

## Rapport fra CCME General Assembly 2014

Sted: Sigtuna, Sverige

Tid: 25.-29. juni 2014

Deltakere fra Norge: Lemma Desta, Andreas H. Aarflot, Sven Thore Kloster

### Europa og migrasjon – et pessimistisk bilde

Generalforsamlingen startet med et heldagsseminar om migrasjonsutfordringer i Europa. Det er et dystert bilde som preger dagens Europa: Med økende politisk og sosial uro i Midtøsten og Nord-Afrika (særlig borgerkrigen i Syria) opplever man en dramatisk økning i antall flyktninger som prøver å ta seg inn i Europa og Schengenområdet. Dette skjer samtidig som Sør- og Øst-Europa fremdeles er preget av finanskrisa og arbeidsledighet. Flere land i Sør- og Øst-Europa har et mottakssystem som ikke fungerer. Asylsøkeres rettigheter ivaretas ikke, og flere steder rapporteres det om grove menneskerettighetsbrudd mot asylsøkere: f.eks. årelang internering av asylsøkere uten dom (særlig Hellas), grensevakter som skyter på personer som prøver å krysse grensene (Hellas og spanske enklaver i Nord-Afrika), kystvakt som tauer båtflyktninger ut på åpent hav (Italia og Hellas). Et stadig økende antall dødsulykker, særlig båtulykker, registreres ved Schengens yttergrenser i sør og øst (Hellas, Spania og Italia). Samtidig har sentral- og nordeuropeiske land nærmest sluttet å ta imot UNHCR-flyktninger (Europa tar samlet imot under 6.000 i året), og det er stor misnøye internt i EU over den skjeve fordelingen av asylsøkere innad i Europa. Parallelt med denne utviklingen opplever man en økende diskriminering, flere steder også lovfestet, av romfolk og andre minoriteter, samt en økende høyrenasjonalisme i flere land i Europa.

Det er for få legale muligheter til å få opphold i Europa, noe som har bidratt sterkt til veksten i menneskesmugler-bransjen. Samtidig er ikke «Fortress Europe» en treffende metafor, for det finnes flere immigrasjonsmuligheter dersom man er ressurssterk (arbeidsinnvandring etc.). Europa kan best beskrives som «a gated community», som slipper noen få inn. Situasjonen er ikke bare usolidarisk overfor andre og langt fattigere land utenfor Europa som tar imot mesteparten av flyktningene, eller kritisk for de flyktninger som aldri greier å komme til Europa. Situasjonen innebærer også en avhumanisering av Europa, hvor Europa mister såvel troverdighet som humanitet.

Det er i denne konteksten CCME ser seg selv og jobber for å ivareta en kirkelig, økumenisk stemme for system- og holdningsendringer i Europa. Vedlagt ligger CCMEs notat om «Future migration challenges in Europe». Det oppsummerer på en god måte utfordringene som relaterer seg til migrasjon som Europa står overfor de neste årene.

### Relasjonen KEK-CCME

Bortsett fra nytt handlingsprogram og budsjett var hovedsaken på generalforsamlingen CCMEs forhold til KEK. KEK og CCME har i over 15 år hatt en dialog om nærmere samarbeid og integrering av de to organisasjonene. På CCMEs generalforsamling i 2008 stilte man seg bak et sett av «Articles of Association» hvor CCME skulle inngå som en kommisjon

i KEK. Men etter at KEKs generalforsamling i Budapest i 2012 vedtok å omstrukturere KEK og legge ned kommisjonene, ble hele KEK-CCME-integreringen lagt på is. Fra CCMEs side har årsaken til dette dreid seg om at CCME ikke kan integreres i en organisasjon de ikke vet hvordan kommer til å se ut.

CCMEs generalforsamling i 2014 vedtok en resolusjon hvor de hilser et tett samarbeid med KEK velkommen. For den neste treårsperioden bør det inngås en avtale med KEK om det praktiske samarbeidet mellom de to organisasjonene og om hvordan CCME kan ivareta arbeidet med migrasjon også for KEK. Samtidig sier resolusjonen at CCME på sikt ønsker en nærmere integrasjon med KEK, og at det i den kommende treårsperioden må forhandles fram en god modell for framtidig organisering og samarbeid med KEK som CCMEs generalforsamling i 2017 kan ta stilling til. Se vedlagte resolusjon om CCME-KEK.

