



THE CONSEQUENCES OF SCHENGEN’S COLLAPSE: POPULIST SHORTSIGHTEDNESS AND THE FUTURE OF EUROPEAN SECURITY

IED Research Project: “Migration, borders control and solidarity: Schengen at stake?”

Geneviève ZINGG

Research Affiliate, Canadian Network for Research on Terrorism, Security and Society

genevieve.zingg@gmail.com

Abstract: The Syrian refugee crisis has sparked anti-immigrant anxiety across the European Union. Right-wing populist parties have capitalized on widespread fears, utilizing nationalist rhetoric and racial tropes to connect Arab-Islamo immigrants with jihadi terrorism, political extremism, economic degradation and ideas of cultural invasion. Citing security concerns, populist parties have called for the abolishment of open borders in the European Union. This paper examines populist claims linking border control with European security and explores the potential socioeconomic impact of eliminating the Schengen Agreement. Ultimately this paper argues that the populist calls to abolish Schengen are based on false claims and that abolishing Europe’s open borders policy would severely jeopardize the future of European security by exacerbating sociocultural tensions between native Europeans and new immigrants. This paper seeks to examine ‘soft’ approaches to European security grounded in social policy in order to strengthen immigrant integration, offset radicalization processes and safeguard the Schengen Agreement.

“This publication received financial support from the European Parliament. Sole liability rests with the author and the European Parliament is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.”



Table of contents

1. THE SCHENGEN AGREEMENT: A BRIEF BACKGROUND. 2. CURRENT SITUATION IN THE EUROPEAN UNION. The Syrian Refugee Crisis. Blocked Borders: The European Response to the Refugee Crisis. The Role of Greece: Strengthening the EU's External Borders. Schengen Suspended: Status and Future of Internal Borders in the EU. 3. THE RISE OF POPULIST POLITICAL PARTIES ACROSS THE EU: SCAPEGOATING AND THE MILITARIZATION OF IMMIGRATION POLICY. Sociopolitical Impact of Militarized Borders. Public Opinion of the Refugee Crisis and Islamo-Arab Immigrants. The Roots of Islamophobia and Immigration Anxiety. Manufacturing Paranoia: Populist Rhetoric and Political Strategy. Anti-Immigrant Platforms and Populist Success in the EU. 4. SCHENGEN UNDER SIEGE: POPULIST POLITICS AND THE FUTURE OF EUROPEAN SECURITY. Security and the Populist Call to Abolish Open Borders. The Economic Impact of Abolishing the Schengen Agreement. Immigration Policy and the Economics of Public Perception. Open or Closed? The Effect of Borders on European Security. Socioeconomic Drivers of Radicalization and Terrorism. 5. STRENGTHENING SCHENGEN: POLICY PROPOSALS FOR A SECURE EUROPEAN FUTURE. Bibliography

1. THE SCHENGEN AGREEMENT: A BRIEF BACKGROUND

The small town of Schengen in southeastern Luxembourg, close to the tripoint border the country shares with its French and German neighbors, was for a long time notable for little else besides perhaps its wine. In 1985, however, Schengen became a significant name in European history as the birthplace of the continent's freedom of movement principle, hailed as one of the most significant achievements of European integration. In that year, five of the European Economic Community's ten Member States met in Schengen to negotiate the gradual elimination of internal borders and the creation of a common visa policy across the continent.



The Schengen Agreement, signed by Belgium, France, West Germany, Luxembourg and the Netherlands on June 14 and supplemented by the 1990 Schengen Convention, cemented open borders and the freedom of movement as a defining feature of the European Union. The free movement of persons was a core element of the Treaty of Rome and, since coming into effect in 1995, has been a prominent and highly regarded characteristic of the 28-member bloc. The agreement is credited with increasing cross-border trade and foreign investment, bolstering the tourism industry and supporting the regional labour market, and strengthening the European economy as whole, and has ultimately proven itself a key ingredient of European power in the international arena.

The Schengen Area today encompasses twenty-eight European countries and more than 400 million people. While Ireland and the United Kingdom have since Schengen's inception chosen to opt out of the agreement, several non-EU states including Switzerland, Norway, Iceland and Lichtenstein have negotiated separate agreements to join the open border area.

In 1985, negotiators at the table in Schengen recognized the need to include temporary border controls as a circumstantial option of the agreement. The final text included a provision allowing Schengen states to temporarily reintroduce border controls under Article 25 of the *Schengen Borders Code*. The provision allows Member States to reintroduce border controls in exceptional circumstances for no longer than thirty days, namely when a serious threat to the state's "public policy or internal security"¹ exists. Schengen states are required to notify the European Commission, the European Parliament, the other Schengen countries and the public in advance of the border reinstatement.² In Schengen's 30-year history, temporary border controls have been implemented only a handful of times, generally only as a precautionary measure prior to high-profile events like international summits, conferences, and sports games.

However, following the Tunisian revolution in 2010-2011, the Italian government provided six-month temporary residence permits to approximately 25,000 Tunisian migrants

¹ "Schengen Area." European Commission, Migration and Home Affairs: Policies. http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/borders-and-visas/schengen/index_en.htm

² "Schengen Area." European Commission, Migration and Home Affairs: Policies. http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/borders-and-visas/schengen/index_en.htm



who had landed on the island of Lampedusa. The move effectively granted the migrants the legal ability to travel freely within the Schengen Area. In response, both France and Germany threatened to impose border checks³, and in April 2011 France followed through by blocking trains carrying migrants at its border with Italy at Ventimiglia⁴. This action, while officially cited as a response to national security concerns and therefore not in technical violation of Schengen, was nonetheless sharply criticized by European Commissioner for Home Affairs Cecilia Malmström, who said it “severely tested the trust essential to the sustainability of the system.”⁵

The brief suspension of borders during the Tunisian migrant standoff of 2011, sparked by the Arab Spring uprisings in northern Africa, was not to be an isolated incident. Schengen’s relatively nondescript history veered sharply off course when the Syrian refugee crisis began in earnest the following year, and the agreement has garnered increasingly hostile attention as the situation deteriorates.

2. CURRENT SITUATION IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

The Syrian Refugee Crisis

Spurred by civil uprisings in Tunisia, Libya, Egypt and other Arab League countries, protests against Syrian President Bashar al-Assad began in Damascus in March 2011. Assad responded by sending the Syrian Army to crush the uprising and the situation quickly descended into violent armed rebellion waged between several rival groups and factions, producing a full-fledged civil war by June of that year.

The instability allowed the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) to establish itself in Syria’s northern and eastern regions, where it gained control of nine provinces.⁶ The rapid

³ “Germany tells Italy to ‘solve its own problems’ in Tunisian refugee row.” Deutsche Welle. 10 April 2011. <http://www.dw.com/en/germany-tells-italy-to-solve-its-own-problems-in-tunisian-refugee-row/a-14980272>

⁴ “France blocks Italian trains carrying Tunisian migrants.” BBC World News. 17 April 2011. <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-13109631>

⁵ “The Importance of Safeguarding Schengen.” Speech delivered at European Parliament S&D Conference on ‘Upholding Freedom of Movement – An Improved Schengen Governance.’ European Commission: Press Release. 8 February 2012. http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-12-78_en.htm?locale=en

⁶ “State Fragility Around the World: Fractured Justice and Fierce Reprisal.” Gould, Laurie and Matthew Pate. Published by CRC Press, 2016. <https://books.google.ca/books?id=mPUBDAAAQBAJ&pg=PT101&lpg=PT101&dq=ISIS+control+nine+provinces+>



growth of the terrorist organization's presence in the region further complicated the conflict and resulted in international involvement. According to statistics collected by the US Air Forces Central Command and published by *Bloomberg*, Syria has been bombed more than 32,000 times by the U.S. since 2014⁷ and endured hundreds of airstrikes levelled by the remaining members of the international coalition, including France, Canada, and Saudi Arabia. The staggering level of violence has fuelled a mass exodus of people desperately fleeing the country by land and sea.

Nearly 1.1 million Syrian, Iraqi, and Afghan refugees have arrived in the European Union in 2015 alone.⁸ The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) estimates that more than 4,000 people have drowned during the treacherous journey to European shores⁹, while *Medecins Sans Frontieres* says another 50,000 asylum-seekers remain stranded in refugee camps along the Greece-Macedonia border.¹⁰ Another 1.3 million are expected to arrive in Europe between 2016 and 2017.¹¹ Exacerbated by prominent jihadi terror attacks in Paris and Brussels, the scope of the crisis – surpassing any period of mass immigration and forced displacement since World War II – has prompted more than a third of Schengen's Member States to invoke emergency measures and shutter their borders in the name of urgent migration control.¹²

[syria&source=bl&ots=2QrKShNd5U&sig=IXWXCSyEvCGXi-e9dR20iBipxw&hl=en&sa=X&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=ISIS%20control%20nine%20provinces%20syria&f=false](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-12-05/record-bombing-of-islamic-state-targets-tallied-by-u-s-military)

⁷ “Record Bombing of Islamic State Tallied by U.S. Air Force.” *Bloomberg*. 5 December 2015.

