

EU CITIZENSHIP LAW: INTEGRATION OF IMMIGRANTS

Deyan DIMITROV*

Abstract

This article examines the concept of European citizenship, formally introduced by the Treaty of Maastricht. Emphasis is placed on the fact that currently, the EU has no common citizenship policy and citizenship issues are completely fragmented between the national legal systems of the Member States. This study draws attention to the challenges and opportunities posed by this situation for the integration of immigrants and raises the question of nationality in the EU and whether EU citizenship should be distinguished from that of Member States? The study focuses on what it means to be “European” in the era of global mobility and freedom of movement and examines the interconnections between national sovereignty, self-determination and EU citizenship.

Keywords: EU citizenship, immigrants, integration, nationality, third-country nationals

Introduction

According to legal science, citizenship is the political and legal relationship between the individual and the state, which has a lasting and sustainable character. In this sense, the citizenship of the European Union (EU) is another feature of it that distinguishes the Union from the classical understanding of an international organization. The legal regime of EU citizenship is one of the most significant achievements of the European integration legal order and is of great importance for the development of the European integration process.

In deciding to establish citizenship of the Union, Member States were driven by the desire to establish a direct political link between the EU and the people, so that they could be more actively involved in social, economic and cultural life at European level. First of all, it should be noted that citizenship of the Union is acquired as a direct legal consequence of the full membership of the national state of the person in the European Union. When a natural person acquires the nationality of a Member State for any reason, they also acquire EU citizenship – automatically, without the need to take any legal action.

* Deyan DIMITROV, PhD, Institute for the State and the Law, Bulgarian Academy of Science, Sofia, Bulgaria; e-mail: dmdimitrov@abv.bg.

It is interesting to note that at the moment, European citizenship does not carry burdens and obligations, but only rights. In other words, *de lege lata* has no clearly defined obligations arising from European citizenship: for example, there is no compulsory European military or civilian service; there is not even a European tax. In this regard, according to the EU Parliament “Like national citizenship, EU citizenship refers to a relationship between the citizen and the European Union, which is defined by rights, duties and political participation” (European Parliament, 2020).

It is clear that EU citizens are given many, and quite important, rights and opportunities, the legal fact of which is the membership of the respective nation state in the Union. However, in view of the problem at hand, it is important to emphasize that Union citizenship cannot be used to acquire the citizenship of a Member State other than the country of origin of the individual European citizen.

Following the latest events in Europe and the world, EU Member States have paid special attention to the integration of immigrants into the European common society. Recent years have emerged as a serious test for the EU in the context of the citizenship and nationality issues. Given the many common challenges, the need for enhanced cooperation between EU countries in the field of integration policies is becoming increasingly important. In this sense, it is necessary to reform the legal framework with a view to greater resilience, efficiency, harmonization and fairness to future migratory pressures, so that the EU can ensure its citizens the right to move, work and live anywhere in the Union.

1. What makes the European Citizenship specific?

United Europe does not strive for unification, but for the richness of its model by preserving and stimulating diversity and, most importantly, upholding the right to choose of every citizen, of every individual. In itself, upholding national specificity and identity also means upholding European values, because the more national wealth and diversity are preserved and upheld, the more the European principles of democracy and pluralism are preserved (Stoilova, 2011, p. 55). It is this fundamental principle of the European model and of the European spiritual space that reflects the possibility for every citizen of a United Europe to be able to identify themselves through both the “European” and the “national”. It is not a question of imposing one or the other principle, but of the possibility for the two to coexist together so that they can complement and enrich each other.

Following this ambitious goal the Treaty of Maastricht introduced EU citizenship in 1992. It was established as a supranational form of citizenship with attached legal and enforceable rights. In this regard, it should be noted that citizenship of the Union is acquired as a direct legal consequence of the full membership of the national state of the person in the European Union. Initially, the concept of European citizenship was more symbolic than essential, but over the years its role has been further developed through court judgments of the European Court of Justice.



