


6-2016

Democracy and Citizenship: A Counterintuitive Relationship Examined Through Ancient Athens and the Contemporary Crisis

Shivangi Mehta

Union College - Schenectady, NY

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalworks.union.edu/theses>

 Part of the [Ancient History, Greek and Roman through Late Antiquity Commons](#), [Migration Studies Commons](#), and the [Politics and Social Change Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mehta, Shivangi, "Democracy and Citizenship: A Counterintuitive Relationship Examined Through Ancient Athens and the Contemporary Crisis" (2016). *Honors Theses*. 184.

<https://digitalworks.union.edu/theses/184>

This Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at Union | Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of Union | Digital Works. For more information, please contact digitalworks@union.edu.

Democracy and Citizenship: A Counterintuitive Relationship Examined Through Ancient Athens
and the Contemporary Refugee Crisis

By

Shivangi Mehta

* * * * *

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for Honors in the Department of Classics

UNION COLLEGE

June 3, 2016

ABSTRACT

ADVISORS: Tommaso Gazzarri, Cigdem Cidam, and Hans-Friedrich Mueller

Ancient Athens is often valued for being the birthplace of democracy, a form of government that is often believed to be “by the people, for the people.” With democracy came the emergence of citizenship. In ancient Athens, citizenship was created to outline the political community by defining who belonged to the community and who was excluded from it. Through time, as countries have been claiming they are becoming more democratic, more restrictions have been imposed. These restrictions have created boundaries, thus excluding individuals from citizenship status causing them to lose their rights and abilities, specifically in areas such as political participation and ownership, as well as how they and their contributions are viewed in society. This research studies ancient Athens through three leaders, Solon, Cleisthenes and Pericles, who played significant roles in the creation and development of democracy and citizenship. Classical Athenian citizenship is then compared to citizenship in modern Athens, with a particular comparison between resident aliens, or metics, from ancient times to the contemporary refugee crisis. I aim to understand how and why with more democracy, comes counterintuitive restrictions on citizenship and migrants.

The second half of my thesis focuses on the contemporary refugee crisis and how the refugees themselves have been impacted by democracy and citizenship. With a specific focus on Greece’s political parties, as the country has been significantly impacted by the crisis, we are able to understand how Athens defines democracy and citizenship, as well as how the European Union defines them. This crisis is bigger than just one country. Legal changes and long term

objectives need to be implemented if there is ever to be a resolution. The first step in dealing with this crisis is learning how we can better help the refugees who are fleeing violence and persecution, and figuring out how we can integrate them into European societies. Only then will we be able to get started on a long term goal, which would include trying to achieve peace in the countries they are fleeing from.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction:	1
Chapter 1: Ancient Athens and the Establishment of Citizenship and Democracy	6
Chapter 2: The Paradox of Democracy in Athens	22
Chapter 3: The Creation and Development of the European Union	42
Chapter 4: Greek Parliament and the Contemporary Refugee Crisis	58
Conclusion:	72

INTRODUCTION

It was a Tuesday in Athens and I had just finished my Art and Archeology class in the National Archeological Museum. I decided to go for a walk and eventually hit 3is Septemvriou (street) and came across Plateia Viktorias. Upon entering the square, the first thing I saw was the spray painted wall that read “IMMIGRANTS YOU ARE WELCOME” across from the exit of the metro station. The second thing I noticed were all the police officers.

I sat down in a cafe and asked my waitress if there were always so many officers around, and why. She replied yes, for safety. The waitress told me the square was a popular destination for refugees; this made me wonder whose safety she was referring to. All of a sudden I saw and heard a flock of people coming out from the underground metro station. There were men, women, and children. They were all holding clear plastic bags or small backpacks, and nothing else.

The people entered the square and sat on the benches and ground; they stayed in groups, huddled together. An older woman, who was wearing a hijab, watched young children playing while she wore a tired look. The woman had dark circles underneath her eyes and a frown plastered onto her face. She was not the only one with a distressed look. There was also a man, in his 60s, sitting on a bench across from the woman and children. He was looking out into nothing, with a melancholy energy surrounding him. The younger people who entered the square looked as though they were in their late teens or early twenties and stayed together in packs. As they walked through the square, they were talking to each other animatedly. This group consisted of mainly male and only had backpacks. There was a clear dichotomy in these age groups of

refugees. There were those who were older, who had lived through years of violence and left their entire lives behind, and the younger people who saw Greece as a possibility of a hopeful future.

When I was done with my coffee at the cafe, I realized I had an urge to talk to the officers. I went up to a large group of officers and asked if they spoke English, “Γεια σας. Αγγλικά?” An officer responded and asked if I needed help. I explained that I was new to the area and was curious about their presence. He looked at me for a couple seconds, formulating his answer. He finally said, “Yes, we are here a lot because of the refugees. We are here for safety. They cannot sleep here so we tell them to sleep somewhere where it is safer or to go back to the border.” Something stuck with me as I left Plateia Viktorias. Were the police officers actually there to move the refugees to a safer place or to scare them away?

Throughout history people have been fleeing oppression and brutality, relocating as refugees in hopes of better lives. When I was studying abroad in Athens. I witnessed one of the largest migrations in contemporary history; individuals who were fleeing from Syria and Iraq, were entering Europe through Greece. These people had left their homes, goods, and often families behind and were entering new unfamiliar territory.

Bonnie Honig, an author whose work studies democracies and foreigners, finds that “... aliens throughout Western culture have been depicted not only as the causes but also...as the cures of political alienation and corruption.”¹ Honig argues that xenophilic view of the foreigner feeds the opposing xenophobic feelings towards the alien.² The xenophilic perspective views

¹ Honig, Bonnie. 1998. Immigrant America? How Foreignness “Solves Democracy's Problems. *Social Text*(56), 2.

² *Ibid.*, 16.

foreigners as people whom we should welcome into society because they can offer potential contributions, while the xenophobic outlook is connected to a fear within the presence of the foreigner. Honig explains that when people assume foreigners are good because they can contribute to society, this allows for the opposing argument to be made. Others can then assert that a foreigner is automatically bad if they are not contributing to society. Once something is characterized as good, the characterization of bad is automatically created. Honig asserts that this is not a good argument to make. Through both the xenophilic and the xenophobic arguments, we are basing the help and acceptance we provide foreigners with on things a society may or may not gain. These views are closely tied to each other and are harmful in practice as they create the possibility of the denial of help based on reward.

In ancient Greece we saw this transitional view towards these strangers through legislation that was passed. Archons, or chief magistrates, in Athens once viewed individuals coming in as those who possessed potential, while later archons viewed them as threats and so restricted their abilities. Solon, one of the earliest archons, saw foreigners as people who could come in and further the interests of Athens, and if the foreigners came in and did so, Solon made it possible for them to become citizens. Pericles, an archon from a later period, is remembered for being responsible for the Golden Age in Athens. He saw foreigners as a threat to Athenian greatness and so passed legislation that made it difficult for foreigners to be fully integrated into society. For example, he created a citizenship law that required double citizen decent (meaning one's paternal and one's maternal grandfather had to have been citizens in order for an individual to be a citizen). Pericles saw possible corruption in the presence of the foreigner.

These xenophilic and xenophobic views, from possible potential to possible corruption coming from the foreigner, has moved to more xenophobic feelings in Greece's political climate today. However the people on the Greek islands where these refugees are coming from, have chosen to try and move away from these expectations of foreigners. Instead of assuming these people will come in and contribute to society or corrupt it, volunteers and organizations have decided to aid the people in any way they can on the basis of them needing help alone.

In my thesis, I argue that the volunteers who are on the ground helping refugees have planted seeds to begin a move from this xenophilic and xenophobic thinking. These volunteers are offering whatever they can on the basis of the refugees being people who need help, and nothing else; they are challenging the traditional way of thinking based on gain and contribution. In order to elaborate on this transition and the work that is being done, my thesis first turns to ancient Greece and studies how the concepts of citizenship and democracy first arose and developed. In doing so, three major archons are focused on: Solon, Cleisthenes, and Pericles. Different figures were treated in varying ways and chapter one discuss' the conditions of citizens, women, slaves, aliens, and resident aliens in ancient Athenian society

Chapter two focuses on the changing population within Athens, specifically the presence of foreigners in democracies. This part of my thesis finds there to be counterintuitive relationship that exists between the governmental form of democracy and the way foreigners are treated. I discuss four different perspectives on the paradox, with the views of Donald Kagan, Karl Popper, Josiah Ober, and Bonnie Honig taken into consideration. Honig has a more interpretive answer to the paradox, focused specifically on the role of the foreigner.

Chapter three looks at citizenship from a broader lens, the European Union. Greece, being a member state of the EU, must comply with certain legislation and expectations of the organization. Specifically, treaties and border control at the hands of the EU, have effected refugees and their paths in Europe. Morally and legally our obligations differ, however the organization as a whole has made a commitment to taking action to improve the overall conditions of those fleeing Middle Eastern countries. Nonetheless, policies only go so far as implementation holds greater weight.

My thesis concludes by coming back to Greece and reviewing the political parties which are in power. Synaspismos Rizopastikis Aristeras (SYRIZA) Coalition of the Radical Left, Nea Dimokratia (ND) New Democracy, Chrysi Avyi (ChA) Golden Dawn, and Panellinio Sosialistiko Kinima (PASOK) Panhellenic Social Movement are the four most represented parties in parliament. SYRIZA, holding the most seats, has been responsible for implementing policy during the contemporary refugee crisis. As a leftist party, expectations have been high for SYRIZA to do everything possible to benefit these refugees. However, the actions of the party have proved otherwise. While all of these political parties have moved towards a xenophobic mindset, independent humanitarian groups and volunteers like the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNCHR) and Doctors without Borders (MSF) have tried to break away from expectations and help the refugees for the basic idea that they are humans who need help; these volunteers are not passing judgement, they are simply providing services. In this contemporary refugee crisis, foreigners have fled war, violence, and persecution, in hopes of starting a new life.

CHAPTER 1: Ancient Athens and the Establishment of Citizenship and Democracy

Citizenship, as conceived by the ancients, is a term that creates an outline of the political community by defining who belongs to the group and who is excluded from it.³ Citizenship describes who has a right to be politically involved within a community. Today the definition of citizen varies by region. The privileges and rights associated with this title differ from country to country and through different time periods. In this chapter, I study the creation and development of citizenship and democracy through three major archons, and the impacts of these two concepts on different individuals throughout Athens.

Democracy is a form of government supposedly composed of the people, ruling for the people. A common belief is that as regions become more democratic, people receive more of an equal say in government and society. It would be unexpected that a region developing into a democracy would impose restrictions upon the people that would hinder their abilities in society, especially politically. Though through various archons (chief magistrates who acted as leaders in Athenian government) this is exactly what happened in Athens. The Athenian polis became more democratic while simultaneously imposing restrictions, especially during the time of Pericles. Ancient Athens began with Solon creating the Athenian polis and eventually led to Pericles defining the limits of democracy and the terms of citizenship. Thomas Dyenneson argues that “Periclean democracy was based on the assumption that politics was a natural aspect of human nature and that man was designed by nature to live in a community setting.”⁴ The privileges

³ Magnette, Paul. 2005. *Citizenship: The History of An Idea*. Trans. Katya Long, ed. Alan Ware. Worcester College, Oxford University, United Kingdom: ECPR Press., 7.

⁴ Dynneson, Thomas L. 2008. *City-state Civism in Ancient Athens*. New York, New York, United States: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., 58.

afforded to the people were based on political involvement to better the city. It was considered important to have a role that allowed an individual to be a part of this participation. The development of ancient Athenian democracy took place over many years. Political importance, however, remained embedded within the Athenian citizen. Being involved in politics was the core of Athens and it was expected that individuals who could, would be involved. This can be illustrated through the developing polis, the assembly, and the court system.⁵

Democratic participation in the affairs of the polis required citizens to exercise their judgment within the decision-making process that determined the action and even the fate of the polis.⁶

Dynneson differentiates the type of judgement allowed by different individuals in Athenian society. Citizens received more free reign with these decisions, as other members of society (women, slaves, and metics) faced far more scrutiny in their role of making decisions that could impact the fate of the polis. People in Athens were given the power to decide the path of the polis, however the number of individuals allowed to do so drastically lowered under Periclean democracy. Strict policies were enforced to clearly define who would be able to take part in the significant political aspects of Athenian life. By restricting those who could engage in this involvement, citizenship became more exclusive and privileged.

Solon

The concept of citizenship can be traced back to 594 BC when Solon served as archon in Athens. Philip Manville, in his work *The Origins of Citizenship in Ancient Athens*, studies the

⁵ Dynneson, 59.

⁶ Ibid.

development of the Athenian polis through the lens of archons. Manville suggests that "...Solon can be identified...[as] the man who established the Athenian polis, thereby created the beginnings of a formal citizenship."⁷ During Solon's time as archon, there were many issues that needed solving. Solon's approach focused on political means and capabilities. During his time in power, social divisions in Athens were creating anger amongst the people and the city was on the brink of civil war. There was a clear distinction between the people with money and those without. Athens was home to many people, however the city was without enough land to accommodate them all and their livelihoods. Solon believed that immigration reform was necessary to combat the limited availability. Solon thus limited the number of immigrants who were able to enter into Athens. Solon, through the use of various *thesmoi* (laws), attempted to rid Athens of its divisions in society. He cleared rural indebtedness and lifted oppressive obligations throughout the city, as well as outlawed enslavement as pay for debt.⁸ Solon, in regards to social division, created a new definition for the Athenian community and stipulated where each individual fell within it. Manville emphasizes that "New boundaries made possible both spiritual and institutional birth of the polis."⁹ Solon's reforms created new boundaries and distinctions to find a spot for everyone in society. Solon did not use the term citizen; instead "Athenian identity" was the concept used and it was defined as "individual ownership of land."¹⁰ Being an Athenian equated to being a member of the community.