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-12-05/record-bombing-of-islamic-state-targets-tallied-by-u-s-military>

⁸ “Over one million sea arrivals reach Europe in 2015.” United Nations Human Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). 30 December 2015. <http://www.unhcr.org/en-us/news/latest/2015/12/5683d0b56/million-sea-arrivals-reach-europe-2015.html>

⁹ “Over one million sea arrivals reach Europe in 2015.” United Nations Human Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). 30 December 2015. <http://www.unhcr.org/en-us/news/latest/2015/12/5683d0b56/million-sea-arrivals-reach-europe-2015.html>

¹⁰ “Greece: 50,000 people stranded in refugee camps and detention centres following EU-Turkey deal.” *Medecins Sans Frontieres/Doctors Without Borders*. 12 May 2016. <http://www.msf.ca/en/article/greece-50-000-people-stranded-in-refugee-camps-and-detention-centres-following-eu-turkey>

¹¹ “The Refugee Surge in Europe: Economic Challenges.” International Monetary Fund Staff Discussion Note. January 2016. <https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/sdn/2016/sdn1602.pdf>

¹² “Full list of Member States’ notifications of the temporary reintroduction of border control at internal borders pursuant to Article 25 et seq. of the Schengen Borders Code.” European Commission: Migration and Home Affairs. Retrieved 25 May 2016. http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/borders-and-visas/schengen/reintroduction-border-control/docs/ms_notifications_-_reintroduction_of_border_control_en.pdf



Blocked Borders: The European Response to the Refugee Crisis

Hungary was the first to close its borders, announcing in June 2015 that it would be constructing a 4-metre high, 175km long razor-wire fence along its southern border with Serbia.¹³ Hungary heavily militarized the fence, fortifying it with mounted police, dogs, soldiers, and helicopters and threatening to arrest anyone crossing illegally.¹⁴ The country made international headlines for using tear gas and water cannons against the several hundred migrants camped out at the newly closed border in September¹⁵, and closed its eastern border with Croatia the following month.

Austria, Croatia, and Slovenia followed suit in September 2015. Between September and October Austria closed its borders on all fronts, building a fence along its Slovenian border and deploying the Austrian army to patrol its border with Hungary. Croatia experienced increased migrant flows as a result of the Hungarian border closure, and reversed its earlier decision not to erect fences along its borders, closing its borders with Serbia in September 2015. Slovenia, with a population of only 2 million, first established border controls on its Hungarian border in September and subsequently built a razor-wire fence on its border with Croatia in December 2015. Slovenia also deployed its army to its Hungarian border and authorized it to use force when necessary.¹⁶

Germany, the most sought-after final destination for refugees, also introduced temporary border controls in early September 2015. The German Interior Minister announced that the border controls focus on the German-Austrian land border and incorporate a temporary suspension of rail travel from Austria in addition to spot checks on all automobiles entering the country.¹⁷ Other EU Member States, unhappy at having previously been publicly scolded by German Chancellor Angela Merkel for closing their borders, criticized Germany's reversal on

¹³ "Hungary to erect 175-km-long fence along border with Serbia." *The Budapest Beacon*. 17 June 2015. <http://budapestbeacon.com/politics/hungary-to-erect-175-km-long-fence-along-border-with-serbia/24389>

¹⁴ "Hungary scrambles to confront migrant influx, Merkel heckled." *Reuters*. 26 August 2015. <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-europe-migrants-hungary-idUSKCN0QV0L720150826>

¹⁵ "Hungary fires tear gas, water cannons at refugees." *Al Jazeera*. 16 September 2015. <http://www.aljazeera.com/news/2015/09/hungary-tear-gas-water-cannon-refugees-150916140918312.html>

¹⁶ "Slovenia deploys army to Schengen zone border to tackle refugee influx." *Deutsche Welle*. 23 February 2016. <http://www.dw.com/en/slovenia-deploys-army-to-schengen-zone-border-to-tackle-refugee-influx/a-19066844>

¹⁷ "Germany extends border checks to halt refugees." *The Local*. 13 October 2015. <http://www.thelocal.de/20151013/ministry-extends-border-controls-to-curb-refugee-flow>



the issue. Merkel defended her decision, arguing that the borders were being erected in accordance with Schengen provisions and that they were not an attempt to expel or refuse migrants but instead a mechanism to help regulate and support an orderly flow of migration into the country.¹⁸

The situation in Europe was drastically worsened by the terrorist attacks carried out in Paris in November 2015. Immediately after the attacks, France fortified all internal land borders and air borders and declared a state of emergency¹⁹, which was subsequently extended into mid-2016. Sweden also responded to the Paris attacks by swiftly introducing border controls, passing a temporary law the following month that required transport companies to verify passenger identification before border crossing²⁰, which led to a significant reduction in the number of migrants arriving in the country. The closure of Sweden's borders prompted Denmark to close its border with Germany in fear of an accumulation of migrants in Copenhagen.²¹

The Role of Greece: Strengthening the EU's External Borders

Comprising the southernmost points of the European Union, the refugee crisis has placed a particularly enormous strain on Greece and Italy. Historically a significant point of entry for Middle Eastern and North African refugees, Italy has experienced a 296% increase of arrivals as compared to 2013, with approximately 170,100 migrants arriving by sea in 2014.²² Greece, however, has borne in the inarguable brunt of the crisis due to its proximity to Turkey, receiving a 750% increase of asylum seekers arriving on its shores in 2015 as it did in 2014.²³

¹⁸ "Merkel defends return to stricter immigration rules." *Deutsche Welle*. 13 November 2015.

<http://www.dw.com/en/merkel-defends-return-to-stricter-immigration-rules/a-18848881>

¹⁹ "Paris Attacks Prompt State of Emergency in France." *The Wall Street Journal*. 13 November 2015.

<http://www.wsj.com/articles/france-declares-national-state-of-emergency-after-paris-attacks-1447457010>

²⁰ "Sweden slams shut its open-door policy towards refugees." *The Guardian*. 24 November 2015.

<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/nov/24/sweden-asylum-seekers-refugees-policy-reversal>

²¹ "Danes, Swedes impose new border checks in fresh blow to open-frontier Europe." *Reuters*. 4 January 2016.

<http://www.reuters.com/article/us-europe-migrants-denmark-sweden-idUSKBN0UI17D20160104>

²² "Between allure of better life and death at Mediterranean sea." *The Guardian*. 22 May 2015.

<http://guardian.ng/features/between-allure-of-better-life-and-death-at-mediterranean-sea/>

²³ "Migrants fight on Greek island of Kos." *CBC News*. 11 August 2015. <http://www.cbc.ca/news/world/migrants-fight-on-greek-island-of-kos-1.3186622>



Responsible for protecting the bloc's external border in the south, Greece is the focal point of Schengen's future. Though the country has been forthright about its strained capacities and several times unsuccessfully appealed to Brussels for operational and financial assistance, in early 2016 the European Commission nonetheless accused Greece of neglecting its obligations to sufficiently fortify the EU's external borders. Specifically, the Commission found that Greece had failed to properly identify, register and fingerprint all arrivals, and check travel documents for authenticity and against security databases.²⁴ On 12 February 2016, the EU gave Greece a three-month deadline to fix its border controls.²⁵ If Greece fails to strengthen its border controls, EU Member States will be authorized to extend border controls for up to two years instead of the six months normally provisioned under the Schengen Agreement. Greece's strained resources were further exacerbated by Macedonia's decision to close its border with the country on 9 March 2016, leaving nearly 20,000 migrants stranded at the border town of Idomeni.

Schengen Suspended: Status and Future of Internal Borders in the EU

In May 2016, the European Commission reaffirmed that continental border controls are justified until Greece has properly secured the external border.²⁶ The Commission recommended a six-month extension of the border checks currently in place in Austria, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. On 12 May, the European Council officially adopted an implementing decision that allows for extended border controls along the Austrian-Hungarian and Austrian-Slovenian land borders; the German-Austrian land border; the Danish-German land border and Danish ports with ferry connections to Germany; the Swedish harbors and the Öresund bridge; and the Norwegian ports with ferry connections to Denmark, Germany and Sweden.²⁷

²⁴ "European Union blasts Greece over migrant crisis." *EU Business*. 28 January 2016.

<http://www.eubusiness.com/news-eu/europe-migrants.1618/>

²⁵ "Schengen zone: EU gives Greece deadline on borders." *BBC News*. 12 February 2016.

