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Abstract
This article seeks to examine how terrorism, migration crisis and geopolitics have played a role to undermine the philosophy of borderless Europe and the future of the Schengen reality. A positivist paradigm to social science research is adopted to explain the causal factors that threaten the Schengen reality. The migrant crisis and terrorism have threatened the foundation of European Union (EU) and Schengen cohesion, social and cultural fabric as a supranational organization. The paper posits that the actions of Russia as a regional power in the current migratory crisis that menace to destroy the EU’s relevance in international affairs is realpolitik. Russia, an ally of the Syrian regime, incessantly bombard rebel held territories leaving on its wake mass exodus of citizens of these areas to populate Europe. The main question of the research is, given the challenges in the wake of the migratory crisis and the attacks in Paris, the aborted attack in Thalys, and Brussels, is there any future for Schengen? The position of the article is that the EU is at the risk of disintegration if its leadership poorly manages the refugee crisis.
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Introduction: Migration has taken center stage in international politics in recent years, yet the phenomenon of the movement (domestically and internationally) of people from one geographical location to the other is as old as history itself. Harziq and Hoerder (2009) posit that the history of humanity is the history of migration. They argue that *Homo sapiens* migrated first across Africa, from 60,000 BCE across the world’s tropical zones, and from 40,000 to 15,000 BCE into colder Eurasian and American zones, diversifying into ever more linguistic-cultural groups in the process. People on the move naturally respond to compelling pull and push factors. Many observers believe that the contemporary notion of migration has been birthed on the economic inequality between the global North and South divide. This development imbalance between the two hemispheres has been the driver of international economic migration on the one hand and civil wars, conflicts, natural disasters, etc. on the other hand, making them intrinsically intertwined. Black, Natali, and Skinner (2005) support the economic factor of migration when they observed that international
migration is a powerful symbol of global inequality, whether in terms of wages, labor market opportunities, or lifestyles. Millions of workers and their families move each year across borders and across continents, seeking to reduce what they see as the gap between their own position and that of people in other, wealthier, places.²

The current migratory crisis that beset Europe is perhaps one of the single most turbulent humanitarian crisis to have hit the continent after the two bloodletting wars that opened the twentieth century. The harrowing effect of the bedevilment in Europe today stems from different factors including wars, migration, conflicts, terrorism, economic and cultural reasons, among others mainly from countries in the Middle East and Africa. Europe seems be the preferred destination for refugees in past and present war-torn areas because of the continent’s propinquity to these areas and its promising economic buoyancy. According to Hudson (2015), by the end of September 2015, 8,000 refugees and migrants, most of them Syrian, were arriving in Europe every day. By November, even with the onset of winter, that number had risen to an average of 8,700, with as many as 10,000 arriving on Greek shores on one October day.³ She rightly terms this human flight as the “Great Syrian Migration” or the “Syrian Exodus” given its epic and tragic nature. These numbers have seen a tremendous increase and a meteoric rise as the civil war continues to ravage Syria. The war has displaced millions of Syrians leaving them with no option but to seek safety elsewhere by any possible means whether safe or perilous. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) estimates that since the beginning of 2016, about 80,000 refugees have arrived in Europe in the first six weeks.⁴ Other refugees from Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Somalia, Nigeria, arriving from other volatile countries, exacerbate the Syrian migration crisis. These alarming numbers send shivers down the spine of many European countries, thereby creating anti-migrants’ sentiments among some European populace.

A Brief Background of Borderless Europe: On 17 June 1984, France and Germany, in the margin of the European Council in Fontainebleau, agreed to define new ways of giving impetus to the process of European integration. At the same time, the Benelux countries (Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands) launched a similar reflection process. They joined France and Germany to define the conditions needed to ensure real freedom of movement for their citizens. Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, France and the Federal Republic of Germany signed the agreement on the gradual abolition of checks at

³ Leila Hudson. “Liquidating Syria, Fracking Europe”. Middle East Council 22, no. 4. 2016.
their common borders on June 14, 1985 at border of town of Schengen, Luxembourg. This led to the Schengen Agreement. The thirty-three Article original document called The Schengen Acquis is divided into measures applicable in the short term and long term. The short-term goals were meant to eliminate the barriers for the take-off Schengen as described in the article.