⁷ Manville, Philip Brook. 1990. *The Origins of Citizenship in Ancient Athens*. Princeton, New Jersey, United States: Princeton University Press. 124.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 126.

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ Magonette, 11.

Solon also took steps to differentiate between public authority and private authority. He weakened the influence of the private sector and the monopoly of power of the aristocrats. Solon took away the constraints individuals were under and put the people under the care of the public authority. The population of Attica, a region that encompassed Athens, was divided into *demes* based on the production of wealth. *Demes* are comparable to local government today. In addition to this, each region had its own responsibilities in regards to assemblies, specifically the *ekklesia* (assembly) and Council of Four Hundred. Issues that were previously taken care of on a private level were now being handled in public courts and archives were systematically organized for future reference. All of these actions by Solon created what we call today the “public sphere.”¹¹ By changing where the public lives of the Athenians were handled Solon enabled the people, as Manville finds Plutarch to say, “to share feelings and pain as if parts of one body.”¹² These actions contributed to the community as it made individuals in the community take responsibility for actions they took that impacted the public. However even though there were those who were able to participate in this public sphere, there were a significant number of individuals who were clearly excluded.

Solon’s actions in ancient Athens were influential in what is today thought of as, as Paul Magnette states, “the birth of the citizen.” This is because it is believed that Solon’s reforms turned the society of Athens into *hèmeterè polis*, “our polis.” There were feelings of togetherness created. Solon did not speak of the people of Athens as citizens. Instead they were referred to as

¹¹ Magnette, 11.

¹² Manville, 155.

Athenians or *epitimoi*; Solon attached a connection from the city to the people.¹³ He thought of the people under the Athenian identity, while creating and solidifying *politeia*, meaning citizenship. The term of citizenship however did not appear until over a century after Solon's social reforms.

Cleisthenes

Eighty five years after Solon, Cleisthenes began officially creating and defining the citizen. Josiah Ober finds that, "The Athenian citizenry would now be a self-defined body."¹⁴ The individuals in Athens were defining themselves and applying worth onto this title. Existing citizens were required, under Cleisthenes, to register in one of the 139 *deme* centers. The *demesmen* determined whether someone who applied to be a citizen was truly a legitimate son of a citizen, who was a member of the *deme*.

Every citizen was directly dependent upon his fellow citizens for his primary political identity, and his very name symbolically retired upon his dependence upon them.¹⁵

The reliance upon neighbors and members of the different *demes* for declaring one a citizen made it difficult for foreigners to become citizens. The actions of Cleisthenes and the creation of *demes* created more difficulty for non-traditional residents of Athens to acquire the title of a citizen. Examples of non-traditional citizens could include individuals who helped the overall well-being of Athens and were declared a citizen by Solon.

¹³ Magonette, 11.

¹⁴ Ober, Josiah. 1989. *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens*. Princeton, New Jersey, United States: Princeton University Press. 70.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

At this point in history, Athenians were enjoying significant economic growth. They won the battles of Marathon in 490 BC and Salamis in 480 BC. By 478 the Delian League was run by the Athenians; they were confident and proud of their victories, and translated their hard work into leadership. These triumphs gave the people of Athens a strong sense of confidence, as Magonette writes, “to the point where they started to believe themselves stronger than...all those around them.”¹⁶ Athenians became very egocentric at this time; they tended to think of themselves as superior which made their privileges even more exclusive. Modern historians say that these rights are why the end of the sixth century BC is named as the birth of a “fully developed citizenship”.¹⁷ Cleisthenes embedded a feeling of pride and a level of arrogance into the Athenian people. Their privileges became something to hold onto, something only a reserved elite had the ability to enjoy. The exclusivity included aspects of political life such as participating in *demes*, speaking in the courts, and voting.

Around 450 BC *demokratia*, direct democracy, appeared and participation in political institutions broadened. At this time only one tenth of the population were citizens; however, these individuals came from all different backgrounds whether they were peasants, merchants, craftsman, or landowners. Out of all the citizens granted this title, only one fifth of them took part in political institutions. By the end of the fifth century, it was common to refer to citizens who did not participate in political institutions as *idiôtai*, ignorant men. Political involvement was the core of Athenian identity and the key to strengthening the polis. The title of a citizen was

¹⁶ Magonette, 13.

¹⁷ Ibid.

exclusionary, and so those who did not take advantage of these privileges if they were able were looked down upon in society.

Foreigners in Athens

Between 480 and 430 BC, the population in Athens doubled as there was an increase in the number of slaves and metics. The status of *xenos*, foreigner, and *metoikos*, metic, was limited in comparison to the citizen. *Metoikoi* had to fulfill certain responsibilities such as participating in military service and paying taxes. While they contributed to the polis in these ways, they were not given the opportunity to enjoy certain rights that citizens were able to. Some of these privileges included owning land and participating in assemblies.¹⁸ During this time, many Athenian citizens set up territories of citizen-soldiers referred to as *klerouchies*. This spread feelings of Athenian self-confidence, leading to what Magnette argues is “a growing political consciousness and sense of power.”¹⁹ I believe that Magnette’s point of political awareness is what is key here; Athenians grew aware that they could have a hand in shaping their surroundings.

Pericles

At this period, reforms were taking place that were making access to Athenian citizenship much more difficult than before. For example, previously those who were sons of male citizens who had been registered in *demes* were able to be citizens. In 451 BC, the laws of Pericles were

¹⁸ Magnette, 14.

¹⁹ Ibid., 13.

put into effect. His citizenship law was extremely controversial as it changed specific aspects of how to become an Athenian citizen. One aspect that changed was regarding descent. Previously, as long as one's father was a citizen, and one was a male, one was able to be a citizen. Pericles' new law required individuals to have "a double-citizen descent" to be a member of the elite group of Athenian citizens.²⁰ John Davies defines membership in the Athenian citizen body as an individual who is required one to be: "...male; were sons of a citizen father; were born from a woman who was the daughter of a citizen father; were born from a woman who was 'pledged'; and had been accepted as member of their father's deme."²¹ Davies' definition of this is representative of Periclean time, when laws had begun to become stricter for the political ability of the citizens.

Pericles' new law did not disfranchise those who were already citizens in Athens. It is not clearly known why the law was enacted but Douglass MacDowell offers up the possibility that "it was because of the large number of citizens."²² Athens was becoming the hot spot, the place to be. The quantity of residents was growing and so a distinction needed to be made. Athenians were extremely proud of this title and wanted to share their privileges with the least number of people possible. Another provision Pericles put into place disallowed marriage between someone who was an alien and a citizen.²³ They did this to "preserve racial purity."²⁴ There were penalties

²⁰ Magonne, 14.

²¹ Davies, John K. 1977. *Athenian Citizenship: The Descent Group and the Alternatives*. The Classical Journal 73 (2), 105.

²² MacDowell, Douglass M. 1978. Personal Status. *In the Law in Classical Athens.*, 67. London, United Kingdom: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 67.

²³ MacDowell, 67.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 87.

for those who defied the laws of Pericles. During his time in power, Athenian citizens were viewed as an interest group who were given certain privileges. The cities were made to feel that they needed to defend these rights. There was a clear effort made during the time of Pericles to keep groups that were not included in the citizen body out. These efforts can be seen most clearly through his citizenship law.

Through Solon, Cleisthenes, and Pericles, the Athenian polis was formed and developed into a democracy. Athenian identity developed into what we know as Athenian citizenship. Along with the new title, came special privileges only the select few were able to enjoy. There were certain individuals who were not impacted in the same way, or were not impacted at all, because they never were able to identify as an Athenian citizen. These individuals included Athenian women, slaves, aliens, and resident aliens.

Athenian Women

Sue Blundell makes the argument for women in Ancient Athens. She finds that during the Classical Age, from 500-336 BC, "... an Athenian woman had no independent existence."²⁵ While the Athenian woman was not thought able to make decisions on her own, whether for herself or others, she was also not seen as an individual who could protect herself. The Athenian woman was able to exist on her own, it was in the decision making process that her role was "supported" by a male who was always watching over her. This person was known as her *kyrios*, also known as her male guardian. Before her marriage, this guardian was her father or the next oldest male of the household. After an Athenian woman was married, her husband became her

²⁵ Blundell, Sue. 1995. *Women in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, United States: Harvard University Press. 114.

kyrios. The main function of the *kyrios* was to provide her with security and to represent her at times a woman could not represent herself. Her guardian watched over her welfare and economic maintenance as well. The Athenian woman was located in the private sphere; her *kyrios* acted as her intermediary between the public and private sphere.²⁶ In regards to legal matters, Athenian women were not allowed to conduct any legal issues or provide evidence in the court system on her own behalf. Women were kept out of the political arena and out of the public sphere; the woman was bound to her house. Athenian women were not able to vote during Assembly meetings, sit as jurors, or serve as magistrates. The political arena was thought of as the place for an Athenian citizen to take advantage of their privileges to enhance the democratic Athenian polis. Women were barred from participating in this very significant portion of Athenian life. Blundell writes, “Democracy...in a very real sense...robbed some women...of the influence which they had exercised in former times.”²⁷ Blundell’s claim is relevant as it makes clear the contradictions that existed among the idea of democracy and rights. After the implementation of the experiment of democracy, roles in society became distinct. Responsibilities between the public and private sectors were switched around, and Athenian women were in the private side of things. Democracy made this boundary clear, by officially restricting women in society.

Though democracy needed them, they were excluded from its institutions; and though after 451/0, they were given a role in the transmission of citizens’, they themselves did not enjoy full citizenship.²⁸

²⁶ Blundell, 114.

²⁷ Ibid., 129.

²⁸ Ibid., 119.

The one area in which Athenian women were allowed some rights was in regards to owning property. Athenian women were considered property owners in three specific ways. These women were able to receive land through gifts, dowry, and inheritance.²⁹ These ancient Athenian women lacked other rights though, as well as titles. They were not thought of as *politai*, also known as ‘citizens.’ The word however, signals much more than that. Blundell asserts that *politai* represents “citizens with full political rights, who were always male.”³⁰ The Athenian women were instead given the term *astai*. This translation can also be taken as ‘citizens,’ but more importantly it represents what citizenship was for Athenian women. Blundell finds that, for Athenian women, being a citizen was having “...a share in the religious, legal and economic order of the Athenian community.”³¹ These aspects also played an important role in Athens. They were not there to progress the overall political environment of the polis. Athenian women were thought of as citizens in their own sense of the term, but they had no direct role in shaping the political development of the Athenian polis.

Slaves

Another group of people who existed in ancient Athens were slaves. Many slaves were foreign captives, and some slaves were the children of slaves. Others had been captured in war and held in Athens as enemies of the state. Athenians could also be enslaved to pay the penalty for various offenses they may have committed.³² These individuals were not allowed to own

²⁹ Blundell, 115.

³⁰ Ibid., 128.

³¹ Ibid.

³² MacDowell, 79.

anything and were comparable to property. They were bought, sold, hired, or given away at the whim of their owner. While owners of slaves were often brutal and could beat them, they were not supposed to kill them by law.³³ One right slaves did have was the ability to seek asylum and ask to be sold to another owner; slaves were able to do this on their own accord. They could do this legally without any harm coming their way.³⁴ However, slaves could not take any legal action. Anything done on the slaves' behalf had to be carried out by his owner. The responsibilities between the owner and slave went both ways. If a slave committed a crime against another person, the legal proceedings would depend on whose orders the slave was acting. If his owner had advised him, the owner himself would be prosecuted. If the accusation was just made against the slave, the slave's owner had to pay whatever fines necessary.³⁵ One positive outcome slaves did have was the opportunity to become a freedman. Their owner could liberate them. If the slave was liberated, he had the option of staying in Athens and becoming a metic.³⁶ Metics were resident aliens, who could never become citizens.

Aliens

Aliens were another group of people who lived in Athens. Aliens often could not become citizens as the title of citizen was acquired by Athenians through birth.³⁷ Exceptions did exist to this however. Solon was the first one to have brought about legislation allowing an alien to

³³ MacDowell, 80.

³⁴ Ibid., 81.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Ibid., 82.

³⁷ Ibid., 70.

acquire Athenian citizenship in two ways. If the alien had been permanently exiled from his own home state, he was eligible to become a citizen. The other exception was if the alien moved to Athens, and brought his whole family with him so that he could practice his trade.³⁸ Thucydides does argue, however, that while they may have been given citizenship in Athens, they were completely separated from the community.³⁹ This separation indicates that while these aliens may have been granted the title of citizen, they faced difficulty using the privileges that came along with the title as they were separated from society. In later times, during the fourth and fifth centuries, this was not as common, and it is reasonable to believe that the law simply fell out of practice. Aliens in Athens could not hold any type of public office, and they could also not take part in the assembly or other aspects of government.⁴⁰ Laws were also strict for aliens in regards to owning homes and getting married. They were not allowed to own land in Athens and they could not marry Athenian woman (after 451 BC). If they wanted to participate in the activities in the Agora, a public space in Athens, such as trading, they had to pay a special alien tax which was called *xenika*.⁴¹ Aliens had the right to speak in the Athenian law court. However the court was a specific area in which the way aliens were treated made them less than a citizen. Aliens could not bring specific cases to the court as certain cases had to be brought by an Athenian. If they were prosecuted, the prosecution had the ability to make whatever demands they wished out of fear that the alien could flee.⁴² Aliens did not have many rights, but their rights were closer to

³⁸ MacDowell, 71.

³⁹ Davies, 107.

⁴⁰ MacDowell, 75.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 76.

⁴² *Ibid.*

the role of citizen than those of Athenian women and slaves. The ability to participate in the Agora and speak in court gave them a say in public life. However, that say was less than the privileges of an Athenian citizen.