<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-35559159>

²⁶ "Germany to Extend Passport Controls until EU Border Checks Effective." *The Wall Street Journal*. 10 May 2016. <http://www.wsj.com/articles/germany-to-extend-passport-controls-until-eu-border-checks-effective-1462892559>

²⁷ "Council adopts recommendation for continuation of internal border controls." *European Council*. 12 May 2016. <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2016/05/12-internal-border-controls/>



The Commission's decision on internal border closures has received a mixed response. In a press release from a plenary session of the European Parliament on May 11, 2016, the internal division towards border closures was plain. Many Members of European Parliament (MEPs) warned of the costs of border controls, which particularly affect transport and tourism sectors. Others questioned the necessity and proportionately of such checks and demanded that borders be reopened as soon as possible. Commissioner Dimitris Avramopoulos maintained that current border controls are considered 'limited, exceptional and temporary' and assured MEPs that the aim is to lift them shortly.²⁸ Further, border closures and especially the decision of several Member States to militarize their borders have been publicly criticized as 'inhumane' by the UN's refugee agency and other prominent human rights organizations.²⁹

Despite the Commission's assurances that internal borders in the EU are a temporary measure, the precarious state of both the refugee crisis itself and the backlash to refugee relocation plans makes it difficult to determine precisely when the border controls will be lifted. For instance, the situation is complicated by the refusal of the Visegrád Group, comprised of Hungary, Poland, Slovakia and the Czech Republic, to accept any compulsory long-term quota on the redistribution of immigrants.³⁰ Slovakia in fact filed a lawsuit against the EU's refugee relocation plan at the European Court of Justice in December 2015, objecting to the German and French-backed plan to relocate refugees across 26 of the 28 countries in the bloc. Hungary did the same a day later. With the EU's unpopular plan to outsource the crisis to Turkey looking increasingly like a failure, the future of border controls in the European Union is enormously unclear.

²⁸ "Secure EU external borders to help save Schengen passport-free area, urge MEPs." European Parliament Newsroom. 11 May 2016. <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/news-room/20160504IPR25746/Secure-EU-external-borders-to-help-save-Schengen-passport-free-area-urge-MEPs>

²⁹ "European border closures 'inhumane' – UN refugee agency." *Reuters*. 23 May 2016. <http://in.reuters.com/article/humanitarian-summit-europe-idINKCN0YE23N>

³⁰ "Refugee quotas 'unacceptable' for Visegrad states." *EU Observer*. 4 Septmeber 2015. <https://euobserver.com/migration/130122>

3. THE RISE OF POPULIST POLITICAL PARTIES ACROSS THE EU: SCAPEGOATING AND THE MILITARIZATION OF IMMIGRATION POLICY

Sociopolitical Impact of Militarized Borders

Cloaked as a necessary and practical means of crisis management, border closures are more genuinely a manifestation of growing anti-immigrant hostilities across the continent. Newly established border controls are, for the most part, not designed to foster efficient refugee registration or cordially regulate incoming flows. Instead, newly built borders feature razor-wire fences and concrete walls patrolled by armies and police, most of whom are authorized to fire tear gas and rubber bullets at any migrant who attempts to pass.

The militarization of borders as an effort to protect against cultural invasion is an unfortunately common phenomenon in European history. While immigration more generally has long topped the list of European concerns, Arab-Islamo immigration in particular has faced a well-documented history of mistrust and paranoia. However, since 9/11 European borders have grown not only increasingly militarized but progressively more invasive and targeted towards Muslims. As Vollmer and von Boemcken (2014) note: “For immigrants, the border potentially looms everywhere – it starts with a visa application...then extends to controls during the journey through transit countries beyond the actual border crossing, all the way to raids, internments, the requirement to carry IDs, and deportations in the country of arrival.”³¹ Characterized by violence and surveillance, border militarization has the effect of criminalizing immigrants, associating them with a sense of suspicion and distrust that in turn permeates national sentiment and informs treatment of immigrants at the local level.

While the militarization of borders and extension of the border control regime is not outside the historical norm, especially considering the scope of the influx, it is unique in its impact on the political landscape of the contemporary European Union. The crisis has created a complex relationship between far right political parties and popular opinion. Buoyed by an increasingly anxious citizenry, far-right nationalist parties have seized the opportunity to

³¹ Vollmer, Ruth and Marc von Boemcken. “Europe Off Limits: Militarization of the EU’s External Borders.” In *Friedensgutachten 2014*. Münster, pp. 126-139.
http://www.friedensgutachten.de/tl_files/friedensgutachten/pdf_eng/fga2014en/Beitrag%201.7.pdf

capitalize on the refugee crisis. A quantifiable surge in the political power of far-right parties across the continent is attributed to strongly anti-immigrant platforms, with party leaders in turn inflaming and validating public panic through racialized rhetoric and domestic policy proposals.

These parties have come to be called ‘populist parties.’ Populism is defined as an ideology based on the power of the public opinion and political power of *the people*, characterized by a ‘pure’ or central community predominantly *opposed to* or *antagonistic towards* ‘others’, among them ‘elites’.³² In this case, the populist core of the people has shifted its gaze not towards the ruling elites – though this can be reflected in growing resentment towards EU leaders like Chancellor Angela Merkel – but is focused instead on Islamo-Arab immigrants as the dangerous *other*.

Public Opinion of the Refugee Crisis and Islamo-Arab Immigrants

Given the scale and scope of the crisis, public panic over the influx of migrants is to some extent organic. However, in the wake of Islamic jihadist terrorism and the prominence of the Islamic State in the public’s collective conscience, fear surrounding Islamo-Arab migrants has been corralled and exploited by far-right populist parties. The uprising of populist parties across the EU is largely rooted in the widespread deployment of fear mongering and sensationalist rhetoric darkening public sentiment towards Islamo-Arab migrants and leading to widespread distrust. Populist political parties across the EU have successfully manipulated public anxiety towards the archetypal scapegoat: the immigrant.

Rising public anxiety over the influx of refugees has been quantified by several public opinion polls. In Germany, for instance, a survey by public broadcaster ZDF found that 60 percent of respondents believe Germany cannot cope with the 1.1 million refugees that have arrived in the country in 2015.³³ This was a spike from 46 percent of people surveyed in December, in part fuelled by the New Years Eve sexual assaults in Cologne. The poll of 1203 people also found that 56% are dissatisfied with the country’s refugee policy, up from 49% in

³² Van Ostaijen and Peter Scholten, “*Policy populism? Political populism and migrant integration policies in Rotterdam and Amsterdam.*” *Comparative European Politics*, Vol. 12 Issue 6, November 2014.
<http://link.springer.com/article/10.1057%2Fcep.2014.26>

³³ “Polls show most Germans fear refugee burden too great.” *The Local*. 15 January 2016.
<http://www.thelocal.de/20160115/poll-shows-most-germans-fear-refugee-burden-too-great>



December, and 7 in 10 people surveyed said that they fear the influx will lead to more crime, compared to 62 percent in October.³⁴

In France, anti-refugee sentiment is based on distrust: one survey found that the people question the “genuine-ness of asylum seekers, believing them to be economically motivated and associated with deviance and illegality.”³⁵ Similarly, in the UK refugees are increasingly viewed through a lens of suspicion, with 67% of respondents saying that they believe less than a quarter of asylum seekers in Britain are genuinely fleeing persecution.³⁶ The same survey indicated that 3 in 5 (61%) British adults said accepting refugees from countries such as Syria and Libya puts Britain’s security at risk.³⁷ Further, more than half of the respondents said they feel that asylum seekers are given preferential treatment to the average white Briton, and 56% said the British economy cannot afford to accept any more refugees. Advocates of the campaign for the UK to leave the EU, commonly referred to as *Brexit*, have capitalized on these perceptions of refugees, arguing that the refugee crisis poses a threat to the security and economy of the UK and are chief reasons to exit the EU.

Public opinion is marked by a particular vitriol towards Muslim migrants. Switzerland has seen a rise in anti-Islam sentiment in response to the migration crisis, reflected by both public opinion polls and a distinctly rightward shift in its local and national laws. As far back as 2009, a Swiss referendum banned the construction of mosque minarets with a vote of 57.5%, while in 2013 a referendum in the Italian canton of Ticino resulted in a ban on burqas and other clothing traditional to Muslim women.³⁸ More recently, one Swiss canton imposed a fine of up to \$5,000 for any student who refuses to shake hands with their teachers, the standard morning and afternoon greeting in schools across the country. The move was sparked by the refusal of two Syrian boys to shake hands with their female teacher on the basis of their Islamic religious beliefs. The controversy reflects widespread anti-Islam feelings in Switzerland, where Muslims comprise only 5% of the country’s roughly 8-million person population.