### **Tung norsk deltakelse i CCME ExCom**

Lemma Desta ble valgt inn i ExCom i CCME for den neste treårsperioden. Etter at først Finland og så Sverige har vært representert i CCME ExCom de siste periodene, var det naturlig med en norsk representant fra den nordiske regionen. Desta jobber til vanlig som koordinator i Flerkulturelt Kirkelig Nettverk i Norges Kristne Råd, men representerer Dnk i CCME i og med at NKR ikke er medlem. Det er generøst av NKR å la Lemma Desta bruke av sin arbeidstid på arbeid i CCME. Lemma Desta bør møte i Mellomkirkelig råd når saker om CCME og KEK behandles.

I etterkant av CCMEs generalforsamling har KEK oppnevnt Andreas H. Aarflot som sin representant i CCME ExCom. Aarflot er fra før Dnks representant i KEKs styre (Governing Board), og han var også delegat fra Dnk på CCMEs generalforsamling. Derfor har det nå blitt to personer fra Norge i CCME ExCom: Aarflot som representerer KEK, og Desta som representerer Dnk. Dette er første gang at Dnk er så tungt involvert i CCME, noe som bør tilsi at CCME får mer oppmerksomhet i MKR og Dnk i den kommende treårsperioden.

### **CCME 50 år**

CCME feiret også sin 50-årsdag på denne generalforsamlingen i og med at det i 2014 er 50 år siden at KV ba europeiske kirker danne et samarbeid for og med migranter i Europa. Gaven fra Dnk til CCME var en konsert med Solfrid Molland og rom-musikere lørdag 28.7. Det var en flott konsert, en verdig avslutning av generalforsamlingen og en viktig påminnelse om og erfaring av romkulturens sofistikerte musikkhistorie og fantastiske musikk talenter.

### **Oppfølging:**

- Årlig arrangeres det kirkelige minnemarkeringer for alle omkomne ved Schengens yttergrenser i mange europeiske land. CCME lager liturgisk materiell for dette. Dnk og NKR bør også sørge for at det arrangeres årlige minnemarkeringer i Norge. Som regel markeres dette på Verdens flyktningsdag 19. juni.

- CCME jobber mye for og med migrantkirker i Europa. Generalforsamlingen ble også en påminnelse om hvor kort Dnk har kommet i oppfølgingen av kirkemøtesaken KM 07/09 *Kristne innvandrere og menighetene i Norge*. Mens flere store kirker i Europa nå har gode strategier for hvordan de vil samarbeide med og inkludere kristne innvandrere og migrantmenigheter, er dette ikke tilfelle i Dnk. Arbeidet med å følge opp KM 07/09 bør intensiveres, og det bør tenkes nytt om hvordan Dnk bedre kan få glede av den store ressursen kristne innvandrere til Norge representerer.
- Generalforsamlingen ble også en uhyggelig påminnelse om hvordan høyrepopulisme og nasjonalisme, særlig i Sentral-Europa, har resultert i oppsving av hatholdninger og diskriminering av romfolk. Europa og kirkene har en mørk historie når det gjelder romfolk, og Dnk og MKR bør vurdere hvordan man kan styrke arbeidet inn mot denne gruppen, både i Norge og i andre europeiske land. Dnk og MKR bør også vurdere å være tydeligere i samtidige debatter som vedrører romfolk, f.eks. tiggerforbudet o.l.
- CCME igangsetter høyst sannsynlig en kampanje i neste treårsperioden om større europeisk solidaritet mtp. å fordele ansvar og byrder med å ta imot flyktninger. Pr dags dato må det kriserammede Sør-Europa bære det meste av byrden, mens Nord-Europa går fri, blant annet pga. Dublinforordningen. Som stor kirke i Nord-Europa bør Dnk være en pådriver i en slik evt. europeisk kampanje.
- Som følge av at Lemma Desta ble valgt inn i ExCom og representerer Dnk der, bør han inviteres til MKR-møter når KEK og CCME-saker står på dagsorden. NKR bør også oppfordres til å søke om medlemskap i CCME. Nå er både Sveriges og Finlands kristne råd medlemmer.

*Lemma Desta, Andreas H. Aarflot, Sven Thore Kloster, juli 2014*

Vedlegg: «The future ecumenical work on migration of CCME and CEC»  
 «Future migration challenges»  
 Report from 19<sup>th</sup> CCME General Assembly June 2014







**ccme**

churches' commission for migrants in europe

**beyond borders**

since 1964

**CCME GA 2014-4  
final**

## **The future ecumenical work on migration of CCME and CEC**

### **Resolution of the 19<sup>th</sup> CCME General Assembly, Sigtuna, 26-29 June 2014**

"Christians are migrants by vocation!" This conclusion from biblical reflections on migration in the Year of European Churches Responding to Migration 2010 remains valid, whatever configuration churches and church-related organisations will find appropriate. It is a reminder and a calling at the same time: Christians are called to identify themselves with the migrants and refugees, with minority ethnic people, not only the well-off ones, but particularly those at the margins. The gift of diversity is a challenging one: often diversity is (mis-) understood as dividing and as a punishment; discovering that diversity is indeed a blessing requires reflection and commitment.