It is important to remark, however, that EU citizenship is acquired as a direct legal consequence of the full membership of the national state of the person in the Union. When individuals acquire the citizenship of a Member State on any grounds, they automatically acquire EU citizenship without the need to take any legal action. There are no legal or political grounds to believe that the acquisition of EU citizenship gives rise to the legal figure of dual citizenship. Combining the citizenship of the nation state with the citizenship of the EU should not be defined as bipatrim, as the EU is not a state. In this sense, the main aspects that need to be emphasized with regard to European citizenship are the fact that EU citizenship confers additional rights and also that it cannot be acquired separately from national citizenship by people who are not citizens of EU Member State or by stateless persons.

However, the formation of the institution of citizenship of the Union does not stop there. As the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Unions' normative achievements stipulate that, "Every person holding the nationality of a Member State shall be a citizen of the Union" (Official Journal, 2012, p. 47 - 390), the Treaty of Amsterdam clarifies the link between European and national citizenship by adding that "Citizenship of the Union shall complement and not replace national citizenship" (Official Journal, 1997, p. 1 - 144). This notion is strengthened by the legal additions of the Treaty of Lisbon, which give the EU citizens the right of citizens' legislative initiative and also underlined the importance of the EU citizenship by referencing the rights and freedoms enshrined in the Charter of the Fundamental Rights of the European Union, which with the Treaty of Lisbon acquired the same legal force as that of the Treaties. At the same time, the Charter further reinforces the idea of EU citizenship. In particular, its preamble states that the EU "puts every individual at the heart of its work by establishing citizenship of the Union and by creating an area of freedom, security and justice".

The wording of the founding treaties gives the impression that their purpose is to build the missing link needed to strengthen the link between all citizens within the EU through the membership of the Member States in the integration communities. The idea behind this connection is to be direct and immediate, without being limited. Such a step towards convergence has not been possible through the classical mechanisms for transforming the norms of international treaties into norms of domestic law in the countries. Furthermore, European integration is created by states, but it is intended for citizens, which means the it serves not relations between states, but relations whose subjects are also citizens. In this context, all future EU action puts the citizens of the Union at the center.

Citizens are not parties to the treaties on the basis of which the integration communities emerged, and later the EU. At the same time, it is the citizens who are the economic catalyst for building the internal market, which is the aim and subject of these treaties. By virtue of the specific principles of application of Community law - the direct effect, the direct applicability and the supremacy of national law - citizens derive directly subjective rights from Community rules. This is proof of the



existence of a legal link between European citizens and the membership of the countries of which they are citizens. The development of integration processes presupposes the constant enrichment of this connection with new elements in order to achieve full and real European citizenship with real dimensions of the rights guaranteed by it. In this sense, it should be emphasized that, for the first time, a text appears in the founding treaties giving citizens of the Union rights.

EU citizenship rights are firmly enshrined in EU primary law and are significantly further developed in secondary law. In particular, the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and the Charter of Fundamental Rights contain (without being exhaustive) a number of rights which are linked to this status:

- The right to move and reside freely within the EU;
- The right of citizens to vote and to be elected in European parliamentary and municipal elections;
- The right to diplomatic and consular protection;
- The right to petition the European Parliament;
- The right to lodge a complaint with the European Ombudsman;
- The right to freedom from discrimination on grounds of nationality;
- The right of contact and to receive a reply from any EU institution in one of the official languages of the EU;
- The right of access to documents of the European Parliament, the European Commission and the European Council under certain conditions;
- The right of equal access to EU civil service;
- The right to good administration;
- The right of citizens' initiatives, through which 1 million citizens from at least a quarter of EU Member States can call on the European Commission to present proposals for legal reform in areas where the Commission would not otherwise have the power to do so.