Resident Aliens

Another, more specific group of aliens, who lived in ancient Athens were resident aliens. These individuals were also known as *xenoi metoikoi* or metics. Resident aliens were not recognized as citizens and did not have any political rights. They were thus similar to aliens. The difference between resident aliens and aliens, however, was the recognition that they received in the community. Metics and aliens differed specifically in the aspect of households. A person who came to Athens and stayed with an Athenian was considered an alien. A person who came to Athens from somewhere else and set up his own household was considered a metic.⁴³ Metics were committed to living in Athens, without the long term support of anyone else. They set up their home on their own to attempt to officially become a member of Athenian society. In order for a metic to set up a type of permanent residence that they were not planning on leaving, they were required to apply for a special metic registration. For this registration they were required to pay a metic tax and have an Athenian citizen sponsor them.⁴⁴ This sponsor vouched for the outsider to come live in Athens. His name was on the line within his *deme*. The Athenian citizen who was the sponsor vouched for the metic as a good candidate to permanently settle in Athens. MacDowell talks about sponsors, who were deemed fit, who had to certify "...in some way that

⁴³ MacDowell, 77.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

the alien was a suitable person to be accepted as a permanent resident in Athens.”⁴⁵ MacDowell brings up an important point here as this, once again, illustrates the prestige of an Athenian citizen. Being an Athenian citizen and playing your part in your deme allowed one to be a sponsor. A sponsor was believed to be equipped with the right skills to make a decision in the public sphere, a decision that would allow an outsider to come live in Athens. The idea of an Athenian held so much weight that a citizen would not sponsor a metic without diligence. This conscientiousness was necessary as the Athenian’s name was on the line. A bad decision would not look good, and as Athenians who believed they were the best, that was not an option. A resident alien was “accepted as a member of the community.”⁴⁶ While metics who were privileged were able to adjust financially and economically, they “remained politically outside.”⁴⁷ Metics had to pay normal Athenian taxes, as well as *metoikion* which was a specific tax for metics. If metics did not pay the tax, they could be enslaved. Metics were also mandated to serve in the army and navy of Athens when necessary. Since metics were not considered citizens, it was easy for them to try and leave Athens to avoid completing their services. If they did, however, they were banned from ever returning to Athens.⁴⁸ They made their future in Athens unlikely if they tried to run, and they hurt the credibility of their sponsor if they had applied to be a permanent resident. Many argued that these were not privileges for the metic, but rather liabilities. They were able to be accepted members of the community, but at a cost. At times some aliens did receive special privileges, privileges that were seen as a reward for their

⁴⁵ MacDowell, 78.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 76.

⁴⁷ Davies, 10.

⁴⁸ MacDowell, 77.

services to Athens. They could gain land, pay *istoleia* (the citizen tax) as opposed to the higher metic tax, be granted *asylia* which was immunity from plundering done abroad by Athenians, and much more. These privileges often aligned with “the titles *proxenos* and *eurgetes* (‘benefactor of Athens’).”⁴⁹ Metics were expected to contribute to Athens just as a citizen would, and to be a member of society. However, they were not eligible to receive the same rights as the citizens of Athens.

Society in ancient Athens was centered around political investment. Athenian citizens contributed to furthering the goals of the polis and working towards democracy. While this path was solidified with Pericles, restrictions came along with his rule. These restrictions seemed counterintuitive to the overall feeling of democracy that was embedded within Athenian culture. Being a citizen was an honor not afforded to many, and even fewer under Cleisthenes and Pericles. Metics, specifically, were something in between. They gave certain contributions to Athens, such as serving in the military and paying special taxes, but were not afforded many privileges simply because they did not hold the title of citizen as their parents were not of Athenian descent. Citizenship and democracy are two terms that go hand in hand, developing in separate ways since they were conceived in ancient times.

⁴⁹ MacDowell, 79.

CHAPTER 2: The Paradox of Democracy in Athens

Foreigners in Democracies

The population within Athens has changed drastically from ancient times to today. Individuals have been moving and relocating, often ending up as immigrants or refugees. This has raised the political question of the “role of the foreigner.” Do foreigners coming into countries have a negative or positive impact in the areas in which they reside? What is the difference between what the foreigner actually does for Athens and what are they seen as doing for Athens? By solving these questions, we are able to tackle the counterintuitive relationship, or paradox, that exists between democracy and increasing restriction. Often we find ourselves in conversation on whether we need a solution to this supposed problem. Ancient Athens is an excellent example of this as we see the changing roles of the foreigner through different archons and the instating of different legislations. Bonnie Honig takes on this contemporary issue between democracy and citizenship; I find her work to draw a clear parallel to ancient Athens. Honig gives us interpretive explanations from history which help us understand how democracy has been impacted by the presence of foreigners, and what has happened to the concept of citizenship along the way. This chapter states what I find the counterintuitive relationship to be between democracy and citizenship, and the perspectives of four different individuals on the paradox.

The Counterintuitive Relationship

As Athens has grown supposedly more democratic throughout the years, it has also increased restrictions in regards to the foreigners who live within the region. My thesis aims to understand how and why these restrictions have been arising while Athens has been claiming to be more representative of its people in government, as these restrictions hinder this exact intention. I argue that individuals, such as Pericles, allowed foreigners to come into Athens so that they could be molded into following the Athenian way of life. Athens gained money and militaristic help from their presence, and in exchange allowed migrants to participate in education and daily life activities. However, restrictions were imposed upon these foreigners as those who had the power to make change in Athens wanted to limit those who could directly impact this ability. As democratic rule was becoming consolidated, people in Athens began to perceive the foreigner as a possible threat. Foreigners came in from different countries and varying backgrounds. Athens wanted to expand politically and economically; Athenians hoped to spread the belief that their state was not only tolerant, but founded on equality. Athens thus appealed to foreigners as a land of opportunity. Foreigners would be able to contribute to society, however did not have it within their capacity to alter the the political power of those like Pericles.

In order to understand the counterintuitive relationship that exists between democracy and citizenship, we must understand the role of the foreigner in democracies. Bonnie Honig gives us an interpretive answer as to how the foreigner impacts a region and how a region impacts the foreigner. Whether we see the the foreigner as a negative or positive force, we need to look at their altering role in ancient Athens and ask the question of why the modification

occurred. In order to understand their changing role, further study into the institutions that expanded democracy is required.

Institutionalizing Democracy

When Solon was the acting archon in Athens (594 BC), foreigners were able to become citizens; their involvement in life in Athens was accepted by other Athenians, and they were able to make Athens their new home.⁵⁰ Athens was still a growing state when Solon was in power; issues that required solutions dealt with the limited land in Athens and excessive debts that were owed. Solon enacted legislation to even the playing field for the citizens. As for the foreigners, Solon saw them as individuals who would be able to contribute to the state of Athens. He offered them the possibility of citizenship if they did something to help, better, or protect Athens. Solon saw potential in foreigners that would allow them to help in the expansion and growth of Athens; he is significant as an archon as he saw a probable future in which foreigners would contribute to Athenian society as a whole which would advance them in all fields. Instead of restricting any rights of the foreigners, Solon saw a future in them, thus creating more opportunity for them to be welcomed into Athenian society.

Cleisthenes served as archon in 525 BC. He began the conversation of defining who a citizen was and creating *deme* centers. Being registered to a *deme* was of significance in Athenian society; it was required of all citizens and this role created a distinction in society between those who were involved and those who could not be. This separation is where restrictions not only began to arise, but became very clear to see. Citizens were defined in their

⁵⁰ Manville, Philip Brook. 1990. *The Origins of Citizenship in Ancient Athens*. Princeton, New Jersey, United States: Princeton University Press., 124.

role and only they could be involved in these *deme* centers, no one else. This inclusion of the organization created obvious exclusion. If you were a foreigner it was not only harder for you to possibly gain the same status of an Athenian citizen, it was the first division created in regards to political involvement. Since foreigners could not be involved in the *deme* centers, they were being further segregated them from the political area.

In 451 BC, Pericles is acting as archon as he begins to enact legislation that creates more restrictions and further excludes the foreigner. Laws were passed that required dual level citizenship in order for one to be considered a citizen (both one's paternal and maternal grandfathers had to have been citizens). Citizens were also not allowed to marry foreigners.⁵¹ I am compelled to ask the question of if this occurred because the role of the foreigner changed from individuals who could contribute to society to those who would corrupt it, or if it was a desired leadership those in power wanted to maintain. I argue that both of these aspects played a role. The overall distinction occurred among the transition of leadership from Solon, Cleisthenes, and Pericles. The Athens each of them was ruling over was different; they were institutionalizing the region in different ways. Solon was trying to maintain peace among the people, Cleisthenes was focused on expanding Athens politically, and Pericles expanded the region in all regards including economically, politically, militaristically, and artistically. The state of Athens changed from archon to archon, and so did the role of the foreigner. Beginning with Solon seeing the foreigner as a good immigrant and someone who could contribute to society, power moved into the hands of Pericles who saw the foreigner as a threat to all that Athens had accomplished.

⁵¹ MacDowell, Douglass M. 1978. Personal Status. In *The Law in Classical Athens.*, 67. London, United Kingdom: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 87.

Bonnie Honig asserts, “established regimes, peoples, or towns that fall prey to corruption are restored or rebounded (not corrupted or transcended) by the agency of a foreigner or a stranger.”⁵² Pericles built structures upon the Acropolis with the help of metics. Metics also traded in the agora while paying a special foreign tax. Pericles made Athens into a militaristic force and solidified the city economically with the metic’s help. Metics in the ancient city transformed Athens into the remarkable city it is remembered for today, a city rich in art, educational opportunity, and a government attempting to represent the needs of all its people. Foreigners played a role in shaping society; by helping build the structures upon the Acropolis and paying special taxes to participate in the activities at the Agora, they were further developing Athens. In return for their contributions, foreigners had access to education and acceptance within the city. This how they were repaid for work artistically, militaristically, and financially.

Foreigners were learning the ideals and democratic values according to Athenians; they were turning into ideal members of society. Metics were helping the city flourish, without playing any type of role politically. Athenian citizens believed they had political control and that all views were represented. While the Athenians had representation politically, they used the ostracism process to make certain no one would gain too much power. However, the individuals in power wanted to limit the number of people who could take their power away from them. This increased through time. With Solon, Athens was still young in its growth. His priorities were centralized around stabilizing the main issues of employment and debt for the people of Athens and creating a society in which everyone could live comfortably. Cleisthenes created political power for the people through the establishment of *demes*. The Delian League was being run by

⁵² Honig, Bonnie. 2001. *Democracy and the Foreigner*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press., 3.

Athens and its status was recognized by other regions. Cleisthenes moved the power from the different towns into the *deme* centers, decreasing the number of people involved politically. Pericles finally came into power during a strong point in Athenian history. He saw this time as an opportunity to pass laws and create institutions. His institutions distracted individuals from the lack of involvement that was being imposed among foreigners, as well as the restrictions he was applying. Various political theorists have differing interpretations as to why these restrictions arose; Bonnie Honig turns to the role of the foreigner to find her answer.

An Interpretive Answer

Honig's work records the stories of the journeys foreigners have taken and what their implications were on the regions they travelled to. The Book of Ruth which chronicles Ruth's biblical journey, outlines the basic elements for the role of the foreigner as a founder.⁵³

The Israelites are in a period of corruption. A foreigner arrives and her presence among them works to effect two significant changes. Ruth, the Moabite, is the vehicle of a regime change from rule by judges to rule by kings. In that sense, she is a kind of founder, even if not exactly a lawgiver. But Ruth is also a (re)founder in Rousseau's other sense: she (re)founds a "people."⁵⁴

Ruth's foreignness enables her to be successful in these endeavors. She is able to inspire a nation as her being a foreigner allows the universality of divinity to become more apparent. When Ruth is done re-founding, she stays and becomes an immigrant.⁵⁵ Cynthia Ozick and Julia Kristeva are representative readers of the Book of Ruth and they find Ruth to be a model immigrant. Ruth, in

⁵³ Honig, 41.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 42.

their interpretation, is a tale of assimilation.⁵⁶ In Kristeva's perspective, Ruth comes in and unsettles the order that already exists. She makes the Israelites more open to differences allowing for a more global identity.⁵⁷ Immigrants are judged by what they will contribute to a nation. They are valued for the diversity, energy, and industry they bring to nation, or they are feared for using welfare benefits we offer, and sabotaging our democratic culture.⁵⁸ In ancient Athens, foreigners were used for what they could offer to the society and restricted from imposing change upon the city. The actions of Pericles illustrate a time in Athenian history in which institutions existed and foreigners contributed to them and learned the Athenian way of life from them. The back side of this can be related to how Ruth unsettles the order that exists. Pericles and those after him, prevent this unsettling by imposing restrictions on the political involvement of these foreigners. The time of Pericles acting as an archon is often regarded to as a "Golden Age." Even while he was limiting the rights of foreigners, he was developing Athens in the educational, political, economic, and militaristic arenas.

Periclean "Golden" Age

The houses of the people in Athens were small and cramped, but there were large open areas where the people were able to congregate. One area where most Athenians went was the Agora. It was a central market where individuals would go to handle all types of matters, ranging from business to political. The latest news was told there and you could also go there to purchase

⁵⁶ Honig, 43.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 46.

goods.⁵⁹ During Pericles' time in power, Athenian slaves and metics did not differ from citizens in their dress or in their actions in everyday life. Athens needed them in order to maintain their maritime power.⁶⁰ Pericles was instrumental during the erection of the Parthenon and the Propylaeum. The Acropolis was a citadel that could be seen all throughout Athens, creating feelings of unity among the people. All of the structures built within the Acropolis was completed by citizens, slaves, and metics. There was no differentiation during the building process. The only time distinctions were made was when the individuals were paid; the money given to slaves went to their owners.⁶¹ Pericles was a leader who identified the city as one unified entity. Meier argues that Pericles, whenever talking about democracy, asserted that it "was a political order embracing all, not the rule of some over the rest."⁶² Pericles believed that the "miracle of Athens" was attributed to the "character of the citizens."⁶³ It was the citizens who treated those supposedly below them with equal respect. This made them superior in their own eyes by being fair even when that was not the norm elsewhere. Pericles did not often speak of differences among the people. For him, it was mutual trust and freedom that were of importance not necessarily equality in actions that were allowed to be taken. Education was liberal, and military training was a process that happened as needed and was not considered strict. The individuals in Athens followed laws from their own free will.⁶⁴ This is what made Athens,

⁵⁹ Meier, Christian. 1998. *Athens: A Portrait of the City in its Golden Age*. Trans. Robert Kimber and Rita Kimber. New York, New York: Metropolitan Books., 381.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Ibid., 389.