As soon as this agreement enters into force and until all checks are abolished completely, the formalities for nationals of the Member States of the European Communities at the common borders between the States of the Benelux Economic Union, the Federal Republic of Germany and the French Republic shall be carried out in accordance with the conditions laid down. Though member countries were poised for integration, they wanted it progressively.

The long-term goals were to harmonize and iron out technicalities pertaining to the different border control systems. With regard to the movement of persons, the Parties (original signatory members) shall endeavor to abolish checks at common borders and transfer them to their external borders. To that end, they shall endeavor first to harmonize, where necessary, the laws, regulations and administrative provisions concerning the prohibitions and restrictions on which the checks are based and to take complementary measures to safeguard internal security and prevent illegal immigration by nationals of States that are not members of the European Communities.

The two fundamental agreements, which originally shaped the Schengen Area, are the Schengen Agreement of 1985 on the gradual abolition of checks at common borders (Schengen I) and the 1990 Convention, which supplements the Schengen Agreement of 14 June 1985 and lays down the arrangements and safeguards for implementing freedom of movement. It entered into force in 1995. The Schengen Area just like the EU has seen a dramatic increase in membership since its inception. The 26 countries out of the 28 members of the EU have abolished their passports and border control systems. The current candidate members of the Schengen are Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Turkey, and Romania but the enlargement to accept new members is in limbo considering the multi-facetted problems that have engulfed the region.

The European Union’s response to the Migration Crisis: The Europe Union is sharply divided on the admission of Syrian refugees. These reasons are many and varied with national security being the main factor. The UK is one of the countries regarded as adopting anti-migrant policies to dissuade the [Syrian] refugees. Charlotte Alfred of The Huffington Post reports of the deplorable nature of the Jungle Migrant Camp in Calais in northern France and UK’s refusal to accept them as "They wonder why they’re able to get this far -- crossing all of Europe -- and not be able to make the final step," he (a migrant) said. "They
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get so far and they’re still so far away in the end" (*The Huffington Post*, 2015).\(^7\) The camp houses refugees from different nationalities including Syrians, Iraqis, Afghans, Eritreans, and Sudanese, among others and their aim is to reach the shores of Britain, where many have relatives, or speak the language, or simply dream of a life of dignity and safety. This article underscores the gravitation of some migrants towards former colonial country because of linguistic heritage as noted by Harzig and Hoeder. Most post-colonial migrants decided to move to the wealthier former colonizer countries with which, after generations of rule, they shared language and structural practices, (Harzig & Hoeder, 2012: 47-48). The United Kingdom’s stance on the migrant policy is a microcosm of the macrocosm of the EU’s response to the different types of migrants particularly the Syrian refugees. This is how Amnesty International succinctly puts it: Every year thousands of migrants and refugees try to reach Europe. Some are driven by the need to escape grinding poverty; others are seeking refuge from violence and persecution. Their journey is fraught with danger. At least 23,000 people are estimated to have lost their lives trying to reach Europe since 2000. And those who make it to the borders of the EU find that safety remains beyond their grasp. Individual member states themselves are taking drastic measures to stop irregular arrivals. Migrants and refugees are being expelled unlawfully from Bulgaria, Greece and Spain, without access to asylum procedures and often in ways that put them at grave risk, (2014).\(^8\)

The EU’s reaction to the deplorable Syrian refugee crisis as an entity and most individual member countries is incongruent with international law in which most countries are signatories and leading figures in human rights campaigns. The Syrian refugees’ plight will the test human right record of the EU as a bastion of freedom. There is difficulty in determining whether their actions and reactions constitute a *refoulement* in international law because of the fact that the status of these asylum seekers have not yet been ascertain as refugees or otherwise.