Very often EU citizens exercise several of their rights as EU citizens at the same time. On the other hand, some rights are a natural prerequisite for the exercise of other fundamental rights of an EU citizen - the right to education in another Member State, for example, would be unthinkable without the right to move and reside freely. The same statement also affects a number of social rights of the Union citizen and, of course, the right to vote in another Member State (for local or European Parliament elections). The most obvious is the connection between the general right to free movement with the specific rights (residence, work, etc.).

It can be summarized that in recent years the European Union has taken important steps to implement and strengthen the values it recognizes in both its domestic and international relations. It not only seeks to ensure the rights of its citizens and residents, but also to uphold human rights in the countries with which it cooperates and has economic relations. The European citizen's first right is the right to move, work and live anywhere in the Union.

In the context of European citizenship, four dimensions of the relationship between the individual and society within the EU can be distinguished: the political, social, cultural and economic dimensions. The scope of the political dimension



includes political rights and responsibilities with regard to the political system. The social dimension of citizenship encompasses the relationships between the various elements of society and includes categories such as loyalty and solidarity. The cultural dimension does not cover issues of common cultural heritage in the EU, emphasizing identities and multicultural diversity. The scope of the economic dimension covers labor and consumer relations with an emphasis on employment and vocational training.

In general, the right to free movement of persons in the EU is a subject of special attention in the EU law. It has also been a subject of significant case law for a long period of time. In this regard, it should be noted that the case law of the Court of Justice of the EU contains a number of examples related to the citizenship issues. Significant for the strengthening of the institution of European citizenship are the cases: Micheletti (CJEU, 1992), Frederick Farrugia (CJEU, 1996, Case T-230/94), Fatna Mesbah (CJEU, 1999), Manjit Kaur (CJEU, 2001), Factortame (CJEU, 1996, C-46/93), Ruiz Zambrano (CJEU, 2011), Janko Rottman (CJEU, 2010), etc. In its case law, the Court confirms that the precondition for acquiring EU citizenship is the possession of the citizenship of any Member State. In this regard, citizenship of the Union is currently a basic status of the individual, the political subject of the process of European integration, allowing everyone to be treated equally, regardless of their nationality.

The judgment of the Court of Justice of the EU in Micheletti case is significant in the context of European citizenship. It emphasizes that, within the Union, States may not deprive persons of the rights deriving from the institution of EU citizenship if the basic precondition for that arises - namely, the possession of the nationality of one of the Member States (CJEU, 1992). The same rule applies in the case of dual citizenship, when a person is a national of an EU Member State and at the same time a national of a third country. Here again, the person who holds rights as a European citizen could not be restricted precisely because, within the EU, everyone should be treated equally, regardless of their nationality.

Another important example from the subsequent case law of the Court of Justice in the context of European citizenship is the judgment of the Court in Rottman case. The decision gives Member States the opportunity to regulate freely citizenship laws. However, for the first time, the case law of the European Court of Justice on citizenship issues stipulates that the exercise of a Member State's competence in regulating citizenship matters fall within the scope of the EU law (CJEU, 2010). In this sense, it should be noted that the freedom to regulate citizenship must be exercised with due regard for EU law. As a result, Member States are limited by the principles of the EU law, which means that where a national provision, aimed at regulating citizenship, restricts Union citizens without a legitimate interest and / or in a disproportionate way, that provision must be repealed by the national court.

Of particular interest is the judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union in the case of Alokpa, which states that in cases where third-country nationals



actually exercise parental responsibility in respect of a child with EU citizenship, may reside with them in the host Member State in accordance with the provisions of Article 20 TFEU (CJEU, 2013). In this sense, it can be summarized that if the refusal of residence would deprive the EU citizen of the opportunity to actually exercise the rights deriving from the citizenship, then this restriction should be removed.