⁶² Ibid., 402.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

according to Pericles, such an inspiration for other states. Pericles was outspoken in how everyone in Athens should regard those around them tolerantly. He believed that foreigners should be able to learn in Athens, just like the citizens were able to.⁶⁵ Meier tends to be skeptical when talking about Pericles' and his descriptions of ancient Athens. I agree with this skepticism as "Pericles claimed that in Athens everybody tended to his own business but was still able to make political judgments...Pericles is intent on showing that their [middle class Athenian citizens] judgement is just as sound as that of the aristocrats, a situation he suggests is particularly Athenian."⁶⁶ This is not true as everyone, including foreigners, were able to live and participate in Athens, they were not able to be politically involved. Pericles was using these individuals for militaristic purposes, having them pay taxes that benefited the Athenian society as a whole, while allowing them to learn and live comfortably within Athens. However, when it came to political involvement there was a clear distinction drawn. If, as many historians do, we want to call the Periclean democracy a golden age, we must understand what a successful democracy is and how the two align. Pericles came into power when democracy existed in a fragile state. He transformed Athenian democracy in a way that enabled it to be considered a golden age, a title that is still recognized today.⁶⁷ While this golden age consisted of prosperousness in Athens, restrictions were still being imposed upon foreigners who resided there. The following theorists portray their findings on the ancient and modern paradox.

Different Perspectives on the Paradox

⁶⁵ Meier, 402.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 403.

⁶⁷ Kagan, Donald. 2001. *Pericles and the Birth of Democracy*. New York, New York: The Free Press. 3.

The enigma of increasing restrictions with a more democratic setting, requires us to look at different political theorists. Donald Kagan and Karl Popper hold a more conservative look, while Sheldon Wolin and Josiah Ober's more liberal arguments contend that democracies cannot exist without the foreigner. Their interpretations when taken with Honig's, allow us to study what the foreigner does for Athens and what Athens does for the foreigner.

Before Pericles took on the role of leading Athens, from 460-429 BC, democracy existed with limited power. Kagan claims that democracy represented aristocratic views of those in Athens as they were the ones who the common people turned to in regards to political life.⁶⁸ The flourishing of democracy under Pericles, Kagan finds, leads to the voices of the common people being heard, as well as advancements in the arts in all regards.

Defining Periclean democracy as a golden age requires careful consideration. The term golden age implies that the democracy in place was successful. Kagan makes the point that successful democracies require much more than just the removal of a tyrannical government. He goes on to define standards for a successful democracy:

An examination of the few successful democracies in history suggests that they need to meet three conditions if they are to flourish. The first is to have a set of good institutions; the second is to have a body of citizens who possess a good understanding of the principles of democracy, or who at least have developed a character consistent with the democratic way of life; the third is to have a high quality of leadership, at least at critical moments. At times, the third qualification is the most important and can compensate for weakness in the other two.⁶⁹

According to this definition, Athens under the direction of Pericles, can surely be considered a successful democracy thus a golden age. One area Pericles institutionally transformed was the

⁶⁸ Kagan, 3.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

political arena. Pericles faced the difficult task of making the citizens of Athens believe that they should make sacrifices for the city so that the city itself could succeed. Pericles was also involved in many varying aspects of life in Athens. This involvement made for his leadership to be powerful, thus leading to the successful democracy.

Pericles' institutional change was significant as it set a precedent in ancient Athens that has been revered by many modern scholars. He established the most democratic constitution of the time. Pseudoxenophon, an opponent of democracy, found the constitution of Athens did promote the interests of the lower classes.⁷⁰ During the 450s, the laws Pericles passed gave direct power to the people who were members of the assembly. Individuals were elected into office by a majority vote.⁷¹ In 458 BC, Pericles passed another bill that made *zeugitai*, small farmers, who had previously fought in the military for Athens as hoplites, eligible to be archons. Before this bill, only those who were rich men and in the top economic classes were able to be eligible for the archonship.⁷² Straying from this inclusive legislation, in 451 BC, Pericles passed a law that directly impacted citizens. This new law created a stricter way of defining an Athenian citizen. The laws were changed from requiring one's father to have been an Athenian citizen to having to have both parents be Athenian citizens in order for a child to be considered a citizen.⁷³ Kagan maintains that the purposes of this new legislation are still unclear, however the consequences included "political membership in the community...determined not by traditionally aristocratic

⁷⁰ Meier, 400.

⁷¹ Kagan, 47.

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Ibid.

religious bodies, or even by individual local townships, but the people as a whole.”⁷⁴ What Kagan does not take into consideration however is the impact on foreigners who have come in and only known Athens as their home. If a child, who has a foreign mother and an Athenian citizen for a father, is born in Athens then he would not qualify for Athenian citizenship under the revised text. This means that many of the children of foreigners will never qualify as Athenian citizens. This legislation attempts to keep Athenian citizenship within strictly Athenian blood; an exclusive measure to take within a seemingly inclusive government system.

Pericles had another task at hand. In order to have his democracy flourish, he needed to create a citizen body who understood the democracy at its roots. He also had to convince the people to fight and had to show them that their city was worth fighting for. Pericles had to convey to the people of Athens that they needed to make sacrifices for each other for the greater good, the city as a whole. Democracies must show the people that they should want to better the situation for those around them as it benefits themselves; individuals in power have to do this without the use of force and compulsion. Kagan argues that democracies, through the use of free public education, are able to teach the people democratic principles and create enough incentive for them to follow the same ideals.⁷⁵ Pericles attempted to teach the people of Athens that their best interests were tied together with those of their community as a whole. If their state was not safe and flourishing, then they would suffer from this condition. On this account Kagan writes:

Pericles tried to shape a new kind of society and a new kind of citizen not by the use of force or terror but by the power of his ideas, the strength of his personality,

⁷⁴ Kagan, 47.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

and the use of reason, and his genius as a uniquely persuasive rhetorician.⁷⁶

Kagan asserts that having a strong leader is arguably one of the most important aspects for a successful democracy. He argues that a majority of the time, powerful leadership takes precedence over existing institutions and the democratic lifestyle people must live by. Kagan argues that a high quality of leadership is necessary specifically during times of hardship such as being at war or a region being economically unstable. Pericles fulfilled these requirements as he influenced every aspect of Athenian life. He took a role in Athens artistically, architecturally, and militaristically. Pericles acted as the producer for the tragedy *Persians*, by Aeschylus. He also beautified the Acropolis with varying sculptures and statues, a citadel seen throughout all of the city. According to Kagan, Pericles “repeatedly commanded armies and navies in battle.”⁷⁷ Pericles was acting as a leader politically as well, and his understanding of the relationship between politics and the arts is what made him an instrumental leader in the shaping of Athens. He knew how the actions in one realm could effect the other and so he was very careful in his actions. When Pericles was able to take the lead, he knew the best thing for Athens would be peace. He chose to end the wars with Sparta and Persia, so that Athens could regain some control of the cities who had once been loyal to them.⁷⁸ Pericles’ central goal, was to solidify the Athenian empire. By doing this, Athens could achieve a form of reliable defense. Reestablishing the Athenian empire would provide security from another Persian or Spartan threat in the future. Kagan asserts that Pericles vision for Athens was wrapped around feelings of wanted glory.⁷⁹

⁷⁶ Kagan, 47.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 6.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 89.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 91.

Pericles wanted glory for Athens; he wanted to help the empire grow and thrive under his leadership. His reforms created clear cut lines on political involvement. He embedded democratic values within the Athenian people. Periclean leadership was strong and dominant. All of these add up to what should be a successful democracy according to what Kagan is asserting. Not only that, but the progress made during these years was significant enough to call for the title of golden age. A golden age is a period of time in which an empire flourishes and has many successes to its name. While Periclean democracy was successful and is considered a golden age, we must ask ourselves how inclusive and representative of the people this period really was. While Pericles created new political institutions and solidified a democratic constitution, he restricted conditions for citizenship. By creating a group of people who are able to contribute to society, an exclusion is created in regards to the people who are living in that same society, but have no rights in regards to its well being. Pericles attempted, as Kagan argues, to use education as a method to show the people they should make sacrifices for the well being of those around them. This can be interpreted in many ways, such as expecting someone who has no rights in society to make sacrifices for someone who has many more rights. Pericles was a strong leader, who strengthened the Athenian empire in the views of some. However he did so while paradoxically moving away from democratic values. The people who contributed to society, such as the slaves and foreigners for example, helped Athens grow. However, those same individuals were not allowed to have a say in the way in which it grew. How can Periclean democracy, a democracy that has been studied for thousands of years as a golden age, be restrictive against a people it calls its own?

Before we look at Periclean democracy, we must study democracies and the paradox that exists within this larger governmental structure. Kagan holds that:

The paradox inherent in democracy is that it must create and depend on citizens who are free, autonomous, and self-reliant. Yet its success - its survival even- requires extraordinary leadership.⁸⁰

Kagan argues that leadership is consistent with the democratic principle of equality. He believes that leadership is necessary to represent the views of all and equality among all. I disagree with Kagan because, as stated by Pseudoxenophon, common people favor the aims of their own classes and aristocrats do the same for their own class.⁸¹ In democracies you are creating a citizen body consisting of individuals who live by supposed democratic values, which include equally representing all the views of the people, yet still are being led by a leader. This type of leader, similar to how Pericles was, needs to take control without appearing to be tyrannical. A leader must guide the people without it being obvious that they are influencing their actions. The individuals must lead the people down the best path for themselves and society as a whole. Kagan believes that democracies expand through the help of extraordinary leadership. Kagan's work praises Pericles for being a powerful leader. However his argument is weak as it only looks at Pericles on his surface, without giving explanations on what his true intentions could have been. Pericles was very particular in his actions and the way in which he used people to better all of Athens as he saw fit. Putting the well being of all the people in the hands of just one leader was not only difficult; it also created a paradox. The actions of Pericles were strategic, and so was changing the role of the foreigner.

⁸⁰ Kagan, 9.

⁸¹ Meier, 402.

Bastiaan Rijpkema believes that this is where the contradiction exists. Rijpkema studies Karl Popper's work *The Open Society and Its Enemies* and finds that he clearly, and correctly, states the paradoxes that exist within democracies. The main 'paradox of democracy' is that a majority of individuals vote to put a tyrant in rule.⁸² There are also two other, lesser known, paradoxes which include the 'paradox of freedom' and the 'paradox of tolerance.' The 'paradox of freedom' is "total freedom leads to suppression of the weak by the strong."⁸³ The 'paradox of tolerance' is "unlimited tolerance leads to the disappearance of tolerance."⁸⁴ Popper aligns with Kagan in his view of the paradox being that individuals must put one person in power. He jumps more quickly to the title of tyrant, as that is often the fearful title that comes along with a representative form of government. While Popper's views on the paradoxes of freedom and tolerance make sense abstractly, these paradoxes do not make sense when applied to Athens. Democratic Athenian values were rooted in freedom and tolerance; this was not the issue. The difficulty was in understanding how to put someone in power to make decisions for the rest of the population, in a manner that was unbiased. The paradox exists within the role of the foreigner; as Athens became more democratic, the foreigner became more restricted. They were seen as individuals who could contribute to society, under Pericles, but not shape it.

When looking at the actual word "democracy" and its root meaning, Josiah Ober finds the etymology to be more telling. *Demos* translates directly to the people and *kratos* translates

⁸² Rijpkema, Bastiaan. 2012. *Popper's Paradox of Democracy*. Think Autumn: The Royal Institute of Philosophy 11: 93., 93.

⁸³ Rijpkema, 93.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

directly to power.⁸⁵ Thus Ober argues that the power that exists within the people in actuality is the power to decide by the majority rule.⁸⁶ Ober claims that originally when democracy was first conceptualized and put into practice, it was centered around equality. Ober refers to three crucial terms which are representative of this: *isokratia*, *isonomia*, and *isegoria*. *Isokratia* translates to equality, *isonomia* translates to equal law, and *isegoria* translates to equal public access.⁸⁷ The prefix “iso-” refers to fairness in the “right to make use of.” In democracies importance lies within individuals in society being able to have public goods accessible to them. This is where the power rests, within the people. Ober argues that public power is the enabling of common good to be done by allowing things to get done in the public realm. His argument is centered around democracy originally being a form of government that gave the collective body, *demos*, the ability to make changes in the public realm of society through the use of these public goods if they so choose. These public goods vary including law or speech. I agree with Ober’s view that democracies expanded through the uses and creation of public resources. For example, starting with Solon, the Council of Four Hundred was established. This institution, along with others, began a democratization process. Individuals in Athens were getting more involved by having the power in participating in political life. Ancient Athens, from Ober’s view became more democratic because of the creation of these new institutions which allowed the people to have a continued voice. Ober’s argument is based within the expansion of these institutions. Foreigners

⁸⁵ Ober, Josiah. 2007. *The Original Meaning of “Democracy”: Capacity to do things, not majority rule*. Princeton/Stanford Working Papers in Classics., 1.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 4.

were able to come into Athens and make use of these public institutions, specifically the ones they could learn from.