It is refreshing to learn that France has taken the opposite direction of Britain in extending support the Syrian refugees. *The Washington Post* (2015) reports of the Francois Hollande’s declaration that his country would accept 30,000 Syrian refugees over next two years.\(^9\) This assistance offered by France shows its commitment to international law and its continued role in global affairs.
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In the same vein, Sweden and Germany have shown great solidarity and protection to the Syrian refugees at the government level. The movement of these refugees to these countries, however, contradicts the assertion by Harzig and Hoeder that migrants’ movement is largely determined by colonial heritage. We believe that deterrent factor for migrants especially in contemporary histories is the receiving country’s readiness to accept them. Any historical affiliation is secondary. Nicole Ostrand, in the *Journal on Migration and Human Security*, compares the responses of the Germany, Sweden, United States and the United Kingdom to the Syrian refugee crisis. By the end of 2014, Germany had provided protection to the largest number of Syrians (approximately 67,000) out of the four countries, leading in both resettlement places and individuals granted asylum. Sweden came in second (approximately 34,500 Syrians), due largely to the high number of Syrians given asylum (Ostrand, 2013).

We observe that migrants emigrate to friendlier countries rather than wealthy or colonial connections. Safety and reception constitute their road map as against other motivating factors in their new adventures.

The open door policy of the Scandinavian country, Sweden, raised hope and optimism for many migrants not only those of Syrians. It is, however sad to learn that Sweden is turning her back to these refugees in recent times. *The Guardian* (2015) reports that Sweden is introducing border checks for the first time since the start of the refugee crisis, hours after its prime minister asked European counterparts at a high-level migration conference in Malta to do more to help his country and Germany care for refugees arriving on the continent. The Atlantic (2015) corroborates this report when it said the fragmented European response to the migrant crisis splintered further Thursday when Sweden announced it would impose temporary border controls, a move that goes against European Union’s open-border policy.

Similarly, Fantziou et al (2014) decried the lame duck attitude towards migrant crisis in Europe. This is problematic: refugees living in cities are quickly running out of money, the cost of this wave of migration is adding up, and international support is very limited. More worryingly still, many Council of Europe members, including several EU member states, have provided extremely inadequate protection to those affected. The writers argue that
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the European Union including the Council of Europe members should take it upon themselves to solve the refugee problem adding that the refugees should be seen as economic benefit to member states instead of the refugees being regarded as a burden. They also maintain that refusal of these helpless refugees will discredit their human rights reputation.

Amnesty International notes that ‘the demands being placed on third countries to prevent irregular departures to Europe put refugees, asylum-seekers and migrants in those countries at risk of prolonged and arbitrary detention, refoulement, and ill-treatment’ (cited in Cogolati et al, 2015). The observation by Amnesty International is also echoed by Harziq and Hoerder (2012), when they maintained that: “In the second half of the twentieth century, decolonization and the continuing imposition of global terms of trade on the decolonized southern hemisphere by the former colonizer or indirect rulers of the “North” shifted refugee and labour migrations to the “South.” They observe that the West had sent out armed migrants to these later colonized territories but are now adamant to help the desperately poor and unarmed refugees in dire need of protection.

The current upsurge of the European Union’s refugee crisis is as a result of varied migration-induced factors which include: economic, socio-cultural, war, conflict, among others which are intrinsically interwoven. The most pronounced of the actual European case is hemispheric factor which is the North-South economic imbalance. After colonization, the West continued to “recolonize” the “Third World” countries through unfair terms of trade. European Union members must show leadership role as human rights advocates in resolving the refugee exodus.

**Terrorism and the Migration Crisis:** The rise in global terrorism is one of the major reasons that refugees are facing stiffer rejection in Europe and the West in general. Even though the recent terrorist attacks in most European countries have no clear direct connection with the refugee upsurge, many European islamophobias believe that these hapless refugees are capable of carrying out these nefarious attacks. The assertion that there is a disconnect between the current wave of terrorism in Europe and Europe bound refugees is aptly noted by Hudson (2015) when she said: “As the aftermath of the November 13 Paris massacres showed, refugees do not seem to be a vector for terrorism, which is more easily incubated domestically and through communications networks. They are girls, boys, men and women, and every one of them has a full complement of ordinary hopes, fears and dreams.”