In this context, the Court of Justice becomes the final instance to verify that national conditions of citizenship comply with the EU law. In the context of the Rottman case, citizenship is emphasized as the basic status of citizens of the Member States. Such a basic status as Union citizenship is difficult to imagine if this status depends only on the Member States. The judgment in the case is fully in line with the established common case law of the Court of Justice, according to which the exercise of Member States' powers may be limited by the general principles of the EU law, even in areas where Member States are competent to act (e.g. health measures or direct taxes). By including Union citizenship as a status separate from any economic objective, the areas of law that affect that citizenship now fall within the scope of EU law and thus also fall under the control of the Court of Justice.

2. EU citizenship issues and the EU rules relevant to immigrants

Currently, the EU has no common citizenship policy and citizenship issues are completely fragmented between the national legal systems of the Member States. In this regard, this research work will try to clarify the challenges and opportunities posed by this situation for the integration of immigrants and also the question of nationality in the EU and whether EU citizenship should be distinguished from that of Member States.

The dramatic events of the past decade in Syria, Iraq, Libya, Afghanistan and Yemen became a major determinant of the intensity of immigration waves to Europe. In addition, the growing number of young people in underdeveloped economies, the lack of resources in the deep social conflicts in Africa and the Middle East are prompting more and more people living there to seek better living and working conditions. The ever-increasing flow of immigration has led to the entry of nearly 1.5 million illegal immigrants into the territory of developed countries in Europe. The influx of refugees has led to a crisis in the EU, threatening its unity and undermining the achievements of the Schengen agreement.

Modern migration processes and their consequences have become one of the central fields of current EU policy. Perhaps it should be recalled that for centuries Europe itself has been a continent of emigrants, with the inhabitants of European countries colonizing vast areas of the world in search of wealth, freedom and peace. Today, the trend is reversed: in the age of globalization, the old continent has become the ultimate goal of unknown till now in scale and intensity migration processes. At first glance, the classic "Push-and-Pull" model is easily applicable here: on the one hand, factors such as poverty, lack of prospects, overpopulation, wars, repression, etc. motivate residents of underdeveloped or developing countries to emigrate in search of a new life elsewhere; on the other hand, Europe is suffering from an aging



population and a shortage of skilled workers. In this sense, it can be said that migration processes to the Union are an unalterable phenomenon, which to a large extent is already shaping the future of Europe (Timchev, 2019, p. p. 13 - 27).

In recent years, EU Member States have paid special attention to the integration of immigrants into society. Given the many common challenges, increasing importance is being given to the need for enhanced cooperation between EU countries in the field of integration policies. The way the EU regulates immigration involves a number of legal and policy instruments. During the last few years, the Union's efforts have focused on the implementation of the European Agenda on Migration and have resulted in the implementation of measures focusing on both the internal and external dimension of migration processes and the EU's external borders. The measures taken in practice include: 1) return and readmission of illegal migrants who are not allowed to enter or reside in the EU; 2) combating the smuggling of migrants; 3) protecting the EU's external borders; 4) creating legal ways for those in need of international protection; 5) creating a stable EU asylum policy, based on a balance between solidarity and responsibility; 6) taking action on migration in cooperation with third countries through political and financial means. Although European legislation establishes common standards in the areas listed, the actual implementation of asylum and migration policy is the responsibility of the Member States, which must ensure that their national legislation is in line with both EU law and the international agreements signed. The migration challenges facing the EU over the last few years have highlighted a number of gaps in the Union's asylum, migration and external border control policies. The EU asylum system has come under serious pressure because asylum seekers are not treated equally in different Member States, due to opposing societal attitudes and difficulties in balancing solidarity and responsibility in them. In this sense, there is a need to reform the legal framework with a view to greater sustainability, efficiency, harmonization and equity in the face of future migratory pressures.