Globally, migration has become a reality for societies. Churches at all levels, local, national, regional, continental and global, and to various degrees seek to find appropriate responses: welcoming migrants and refugees, provide social and legal assistance, improve the conditions of migrants, refugees and minority ethnic persons, advocate vis-à-vis political institutions and society at large for a humane and just migration and asylum framework and for inclusive policies.

#### **CCME and the Conference of European Churches**

Since 1999, the Churches Commission for Migrants in Europe, the Conference of European Churches and the World Council of Churches have cooperated based on a negotiated agreement. It was hoped to foster closer cooperation through CCME forming a Commission of CEC.

In 2013, the Assembly of the Conference of European Churches has opted for a different structure not foreseeing Commissions as working instruments.

The CCME Assembly has received and welcomed the report of the CCME General Secretary on the future ecumenical work on migration of CCME and CEC elaborated after the first meeting of the negotiation group between CEC and CCME.

The CCME Assembly welcomes the decisions of the CEC Assembly to include migration and asylum work under the aims and objectives of the new CEC. CCME members share the conviction expressed in this decision that migration and asylum, as well as work with

Churches' Commission for Migrants in Europe - Commission des Églises auprès des Migrants en Europe - Kommission der Kirchen für Migranten in Europa

and on diaspora and migrant churches are indeed of core relevance for the work of ecumenical organisations in Europe and beyond.

The CCME Assembly took note of the three scenarios discussed in the negotiation group between CEC and CCME. The CCME GA agrees that any scenario for the future cooperation shall be measured by the common aim,

- to enhance and strengthen the visible witness of churches, Councils of Churches, black and migrant churches as well as church-related agencies with and for migrants, refugees and minority ethnic persons.

Therefore the CCME Assembly appreciates the first initiative for finding an agreement between CCME and CEC, as was expressed in the Message by the CEC President Christopher Hill transmitted to the CCME Assembly by the Vice President of CEC, Very Rev. Karin Burstrand.

In the light of the report by the CCME General Secretary, the message from CEC and the recommendations elaborated by the working group during the assembly, the CCME Assembly resolves:

- CCME appreciates the agreement with CEC that the aim of integration and/or cooperation is to strengthen the churches' common witness and service ... "responding to the message of the Bible which insists on the dignity of every human being, in order to promote an inclusive policy at European and national level for migrants, refugees and minority groups".
- CCME reiterates that any scenario has to provide the space for CCME members who are not and cannot be members of CEC according to CEC' constitution to participate and contribute in a meaningful way in the future ecumenical work on migration;
- CEC and CCME shall jointly look for improved visibility for this commonly defined area of work to facilitate broad participation by the members of CEC and CCME to better serve the aims of working for inclusive policies;
- Accountability and trust, mutuality have been key words throughout the negotiation process between CEC and CCME. This requires good and reliable information sharing, and regular exchange and agreement on procedures.
- Effective witness and service with and for migrants, refugees, minority ethnic persons requires capacity and secure funding. Therefore clear agreement between CCME and CEC needs to be reached to share the work and resources in a mutually agreed way.

#### I. Scenarios:

- I. The scenario 1: **Incorporation** of CCME's work and property in CEC - Dissolution of CCME was not regarded as providing the necessary conditions for giving visibility for effective work in the areas of migration and asylum, and therefore not considered an option.
- II. For the second scenario, "CCME in CEC – **"two in one"** or **"one in two"** not all aspects have yet been clear, as following the Budapest Assembly CEC is currently in transition. If and when questions like membership and others are clarified this could turn into an option, when CEC could adopt a working model allowing the existence of an agency/entity inside its structure. This model would enhance that



both organisations, while remaining legally separate, are seen and governed as one.

III. A third scenario consists of **enhanced cooperation** between CCME and CEC.

The CCME Assembly favours the third scenario taking into consideration a possible passage towards scenario two, and mandates the Excom of CCME to negotiate a new agreement of cooperation with the CEC governing board, initially for the next three years. This could be done in the CEC framework of agreements with "organisations in partnership".