³⁴ “Poll: Germans increasingly skeptical of refugees.” *Deutsche Welle*. January 1 2016 <http://www.dw.com/en/poll-germans-increasingly-skeptical-of-refugees/a-18982943>

³⁵ Factsheet, Information Centre about Asylum and Refugees. http://icar.livingrefugeearchive.org/fs_attitudes.pdf

³⁶ Factsheet, Information Centre about Asylum and Refugees. http://icar.livingrefugeearchive.org/fs_attitudes.pdf

³⁷ Factsheet, Information Centre about Asylum and Refugees. http://icar.livingrefugeearchive.org/fs_attitudes.pdf

³⁸ “Swiss vote to ban construction of minarets on mosques.” *The Guardian*. 29 November 2009. <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2009/nov/29/switzerland-bans-mosque-minarets>



Several EU states have openly declared themselves more receptive to Christian migrants. Cyprus, Bulgaria, Estonia, Poland, the Czech Republic and Slovakia have explicitly professed their preference for Christian migrants. Polish Foreign Minister Witold Waszczykowski said that Poland prefers Christian refugees and defended this on the basis that each EU country has the right to pursue an individual migration policy.³⁹ Czech President Milos Zeman said refugees from a different cultural background ‘would not be in a good position in the Czech Republic’, and Slovakia’s foreign minister and deputy prime minister said that the political leaders in the Eastern bloc are obligated to respond to the ‘feelings and expectations’ of their citizens, and cannot ignore negative public sentiment towards Islamic refugees.

However, reports on Islamophobia and public sentiment towards the refugee crisis in the EU are conflicted. The newly released *Refugees Welcome Index*, based on a global survey of more than 27,000 people, demonstrates how anti-refugee political rhetoric and polls limited to a small and potentially biased pool of respondents fail to accurately reflect widespread public opinion.⁴⁰ For instance, in contrast to the polls referenced earlier, the Index says that 56% of Germans would accept refugees into their neighborhood, while nearly all Germans (96%) said they would accept refugees into the country. 66% of the 27,000 respondents stated that their various governments should in fact do *more* to help refugees.

Further, considerable “confusion, ignorance and misinformation” exists among the European public⁴¹, heavily skewing the results of public polls. For example, in one survey, on average people thought that the UK has 23% of the world’s refugees, while the actual figure is closer to 2%.⁴² While a comprehensive analysis of the representation of migrants and refugees in popular media is beyond the scope of this paper, the wide gulf between fact and public perception is a driving factor of populist politics and anti-immigrant sentiment. The wildly inaccurate basis of popular beliefs regarding migrants and refugees indicates the failure of contemporary media, journalism, and governmental offices responsible for public affairs to

³⁹ “Poland: Middle East migrants cause EU tensions.” *EU Observer*. <https://euobserver.com/migration/132881>

⁴⁰ “Refugees Welcome Index shows government refugee policies out of touch with public opinion.” Amnesty International, 19 May 2016. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2016/05/refugees-welcome-index-shows-government-refugee-policies-out-of-touch/>

⁴¹ Factsheet, Information Centre about Asylum and Refugees. http://icar.livingrefugeearchive.org/fs_attitudes.pdf

⁴² Factsheet, Information Centre about Asylum and Refugees. http://icar.livingrefugeearchive.org/fs_attitudes.pdf



provide the European populace with fair, accurate, and objective information regarding the ongoing crisis.

The Roots of Islamophobia and Immigration Anxiety

Three specific threads of thought are consistently present throughout the various public opinion polls and surveys conducted across the EU. The first thread is the pervasive idea that immigrants are a burden to national economies; specific fears include the idea that immigrants will ‘steal’ jobs and be provided financial subsidies and benefits unavailable to nationals, increase taxes and depress wages by providing cheap labour to businesses, and strain various social services including healthcare, housing, and the overall government budgets.

The second thread has been a growing area of immigration discourse since the infamous September 11 attacks in New York in 2001, and is a particularly strong undercurrent of the Syrian refugee crisis. This line of thought associates Islamo-Arab immigrants with national security concerns including jihadi terrorism and political extremism. The preeminent fear in the current scenario is the widespread idea that foreign terror networks are using the influx of refugees as a ‘Trojan horse’ to slip terrorists into the EU undetected. With the majority of refugees arriving from Syria, Iraq, and Afghanistan, three countries pockmarked by ISIS and al-Qaeda strongholds, the thread connecting refugees with security concerns is easily the most pronounced idea permeating public opinion.

The third thread is the increasingly popular idea that a fundamental ‘culture clash’ between Muslims and Europeans prevents Muslims from being able to integrate successfully into the EU. Instead, reflected in public opinion polls across the EU is the idea that Islamo-Arab immigrants will demand Sharia law and Muslim customs replace traditional European culture. A brief assessment of public commentary reflects acutely held fears of an ‘invasion’ and the ‘end of Europe’ at the hands of Islamic migrants. One such comment posted to the website of the *Wall Street Journal* reads: “Today they come as beggars – many with new cell phones – seeking handouts – but tomorrow or the day after they will come with the long knives, the suicide vests,



the rioting rape of infidel girls – justified by Allah – and they will call for the destruction of the EU Constitutions...⁴³

Cultural differences over the treatment of women is perhaps the most common argument held up as a jarring point of contention and an insurmountable obstacle to Muslim integration in the EU. This argument gained unfortunate traction after a mass sexual assault in Cologne on New Years Eve, where dozens of male Muslim refugees were identified as the perpetrators. Coupled with other gender-related points of social friction, like the previously referenced refusal of Muslim students to shake the hand of a female teacher in Switzerland, the incident in Cologne sparked a continental backlash over the ‘backwards’ treatment of women in Islamic culture. Overlaid with colonial overtones and racial tropes, this narrative was furthered by far-right populist parties who used it as another point supporting their pro-borders, anti-immigrant agenda.

The “culture clash” thread woven into public opinion is reflected in rhetoric comparing the refugee crisis to an ‘invasion’ or a ‘flood’, something uncontrollable and disastrous, something bound to alter the social fabric of European society and indeed, the physical space that contains it. Pushback against any alteration of European physical space is illustrated well by the Swiss referendums banning burqas, niqabs, and mosque minarets, and the decision of a Swiss court to forbid mosques from sounding public calls for Muslim prayers. Further, most countries require migrants and refugees to be fluent in English, the national language of the host country, or both. Limiting outward expressions of Islamo-Arab culture in terms of dress, language, and religious symbols is an effort to ensure assimilation, at least externally, and mitigate visually striking differences in culture in order to soothe public anxieties.

Problematic as the strategy may be, policies of external assimilation seek to promote integration between immigrant and host communities by lessening the visibility of cultural minorities. In contrast, populist political parties have sought to highlight sociocultural differences between Muslims and Europeans by presenting them as an *Other* in fundamental conflict with the norms and values of the European Union.

⁴³ “Germany to extend passport controls until EU border checks effective.” *The Wall Street Journal*. 10 May 2016. <http://www.wsj.com/articles/germany-to-extend-passport-controls-until-eu-border-checks-effective-1462892559>



Manufacturing Paranoia: Populist Rhetoric and Political Strategy

Sensationalist rhetoric, thin on fact and heavy with racial overtones, has stoked negative public perception of Islamo-Arab migrants. As Stein and Salime discuss in *Manufacturing Islamophobia: Rightwing Pseudo-Documentaries and the Paranoid Style* (2015), the media and rhetoric produced and circulated by rightwing parties highlights alarmist anecdotal evidence, distorts figures and statistics, and exaggerating the threat radical Islam poses to citizens on European soil.⁴⁴ Several right-wing populist parties are responsible for deepening Islamophobia and anti-refugee paranoia by explicitly connecting Middle Eastern and North African migrants with terrorism, violent extremism, and, to a lesser degree, disease and other health risks.

Social media platforms are inarguably the most direct point of access between modern politicians and their constituents. Unlike traditional modes of media, opinions and statements made on social media are not subjected to fact-checking processes to ensure truth and accuracy before being instantaneously dispatched to the public. Populist parties have been able to exploit the reach and nature of social media tools to their advantage, deploying explicitly anti-immigrant rhetoric to a significant portion of civil society on a daily basis without being compelled or obliged to root their comments in fact.

Twitter accounts operated by Members of European Parliament (MEPs) and party leaders, for example, contain hundreds of comments scapegoating refugees – and open borders – for problems ranging from terrorism to national debts. Jaroslaw Kaczynski, the leader of Poland’s Law and Justice party, posted on Twitter: “After recent events connected with acts of terror we will not accept refugees because there is no mechanism that would ensure security.” British MEP Diane James tweeted after the Brussels bombing a quote reading: “This horrific terrorist act shows that Schengen free movement and lax border controls are a threat to our security.” The infamously vocal Dutch politician Geert Wilders ominously claimed that: “Islam is the Trojan Horse in Europe. If we do not stop Islamification now, Eurabia will be just a matter of time.” He has continuously invoked the idea that the migrant crisis is a disguised cultural war,

⁴⁴ Stein, Arlene and Zakia Salime. “Manufacturing Islamophobia: Rightwing Pseudo-Documentaries and the Paranoid Style.” *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 1 February 2015. <http://jci.sagepub.com/content/39/4/378.abstract>



tweeting in April: “We must destroy the Islamic State but also stop Islamic immigration in order not to become Islamic States ourselves.”