Even though at least two of the killers involved in the Paris attacks infiltrated the crowds of migrants arriving daily on the Greek islands near Turkey, the EU Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker maintains that many asylum-seekers are
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themselves fleeing from the terror inflicted by Islamic State (IS), the Taliban and other extremist groups, (BBC, 2015). Most of the world’s terrorist organizations are associated with the Islamic religion, therefore, Europeans want to control the Islamization of the continent by preventing the influx of these refugees. The fear of Islamization has led to formation of anti-immigrant movements in some European countries and the trickling down effect is that non-Muslim refugees are also put into the cage even though most of these refugees are Muslims and are “harmless”. Under cloak of Islam, all refugees become suspects, tagged, and maltreated. The refusal of these refugees, we believe, is a good news for the ISIS as young male and female refugees who have been denied access to the dreamland continent can be a source of “raw materials” for these terrorist organizations. The ISIS will have a constant supply of labor through outbidding. While some of these desperate refugees will join the terrorist groups for survival, others will join as a form of protest and revenge against Christianism and any ideology associated with the West.

The threat of disintegration and the role of Russia: Jastram and Achiron believe that while the international community has generally responded swiftly and generously to refugee crises over the past half century, in recent years, some worrying trends have begun to emerge. Countries that once generously opened their doors to refugees have been tempted to shut those doors for fear of assuming open-ended responsibilities, of abetting uncontrolled migration and people smuggling, or of jeopardizing national security. This is true especially of the current migratory pressure Europe is facing. The influx of migrants and refugees has brought Europe to its knees and shaken the social foundation of the Schengen reality. The protracted Syrian civil war and other hotspots in the Middle East as well as some troubled parts of Africa are the stoking fires, serving as a great threat for the future of Schengen. According to the International Organization for Migration, a total number of 146,652 migrants and refugees are reported to have arrived to Europe by sea routes since January 1, 2016. In addition, 1,718 have arrived by land routes, amounting to 148,370 arrivals. Tragically, 444 migrants are known to have drowned or are missing. In comparison, in 2015, 1,046,599 migrants, including asylum seekers were reported to have arrived to Europe by land and sea routes. This is the most serious migratory and refugee crisis to hit Europe in the 21st century with its spillover.

The threat to borderless Europe is further worsen by the increase in global terrorism and extremism on the world stage and Europe in particular. Europe has been the prime targets of both external and homegrown terrorists. The terrorist attacks perpetrated in Paris on 13 November 2015 as well as the failed attack in the Thalys train on 21 August 2015 confirmed the seriousness of the terrorist threat faced by the EU. This threat is not limited only to one member state and requires multiple measures to address it in a comprehensive

manner in order to protect the Schengen area. The phenomenon of foreign terrorist fighters remains a major source of concern, especially as EU citizens continue to travel to Syria and Iraq to support terrorist groups.\(^{18}\)

The concept of borderless Europe began in late twentieth century Western Europe. The need for an internal single market, free mobility of citizens, goods, services, and capital (human and material) called for more integration. The economic and political union has increased its membership dramatically after the fall of communism. The Eastern European countries that were mostly communist states deserted the Soviet Empire for capitalism represented by Western Europe. Cold War politics went into hibernation but re-emerged in the 21\(^{\text{st}}\) century. When the “Iron Curtain” was brought down, the United States rejoiced as the only hegemon in global politics and economic relations. Europe, on the other hand, concentrated on the integration of Europeanization efforts without any regard to wounded Russia. Little did Western Europe know that Russia still suffered the defeat and was strategizing politically and economically for the least opportunity to bounce back. The European project which was designed by Robert Schuman in cooperation with Jean Monnet, drew a diverse group of people from resistance fighters to lawyers, the founding fathers held the same ideals: a peaceful, united and prosperous Europe. The main question is whether the architects of the Schengen in the early 1980s and the EU in general considered factors such as Russia’s geopolitics, terrorism and international migration that have the potential of derailing what they called the European project.