Wolin's approach looks at Athenian Democracy and modern America. Wolin argues that the democracy that existed in ancient Athens was "a curiosity rather than an inspiration."⁸⁸ His reasoning is that democracy is a form of government too complex for many regions to practically operate because a democracy must be constricted, before it is enlarged.⁸⁹ This seems counterintuitive in practice. Thucydides and Plato find that a driving force behind democracy is passion, and I find this to go hand in hand with Wolin's point.⁹⁰ People participate in politics to have their voices heard and to have their passions at the forefront of the discussion. As Aristotle argues, the *ekklesia* was where the popular assembly gathered and used their power for significant decisions, this ability giving them high ranking status.⁹¹ The people, as found in ancient Athens, made use of the institutions available to make sure their issues were priority for everyone. While this is not possible, as everyone's issues and concerns vary, it gave the people a say and considerable power in what was put on the agenda in the political realm of ancient Athens. This can be related back to Kagan's second point of necessity in regards to a successful democracy. Kagan argued the importance of having citizens who equally understand the ideas of democracy.⁹² If the citizens within a body of individuals have the similar views, than the passions they have and want to fight for can align. Kagan and Wolin both have different

⁸⁸ Wolin, 475.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Wolin, 476.

⁹¹ Ibid., 475.

⁹² Kagan, 3.

arguments but this is one area in which, I believe, they overlap. Wolin goes on to assert that, “Constitutionalism and electoral democracy became complementary. Together they signified the destruction of the *demos* as the actor, its marginalization as voter.”⁹³ Ober defines the *demos* as the people, and so here Wolin is arguing that these two ideas have led to the current paradox that exists. By participating in a representative form of government, we are moving the power from the hands of the people into the representatives, and have begun to treat the voter as insignificant. Wolin’s views are that this is a modern concept and that it is why as democracies have expanded, they have, to an extent, also become more restrictive. Originally democracies did not put its importance in leadership; that is something that has developed through time. Supposed leadership that exists and that puts all the power into the hands of a single individual is a more recent conception. In ancient Athens, the people were careful to make sure one person did not end up with all the power. Ostracism allowed the people to remove a person from the state, if he had enough power to possibly destabilize the state. Wolin’s findings are consistent with the idea that the institutions existing in ancient Athens are what made it such an interesting success, as democracy is of such complex form. New democracies allow citizens to participate with handling power through the rituals instead of actually using it.⁹⁴ The people of Athens were able to vote to ostracize someone from gaining too much power or could vote to put someone in a leadership role; this ritual of voting was sacred. However the person legitimately in power, such as the archon, was the one who truly had power within their capacity. Ancient Athens allowed the citizens to literally, and actually, rule themselves. Education available in Athens allowed

⁹³ Wolin, 476.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 477.

individuals to learn about caring for the betterment of society. This allowed Athenians to, hopefully, understand that a society that flourished as a whole was made up of people who prospered individually. Wolin is similar to Ober in maintaining that, the expansion of democracies occurs with the expansion and acceptance of institutions. It is the presence of the foreigner that makes a democracy a democracy. However, it was through these institutions that the role of the foreigner was strategically restricted. By limited the foreigners ability within a society that claims to be democratic, a paradox is created.

Foreigners: Integral in Democracies

Kagan does not focus on the foreigner; he finds the success of a democracy to be within extraordinary leadership. Popper, also with conservative views, finds with too much tolerance and freedom, one ends up with none of either. To him, the inherent paradox is with representation of a group of individuals while preventing the creation of a tyrant who only looks out for his own views, or the views of his own class. Ober and Wolin agree that the expansion of democracy occurs with institutions: developing education, building infrastructure, and growing the arts. An example of this was the Council of 500 and the *ekklesia*. These different organizations involved people politically. The agora, central market place, involved people in other means. I find both Ober and Wolin's works to hold truth. I believe their arguments go hand in hand with Bonnie Honig's interpretive, role of the foreigner, explanation to the paradox. We cannot have democracies without foreigners. Whether we find that they contribute to society or corrupt it, they must exist within this form of government, as democracies are held to standards of representing the views of all and suppressing none.

Chapter 3: The Creation and Development of the European Union

Modern European Citizenship

Citizenship in ancient Athens was a term representative of status, giving those who were included within it political rights. This position allowed people take part in self-governance. From ancient Athens to today, there has been a call to reassess citizenship and its role in society, as well as a change in how it is defined. According to Seyla Benhabib, today we divide citizenship into three major components. The first is a common identity that citizens identify with, whether that be through religion, language, similar history, or ethnicity. The second component is the political privileges that all members of the community to participate in public sovereignty. The final component refers to a list of social rights that are accorded to individuals on the basis of their membership in a given community.⁹⁵ In the past, these components of citizenship worked together. Overlap existed between the political preferences and abilities of individuals, as well as their common identities. The “unbundling” of these three components acted as an effect of globalization.⁹⁶ The changing concept of citizenship from ancient Athens to modern times began with the creation of nation states in an international system. This chapter discusses the creation and expansion of the European Union, Greece’s entrance into this organization, and current refugee policies in place.

The definition of citizenship has been further complicated as a result of the creation and development of the European Union (EU). The EU is an international organization consisting of

⁹⁵ Benhabib, Seyla. 2005. Borders, Boundaries, and Citizenship. *Political Science and Politics* 38 (4): 673, 675.

⁹⁶ Ibid.

an economic and political coalition among 28 countries.⁹⁷ The EU was established by Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands. The organization was founded after the end of WWII, with the aim of creating a peace among the countries within Europe. Along with the assembling of the EU, EU citizenship was created. Political rights for example were extended out to citizens who lived in member countries of the EU, even if they were not residing in their own national territory. Benhabib writes:

It is no longer nationality of origin but EU citizenship which entitles one to these rights. Citizens of the EU can vote and stand for office in local elections in their host countries; they can also participate in elections to the European Parliament. If they are long-term residents in their respective foreign countries, on the whole they are also entitled to an equivalent package of social rights and benefits.⁹⁸

Benhabib maintains that the formation of EU citizenship furthered the disintegration of the three components of citizenship. This is because a new identity was created which enabled individuals from various countries to come together and participate politically. The rights that come along with membership within the EU only apply to those whose countries of origin are members states within the organization. While democracy and citizenship are concepts that have developed through time, the most significant change is that claims to rights no longer fall upon one's position as a citizen. Under EU regulations today legal resident aliens, for example, are taken in under regimes of civil and social rights; they are protected by sub-national legislations. Third-country nationals, undocumented aliens, refugees, and asylum seekers fall in the middle, and their status are often unknown, moving between legality and illegality.⁹⁹

⁹⁷ European Union: The EU in Brief. Publications Office of the European Union [database online] 2016 [cited 05/17 2016]. Available from http://europa.eu/about-eu/basic-information/about/index_en.htm.

⁹⁸ Benhabib, "Borders, Boundaries, and Citizenship," 675.

⁹⁹ Ibid.

Third-country nationals are individuals who come from a country that does not belong to the EU. The majority of political, social, and economic rights for these individuals are tied back to their national country of origin; they are not given the right to vote, run, or hold office for elections that are done Union-wide. Some countries within the EU however, do give third-country nationals the opportunity for political involvement. In Denmark, Finland, and the Netherlands, third-country nationals are able to participate in politics at the local and regional level through voting.¹⁰⁰

For other individuals however, access to rights and involvement is not so simple. Undocumented aliens, refugees, and asylum seekers do not necessarily have sub-national legislations under which they are protected.¹⁰¹ Benhabib finds that these individuals are generally limited in what they are able to take away from a country of residence. Individuals who are seeking asylum or are refugees in EU countries are able to have access to medical care, and their children are allowed to go to school. Undocumented migrants however, are excluded from these rights and benefits.¹⁰² Benhabib contends that this is the current situation because the EU is currently facing difficulty in trying to deal with sovereignty working together with hospitality.

The EU is caught among contradictory currents which move it towards norms of cosmopolitan justice in the treatment of those who are within its boundaries, while leading it to act in accordance with outmoded Westphalian conceptions of unbridled sovereignty towards those who are on the outside.¹⁰³

¹⁰⁰ Benhabib, "Borders, Boundaries, and Citizenship," 675.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ Ibid.

One of the main goals of the EU “is to promote human rights both internally and around the world.”¹⁰⁴ The EU aims to make and develop democratic institutions within the countries which are members of the organization, while increasing the opportunities for individuals to play a role in the political process.¹⁰⁵

Benhabib claims the EU is having difficulty in maintaining its borders, while attempting to maintain both sovereignty and hospitality. Sovereignty refers to the authority of the EU and hospitality refers to the generosity. The EU is rooted in equality and human rights, and this raises the difficulty Benhabib discusses. The European Union is trying to understand where they are in their power of authority in Europe when discussing the concerns around borders; the Union has set external boundaries, however once an individual has entered within EU territory, there are no internal borders. The organization is facing hardship in balancing the relationship among power, courteousness, and boundaries. The EU struggling with its original intentions can be traced to the current migrant and refugee crisis.

The Creation and Expansion of the European Union

Before the EU emerged, the European Economic Community (EEC) was established in 1957. This organization was the first step in laying the foundation for integration to occur within the European countries, by promoting economic and political development among them.¹⁰⁶ The EEC created a common market where people and goods were able to move freely through the

¹⁰⁴ European Union, “The EU in Brief.”

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶ Gilsinan, Kathy. 2015. What is the European Union, Exactly? *The Atlantic* 2015.

borders of different member countries. In 1999, the EEC finally adopted the Euro to be the common currency for this coalition.¹⁰⁷

The formation of this international common market place was the first step in economic development and unification. The EEC had another goal in mind; the expansion of political cooperation among the countries as well. The transition from an economic union to a political one caused a name change in 1993; the European Economic Community became the European Union.¹⁰⁸ Everything the EU does is based on the treaties that are written and passed by all its member countries.¹⁰⁹ Since the principles of the EU are embedded within creating and maintaining democratic institutions, it is logical that the organization represents European member countries through a representative democracy. Citizens of the EU are guaranteed representation through the European Parliament. This governmental institution is the law making body; every five years, EU voters select its members. The three roles of the European Parliament are legislative, supervisory, and budgetary.¹¹⁰ The member countries of the organization are represented through the Council of the EU and the European Council.¹¹¹ The Council of the EU is the most significant decision making committee. The panel consists of cabinet members from the EU member countries who discuss, modify, and arrange legislation. The individuals on this council have the power to make their respective national governments follow the policies

¹⁰⁷ Gilsinan.

¹⁰⁸ European Union, "The EU in Brief."

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

¹¹⁰ European Union: European Parliament. Publications Office of the European Union [database online]. 2016 [cited 05/17 2016]. Available from http://europa.eu/about-eu/institutions-bodies/european-parliament/index_en.htm.

¹¹¹ European Union, "The EU in Brief."

implemented by the Council of the EU.¹¹² Finally, the European Council is a committee of EU leaders who set the overall political agenda of the organization. This is representative of political cooperation among the member countries of the EU.

The Single European Act, the Maastricht Treaty, and the Treaty of Amsterdam all played a role in shaping the EU. The Single European Act was passed in 1986 and it created a six year program that sorted out any economic issues with trade throughout the EU borders.¹¹³ The Maastricht Treaty was passed in 1993 and the Treaty of Amsterdam in 1999. These treaties dealt with issues such as protecting the environment the overall European response to safety and defense matters.¹¹⁴ The Maastricht Treaty also specifically defined EU citizenship, stating that only individuals who are of the nationality of the member states are able to be a citizen of the EU.¹¹⁵

The Schengen Agreement was also of significance. According to BBC, “The Schengen Agreement abolished many of the EU’s internal borders, enabling passport-free movement” among most Schengen zone countries.¹¹⁶ The agreement was signed in 1985 in Luxembourg and eventually took effect in 1995. This accord dissolved internal borders, however allows states to reinstate border control internally for 10 days for national security reasons There are some countries in the Schengen zone that still do have border controls internally: Germany, Denmark,

¹¹² European Union: Council of the European Union. Publications Office of the European Union [database online]. 2015 [cited 05/17 2016]. Available from http://europa.eu/about-eu/institutions-bodies/council-eu/index_en.htm.

¹¹³ European Union: The History of the European Union. Publications Office of the European Union, 2015 [cited 05/17 2016]. Available from http://europa.eu/about-eu/eu-history/index_en.htm#goto_1.

¹¹⁴ European Union, “The History of the European Union.”

¹¹⁵ Benhabib, Seyla. 2002. In Search of Europe’s Borders. *Dissent* 49 (4): 33., 35.

¹¹⁶ Schengen: Controversial EU free movement deal explained. 2016. BCC, April 24, 2016.

Austria, Sweden, France, and Norway.¹¹⁷ This means that when migrants are coming in through Greece, a common entry point, they are gaining access into the European Union without passport checks. This external border is of extreme significance to the EU as it is the entry way into the continent.

Today the EU today has expanded to include 370 million residents from over fifteen European countries.¹¹⁸ Since the 1993 Copenhagen accords, full membership into the EU is determined by the following criteria:

(1) a demonstration of a country's commitment to functioning democratic institutions, human rights, the rule of law, and respect for and protection of minorities; (2) a competitive market economic as well as the capacity to cope with competitive pressure; and (3) evidence that the country is able to take on the obligations of membership, including adherence to the aims of political, economic, and monetary union.¹¹⁹

After the Second World War, the foreign population in Europe consisted of 1.3 percent. In the early 90s, this percentage increased to 4.9. In the late 90s however, the EU began monitoring the flow of refugees, guest workers, and asylum seekers coming into its member countries; the Treaty on European Union had been signed in 1992, and the EU felt the need to start monitoring individuals coming in as the number of them has risen drastically.¹²⁰ This has effected the make-up of these European countries and feelings of identity. The EU countries are wrestling with conflicting feelings rooted in this "radically new collective self-definition."¹²¹ Benhabib finds that citizens are denouncing foreigners coming into their countries for they feel their culture is at

¹¹⁷ "Schengen: Controversial EU free movement deal explained."

¹¹⁸ Benhabib, "In Search of Europe's Borders," 33.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 34.

¹²⁰ Ibid.

¹²¹ Ibid.

risk. Benhabib asserts that there has been a change in Europe from it once being a continent open to both emigration, as well as immigration.¹²² While the EU has changed and adapted its policies through time and as it seemed it fit, the organization keeps the same expectation for countries to do the same if they want to be a member of the European Union.