Anti-immigrant rhetoric is not limited to social media alone. Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orban said in a July 2015 speech: “What we have at stake today is Europe, the European way of life, the survival or disappearance of European values and nations, or their transformation beyond recognition.” Kaczynski alluded to the same apocalyptic end of Europe while discussing the refugee crisis in European Parliament: “First, the number of foreigners increase violently. Next they declare that they won’t respect our law and our customs. Then they impose their sensitivities and demands on the public sphere, on all spheres of life, violently and aggressively.”

While far-right nationalist parties have explicitly associated refugees with crime, violence, disease, and terrorism, political parties closer to the center and left of the political spectrum have been decidedly more stealthy in their approach to the crisis. Recognizing widespread discontent with pro-refugee policies and eager to maintain public support, parties have used implicit references and coded rhetoric to oppose migration on the basis of socioeconomic concerns like employment, public spending, and social services. Ramos et al. (2016) term this approach “reframing the meaning” of immigrant opposition: “Individuals can reframe the meaning of their opposition to immigration by saying that it is not motivated by prejudice but rather that it reflects genuine concern...They may even argue that the socioeconomic situation of the country means that it can no longer receive more people because immigration rates increase competition for very scarce resources (Pereira et al, 2010; Stephan and Stephan 2000).”⁴⁵ Like overt claims of terrorism and disease, the argument that immigrants have a negative impact on host economies and social services is not one supported by the evidence.

⁴⁵ Ramos, Alice et al. “Economic crisis, human values and attitudes towards immigrants.” *Values, Economic Crisis and Democracy*. Published January 2016. https://books.google.ca/books?hl=en&lr=&id=qzR-CwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA104&dq=economy+immigrants+blame+public+europe&ots=40Sq6vIukk&sig=MYe qpM_1kXtrOp4JcH8zopQ4ddE#v=onepage&q=economy%20immigrants%20blame%20public%20europe&f=false



Anti-Immigrant Platforms and Populist Success in the EU

Veracity aside, rhetoric based on anti-immigrant sentiment has been a successful strategy for several far-right parties and caused a major disruption to the European Union's political landscape.

The sudden surge of Austria's right-wing Freedom Party (FPÖ) is a prime example of the populist uprising. The party has played to the country's Catholic majority, comparing the influx of Islamo-Arab migrants to the Ottoman sieges Austria fought off during the Hapsburg Empire. Running on an anti-immigrant platform punctuated by promises to shutter the country's borders, refuse Arab refugees, and favour Austrians in the job market⁴⁶, the party won 49.7% percent of the vote in a tense runoff election. Though FPÖ's presidential candidate Norbert Hofer was ultimately defeated by Alexander Van der Bellen, the party now holds 40 of the 183 seats in Austria's National Council, or 21.8%.⁴⁷

Parties like *Front National* in France, *Fidesz* in Hungary, the Law and Justice Party in Poland and *Alternative für Deutschland* (AfD) in Germany have also made significant political gains on the basis of populism and anti-immigrant platforms. Under the leadership of current Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán, *Fidesz* has widened its lead over other parties in public opinion polls and has handily won the country's last two parliamentary elections. In Poland, the nationalist Law and Justice party won 39% of the national vote in the 2015 parliamentary elections on the strength of a platform that includes pledges to defy Brussels' refugee relocation plan. In France, despite an ultimate loss in the second-round runoffs, the *Front National* won 27% of the vote in the first round of voting in regional elections in December 2015, surpassing its previous record. The party's leader Marine Le Pen has rocketed to the forefront of French politics on promises to protect France from "Islamization" and remove the country from the EU. Frauke Petry, the leader of AfD, has echoed Le Pen on the issue of Islam, saying that 'Islam does not belong in Germany' and calling for a ban on the construction of mosques.⁴⁸

⁴⁶ "Austrian Presidential Candidates Neck and Neck in Election Runoff." *The Wall Street Journal*. 22 May 2016. <http://www.wsj.com/articles/austria-to-elect-new-president-as-immigration-issues-loom-large-1463905093>

⁴⁷ "How Far is Europe Swinging to the Right?" *The New York Times*. 22 May 2016. http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/05/22/world/europe/europe-right-wing-austria-hungary.html?_r=0

⁴⁸ "Bavarian AfD wants to shut down mosques." *Deutsche Welle*. <http://www.dw.com/en/bavarian-afd-wants-to-shut-down-mosques/a-19149600>



4. SCHENGEN UNDER SIEGE: POPULIST POLITICS AND THE FUTURE OF EUROPEAN SECURITY

Security and the Populist Call to Abolish Open Borders

The European Parliament has published a detailed plan outlining the gradual reestablishment of the Schengen Area. However, prominent populist politicians in several EU Member States have called for the permanent end of the Schengen Agreement. Geert Wilders has called for the elimination of the Schengen open borders policy, as has Marcel de Graaff, head of the Party for Freedom delegation in European Parliament, who tweeted in October 2015: “Tear up [the] Schengen treaty! Restore national borders!” British Justice Minister Dominic Raab criticized Schengen for “expanding the pool of those with criminal or terrorist links that the police and intelligence services have to monitor, imposing huge strains on their resources and magnifying the risk that dangerous people are slipping through the border.” And at a January 2015 press conference in Strasbourg, *Front National* leader Marine Le Pen said that “passport-free travel in the Schengen Area must be stopped”, arguing that control over who enters a given country should be a matter left to that government alone.

The refugee crisis has exposed significant tensions within the European Union itself. Member States have expressed resentment towards Germany and France, the chief architects of the refugee relocation plan, and refused to heed directives from EU leadership in Brussels. Progress in the management of the refugee crisis has been blocked by a lack of consensus over whether border controls fall under the national jurisdiction of sovereign states or the mutual control of the bloc. With the Brexit referendum looming – to be voted on in June 2016 – and other Member States also mulling the option of leaving the EU, Brussels’ power to protect the Schengen Agreement is severely handicapped.

The Economic Impact of Abolishing the Schengen Agreement

Eliminating the Schengen Agreement would have significant socioeconomic ramifications at the local, regional, and global levels. With approximately 1.3 billion cross-border trips and roughly 57 million trucks carrying €2.8 trillion worth of goods on an annual

basis, open borders are critical to several sectors and would significantly affect European transport, trade, labour and tourism.⁴⁹

At the local level, the impact of permanent border controls would have the most significant effect on the tourism industry, with France, Spain, and Italy expected to be hit the hardest. Depending on the exact nature of the controls, the direct cost to France's tourism industry would be €1-2 billion annually, while 38% of the costs would result from the impact on cross-border workers.⁵⁰

The reestablishment of internal borders would be a major deterrent to cross-border employment, reduce job opportunities and restrict the pool of labour for employers. The result, according to a study published by Bertelsmann Stiftung, would be restricted job mobility and a heterogeneous job market.⁵¹ In sum, borders would have a visible impact on the national economies of the EU, with economists forecasting the economies of Austria, Spain, and the United Kingdom to be hit particularly hard. Economists also predict that annual economic growth would be significantly slowed in Poland, Slovenia, Slovakia, the Czech Republic, and Hungary⁵² – ironically some of the countries who have most vocally lobbied for the reestablishment of permanent borders.

According to analyses from several different studies⁵³, the elimination of Schengen would have the strongest impact on trade in the EU. Cross-border trade would be hindered by new costs of €11-47 billion per year, with an overall reduction in output of 0.8% or €110 billion over the next decade. According to Assilloux and Le Hir (2016), replacing the Schengen agreement with permanent border controls would decrease trade between Schengen countries by

⁴⁹ “Schengen’s Economic Impact: Putting Up Barriers.” *The Economist*. 6 February 2016.