The EU currently has a shared competence to develop a common immigration policy. In this sense, the legal framework established by the founding treaties should be recalled. For example, according to Article 67 TFEU, the Union "shall develop a common policy on asylum, immigration and external border control, based on solidarity between Member States and fair to third-country nationals". Here is the place to clarify that the concept of third-country nationals also includes stateless persons. Furthermore, Article 78 TFEU provides for the possibility for the EU to develop a common policy on asylum, subsidiary protection and temporary protection. It emphasizes the role of the European Parliament and the Council as co-legislators in adopting measures for a common European asylum system. It also outlines the temporary measures that can be taken in the event of a sudden influx of third-country nationals in one or more Member States. Article 79 provides for the development of enhanced measures to combat illegal immigration and trafficking in human beings, including the possibility for the Union "to conclude agreements with third countries for the readmission to their countries of origin or provenance of third-



country nationals who do not or who no longer fulfil the conditions for entry, presence or residence in the territory of one of the Member States”. The principle of solidarity and fair distribution of responsibilities, including in financial terms, between Member States when implementing border, asylum and immigration control policies is summarized in Article 80 TFEU.

It should be recalled here that Article 18 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union governs the right to asylum and Article 19 the prohibition on return. The validity and legality of EU secondary legislation depends on its compliance with the Charter. In its work, the EU should respect and at the same time require Member States to respect and implement the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol (Geneva Convention), as well as other relevant treaties.

Most EU funds related to migration policies are included in the Union’s Multiannual Financial Framework. These include the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund, which aims to promote the effective management of migration flows and the development of a common Union approach to immigration and asylum, and the Internal Security Fund, which provides support for the management of external migration. borders, as well as the common visa policy and financial support for police cooperation, crime prevention and counteraction, including the smuggling of migrants.

Within the EU, Member States are also taking measures to resettle refugees from third countries directly under the provisions of the EU’s emergency resettlement scheme, focusing on flows from North Africa, the Middle East and the Horn of Africa. However, the number of resettlements remains modest for the last 3 years. Currently, the EU debate on migration is mainly focused on two areas - the first on the EU resettlement framework, which provides safe and legal ways to access Europe for people in need of international protection, and the second on the EU Blue Card, which aims to attract and retain highly skilled workers. Progress on these topics is yet to be reported.

The risk of additional migratory pressures caused by both short-term instability and long-term trends such as demographic and climate change shall not to be overlooked. Finding an adequate regulatory framework at the European level and integrating migrants remains a challenge for the EU. More efforts are also needed to return, readmission and reintegrate those who do not need protection. In this sense, there is a need to establish a sustainable long-term EU system for better management of migration in all its aspects. In order for this to happen in practice, it is necessary to continue the operational and financial support, to supplement and implement the existing legislative framework, as well as to deepen the partnerships with third countries. Legislative reform is emerging as a necessity, as it should be based on more solidarity and willingness to compromise on all sides. The regulation of migration processes is becoming increasingly important in the context of EU citizenship.

Current trends show that Europe will undoubtedly continue to be an attractive place for immigrants and asylum seekers, and managing migration flows will



continue to be high on the EU agenda. This is due to a number of factors, such as growing international and domestic conflicts, climate change and continuing economic disparities between the EU Member States and other countries. That is why the EU must combine different internal and external instruments in the field of migration. As the EU does not have a common citizenship policy, communication between countries on migration processes and the integration of migrants is carried out by harmonizing the principles, powers and procedures in the field of border management and changing the border control system in terms of competencies and logistics. EU countries have the task of guarding the external European border with a focus on combating illegal migration in the context of national and European security.