Greece Entering the EU

Greece first applied to be a member of the EEC in June 1961. In 1961 both Greece and the EEC signed the Association Agreement. This agreement aimed to integrate Greece within the EEC over a period of 22 years.¹²³ From 1967 to 1974 this agreement was frozen as a military regime had taken over power in Greece. This movement from a democracy to a dictatorship went against the views and intentions of the EEC. However democracy was eventually reinstated in July 1974, and Greece received its full membership status in 1975. Eventually, six years later, Greece became the official tenth member of the EEC in 1981.¹²⁴

In order to be included as a member of the EEC, Greece faced many challenges. The gap between the EEC and Greece had to be bridged specifically in terms of political identity, economic identity, and cultural identity of western European identity, with its eastern European customs and location.¹²⁵ Greece's identity lies on two ends of the spectrum in regards to its cultural identity and linking the two, western and eastern European identities, were key in allowing Greece to be a member of the EEC. Greeks saw joining the EEC as an opportunity for

¹²² Bebbib, "In Search of Europe's Borders," 35.

¹²³ Tsinisizelis, Michael. *Greece in the European Union: A Political/Institutional Balance Sheet*. University of Athens: 145., 146.

¹²⁴ Ibid.

¹²⁵ Ibid., 148

them to further the success of their own country. They would be able to work closely with other countries and gain recognition in Europe. The EEC was viewed as an organization that would be able to support and protect their liberal regime after the years of dictatorship. The European community was also seen as capable to facilitate both the economic and political development of Greece.¹²⁶ The Greek government believed that the country must adjust to the competitive environment of the EEC if Greece wanted to succeed and gain the help of the organization.¹²⁷

Greece wanted to be fully accepted into the EEC for many different reasons. Firstly, Greek people believed that being a member of this European community would bring stability to their country by making Greece fall within the institutional framework of the European Community. This would allow Greece to take part in the institutions of the EEC, as well as to have its own impact on this European model. The people of Greece believed that being a member of the EEC would not only develop their own economy, but also modernize it.¹²⁸ Along with integrating themselves with the EEC, they were also required to follow the policies set forth by the EEC and later, the EU.

Current EU Migrant Law

While the EU expanded since its time as the EEC, so has its policies for immigration. While Europe was originally thought to be supportive of both emigration and immigration, as the EU expanded so did the legislation it passed in regards to the movement of people. This is

¹²⁶ Tsinisizelis, 148.

¹²⁷ Ibid., 149.

¹²⁸ Greece's Course in the EU. Ministry of Foreign Affairs [database online]. 2016 [cited 05/17 2016]. Available from <http://www.mfa.gr/en/foreign-policy/greece-in-the-eu/greeces-course-in-the-eu.html>.

because the number of individuals coming into Europe has greatly increased within the last twenty years. Following the financial crash in 2008, many migrants have been coming to Europe to leave their lives of poverty behind.¹²⁹ Europe has been seen as a safe haven for these individuals, however this has put a greater strain on the continent in handling this flux, while reeling from the financial breakdown. This has required regulations to be amended and implemented.

The Common European Asylum System (CEAS) was implemented with the hopes of coordinating the legal framework of the member countries of the EU, while setting base standards for granting asylum.¹³⁰ CEAS attempts to give asylum to individuals who are fleeing harm or persecution. Throughout the EU member countries, individuals are able to apply for asylum through the Asylum Procedures Directive. All who applies have their fingerprints send to Eurodac. The data that is being gathered through the Eurodac database aids in identifying the country that is answerable for the asylum application (Dublin Regulation).¹³¹ All asylum applications are put in housing and given food (Reception Conditions Directive). The applicant is then interviewed by someone who is trained in EU law to determine if the applicant qualifies for refugee status (Qualification Directive and Asylum Procedures Directive). The refugee is then either granted a residence permit and is recognized as a refugee (Qualification Directive) or is not.¹³² If the applicant is not granted asylum, the applicant will likely be returned to his or her

¹²⁹ Reinisch, Jessica. 2015. 'Forever Temporary': Migrants in Calais, Then and Now. *The Political Quarterly* 86 (4): 515., 518.

¹³⁰ Ibid.

¹³¹ European Commission: A Common European Asylum System. Publications Office of the European Union [database online]. Luxembourg, 2014 [cited 05/17 2016]. Available from http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/e-library/docs/ceas-fact-sheets/ceas_factsheet_en.pdf, 4.

¹³² Ibid.

country of origin.

The Reception Conditions Directive makes sure that all who are waiting to hear back on the status of their application are provided with necessities.¹³³ The Qualification Directive and Asylum Procedures Directive specifies that before an individual is able to receive asylum, he or she must first be recognized as a refugee.¹³⁴ The Dublin Regulation is very specific in the expectations it holds EU member states to, and this piece of writing has been modified and adapted over time.

The Dublin Regulation came into action in 1997. It placed the responsibility of asylum applications within the EU country where the migrant first arrived. Said country was responsible for the processing of those applications. This was possible through the Eurodac system: a database that would track the fingerprints of migrants, through Europe, making it easy to identify asylum seekers. The problem with this original Dublin Regulation however was that the number of migrants coming in from the south was dramatically increasing. Southern European countries, like Greece, did not want to take the fingerprints of the migrants coming in because it would place more responsibility on the countries themselves.¹³⁵ This is because the liability of these migrants regardless of where they travelled throughout Europe, would be traced back to Greece which could end up putting the country in jeopardy.

The Dublin II Regulation changed the way responsibility was placed. It created new criteria for putting responsibility on member countries of the EU. Members were given the ability to take responsibility for a migrant even if their country was not the point of entry he or

¹³³ European Commission, "A Common European Asylum System," 7.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, 8.

¹³⁵ Reinisch, 518.

she came into Europe through. This played a role in family reunion, as Dublin II enabled asylum seekers to be sent to where their family was.¹³⁶ The ‘Sangatte clause’ was added to this amended regulation. This clause exonerated countries from claiming responsibility for migrants who moved within various countries, without being detected.¹³⁷ Pressure was taken off of member countries of the EU, while responsibility placement changed. The country that the migrant first arrived in no longer had to take complete responsibility for said migrant; the individual would not be linked to that country. These directives and regulations play a prominent role in making sure the EU has a unified front when dealing with the current refugee crisis.

Current European Migrant Crisis

In 2015, over one million refugees and migrants entered into Europe. Many of these individuals are escaping from Syria, Afghanistan, Eritrea, and Iraq.¹³⁸ The EU was unsure of how the influx of individuals should be handled without creating division, while helping them resettle successfully. Seyla Benhabib distinguishes between proper terminology of refugee and migrant, and sheds light on this situation. According to the 1951 Geneva Convention, people who are fleeing their country of origin because of political persecution, continuing instability, or ongoing instability are considered refugees. While definition remains standard from the 1951 Refugee Convention, the interpretation by states differ.¹³⁹ Individuals who leave their home country for better economic and life opportunities are called migrants; these individuals do not face life

¹³⁶ Reinisch, 518.

¹³⁷ Ibid.

¹³⁸ Benhabib, Seyla, and Slawomir Sierakowski. 2015. *European Union - A Cosmopolitan Legal Space. Open Democracy* 2015, 1.

¹³⁹ Ibid.

threatening conditions, however their livelihood may be precarious.¹⁴⁰ This distinction is significant because in European public opinion, and international law, according to Slawomir Sierakowski's interview with Benhabib, obligation exists to help refugees and not migrants. This is not only the view of the member countries of the EU, but also the role of international law. International legislation provides protection to refugees but not migrants.¹⁴¹

Benhabib contends that the impacts that migrants and refugees have on a country differ. This differentiation lies between the long term and short term. Benhabib argues that migrants are often "young, mobile" individuals who contribute what they can to the economy. Migrants do place burden on the economy, but benefit it in the larger picture.¹⁴² Refugees are individuals who are coming in and applying for asylum status. Often these refugees do not have access to work permits within the country and so cannot be considered economic migrants.¹⁴³ While both migrants and refugees are accepted into a country at a national level, the burden and resources fall upon the local government.¹⁴⁴

Various countries in Europe are reacting differently to the current refugee and migrant crisis. While some countries like Germany, Sweden and Iceland have accepted many of the individuals coming in, other countries, such as Slovakia, are much more restrictive in whom they are allowing within their borders.¹⁴⁵ This distinction lies within the "fear of the Other." Benhabib explains that Icelandic societies, for example, have displayed an almost moral altruism.

¹⁴⁰ Benhabib and Sierakowski, 2.

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

¹⁴² Ibid.

¹⁴³ Ibid., 3.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid.

Countries, like Slovakia, which do not want to let many of these outsiders in, are smaller nations that fear losing their own identity.¹⁴⁶ The “Other” is representative of an individual the country is not distinctly familiar with coming in and becoming a part of their society. I agree with Benhabib, as these feelings of identity go back to the concept of citizenship. Citizens often identify with individuals who share similar beliefs or views in a particular arena. Smaller countries are afraid that they will lose their own collective identity if they do not impose severe restrictions on those they are allowing to come within their borders.¹⁴⁷

There is also a moral and legal component of citizens’ rights that needs to be defined. Morally we have an obligation to help “the Other” individual, whether they are a migrant or a refugee.¹⁴⁸ Legally, nation states creates categories and distinctions among groups of people, thus giving some rights over others.¹⁴⁹ Today we exist in legal regimes that understand and accept that there are universal human rights, with more than just citizenship status and nationality at the foundation. Benhabib maintains that the current legal obligation have made it so, “The human being, regardless of citizenship, is now considered entitled to certain human rights.”¹⁵⁰ This causes a need for action. Benhabib suggests that porous borders are the only way in which state will be able to co-exist successfully. This being because porous borders equate to acceptance of human beings to move from one border to another, without fear of criminalization.¹⁵¹ This is key because regardless of the legal actions taken, individuals will always be moving without

¹⁴⁶ Benhabib and Sierakowski, 3.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 4.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 3.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 5.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 6.

¹⁵¹ Ibid., 7.

documents. By decreasing those who are being outlaw, we are able to help these individuals without criminalizing them. While this is possible among the EU member states, the concept of porous borders becomes tricky when talking about individuals coming in who do not have EU citizenship. They are supposedly entitled to human rights, but conflict arises when looking at the Dublin Regulation, as it is difficult pin pointing the country that is to be held responsible for providing these rights.

Greece, located in the south of Europe, is a common entrance point for many refugees and migrants. Greece acts an entry point into the EU; the borders that exist are the European Union borders. Internal borders have been dissolved and so once migrants come into Greece, they gain access into the EU. Individuals often travel dangerously into Greece by boat. EU member countries have begun to put pressure on Greece to tighten its borders.¹⁵² The increasing number of refugees and migrants coming in are weighing on Greece's already struggling economy. The European Migration Commissioner Dimitris Avramopoulos said that it is the responsibility of Greece to protect its external borders.¹⁵³ Greece has been warned that if it is not proving able to reduce the flow of refugees and migrants coming in, it is likely their Balkan neighbors will seal their borders thus hurting their relationship with Greece. This would further harm Greece's economy, and severely increase its population. In order to curb the migrants coming in, the European Commission recommended that Greece should allow more EU guards to be placed at its borders.¹⁵⁴ Greece's relationship with the EU is currently at risk, an association

¹⁵² Pop, Valentina. 2016. Greece Under Pressure to Better Manage Migrant Influx. *The Wall Street Journal* 2016.

¹⁵³ Ibid.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.

which took over 30 years to build.

European Union Response

The EU as a whole has made a commitment to take whatever action necessary to prevent more deaths from occurring as a result of the refugee crisis and to overall improve the conditions of those who are coming into Europe seeking protection. The organization has pledged these actions under the European Agenda on Migration.¹⁵⁵ This agenda finds that migration management is a responsibility shared among all of the member countries of the EU, as well as non-EU countries. The short term goals of the European Agenda on Migration include rescue operations, and the overall safe and legal resettlement of the people coming in throughout Europe. The EU is also in the process of activating its emergency system, so that those who are seeking asylum are able to be relocated in a more cohesive manner.¹⁵⁶ The long term goals of this agenda include getting to the root of irregular migration (specifically in non-EU countries), saving the lives of the individuals who are traveling in such dangerous ways, securing borders, modifying and strengthening a common asylum strategy, and developing new legal migration policies.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁵ Understanding Migration and Asylum in the European Unions. Open Society Foundations [database online]. 2015 [cited 05/17 2016]. Available from <https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/explainers/understanding-migration-and-asylum-european-union>.

¹⁵⁶ European Commission: European Agenda on Migration. Publications Office of the European Union [database online]. 2015 [cited 05/17 2016]. Available from http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-migration/index_en.htm.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid.

Chapter 4: Greek Parliament and the Contemporary Refugee Crisis

The contemporary refugee crisis has had a huge effect on Greece's political climate. Greece acting as the external border, and entry way, into the European Union has made it one of the countries in Europe most significantly impacted by this crisis. Once migrants have entered into Greece, internal borders do not exist. Individuals can easily travel to other European countries, more specifically those in the Schengen zone. In order to fully comprehend what the official response has been from Greece, I spend most of this chapter looking at the Greek political system and the different parties that are represented in parliament. At the end of the chapter, I look into the people who are on the ground helping these migrants. These individuals are significant because of their actions, as they have begun to move away from an anti-foreigner way of thinking that has engulfed Greek political parties. This has effected the policies of the parties, which has not done much to benefit the refugees in their time of need.

Today Greece can be politically identified as a Parliamentary Republic. Every five years the parliament elects the President, who is recognized as the Head of State. The Head of Government is the Prime Minister.¹⁵⁸ The President is responsible for appointing the Prime Minister, who in turn appoints other members in government. General elections normally take place every four years, and Greek citizens over the age of 18 are able to participate.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁸ Hellenic Republic, Greece in the USA: Government and politics. in Hellenic Republic - Greece in the USA [database online]. 2016 [cited 05/29 2016]. Available from <http://www.mfa.gr/usa/en/about-greece/government-and-politics/> (accessed May 29, 2016).