<http://www.economist.com/news/briefing/21690065-permanent-reintroduction-border-controls-would-harm-trade-europe-putting-up-barriers>

⁵⁰ “Departure from the Schengen Agreement: Macroeconomic impacts on Germany and the countries of the European Union.” *Global Economic Dynamics*. https://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/fileadmin/files/BSt/Publikationen/GrauePublikationen/NW_Departure_from_Schengen.pdf

⁵¹ “Departure from the Schengen Agreement: Macroeconomic impacts on Germany and the countries of the European Union.” *Global Economic Dynamics*. https://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/fileadmin/files/BSt/Publikationen/GrauePublikationen/NW_Departure_from_Schengen.pdf

⁵² “Departure from the Schengen Agreement: Macroeconomic impacts on Germany and the countries of the European Union.” *Global Economic Dynamics*. https://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/fileadmin/files/BSt/Publikationen/GrauePublikationen/NW_Departure_from_Schengen.pdf

⁵³ “The Economic Costs of Non-Schengen: What the Numbers Tell Us.” Dr. Anna auf dem Brinke – Policy Paper. 20 April 2016. <http://www.institutdelors.eu/media/costnonschengen-aufdembrinke-jdib-april16.pdf?pdf=ok>



10-20% in the long term.⁵⁴ Assilloux and Le Hir estimate the GDP of the Schengen area would fall 0.8% (€100 billion) by 2025, while an analysis conducted by Felbermayr et al (2016) indicates that GDP for the EU would fall by 0.31% if identity checks are established at all internal borders.⁵⁵

Internal borders are expected to lead to higher costs across the EU, which would in turn impact value chains, foreign direct investment, and price competitiveness. In addition, close trading partners like China and the United States would be ‘noticeably’ affected by border controls within the EU as well.⁵⁶ Ultimately, the prevailing finding of economists studying the potential impact of Schengen’s collapse is that the economic damage – a staggering €63 billion per year – would threaten the stability of the euro zone and significantly impair the European single market.⁵⁷

While it is uncertain whether countries would implement spot checks or reintroduce full borders, and calculations of potential costs are therefore hypothetical, the ultimate forecast is that by 2025 the cumulative economic performance of the EU would be approximately €1.4 trillion lower than it would be under the Schengen Agreement.⁵⁸

Immigration Policy and the Economics of Public Perception

Given the economic anxiety already present in public opinion towards refugees, the local reverberations of a regional recession would cement the immigrant’s role as public scapegoat, and reinforce the perception that immigrants have a poor effect on host economies.

⁵⁴ “Schengen’s Stress Test: Political Issues and Perspectives.” Published by Jacques Delors Institute. February 15 2016. <http://www.institutdelors.eu/media/schengensstresstest-bertoncinivitorino-jdi-feb16.pdf?pdf=ok>

⁵⁵ The Economic Costs of Non-Schengen: What the Numbers Tell Us.” Dr. Anna auf dem Brinke – Policy Paper. 20 April 2016. <http://www.institutdelors.eu/media/costnonschengen-aufdembrinke-jdib-april16.pdf?pdf=ok>

⁵⁶ The Economic Costs of Non-Schengen: What the Numbers Tell Us.” Dr. Anna auf dem Brinke – Policy Paper. 20 April 2016. <http://www.institutdelors.eu/media/costnonschengen-aufdembrinke-jdib-april16.pdf?pdf=ok>

⁵⁷ The Economic Costs of Non-Schengen: What the Numbers Tell Us.” Dr. Anna auf dem Brinke – Policy Paper. 20 April 2016. <http://www.institutdelors.eu/media/costnonschengen-aufdembrinke-jdib-april16.pdf?pdf=ok>

⁵⁸ Departure from the Schengen Agreement: Macroeconomic impacts on Germany and the countries of the European Union.” *Global Economic Dynamics*. https://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/fileadmin/files/BSSt/Publikationen/GrauePublikationen/NW_Departure_from_Schengen.pdf

The health of a national economy has a critical impact on public perceptions of immigrants. The scapegoat theory, developed by Hovland and Sears (1940), argues that the perception of declining opportunities and the perception of competition in the labour market can generate negative ‘blaming’ attitudes towards immigrants. This attitude would presumably extend to visible minorities too, regardless of whether or not they were born in the EU. Researchers have further developed the scapegoat theory in modern immigration discourse. Within the group-threat framework, Semyonov et al. (2006) found a direct correlation between GDP and anti-foreigner prejudice in Western Europe, ultimately concluding that racial prejudice is lowest in countries with higher GDPs.⁵⁹

The economic consequences of abolishing Schengen is likely to result in critical social tensions between native Europeans and immigrants, in this case specifically between Arab-Islamo newcomers and white Catholic Europeans. As Ramos et al. (2016) argue, the perception of immigrants as a threat rises in those who have experienced “a severe degradation of their economic situation.”⁶⁰ Studies supporting this theory are based in the relative deprivation framework regarding competition for material resources (wages) or for social resources (education, health, and social security).⁶¹

The economic degradation analysts predict in the wake of reestablished borders would essentially transform the basis of anti-immigrant sentiment in the EU from a perceived threat to a real or valid threat. Most importantly to the current situation, however, is that the presence and agency of far-right parties is found to be a crucial component of the relationship between economic health and anti-immigrant sentiment. Cochrane and Nevitte (2014) found that anti-immigrant sentiments increase alongside the unemployment rate only in countries with established far-right parties:

⁵⁹ Callens, Marie-Sophie. “Integration Policies and Public Opinion: in conflict or in harmony?” Luxembourg Institute of Socioeconomic Research and University of Leuven. February 2015.

http://www.migpolgroup.com/wp_clean/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/MIPEX_Literature-review_Integration-and-public-opinion.pdf

⁶⁰ Ramos, Alice et al. “Economic crisis, human values and attitudes towards immigrants.” *Values, Economic Crisis and Democracy*. Published January 2016. https://books.google.ca/books?hl=en&lr=&id=qzR-CwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA104&dq=economy+immigrants+blame+public+europe&ots=40Sq6vIukk&sig=MYe qpM_1kXtrOp4JcH8zopQ4ddE#v=onepage&q=economy%20immigrants%20blame%20public%20europe&f=false

⁶¹ Malchow-Møller, Nikolaj et al. “Attitudes towards immigration – perceived consequences and economic self-interest.” 2008 <http://www.econ.ku.dk/jrm/pdf/files/malchow-m%C3%B8llermunchschrollskaksen2008.pdf>



“In countries with far-right parties, the probability that a citizen does not want an immigrant as neighbor increases more than six-fold, from just under 5% to more than 30%, as the level of unemployment increases. This core finding provides convincing support for the political scapegoating hypothesis. A high unemployment rate does not translate on its own into anti-immigrant sentiment: far-right parties provide the linkage.”⁶²

Karger (2014) points to Hungary as a model of this relationship, arguing that the country’s public debt and high unemployment rate are to a large extent responsible for the rising popularity of neofascist and ultra nationalist anti-immigrant political parties.⁶³

Open or Closed? The Effect of Borders on European Security

Proponents of closed borders, both of the public and political variety, argue that the economic cost of Schengen’s collapse is a worthwhile price to pay in the name of European security. Political leaders lobbying for the permanent closure of borders have argued that ending the EU’s open borders policy is necessary to ensuring public safety and safeguarding national security. The idea that permanent internal borders will strengthen European security is, on the surface, a relatively reasonable assumption, but it is also a dangerously crude and woefully shortsighted policy proposal, demonstrating a clear lack of understanding of the dynamics of modern security.

It cannot be denied that border controls have some positive effects on security, particularly in the immediate aftermath of their implementation. Border closures quickly and severely lessen the rate of migrants attempting to enter the country, allowing for governments to safely regulate, manage, and process the flow of new arrivals. The rate of refugees arriving in Sweden, for instance, dropped substantially after the country introduced strict border controls, from 10,000 a week in October 2015 to approximately 100 per day in January 2016, when the

⁶² Cochrane, Christopher and Neil Nevitte. “Scapegoating: Unemployment, far-right parties and anti-immigrant sentiment.” 2014. <http://individual.utoronto.ca/cochrane/research/CEP2014/Scapegoating.pdf>

⁶³ Karger, Howard. “The Bitter Pill: Austerity, Debt, and the Attack on Europe’s Welfare States.” University of Queensland, Australia School of Social Work and Human Services, 2014. https://www.wmich.edu/hhs/newsletters_journals/jssw_institutional/individual_subscribers/41.2.Karger.pdf



controls were implemented.⁶⁴ Similarly, after Hungary shut its border with Serbia the number of migrants attempting to cross the border dropped from 9,380 to 366 within the span of a week.⁶⁵ The impact on security is twofold: first, the lower rate of refugees arriving at the border results in a lower probability that potential security concerns will slip through, and second, the lower rate of arrivals allows border security agencies to focus on quality rather than efficiency and perform more thorough identity checks and background screenings.

However, populist political parties have largely overstated the effectiveness and applicability of border closures in the current security climate. Since the 9/11 terrorist attacks – which experts consider the onset of the modern security era – there have been eleven Islamic terrorist attacks on European soil. These attacks include suicide bombings in Madrid (2004), London (2005), Stockholm (2010), and Brussels (2016), and mass shootings in Frankfurt (2011), Montauban/Toulouse (2012), Burgas (2012), Brussels (2014), Copenhagen (2015), and Paris (2015).