3. Integration of immigrants and the nationality issue in the EU

The deepening of integration and the introduction of the Institute of European citizenship is closely linked to the very question of the scope of European integration. In the context of nationality in the EU, countries currently retain the freedom to determine the criteria for who their citizens are and who are not. Here it is important to remark that it is nationality that is used as a criterion in determining who qualifies as an EU citizen. In this sense, it should be noted that the link between a community of citizens and the affirmation of political affiliation between the Member States is not at the heart of the concept of citizenship (Bauböck *et al.*, 2019, p.). The EU recognizes the equal legal status of individuals at the supranational level, not by recognizing and supporting the political representation of individuals as citizens, but by granting them specific rights and freedoms. As EU citizenship is acquired as a direct legal consequence of the full membership of the country concerned (only the citizens of the Member States can acquire the rights deriving from it), it is through the acquired additional rights that the idea of participation of all citizens of the Member States materializes not only in the building of the Union, but also in the actual establishment of integration as a pan-European process. The legal framework for citizenship is structured in such a way as to avoid the specificities and restrictions of individual Member States, so that EU citizens can be recognized as having rights under exactly the same conditions as citizens of the host country. To what extent, however, does EU citizenship limit the sovereignty of Member States in the context of their national legislation? EU citizenship status implies a direct link to national citizenship. However, as set out in the founding treaties, it acts as a kind of precautionary measure when there is no possibility to apply existing EU secondary legislation in this area (European Parliament and the Council, 2004).

The main criterion for identifying European citizenship after the Treaty of Maastricht is the nationality of the country of origin. It is apparent from the declaration of nationality annexed to the Treaty of Maastricht that whether a person is a national of a Member State is determined by the national law of the Member State concerned (Official Journal, 1992). In addition, the case law of the Court of



Justice confirms the established practice of harmonizing European legislation with national law and, in the context of the issue of citizenship, emphasizes the need for each Member State to comply with the EU law. In this sense, it is precisely the harmonization of national legislation with that of the EU that needs to be done very carefully, given that the acquisition of citizenship opens the way to EU citizenship and the right to free movement.

Third-country nationals, who represent 5% of the total EU population, are excluded from the scope of EU citizenship. In this context, the EU is aiming at establishing a common and at the same time effective migration policy at European level. That is why measures have been taken to outline a practical framework for managing migration flows. There are categories of asylum seekers, highly skilled workers, students and researchers, seasonal workers and people who migrate to reunite with their families. A special regime has been introduced for third-country nationals staying in an EU country for a long time in an attempt to approximate their rights with those of EU citizens. The integration of legally residing third-country nationals into the territory of the Member States is possible, given that the EU can encourage such actions. However, European legislation does not provide for the harmonization of Member States' legal provisions and legislation.

For example, in 2009 the Council of the European Union adopted Directive 2009/50/EC (Council of the European Union, 2009) with regard to the conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals for the purposes of highly qualified employment. The aim of the so-called Blue Card is to attract highly qualified immigrants, making their legal status fully transferable within the EU. This is a way of expressing the EU's readiness to attract more skilled immigrant workers and to reduce the number of undocumented immigrants (Ilieva, 2018, p. 258 - 276). In addition, in this way, the tensions that Europe's aging population creates for Member States' pension systems may be reduced due to the influx of immigrants moving to areas where labor is scarce.

Immigrant integration and the issue of nationality in the EU face another major challenge. The process of withdrawal of the United Kingdom from the European Union, known as Brexit, shows that regional integration can be reversed and that supranational (civil) rights can be terminated. After leaving the EU, the citizens of the United Kingdom practically will lose their status as European citizens, as well as the rights deriving from European citizenship itself. Conversely, nationals of other Member States residing in the United Kingdom, in practice, will acquire the status of aliens to whom United Kingdom immigration law will be fully applicable (Stoilova, 2019, p. 36 - 44). There is a real possibility that some Member States will introduce more favorable conditions for migration issues. Similar examples are Cyprus and Greece. Furthermore, some additional mobility arrangements can be proposed between the EU and the UK and can be agreed and accepted as part of the negotiations on their future relationship. At the beginning of 2020, new immigration rules have been proposed in the UK, which will apply after 1 January 2021.

Regardless of how it will be implemented in practice, Brexit will bring about changes in the territorial scope of EU primary law, including on citizenship issues.