The EU is faced with both internal and external pressures pushing for its disintegration. There are increasing numbers and support for Far Right Wing parties today than ever in its history. Jeffrey Marcus of the New York Times observes that the bloc’s [EU] unity is being challenged from the outside by an increasingly aggressive Russia and from inside its own ranks by a restless Britain.\(^{19}\) The Brexit support is given impetus following the recent terrorists’ attacks in the European capitals. Those pressures have aggravated long-term fissures in the Continent; if left unresolved, they could irrevocably splinter Europe’s future. Stack and Zraick (2015) contend that since the fall of the Soviet Union, Russia’s international military operations have focused almost exclusively on its neighbors, former Soviet republics. One pattern is clear: interventions that inflame conflict and create permanently tense and unstable “frozen zones,” allow Russia to exert influence and confound its opponents and, often, its rivals in the West\(^{20}\). Russia is exerting its weight in


these former communist countries to safeguard its interests and ethnic Russians. The annexation of Crimea in 2014 at the displeasure of the West exemplified Russia as a geopolitical player in the region in the Post-Cold War Era. The economic embargo sanctioned by the EU after the Crimea takeover does not change the aggressive posture of Russia. There is a symbiotic relationship between some EU heavy weights like Germany and Italy that rely on Russia for gas supply, therefore making an effective application of the sanctions difficult. Soros (2016) maintains that the most effective way Putin’s regime can avoid collapse is by causing the EU to collapse sooner. An EU that is coming apart at the seams will not be able to maintain the sanctions it imposed on Russia following its incursion into Ukraine. On the contrary, Putin will be able to gain considerable economic benefits from dividing Europe and exploiting the connections with commercial interests and anti-European parties that he has carefully cultivated. A balkanized Europe will weaken its front and ensure that Russia regains its former communist allies. The latent goal of this Russian strategy is to weaken capitalist Europe through countries that are in propinquity to the theater of the refugee crisis. This is a subtle revenge of former communists’ schism and a grand strategy to court for their bolshevization. The former communists’ states mostly Eastern European countries and Southern Europe are economically incapable of managing the refugees menace alone, hence the spilling over effect on Western Europe. The Russian intention is conspicuous because it intervened to broker peace between the Syrian regime and the rebels and to fight ISIS. The supposed aggression on ISIS intensified when Islamists militants in the Sinai Peninsula shot the Russian A321 airliner in Egypt down last year, killing all 224 passengers on board. The Russian president’s vow to punish the perpetrators is yet to be seen by observers as his bombardment is mainly on rebel held zones. The scheme is to bolster the gains of the Al Assad government in order to overturn the rebels. Archick (2016) notes that many in the EU are also concerned about recent Russian efforts to expand its influence in Europe through the use of Russian television and Internet broadcasting, and its alleged financial support for some European political parties (especially far-right, euroskeptic parties). The Kremlin therefore continues to intervene in conflicts far and near to showcase its relevance in contemporary international politics.

The Russian intervention underway in Syria represents the remote and the immediate causes of the mass influx of migrants and refugees into Europe. Russia is vilified for hiding under the cloak of ISIS to dismantle the Schengen reality. A 2015 survey by Neli Esipova and Julie Ray indicates that Russia poses the biggest threat to European Union member


states in Eastern Europe, while in non-member states residents are more likely to perceive the U.S. as the biggest threat. The following countries: Poland (69%), Estonia (58%), Romania (57%), Lithuania (46%) and Latvia (42%) spontaneously name Russia as the biggest threat. What is significant about the survey is all these countries are members of the EU. According to Rettman, after Russia, “mass migration from other regions” and “foreign terrorist fighters…transiting through Europe” as elements which “jeopardise European security.”

The repercussions of the Syrian Civil War, in the view of General Philip Breedlove, cited in Sandbrook (2016), not only target Europe alone, but also the West in general. He observes that at the heart of the migration crisis is a “resurgent, aggressive Russia” that has “chosen to be an adversary and poses a long-term existential threat to the United States and to our European allies and partners”. Putin’s chosen weapon, according to the General, is the migration crisis itself.