None of these attacks were perpetrated by a refugee or migrant who entered the EU by deceit. Three of the four London bombers were born and raised in England to Pakistani immigrants, while the fourth was a recent convert to Islam born in Jamaica. The Stockholm suicide bomber, Taimour Abdulwahab al-Abdaly, was born in Baghdad but had been a naturalized Swedish citizen for nearly twenty years, while Arid Uka, who shot and killed two U.S. Air Force airmen in Frankfurt, was born in Kosovo but had lived in Germany since he was a year old. Mohammed Merah, the gunman who left six dead in two French cities in 2012 in retaliation for France’s ban on the burqa, was a French citizen of Algerian descent, as were the two brothers who left twenty dead in the January 2015 attack on the offices of *Charlie Hebdo*. The trend of second-generation immigrants perpetrating attacks is strikingly consistent across the board: the terrorist who killed four in Brussels in 2014 was also a French national of Algerian origin; Omar Abdel Hamid El-Hussein, who killed three people in Copenhagen in February 2015, was born in Denmark to Palestinian parents; and the two terrorist rings responsible for

⁶⁴ <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/refugee-crisis-swedens-mass-deportation-of-asylum-seekers-could-strengthen-eu-migration-policy-a6840521.html>

⁶⁵ “Ban criticizes Hungary over treatment of people at border.” Raldió Telliffis Éltreann News. 16 September 2015. <http://www.rte.ie/news/2015/0916/728116-migrants-crisis/>



orchestrating the recent attacks in Paris and Brussels were almost all Belgian nationals of Moroccan descent. Only in the Madrid bombings of 2004 was one perpetrator found to have entered the country illegally some fourteen years prior. However, that terrorist, Jamal Zougam, was already under Spanish police surveillance when he executed the attack⁶⁶, indicating a far greater failure much further up the counterterrorism chain than his initial ability to enter Spain.

Several studies reinforce the inability of border controls to address issues in the current security scheme. A quantitative study on terrorists in Europe and the US between 1999 and 2004 found only 6% travelled without a valid visa, while nearly half (41%) were citizens of the states affected and therefore examples of homegrown terrorism.⁶⁷ Similarly, in a study profiling terrorists responsible for five European plots between 2004 and 2006, it was found that most were “local residents or citizens of Western liberal democracies.”⁶⁸ Statistics from Europol are even more telling: in 2007 Europol reported arrested 1,044 individuals for terrorism-related offenses (an increase of 48% from the previous year) and, of the suspects arrested, up to 91% of them were EU citizens.⁶⁹

The point here is clear: internal borders targeting foreigners arriving from countries outside the EU would have been unable to prevent the majority of recently plotted or perpetrated terrorist attacks. Internal borders are not designed to effectively detect or combat homegrown terrorism, which has been repeatedly found the greatest threat to European security at present. Further, border controls have not been identified as an immediate security issue in need of urgent reform. Investigations conducted subsequent to each of the aforementioned attacks have instead generally identified cross-border information sharing and a lack of intelligence coordination

⁶⁶ “Jamal Zougam: Madrid bomb suspect.” *BBC News*. 2004. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/3515790.stm>

⁶⁷ Vollmer, Ruth and Marc von Boemcken. “Europe Off Limits: Militarization of the EU’s External Borders.” In *Friedensgutachten* 2014. Münster, pp. 126-139. http://www.friedensgutachten.de/tl_files/friedensgutachten/pdf_eng/fga2014en/Beitrag%201.7.pdf

⁶⁸ Jordán, Javier. “Evolution of Jihadism in Spain Following the 3/11 Madrid Terrorist Attacks.” In *Perspectives on Terrorism*, Vol. 1. No. 3. (2007). <http://www.terrorismanalysts.com/pt/articles/issues/PTv1i3.pdf>

⁶⁹ d’Appollonia, Ariane Chebel. “Managing Ethnic Diversity after 9/11: Integration Security and Civil Liberties in Transatlantic Perspective.” Rutgers University Press, March 2010. https://books.google.ca/books?id=PN0TdVJUg5YC&pg=PA134&lpg=PA134&dq=Robert+Leiken+Steven+Brooke:+The+quantitative+analysis+of+terrorism+and+immigration.+An+initial+exploration,+in:+Terrorism+and+Political+Violence&source=bl&ots=jEfZ7jz129&sig=B32Wbn265HmcdAVmzDCoQXNJwdg&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKUw7u-ji_6LNAhUM64MKHYBkAZ4Q6AEIMjAF#v=onepage&q=terror&f=false



between Member States as the primary weak links in European security.⁷⁰ Border controls are in essence neither the problem nor the solution.

The costly effort of establishing and patrolling internal borders across the EU is predicated on a faulty claim, given that Arab refugees and first-generation immigrants have not in fact proven to be a significant security threat. More importantly, implementing internal borders would detract critical operational, administrative and financial resources from counterterrorism strategies focused on combating the radicalization of European nationals and second-generation immigrants in particular. Finally, in the long-term, border controls pose a risk to the bloc's stability and security by fragmenting European integration, damaging national economies, disrupting intelligence and information-sharing systems between Member States, and fanning the flames of potentially dangerous strains of nationalism.

Socioeconomic Drivers of Radicalization and Terrorism

The overall impact of reestablishing internal borders across the EU would in fact jeopardize rather than protect European security in the long-term. Viewed alongside contemporary discourse on terrorism and radicalization, the potentially severe economic effect of abolishing Schengen is a risk to the future of European security. While the roots and causes of radicalization and homegrown terror is a topic of much debate among theorists and scholars, the prevailing theory indicates that a lack of social and economic integration is a key condition for violent extremism and radical Islamism.

Economic disenfranchisement is considered a chief ingredient of radicalization in the EU. There has been a resounding failure to fully integrate Arab-Islamo immigrants into the national economies of EU Member States. In the UK, for example, Muslims are three times more likely to be unemployed than the Christian majority and have the highest level of economic inactivity at 52%.⁷¹ Further, as a 2002 report produced by the UK government highlighted, Muslims of

⁷⁰ “Terrorists Cross Borders, Europe Sees Anew That Its Intelligence Does Not.” *The New York Times*. 23 March 2016. <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/24/world/europe/as-terrorists-cross-borders-europe-sees-anew-that-its-intelligence-does-not.html>

⁷¹ d’Appollonia, Ariane Chebel. “Managing Ethnic Diversity after 9/11: Integration Security and Civil Liberties in Transatlantic Perspective.” Rutgers University Press, March 2010. <https://books.google.ca/books?id=PN0TdVJUg5YC&pg=PA134&lpg=PA134&dq=Robert+Leiken+Steven+Brooke>

both genders are both “overrepresented in the lowest income band.”⁷² The exclusion of European Muslims from the labour market is attributed to factors like educational and professional qualifications and language skills in addition to religion.⁷³ Religion is a particular factor for Muslim women, who often encounter resistance to the wearing of the hijab.

Immigrants often find themselves in a type of socioeconomic subclass as a result of criminalized immigration policies and a lack of full citizenship. Irregular or uncertain status affects “access to the job market, health care and education system, and restricts freedom of movement and choice of place of residence.”⁷⁴ As Freeman (2016) postulates:

“The labour attraction of many immigrants through colonial or biltateral agreements was accompanied by uneven (or non-existent) integration schemes, which resulted in large numbers of denizens who either lacked economic rights or the traditional Marshllian triptych of social, civil, and political rights. This anomalous situation has provided a fertile European breeding ground for the evolution of enclave communities of second or third generation youths who may be economically, socially and politically deprived, and alienated from the mainstream culture. These new social conditions have facilitated the growth of sub-groups within the communities who may openly express their frustration through radical political activities.”⁷⁵

[+The+quantitative+analysis+of+terrorism+and+immigration.+An+initial+exploration,+in:+Terrorism+and+Political+Violence&source=bl&ots=jEfZ7jz129&sig=B32Wbn265HmcdAVmzDCoQXNJwdg&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUK Ewj7u-ji_6LNAhUM64MKHYBkAZ4Q6AEIMjAF#v=onepage&q=terror&f=false](#)

⁷² “Report on Muslims in Britain.” Minority Rights Group International, 2002. <http://minorityrights.org/wp-content/uploads/old-site-downloads/download-129-Muslims-in-Britain.pdf>

⁷³ d’Appollonia, Ariane Chebel. “Managing Ethnic Diversity after 9/11: Integration Security and Civil Liberties in Transatlantic Perspective.” Rutgers University Press, March 2010.

https://books.google.ca/books?id=PNoTdVJUg5YC&pg=PA134&lpg=PA134&dq=Robert+Leiken+Steven+Brooke:+The+quantitative+analysis+of+terrorism+and+immigration.+An+initial+exploration,+in:+Terrorism+and+Political+Violence&source=bl&ots=jEfZ7jz129&sig=B32Wbn265HmcdAVmzDCoQXNJwdg&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUK Ewj7u-ji_6LNAhUM64MKHYBkAZ4Q6AEIMjAF#v=onepage&q=terror&f=false

⁷⁴ Vollmer, Ruth and Marc von Boemcken. “Europe Off Limits: Militarization of the EU’s External Borders.” In *Friedensgutachten* 2014. Münster, pp. 126-139. http://www.friedensgutachten.de/tl_files/friedensgutachten/pdf_eng/fga2014en/Beitrag%201.7.pdf

⁷⁵ Freeman, Gary P. “Immigrant integration, political radicalization and terrorism.” *Handbook on Migration and Social Policy*. 2016.

