Member States to ratify the International Convention on the Rights of all Migrant Workers and the Members of their Families. Family unity should be particularly protected and supported.

5. The EU needs a common approach to integration policy that promotes integration as a reciprocal process resulting in an inclusive and welcoming society. The increasing diversity should be acknowledged and respect for diversity actively promoted as a positive factor. In order to promote the active role of migrants in local community, political participation is a must. The EU should use its competence in the area of antidiscrimination to promote the social inclusion of all members of society.

6. Combating Trafficking in human beings should constitute a specific policy area in itself. Victims of trafficking should be offered safe solutions and long-term perspectives in order to enable them to live a self-sufficient life independent of their willingness to testify against the traffickers in court. In order to gather a comprehensive knowledge of the phenomenon more resources should be invested in research and the collection of data. We would strongly recommend the EU and EU Member States ratifying the European Convention against Trafficking in Human Beings of 2005.

7. The fact that restrictive migration policies contribute to irregular migration should be fully acknowledged. Under a set of common criteria, regularisation schemes for undocumented migrants should be seen as a means to improve the individual situation of the undocumented migrant. These criteria should take into account the length of residence, family situation, if the person has a job, if removal is impossible and the potential risks for the person in her or his country of origin. EU legislation should not criminalize migrants in irregular situations. Humanitarian assistance to undocumented migrants provided by Churches, Christian organisations and NGOs or public institutions should be protected from prosecution and administrative sanctioning.

8. A common policy on return and readmission needs to uphold the dignity of the person and provide viable prospects for the migrants. Thus there should be no forced return after 5 years of legal stay in the country of residence. To support voluntary return to the country of origin, coherent reintegration schemes need to be established. Readmission to a third country is only acceptable if strong personal links to that country exist or the person requests this as an alternative. Any return policy has to safeguard family unity and particularly children’s rights. Detention of undocumented migrants and asylum seekers should be avoided.

9. The execution of any removal order or return decision should be carried out within a reasonable period fixed by law. Where removal cannot be effected within this period, the removal order or return decision should be cancelled or suspended and the person should be granted a legal status that allows for the exercise of rights such as access to the labour
CREATE A COMMON AND COHERENT ASYLUM SYSTEM

10. A European right to asylum and subsidiary protection should be established as soon as possible in the EU Treaty. Existing international law on the protection of refugees must be fully and correctly applied in order to achieve high standards in a common EU asylum system. Measures in the area of border management should not result in violations of fundamental human rights, such as the right of full access to a refugee status determination procedure within the EU with free and appropriate legal and interpretation services and the possibilities for appeal with suspensive effect.

11. The objective of all asylum policy and of other instruments for refugee protection should be to find durable and fair solutions for refugees. Asylum applications should be processed within 6 months; all asylum seekers should have access to the labour market after the shortest possible time. Refugees and persons granted a complementary protection status should be allowed to move in the EU without restrictions. We thus recommend to speedily amend the EU directive on long-term residence status to cover also refugees and persons with a complementary protection status while safeguarding special needs they may have. The duration of temporary protection status should be limited to 2 years maximum. We wish to encourage the EU and its Member States to enhance protection of refugees by providing durable solutions also through refugee resettlement.

A GLOBAL APPROACH TO MIGRATION POLICY FOR A TRIPLE WIN

12. Access to and the organisation of systems for legal migration demand a global approach, taking into account the possibilities and constraints of countries of origin, transit and destination and of the migrants themselves. The social and economic situation in these countries needs to be balanced with the interests of the persons concerned. Safeguarding the rights of individuals, improving their living and working conditions, cheaper and safe transfers of remittances, programmes to fight poverty and injustice require a strong commitment and action to address this wide range of issues. We therefore urge the EU to advocate for greater policy coherence in these areas at the level of the EU, but also on the global level.
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31 For this section we are grateful to Doris Peschke, General Secretary of the Churches Commission for Migrants in Europe.

32 The definition of the attacks as a crime is in our view preferred to the label "terrorist". Current law provides for sufficient means to sentence criminals, and in the case of the attacks on the World Trade Center for a sentence for mass murder, if the persons are found guilty. However, the concept of a 'war on terror' lies outside the judicial system and poses a severe threat to international human rights standards.


35 For this text we are grateful to the ‘Projet Mosaic’ of the French Protestant Federation (FPF), particularly its French text which has formed the basis from which our English text has been written. Any shifts of emphasis are our own and our text should not be taken as a direct translation of the FPF’s own text.

36 The use of the Hebrew term ‘Abba’ is often translated as the diminutive or familiar form of ‘Father’, perhaps ‘Dad’ or ‘Daddy’.

37 This article was previously published in Mozaik, Vol XII (20), 2007/2.


40 Campese uses convivencia, a Spanish term, to describe the sense of harmonious co-existence and life together in a way that Liberation theologians used it in Central and Southern America to refer to the ecclesial base communities.

41 Ibid, p.184.


43 This and the next section are based upon a presentation given by Annemarie Dupré at the Conference ‘Migration and Religion in a Globalised World’, organized by IOM, 5-6th December 2005, Rabat, Morocco.

44 This story has been supplied from the Ecumenical Group for Church and Society, by Michael Knoch, to whom we are grateful.


47 Editor's note: Fahjid's story was shared in 2003, so his arrival at the Church occurred in early 2001.
The World Council of Churches promotes Christian unity in faith, witness and service for a just and peaceful world. An ecumenical fellowship of churches founded in 1948, today the WCC brings together 349 Protestant, Orthodox, Anglican and other churches representing more than 560 million Christians in over 110 countries, and works cooperatively with the Roman Catholic Church.

The Churches’ Commission for Migrants in Europe (CCME) is the ecumenical agency on migration and integration, asylum and refugees, and against racism and discrimination in Europe. Members are Anglican, Orthodox and Protestant Churches, Councils of Churches, and church-related agencies in 18 European countries at present. CCME cooperates with the Conference of European Churches and the World Council of Churches.

The Nova Research Centre is a relatively new initiative of Redcliffe College in Gloucester, UK. Its Director, the Revd Darrell Jackson, was formerly the Researcher in European Mission with the Conference of European Churches, based in Budapest, Hungary. Nova engages in field research, maintains an archive, and provides support for the teaching of European Studies up to Masters’ level at Redcliffe.