The agreement of cooperation should stipulate common areas of work and clear budget agreements between both organisations. It is understood, that such an agreement will formulate rights and responsibilities of both organisations vis-à-vis the other. Therefore, building of mutual trust will be necessary. The CCME Assembly commits CCME to sharing relevant information with CEC and recommends to the CEC governing board to ensure appropriate information flows. Common working methods and mechanism will have to be agreed upon.

The CCME Assembly hopes that the negotiation group between CCME and CEC can elaborate the content of a cooperation agreement on behalf of the ExCom and Governing Board. The Assembly recommends that

- An evaluation of the cooperation is undertaken in the second half of 2016 in order to make available recommendations to CEC and CCME 6 months prior to the CCME Assembly 2017.



**ccme**

churches' commission for migrants in europe

**beyond borders**

since 1964

**CCME GA 2014-7.1**

## Migration in Europe: A Call for Change

### Future migration challenges

The current European migration situation is dominated by rather restrictive policies decided particularly by the European Union and its member states. It is based on fear that if more opportunities for migration and protection were offered, more and more people would arrive. At the same time, there is some recognition that the current system does not work and creates imbalances.

As CCME prepares for another term of its work, it seems like an opportune time to look at the environment in which CCME's work takes place. This paper briefly discusses some current and future challenges and offers reflections on some of the dilemmas for CCME's work.

**The CCME Assembly is requested to discuss the challenges and formulate adequate responses for churches in Europe.**

#### Access to Europe:

As a consequence of the tragic deaths at the EU's external borders, the question of legal and safe access to Europe has become one of the most pressing concerns for churches in Europe. There appears to be general agreement that there should be more legal migration possibilities as well as legal pathways for refugees into the EU. However the question remains how far such legal access should go. Would CCME argue for completely open borders, or lifting visa requirements in conflict situations such as Syria, or rather look at quotas; how would quotas be determined? In the political discussions, humanitarian visa and external processing are raised as possible avenues.

#### Solidarity:

CCME has with many other organisations criticised that the responsibility for protecting refugees in the EU is unevenly distributed – due to the "Dublin" system, which mainly entrusts the countries at the EU external borders with this responsibility. However, a precise alternative has not yet been agreed. Would an alternative include some kind of more even distribution, e.g in the form of a European distribution key? Would CCME argue for a completely free choice for asylum applicants where their case is treated? How would

Churches' Commission for Migrants in Europe – Commission des Églises auprès des Migrants en Europe – Kommission der Kirchen für Migranten in Europa



expressions of solidarity with countries at the EU borders not run the risk of “rewarding” those among them who have often for decades not done enough to make their asylum reception systems fit for significant numbers of arrivals.

### **More legal migration:**

While many countries in Europe are still struggling with the effects of the economic crisis, including unemployment, it is increasingly becoming clear that Europe will need immigration on an unprecedented scale in the next decade(s) to stabilize economic viability and social security systems. In many countries policies as well as discourse are beginning to shift away from “zero immigration” to “migration is useful for us”. Can CCME continue to argue that migration is useful and normal without contributing to a utilitarian discourse, which sees migrants as a commodity? How can CCME best maintain an argument around human dignity which includes the most vulnerable, who are regarded as not useful, e.g. refugees or migrants’ family members? How can CCME argue positively about immigration given that it often results in a typical globalisation pattern, namely that gains from it are privatised and (social) costs are socialised?

### **Environmental displacement**

A phenomenon which is slowly, but visibly developing is displacement due to environmental degradation and climate change. So far there has been no recognition of those migrating/fleeing for environmental reasons in international migration law. Should CCME take up the issue and argue for e.g. an inclusion of “environmental refugees” in the 1951 Geneva (Refugee) Convention or in a protocol to it; or would such an opening rather jeopardise refugee protection as a whole – given the current political climate around refugee questions?

### **Migration and development**

Almost 10 years after the Global Commission’s Report on International Migration, and 7 years’ experience with the Global Forum on Migration and Development, knowledge around international migration, forced and voluntary, has increased, but only few measures have been taken – e.g. costs of remittances were reduced. Yet, development actors remain cautious to engage. The process of Churches Witnessing with migrants has developed advocacy aims. Crucial aspects identified are development justice, and migrants’ rights.

### **Cherishing diversity**

Migration is changing societies and churches – and there are many good models of living together and successful integration. Yet, in many European countries opposition to migration and rejection of minority ethnic people flourish, an increase of racist violence against minorities is of grave concern. How can churches effectively engage to stem the tide and contribute to a change of attitudes?