Russia and the Assad regime are deliberately weaponising migration in an attempt to overwhelm European structures and break European resolve. As evidence, General Breedlove pointed to Russia’s indiscriminate use of unguided barrel bombs, which have killed at least 20,000 Syrians since the conflict began. Their purpose is to terrify Syrian civilians and ‘get them on the road’, pushing them north through Turkey and into Europe. The intervention in Syria by Russia is regarded as a realpolitik. Russia has a lot of stakes in Syria, coupled with its interests in repositioning itself as a global superpower and will protect these gains. Russia has a naval installation in Tartus, Syria, which is the last of its foreign military outside of Russia. In addition, Syria imports a lot its military equipment from Russia and this is of economic importance to Russian economy, which cannot afford to cut ties. Geopolitics, therefore, plays an important role in the international system. Russia’s intervention in Syria does not only have an impact in the Middle East but Europe

---


as well and the Schengen Area in particular. The reintroduction of internal borders in the Schengen Area in an indication that it is at the verge of collapse if EU leaders do not act swiftly to contain Russia and provide a lasting solution to the Syrian Civil War.

The Future of Borderless Europe: The Schengen area which currently consists of 26 member countries including 4 non-European Union members is under a serious threat of collapse. The ideals of the cherished union are being defeated with the rise of homegrown terrorism, the Middle East and Africa migration crisis that continue to metastasize Europe. The Schengen area states are uncertain on the future of borderless Europe, as some heavyweights such as Germany, France, Austria, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway have started the reintroduction of internal frontiers with other Schengen states. Frans Timmermans, the first vice president of the European Commission and the former foreign minister of the Netherlands, voiced his deepest fears. “The challenge to the European project today is existential,” he said before the Paris attacks. “The refugee crisis has brought that to light. What was unimaginable before now becomes imaginable, namely the disintegration of the European project.” (VF News, 2016).  

The observation of many experts and actors speaks doom for the continued existence of the ambitious “United States of Europe”. The Schengen disintegration crack is deepening as leading EU proponent Angela Merkel warns member states. She advocates for the redistribution of migrants and refugees from overstretched countries. "If we don't arrive at a fair distribution then the issue of Schengen will arise - we do not want that," (The Local Italian, 2015). This call has been ignored, as some member states are adamant and resolute on their anti-immigrant policy. We are of the view that there is a recall of the Cold War politics (New Cold War) in the European migration crisis. Some analysts believe, that America “hails” the disintegration. A united Europe, with the emergence of Asia and regional powers means a multipolar world threatening the US hegemony. McNamara (2011) believes that the U.S. government must defend America’s sovereignty against EU attempts to reshape the international system and counterbalance U.S. interests. The Obama Administration must not cede authority over America’s security or foreign policies by embracing the EU’s “multilateralisation of multipolarity” approach. It must actively resist treaties that contravene U.S. sovereignty.  

The hegemonic struggle between the US and EU could further give advantage to Russia to re-communize Eastern without regard to the transatlantic alliance- NATO.


Conclusion: In conclusion, homegrown terrorism in European countries and the migration crisis pose a great problem to the stability of the Schengen reality. There are saboteurs within and outside of Europe who are working for the collapse of the union. For Schengen to stay, EU has to adopt a sophisticated asylum policy agreed by all member states and meaningfully engage with the actors in the drama theater of the refugee “producing” countries in Africa and the Middle East.

Effective intelligence sharing by EU member countries will help curb homegrown terrorism. Governments should also, as a long-term measure, roll out de-radicalization programs in elementary schools to instill anti-terrorism values in future generations.

Syrian civil war is the main stoking fire to the migrant crisis. The Syrian exodus en masse will drastically reduce if not completely stopped, when EU engages Russia politically. Russia’s consensus is not only a solution to the migrant crisis but also to ISIS and terrorism plaguing the Schengen states.

Europe and the West should revisit the continued economic colonization that is deepening the Global North-South gap. Better terms of trade will reduce economic migration.
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