Until the withdrawal decision of the United Kingdom, the European project assumed that the only way for a European citizen to lose European citizenship was by losing the citizenship of a Member State. Brexit proves that an automatic loss *ex lege* due to leaving a Member State is also a possible option. Similar to the clause for automatic acquisition with the accession of a country to the EU (Article 49 TFEU), the clause for voluntary departure (Article 50) adds grounds for loss of Union citizenship.

The interaction between nationality and EU citizenship within the established legal framework in the EU is direct and decisive for the mobility of nationals of the Member States and those of third countries. At present, matters of nationality are part of the exclusive competence of the Member States, which determine the conditions for acquiring and losing citizenship, in strict compliance with the EU law. In this sense, a change in the national legislation on citizenship in one of the Member States cannot be ignored, as it has a direct impact and leads to changes in the others. With the acquisition of citizenship of a Member State, individuals acquire the right to intra-European mobility, which in itself is directly linked to citizenship in the other Member States. It is the link between intra-Union mobility and nationality that subsequently triggers an informal process of harmonizing the conditions for acquiring and losing citizenship in the various Member States.

In the coming decades, the proportion of people in different European countries who are not nationals across Europe will increase as a result of mobility between countries, as well as the influx of immigrants from abroad. The promotion of the right to diversity by minority groups, both indigenous and non-indigenous, is now an established practice in European social and political life. This means that the very concept of citizenship is changing towards a broader definition, within which legal and social rights and privileges continue to be a key element, but the importance of culturally agreed and culturally influenced perceptions of citizenship.

Conclusions

In conclusion, it should be noted that the EU has no common citizenship policy and citizenship issues are completely fragmented between the national legal systems of the Member States. European citizenship is becoming increasingly important in the context of the issue of nationality in the EU. Whether EU citizenship should be different from that of the Member States and what it means to be ‘European’ in an era of global mobility and freedom of movement are questions that have yet to be discussed at European level.

European citizenship distinguishes within the Union between “European” citizens and “non-European” citizens, who do not have this specific status and therefore do not have access to all the rights included in it. This distinction is partially bridged in the Treaty of Maastricht, which opens up some rights to all other persons legally residing in the territory of the Union. The essence of the distinction, however, remains.



Despite the demonstrated direct link between national and European citizenship, a clear distinction is made between them: EU citizenship provides and guarantees new rights that national citizenship cannot provide and guarantee. In this sense, European citizenship, although functionally subordinate to the national, puts the “European citizen” in a different position from the national. In general, the content and implementation of the right to free movement of persons in the EU are the subject of special attention and extensive regulation in the “secondary” EC law. They are also the subject of considerable case law over a long period.

Successful management and regulation of migration processes is an important tool for development in the globalizing world economy. This fact raises the issue of migration and integration of immigrants at a key moment at national, regional and global levels. We are witnessing a global redistribution of labor, which is an irreversible process and should be managed wisely, in the interests of countries of origin and destination, as well as migrants themselves. Conversely, inefficient management of migration processes can lead to the growth of the informal economy, to the build-up of tensions in host societies, to the humiliation and exploitation of illegal immigrants.

However, the practical importance of the institution of European citizenship and, in particular, of the extremely wide and daily application of some of its constituent rights, in relation to a very large number of individuals, cannot be underestimated. In fact, it can be assumed that this is the only institution of the EU law that simultaneously engages all citizens of all Member States, in other words, the entire population of the EU.

References

- Bauböck, R., Shaw, J. and Vink, M. (2019), *Debating European Citizenship, IMISCOE Research Series*, Springer International Publishing.
- Council of the European Union (2009), *Council Directive 2009/50/EC of 25 May 2009 on the conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals for the purposes of highly qualified employment*. OJ L 155, 18.6.2009, p. 17–29.
- CJEU (1992), *Judgment of the Court of 7 July 1992. Mario Vicente Micheletti and others v Delegación del Gobierno en Cantabria. Case C-369/90*. European Court Reports 1992 I-04239. ECLI identifier: ECLI:EU:C:1992:295.
- CJEU (1996), *Judgment of the Court of First Instance (Second Chamber) of 21 March 1996. Frederick Farrugia v Commission of the European Communities. Case T-230/94*. European Court Reports 1996 II-00195. ECLI identifier: ECLI:EU:T:1996:40.
- CJEU (1996), *Judgment of the Court of 5 March 1996. Brasserie du Pêcheur SA v Bundesrepublik Deutschland and The Queen v Secretary of State for Transport, ex parte: Factortame Ltd and others. Joined cases C-46/93 and C-48/93*. European Court Reports 1996 I-01029. ECLI identifier: ECLI:EU:C:1996:79.