¹⁵⁹ Ibid.

This modern Greek government and party system can be traced to 1974, being established after the seven year dictatorship had ended and democracy had been restored.¹⁶⁰ Up until 2009, two major parties alternated being in office: New Democracy (ND) and Panhellenic Socialist Movement (PASOK). ND is a centre-right party, while PASOK identifies as centre-left.¹⁶¹ This two party system disintegrated at the beginning of the financial crisis. From 2009 forward, “there have been five national elections all called early; the first referendum since 1974; eight prime ministers and four coalition governments.”¹⁶² Nasos Roussias finds that the number of political parties increased in 2012 when the first and second bailout programs were implemented. Roussias argues that the coalition government became the norm in Greece at this time as there were high levels of unemployment and abstention, and party identification significantly decreased.¹⁶³ He asserts that, “The weakening ties between parties and citizens suggests that parties will have to work hard to regain the trust of voters.”¹⁶⁴ To understand the impact of this party system on the contemporary refugee crisis, I will focus on the official refugee policies of each political party that is currently represented in parliament.

Four major political parties that currently represented in Greece are Synaspismos Rizopastikis Aristeras (SYRIZA) Coalition of the Radical Left, Nea Dimokratia (ND) New Democracy, Chrysi Avyi (ChA) Golden Dawn, and Panellinio Sosialistiko Kinima (PASOK)

¹⁶⁰ Roussias, Nasos. 2015. The Greek Party System: Out with the old, in with the new? *Ekathimerini*, September 19, 2015.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁶² *Ibid.*

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

Panhellenic Social Movement.¹⁶⁵ These parties collectively represent the people's view of what needs to change in Greece both economically and socially. Each of these parties perceive the issues of the refugee crisis in different ways.

Synaspismos Rizopastikis Aristeras

SYRIZA is a democratic socialist party, located on the left side of the political spectrum.¹⁶⁶ The current Prime Minister of Greece is Alexis Tsipras, who is also the leader of SYRIZA. At the end of 2014, Greece had failed to elect a new president. This opened the door for a call for an election and SYRIZA held the lead with approximately 35% of the polls.¹⁶⁷ As of the election from September 2015, SYRIZA received 1,925,904 of the votes giving them 145 seats in parliament.¹⁶⁸

SYRIZA garners much support from the people in Greece as it is an anti-capitalist party that ran on the ideas of many reforms. Michelle Chen explains that:

As part of their broader push for social equality, SYRIZA has championed policy changes such as speeding up the asylum petition process—which could help migrants secure their right to resettle and protect them from deportation; repealing the EU-wide rules restricting migrants' travel within the region; guaranteeing human rights protections for immigrants currently in detention; promoting reunification of immigrant families (who are often separated on the grueling and dangerous journey); and overall, “Social inclusion of immigrants and equal rights

¹⁶⁵ The Parliament: The Political System: Elections. in Hellenic Parliament [database online]. Greece, 2015 [cited 05/29 2016]. Available from <http://www.hellenicparliament.gr/en/Vouli-ton-Ellinon/To-Politevma/Ekloges/Eklogika-apotelesmata-New/#Per-17> (accessed 05/29/2016).

¹⁶⁶ Parties and Elections in Europe. 2015 [cited 05/29 2016]. Available from <http://www.parties-and-elections.eu/greece.html> (accessed May 29, 2016).

¹⁶⁷ Nardelli, Alberto, and Jennifer Rankin. 2015. Greece Election 2015: The Politics and Economics in Numbers. The Guardian, January 20, 2015.

¹⁶⁸ “The Parliament: The Political System: Elections.”

protection.”¹⁶⁹

Chen, writing in January 2015 was skeptical about the actual legislative reforms that would take place because SYRIZA had formed a coalition with ANEL (a right wing party, comprised of Independent Greeks who are anti-immigration).¹⁷⁰

SYRIZA’s Peace Proposal for the Middle East and Mediterranean is a response to the refugee crisis and outlines steps the party believes are necessary for achieving eventual peace in the region. The proposal however is vague in that it does not specify the means with which to accomplish these six points. The proposal also does not take into account the current influx of refugees and what to do about their presence. The World Socialist Web Site which is published by the International Committee of the Fourth International (ICFI) argues that SYRIZA is currently taking action with the refugees coming in. Katerina Selin asserts that the SYRIZA government in power in Greece is detaining refugees, as of March 26, 2016.¹⁷¹ Bill Van Auken, as of April 5, 2016, finds SYRIZA to be performing crimes against the refugees.¹⁷²

According to SYRIZA’s official political website, the Central Committee of the organization approved a 6-point Peace Proposal on March 6, 2016. SYRIZA argues on their webpage that the developments of the refugee crisis has made it clear that peace needs to be developed in the Middle East not only for those countries, but for Europe and the rest of the

¹⁶⁹ Chen, Michelle. 2015. What Does Syriza’s Victory Mean for Greece’s Immigrants? *The Nation*, January 27, 2015.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid.

¹⁷¹ Selin, Katerina. 2016. Greece’s Syriza Government Detains Refugees. *World Socialist Web Site*, 05/2016, 2016.

¹⁷² Auken, Bill Van. 2016. Greece's SYRIZA: Full Partner in Historic Crime Against Refugees. *World Socialist Web Site*, 04/2016, 2016.

world.¹⁷³ The first point of this proposal contends that much of international efforts need to go towards ending the war in Syria, and creating a representative form of government that will create and maintain the rights of the Syrian people. The second point emphasizes the need to control the exports of arms that are going into the regions where conflicts exist in the Middle East. The third point of this proposal calls for the establishment of Palestine as a state from borders that were established in 1967. SYRIZA argues that this would allow Israel and Palestine to live near each other in peace and security. The fourth point calls for peace between the Kurds and Ankara so that democratic Turkey can benefit.¹⁷⁴ The fifth proposal point contends that finding peace with Cyprus, and ensuring security, would become a peace bridge from Europe to the Middle East. The final point of this proposal points to the necessity of promoting cooperation and security in the Mediterranean as a whole, the goal being “to bridge the explosive north-south gap in the Mediterranean.”¹⁷⁵ Studying this peace proposal is important in understanding SYRIZA’s view on the current refugee crisis and what they believe the best possible solutions are. Throughout these points the refugees themselves are not mentioned; these individuals are fleeing violence and persecution, and are attempting to have a better life. SYRIZA believes the crisis can be taken control of by creating peace. This is a future solution, not a current one; a current proposal should take into consideration the influx of refugees coming in in order to be successful.

¹⁷³ SYRIZA Peace Proposal for the Middle East and Mediterranean. 2016 [cited 05/29 2016]. Available from <http://www.syriza.gr/article/id/65067/SYRIZA-Peace-Proposal-for-the-Middle-EastandMediterranean.html#.V02WEJMrLBJ> (accessed May 29, 2016).

¹⁷⁴ Kurds are a group of individuals who come from the Mesopotamian plains. The Kurds do not have a homeland and after the Treaty of Lausanne, boundaries were created within Turkey and there was no Kurdish state created. This left them with minority status. Kurds are receive severely harsh treatment from the Turkish authorities. (Who are the Kurds? 2016. BBC, March 14, 2016.)

¹⁷⁵ “SYRIZA Peace Proposal.”

EU representatives and Turkey decided, on March 18, that anyone who has come to Greece in an untraditional way will immediately be deported to Turkey. If the refugee who is being deported is able to prove that they will be oppressed and unsafe in Turkey, then they are able to gain asylum in Greece.¹⁷⁶ Over 50,000 refugees are currently in Greece, and new ones are arriving everyday. Up until this point, refugees were provided for and registered. Refugees had the right to move around freely.¹⁷⁷ The SYRIZA government has now taken steps to impose restrictions upon this movement. The police have been mobilized to alter refugee camps into detention centers. Selin quotes a member of Doctors without Borders (MSF) stating that “entire families are not even allowed to leave their barracks. If this isn’t a detention centre, what is it?”¹⁷⁸ Selin claims that the government is registering refugees quickly and hurrying them through the asylum process so that the majority of them can be deported to Turkey. Prime Minister Tsipras claims that the EU deal with Turkey is the best option and a preventative measure. This is because it moves the refugees out of Greece and they become the responsibility of another country. Volunteers on the Greek islands, where a majority of refugees are coming in, have resisted these actions by suspending their work at the camps.¹⁷⁹ The United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) and MSF are two of these organizations. An expert at the latter, Aurélie Ponthieu, believes that, “The only goal of the pact is to prevent people from coming to Europe. Their rights or how they are dealt with play a subordinate role.”¹⁸⁰ These

¹⁷⁶ Selin.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid.

organizations find the current conditions of the camps to be horrid; UNHCR and MSF have decided to no longer tolerate the actions of the Greek government. They have removed their services as they do not agree with the actions being taken.

The refugees on the Greek islands feel as though they are in prison. On the island of Chios exists Vial, a closed detention camp. A volunteer shot a video shows how children and the elderly are not receiving any protection from the cold.¹⁸¹ At the Idomeni camp at the Greek-Macedonian border, two men were so desperate that they set themselves on fire. Others at the camp, took part in a hunger strike while yelling, “If you won’t give us any human rights, then at least give us the rights you give to animals... No food, no water, until you open the borders.”¹⁸²

Auken argues that these policies and implementation are truly crimes against the refugees. He asserts that it is the coalition between SYRIZA and ANEL that voted to make legal changes to help in the process of the deportations.¹⁸³ The police were given massive power and the EU-Turkish agreement has Turkey accepting billions of Euros for dealing with refugee situation on behalf of for the EU.¹⁸⁴ Auken finds Tsipras to also be giving power to the riot police and military to go around rounding up refugees.¹⁸⁵ The refugee crisis in Greece has turned into a manhunt, where refugees are left right-less and hopeless.

The inhumane conditions the refugees are being forced to live under in Greece are being brought on and reinforced by SYRIZA. Tsipras released a statement on refugee crisis in

¹⁸¹ Selin.

¹⁸² Ibid.

¹⁸³ Auken.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid.

September of 2015, stating that this refugee crisis is not just the responsibility of Greece, but the responsibility of Europe as a whole.¹⁸⁶ Tsipras felt the need to clarify the following:

I would like to make clear that the human beings who are gathering and dying at our borders are not migrants but refugees. This means that Greece has the international and European obligation to ensure humane reception and living conditions.¹⁸⁷

Tsipras distinguishes between a migrant and refugee, and understands that the role of creating and maintaining certain conditions is in the hands of Greece. SYRIZA being a leftist group was elected into office under the belief that their actions would be significant in controlling the refugee crisis. However the actions of the party prove otherwise. Tsipras argued that SYRIZA has done a lot in regards to policy and planning for the refugees who are coming in, while New Democracy (ND) has done nothing, all while making accusations against SYRIZA. New Democracy is the next largest political party represented in Parliament.¹⁸⁸

New Democracy

New Democracy (ND) is another prominent political party in Greece, holding 75 seats in parliament after receiving 1,526,205 of the votes.¹⁸⁹ This political party's ideology falls in line with liberal conservatism and Christian democracy.¹⁹⁰ Claus Kikilias, the official Coordinator of the Migration Policy ND released the following statement regarding the refugee crisis and the

¹⁸⁶ Statement by the President of SYRIZA on the Refugees. 2015 [cited 05/29 2016]. Available from <http://www.syriza.gr/article/Statement-by-the-President-of-SYRIZA-on-the-refugees-.html#.V02ZiZMrJAZ> (accessed May 29).

¹⁸⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸⁸ "The Parliament: The Political System: Elections."

¹⁸⁹ Ibid.

¹⁹⁰ "Parties and Elections in Europe."

accommodation that exists in Schisto. This center is newly opened, and facing backlash and resistance from Chrysi Avyi (ChA/Golden Dawn). Kikilas states:

The emerging situation in Schisto confirms, once again, that the centers fail to create decent living conditions for refugees. Medical services and required medications provides the Air Force with staff not sufficient for daily needs. Apart from the lack of medical coverage of these people, security problem has arisen of 1850 refugees and adequate stewardship of the accommodation center, as it is very small the number of soldiers and policemen entrusted with ensuring the proper functioning. We call on the competent authorities to strengthen the medical staff before it is too late, and the strengthening of existing police force and Army to avoid offending behaviors.¹⁹¹

ND adopted stricter immigration policies in 2012, as it being a more conservative group aligned itself as an an anti-immigration party. Panellinio Sosialistiko Kinima (PASOK) Panhellenic Social Movement, a more liberal political party, passed a citizenship law that allowed immigrants, who were second generation, whose parents lived in Greece legally, to petition for citizenship.¹⁹² While many who took advantage of this law had familial Greek ties, “New Democracy insists it was a magnet for undocumented migrants who see it as an opportunity to obtain legal status in a European Union country.”¹⁹³ Antonius Samaras who was the then leader of ND argued to his party that their Greek cities had been taken by illegal immigrants and that it was the people of Greece’s job to reclaim the cities.¹⁹⁴ Samaras also made the claimed “the SYRIZA-ANEL coalition government of trying to create division rather than unity in the country.”¹⁹⁵

¹⁹¹ “New Democracy: Statement by the Coordinator.”

¹⁹² Malkoutzis, Nick. 2012. Is Immigration a Bigger Issue for Greece than the Economy? Ekathimerini, March 30, 2012.

¹⁹³ Ibid.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid.