- CJEU (1999), *Judgment of the Court (Sixth Chamber) of 11 November 1999. Belgian State v Fatna Mesbah. Case C-179/98*. European Court Reports 1999 I-07955. ECLI identifier: ECLI:EU:C:1999:549.
- CJEU (2001), *Judgment of the Court of 20 February 2001. The Queen v Secretary of State for the Home Department, ex parte: Manjit Kaur, intervener: Justice. Case C-192/99*. European Court Reports 2001 I-01237. ECLI identifier: ECLI:EU:C:2001:106.
- CJEU (2010), *Judgment of the Court (Grand Chamber) of 2 March 2010. Janko Rottmann v Freistaat Bayern. Case C-135/08*. European Court Reports 2010 I-01449. ECLI identifier: ECLI:EU:C:2010:104.
- CJEU (2011), *Judgment of the Court (Grand Chamber) of 8 March 2011. Gerardo Ruiz Zambrano v Office national de l'emploi (ONEm). Case C-34/09*. European Court Reports 2011 I-01177. ECLI identifier: ECLI:EU:C:2011:124.
- CJEU (2013), *Judgment of the Court (Second Chamber) of 10 October 2013. Adzo Domenyo Alokpa and Others v Ministre du Travail, de l'Emploi et de l'Immigration, Case C-86/12* (retrieved from <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A62012CJ0086>).
- European Parliament (2020), *Fact Sheets on the European Union. The Citizens of the Union and their Rights* (retrieved from: https://www.europarl.europa.eu/ftu/pdf/en/FTU_4.1.1.pdf).
- European Parliament and the Council (2004), *Directive 2004/38/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the right of citizens of the Union and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States amending Regulation (EEC) No 1612/68 and repealing Directives 64/221/EEC, 68/360/EEC, 72/194/EEC, 73/148/EEC, 75/34/EEC, 75/35/EEC, 90/364/EEC, 90/365/EEC and 93/96/EEC (Text with EEA relevance)*. OJ L 158, 30.4.2004, p. 77–123.
- Ilieva, I. (2018), *Tendentsii v pravната uredba na zakonната trudova migratsia na grazhdani ot treti strani v Bulgaria. Izvestia. Spisanie na Ikonomicheski universitet – Varna*. 62 (3), pp. 258 – 276.
- Official Journal (1992), *Denmark and the Treaty on European Union*, Official Journal C 348, 31/12/1992 P. 0001 – 0001.
- Official Journal (1997), *Treaty of Amsterdam amending the Treaty on European Union, the Treaties establishing the European Communities and certain related acts*. OJ C 340, 10.11.1997, p. 1–144.
- Official Journal (2012), *Consolidated version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union*, OJ C 326, 26.10.2012, p. 47–390.
- Stoilova, V. (2011), *Intercultural dialogue in the European Union. Shared values and realities*, Petrozavodsk State University, p. 55.
- Stoilova, V. (2019), *BREXIT: vodeshti problemi i tendentsii, Sbornik s materialii: Predsedatelstvoto na Saveta na Evropeyskia sayuz prez 2018 g.: evropeyskoto predizvikatelstvo za Bulgaria*, pp. 36 - 44.
- Timchev, L. (2019), *Upravljenie na migratsiyata v Republika Bulgaria*, Sofia: Akademia na MVR, pp. 13 – 27.