Other Political Parties

Chrysi Avyi, also known as ChA or Golden Dawn, and Panhellenic Social Movement, also known as PASOK are other Greek political parties that are represented in parliament. These parties though, have fewer seats in parliament than SYRIZA and ND. Golden Dawn, is a far right political party.¹⁹⁶ Panhellenic Social Movement, also known as PASOK, is affiliated with social democracy.¹⁹⁷

Golden Dawn received 379,581 of the votes, giving them them 18 sears in parliament.¹⁹⁸ This party emerged because people in Greece felt there was a lack of leadership which was hindering the issues related to the refugee crisis further.¹⁹⁹ Golden Dawn is bringing up feelings of fear within their followers to maintain their support. The party believes that the refugees and migrants coming into Greece, are actually invading Greece and thus threatening its existence. Propaganda used by Golden Dawn include advertisements on TV including slogans such as: “I don’t want to be a minority in my own country.”²⁰⁰ Ilias Kasidiaris, a spokesman for Golden Dawn, argues that this political party is rooted in power, not protest.²⁰¹ Helena Smith finds the support for Golden Dawn to be rooted in fear. She contends:

Golden Dawn’s anti-immigrant stance at a time of mounting fears over Greece’s frontline role in Europe’s biggest humanitarian crisis in recent history, almost certainly helped. The party, portraying itself as the “only nationalist choice” played heavily on fears that Greeks could soon become a minority in their

¹⁹⁶ “Parties and Elections in Europe.”

¹⁹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁹⁸ “The Parliament: The Political System: Elections.”

¹⁹⁹ Baboulias, Yiannis. 2015. The EU’s Woeful Response to the Refugee Crisis has Revived Golden Dawn. The Guardian, September 21, 2015.

²⁰⁰ Ibid.

²⁰¹ Ibid.

own country. But, so too, did its shrill opposition to the internationally sponsored bailout accords, or memoranda, that the extremists have said amount to “ethnocide” or death of the nation. Polls showed that 16.6% of those who voted for Golden Dawn were victims of record levels of unemployment – the most grievous side-effect of massive budget cuts and lay-offs enforced as the price of being bailed out to the tune of €326bn by creditors from the EU and International Monetary Fund (IMF).²⁰²

Golden Dawn holds rallies and protests, gathering the people of certain communities to come out and speak against the actions being taken regarding the refugee crisis. In February for example, the people of Piraeus participated in a demonstration against a refugee center that was planned to open in Schisto. While it is not openly known if it was Golden Dawn who set up the rally, the concerned individuals shouted typical Golden Dawn slogans, on such being “Greece belongs to the Greeks.”²⁰³ Golden Dawn’s nationalist views claim that Greece belongs to the Greeks and no one else; the fear of loss of identity is what is keeping this political party afloat.

PASOK received 341,390 votes, giving them 17 seats in parliament.²⁰⁴ The ideals of PASOK align more closely with SYRIZA. Kofi Gennimata, the leader of PASOK, sat down with Tsipras to discuss the current refugee crisis. PASOK understands that there needs to be something done about the influx of individuals coming in; Gennimata argues that it is “a matter that concerns the whole of Europe.”²⁰⁵

Greek Political Parties: Anti-Foreigner Sentiment

²⁰² Smith, Helena. 2015. Neo-fascist Greek Party Takes Third Place in Wave of Voter Fury. *The Guardian*, September 20, 2015.

²⁰³ Zafiroopoulos, Pavlos. 2016. Golden Dawn Seeks to Exploit Greek Refugee Crisis. *Deutsche Welle*, February 19, 2016.

²⁰⁴ “The Parliament: The Political System: Elections.”

²⁰⁵ Refugee issue is not only a Greek problem, PM Tsipras and PASOK leader Gennimata say. 2016. *Protothema*, February 2, 2016.

SYRIZA, ND, Golden Dawn, and PASOK all fall at various points on the political spectrum. While their ideologies differ and their policies vary, all four political parties have some level of anti-foreigner sentiment. SYRIZA, holding the most seats in parliament, claimed to be a party supportive of immigration when they came in. However, their actions illustrate otherwise. The alliance of SYRIZA with ANEL is significant as it compromised the premise on which SYRIZA ran, and won, for office. Supporters of SYRIZA are disappointed by their party's lack of implementation of policies they based their foundation on.

The people in Greece are unhappy with their government's actions, that is why there have been so many unprecedented elections within the last seven years. Unemployment is high, the economic situation with the EU is financially hurting Greece, and the refugee crisis is putting more responsibility in the hands of a country who is struggling. A nationwide survey on the refugee crisis in Greece was conducted in November 2015 within Greece. While many Greeks, 7 out of 10, are somewhat satisfied with how Tsipras is handling the crisis, 8 out of 10 individuals view the lacking cooperation on the EU level negatively.²⁰⁶ This is significant as the poor outlook lies within Greece's relationship with the EU, and the EU's support of Greece. When asked what problems would be associated with the massive influx of refugees, about half of the people surveyed believed it would be the increasing death toll.²⁰⁷ Many Greeks do not associate the many refugees coming in as negative because of how it would effect their country, they associate the problems with the refugees themselves and the issues they are suffering.

²⁰⁶ Rapidis and Schmidt.

²⁰⁷ Ibid.

Astonishing Greek Generosity in a Time of Hardship

Over the last six years, Greeks have been dealing with an economic crisis that has caused Greece's place in the EU to come into question, and has brought up unemployment levels. Through this hardship however, many Greeks have opted to help in which ever way they can. Helena Smith shares the stories of some in Athens:

In Athens, where passenger terminals, parks and public squares have been turned into chaotic reception centres, Greeks of all backgrounds and ages have rushed to join the relief effort. Everywhere, NGOs speak of an explosion of giving that has taken them aback. "I could tell you so many stories," says Caroline Haga, a Finn seconded for the past four months to the country, with the International Red Cross. "In Samos and Chios, recently, every shopkeeper I met wanted to give something for the children. It's amazing, considering what they've been going through themselves. And more and more, every day, are signing up as volunteers."²⁰⁸

Many Greeks find aspects of reliability the modern refugee crisis as Greeks themselves has to move through foreign lands, and were once themselves migrants. Smith contends, "After the civil war's brutal end in 1949, more than a third of the rural population emigrated to Australia, Germany and America."²⁰⁹

The actions of the Greeks illustrate how there is so much that can be done, and needs to be done, at the level of the refugees themselves. Political parties pass proposals and legislation, however these long term methods do not solve or deal with current issues of the refugees coming in. While some are unsure of how to help, and others believe that refugees need to be routed elsewhere, two things are certain: support from the EU is necessary, and the refugees are fleeing violence and coming to European countries to have a better life. The EU is a community of

²⁰⁸ Smith, Helena. 2016. Refugee Crisis: How Greeks opened their hearts to strangers. The Guardian, March 12, 2016.

²⁰⁹ Ibid.

European countries; the policies they pass are expected to be adapted by all member countries. The EU needs to take a stand against the actions of political parties in Greece, such as SYRIZA, that are creating a more hostile situation for the refugees. These conditions go against the very premise of the EU and so action needs to be taken. The refugees coming in should not be forced to live in areas that resemble detention centers, so much so that UNCHR and MSF feel the need to leave their posts. The people coming in are people who are fleeing persecution and violence, something that has been happening all throughout history. The refugees need help and support; it is up to the European countries to provide them with the capability to start a new life, with Greece playing an integral role in this because of its location within Europe. The democratic values of the EU are important here and their actions will illustrate if their values are truly being followed.

CONCLUSION

When I was studying abroad in Greece, I volunteered with refugees to provide them with clothing and food. Further research for my thesis has illustrated that the refugees require much more. Facilities originally provided for their benefit have become similar to detention camps, and international organizations such as the UNHCR and MSF have withdrawn their help. Refugees need to be encouraged and motivated so that they can see a future for their lives. The refugee camps, or detention centers, should not be the end all for them. The EU-Turkey deal has caused mass deportations and the camps within Greece have stopped allowing movement of the refugees. The violence and persecution they fled from has brought them to lives of hardship and struggles which they do not feel they can escape from. Many have attempted to take their own lives, as they do not find this restricted life worth living.

Greece is facing backlash from the European Union and countries that border them. Greece's current economic situation has already put the country under fire, and the refugee crisis has deepened the hole they are in. According to the Schengen Agreement, "Schengen Area... signifies a zone where 26 different European nations acknowledged the abolishment of their internal borders with other member nations and outside, for the free and unrestricted movement of people, goods, services, and capital..."²¹⁰ Greece's location makes it easy for refugees to come in. This is because as it is in the Schengen zone, Greece acts as the external border for Europe, and more importantly the EU. When migrants come in through Greece, they gain access

²¹⁰ Schengen visa info: Schengen area countries list. 2016 [cited 06/02 2016]. Available from <http://www.schengenvisainfo.com/schengen-visa-countries-list/> (accessed June 2, 2016).

to easily travel into other European Union countries. This is what most individuals coming in want.

The refugee camps are not meant to be permanent solutions. According to the Boston Review, “Refugee camps are designed for the short term: to meet an emergency need and then disappear.”²¹¹ The problem is that refugees, especially with conflicts occurring today, will not be able to return to their countries of origin any time soon. These camps have essentially allowed lawmakers to dump these individuals at one location and not have to worry about making decisions or policy changes.²¹²

There needs to be a better way to deal with the contemporary refugee crisis, specifically the movement of so many people. While there is no easy solution, the situation needs to be dealt with in a way that allows there to be better treatment for refugees. Many have offered up various solutions. Guy Verhofstadt recommends that there needs to be the creation of a coherent asylum policy by the European Union. He feels the first step would be securing the border between Greece and Turkey. This would allow the officers who are stationed to decide who is able to travel into Europe and who must travel back to his/her home country.²¹³ Verhofstadt’s proposal is problematic. By creating legal hurdles, the EU is increasing the criminalization that will occur. After the Schengen agreement, internal borders were dissolved but external ones were made stronger. It became very difficult for people to enter Europe legally and so they did so in dangerous ways. Through the creation of more obstacles, the EU will be increasing the likelihood of more migrants attempting to enter Europe through unsafe ways.

²¹¹ Dunn, Elizabeth. 2015. The Failure of Refugee Camps. Boston Review, September 28, 2015, 2.

²¹² Ibid., 1.

²¹³ How to solve Europe’s migration crisis. 2016. Politico, February 8, 2016.

This can be seen through the new routes being attempted through Libya. Since the EU-Turkey deal, many are trying to make the trip into Europe through an alternative route through Libya. According to the UNHCR, “Libya already has at least 100,000 migrants, who are packed into towns and cities along its western coast.”²¹⁴ It was even reported that thousands of refugees are being detained in Libya and are facing torture. A year ago, some migrants did not even make it to Libya as over 700 migrants drowned when their boat sank.²¹⁵ Migrants are going through even more dangerous means to enter Europe; the EU needs to take this into account and broaden the legal possibilities so that it can truly uphold its own statement of attempting to decrease the number of lives lost. Border control cannot act as the solution.

György Schöpflin of the Hungarian Fidesz party argues that the solution lies in member countries of the European Union returning economic migrants (those who left for economic reasons) to their countries of origin.²¹⁶ This would free up space in a number of countries for refugees, who do not have the option of returning to their home countries. Schöpflin asserts that a “distinction between genuine asylum-seekers and economic migrants” needs to be further developed.²¹⁷ This attempt at a solution is very extreme, going back to the above mentioned issue. Those who want to enter Europe will still do so, through dangerous means. They will be risking their lives be criminalized by the system in place.

Right now the burden has been put on Greece. Since Greece is acting as the entry way into Europe, it is expected to halt this movement. While this is not realistic, what can be done is

²¹⁴ Stephan, Chris. 2016. Libya faces influx of migrants seeking new routes to Europe. The Guardian, April 9, 2016.

²¹⁵ Ibid.

²¹⁶ Ibid.

²¹⁷ “How to solve Europe’s migration crisis.”

allocating the refugees in a more strategic way. The EU needs to step in to create a common asylum policy that is followed by all member countries. Cooperation for this policy should be rewarded, and those who do not cooperate should be penalized; one example of penalization could be putting their EU membership in question. This could also be used to incentivize non-member countries. The countries that are members should be evaluated and screened; based on their economic condition, population, and ability to support, countries should be placed on a scale. Then, the number of refugees sent to a country would depend on their number on the scale. The refugee's ability to assimilate in a given country's culture should also be taken into consideration.

The second step in my proposal would be taking the money we are spending and using it in a more productive manner, to empower the refugees by giving them more control over their current situation. By offering refugees health care and education for example, they could view this difficult time as a growing opportunity as opposed to being forced to think about the horrid conditions in which they are stuck in.

The key in these steps lie within increasing the legal means. Migrants cannot easily be differentiated between refugees, and those coming from economic reasons. Also, securing borders cannot act as a solution as people will always try to find other ways to enter Europe. We must create a safer method so that less lives are risked when individuals are trying to simply start a better life for themselves and their families. While the countries the individuals are fleeing from may not be ready for the migrants to return any time soon, we also need to look at achieving a peace for some type of possible long term stability. The six point peace proposal SYRIZA released contains actions such as ending the war in Syria and controlling the exports of

arms. While we currently attempt to help the refugees, it is up to the European Union to implement long term action.

While these ideas are not overnight solutions, and may take time to implement, they need to be seriously considered. This crisis has many people displaced and needing help, something that needs to happen solely based on morals, democratic values, and expected human rights. Xenophilic and xenophobic feelings have no place in this discussion. Stories like the following, as stated in *The Guardian*, should not be recurring.

An Afghan father with a baby in his arms asks for somewhere to sleep. He offers to pay three times the price in a hotel, even just for his wife and baby. When it's explained there is nowhere left and no blankets, he says: "Touch me, am I not human too?"²¹⁸

This crisis is bigger than Greece and it is bigger than European Union can handle alone. We cannot tackle this crisis on the basis of arguing that migrants will or will not contribute to society. Help is needed and that is where the reasoning should end. The conversation should continue on how rather than why. The contemporary refugee crisis is an issue the world needs to tackle together if a solution will ever be in the foreseeable future.

²¹⁸ Duley, Giles. 2015. "The noise and chase is deafening; humanity is laid bare on the shores of Europe". *The Guardian*, November 7, 2015.