[https://books.google.ca/books?id=3nKNCwAAQBAJ&pg=PA268&lpg=PA268&dq=Marshall+1965;+Hammar+1985\).+gary+freeman&source=bl&ots=md5Qx-](https://books.google.ca/books?id=3nKNCwAAQBAJ&pg=PA268&lpg=PA268&dq=Marshall+1965;+Hammar+1985).+gary+freeman&source=bl&ots=md5Qx-)

The widespread failure to integrate Islamo-Arabs into European economies has several negative consequences. First, lack of employment opportunity is a direct precursor to involvement in criminal activity and prisons have proven to be a breeding ground for radical Muslim clerics, who target vulnerable and isolated young men. The inability to gain fruitful employment in the EU has a domino effect: immigrants are then unable to gain skills, improve their language abilities, or transcend their low social status. Isolated in poorer neighborhoods limits social interaction with the native population and has resulted in ‘parallel communities’, in turn reinforcing patterns of socioeconomic alienation and disadvantage.⁷⁶ Physical segregation is a significant factor to the process of radicalization. Sociological studies indicate that residential segregation is often largely responsible for repeated ethnic conflict⁷⁷ and the ‘contact hypothesis’ suggests that repeated, sustained contact between individual members of different groups contributes to breaking down wider fears and anxieties and results in positive attitude change.⁷⁸ Indeed, extremist views have been found to flourish in isolated groups of likeminded people by creating a warped norm, whereas interaction between different groups reduces extremist views; physical segregation in areas like the *banlieues* on the outskirts of Paris therefore reinforce extremism.⁷⁹

Political, civic, and social alienation further deepen the risk of radicalization. Theorists have identified factors ranging from repressive policies (banning of the hijab, for example), political and media propaganda against Muslims, sense of political impotence, feeling that Islam is under attack, personal identity crises, discrimination in the labour market, sense of marginalization, injustice, and alienation, and state infringement on privacy and civil liberties.⁸⁰

[c1Jk&sig=dB5PcYOS3YqF2XB2s4apEkIL2oI&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiotrPSrovNAhVXV1IKHRuDCcMQ6AEIGzAA#v=onepage&q=Marshall%201965%3B%20Hammar%201985\).%20gary%20freeman&f=false](http://www.minorityrights.org/wp-content/uploads/old-site-downloads/download-129-Muslims-in-Britain.pdf)

⁷⁶ “Report on Muslims in Britain.” Minority Rights Group International, 2002. <http://minorityrights.org/wp-content/uploads/old-site-downloads/download-129-Muslims-in-Britain.pdf>

⁷⁷ Frey, Bruno S. “Terrorism and Business.” University of Zurich and Federal University of Technology Zurich. 2007. <http://www.crema-research.ch/papers/2007-12.pdf>

⁷⁸ Factsheet, Information Centre about Asylum and Refugees. http://icar.livingrefugeearchive.org/fs_attitudes.pdf

⁷⁹ Frey, Bruno S. and Simon Luechinger. “How to Fight Terrorism: Alternatives to Deterrence.” University of Zurich. November 2002. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.9.1833&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

⁸⁰ d’Appollonia, Ariane Chebel. “Managing Ethnic Diversity after 9/11: Integration Security and Civil Liberties in Transatlantic Perspective.” Rutgers University Press, March 2010. <https://books.google.ca/books?id=PNdTdVJUG5YC&pg=PA134&lpg=PA134&dq=Robert+Leiken+Steven+Brooke:+The+quantitative+analysis+of+terrorism+and+immigration.+An+initial+exploration,+in:+Terrorism+and+Political>



Socially segregated, economically handicapped and often witness to Islamophobia and other forms of discrimination, it is a short journey for second-generation immigrants to engage in criminal activity as a way to bolster their economic position or be attracted to radical Muslim mosques as a way of regaining personal agency and identity.

Ultimately, then, the shortsighted nature of populist rhetoric against Schengen in fact threatens the security of the European Union by furthering the socioeconomic oppression of first and second-generation immigrants. By promoting xenophobia and exploiting racial tensions, populist parties are unwittingly creating the exact conditions that radicalization and homegrown extremism flourishes in. European Muslims will be unable to integrate into host economies, refused by hostile employers, and rejected socially. The economic impact of abolishing Schengen would only serve to fragment the continent along lines of far-right nationalism and contribute to the alarming rise of Islamophobia, validating the resentment of young Muslims. The failure of populist parties to understand the potential ramifications of Schengen's collapse is not merely uncouth but poses an imminent threat to the EU's political objectives of peace, stability and economic prosperity.

5. STRENGTHENING SCHENGEN: POLICY PROPOSALS FOR A SECURE EUROPEAN FUTURE

Abandoning the Schengen Agreement entirely would jeopardize European security in the long-term by fuelling nationalistic rifts, legitimizing the scapegoating of Islamo-Arab immigrants, deepening the so-called 'culture clash', and increasing the appeal of radical terrorist networks to future generations of European Muslims.

That being said, however, Schengen is not without its flaws. Schengen's major flaws include its failure to sufficiently exploit modern technology and the structural and organizational issues that compromise cross-border cooperation and information-sharing systems. The EU's failure to coordinate and share intelligence and information, often due to politicized issues and disputes, is the chief culprit threatening contemporary European security.

[+Violence&source=bl&ots=jEfZ7jz129&sig=B32Wbn265HmcdavmzDCoQXNJwdg&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUK Ewj7u-ji_6LNAhUM64MKHYBkAZ4Q6AEIMjAF#v=onepage&q=terror&f=false](#)



Policy proposals with respect to the effective management of the refugee crisis are two-pronged. In the short-term, the EU needs to take immediate action with regard to distribution quotas, refugee camps, and national security. Intra-EU rifts and tensions with Brussels' leadership must be diffused and replaced with a coherent and unified strategy moving forward. In the same vein, EU Member States should provide greater financial and operational assistance to Greece, who is currently struggling under a lack of capacity to properly register and process refugees. Financial and operational assistance – rather than military reinforcement – should also be provided to the largest refugee camps, particularly those at the town of Idomeni on the Greece-Macedonia border and on the Greek islands. Strengthening and developing processing systems to facilitate efficient resettlement is a key priority in order to prevent the camps from spiraling into urgent humanitarian situations.

Further, information campaigns and communications strategies can be leveraged to combat right-wing rhetoric surrounding refugees. As indicated previously, there is an alarming amount of misinformation being circulated to and reproduced by the public. EU Member States should invest in their offices of public diplomacy in order to effectively combat fear-mongering narratives. Terrorism and radicalization are thought of as 'hard' concepts that require equally forceful and hardline approaches of law and order; however, tactical counterterrorism efforts should be complemented by long-term and sustained 'soft' efforts. Soft approaches to radicalization and homegrown terror include invest into public offices of information, education, and community building facilitated by programs, events, and the creation of shared physical spaces.

European governments should invest in social programs for refugees and immigrants aimed at providing education, skills training, and the full integration of newcomers into social, economic, and political processes. Focusing on digital education and technological literacy is crucial to increasing the ability of immigrants to obtain regular employment. The civic integration of young Muslims is particularly important: there are only about thirty Muslims elected to western European parliaments, out of an estimated population of fifteen million.⁸¹

⁸¹ d'Appollonia, Ariane Chebel. "Managing Ethnic Diversity after 9/11: Integration Security and Civil Liberties in Transatlantic Perspective." Rutgers University Press, March 2010.
<https://books.google.ca/books?id=PN0TdVJUg5YC&pg=PA134&lpg=PA134&dq=Robert+Leiken+Steven+Brooke>:



Further, in the UK and the Netherlands, more than half of the Muslim population cannot vote due to restricted citizenship.⁸² Improving access to the political system is key to offsetting the lack of power and agency felt by young Muslims.

Finally, European governments can offset the appeal of radical terrorist networks like ISIS by better respecting the civil liberties of immigrants. Treating the Muslim population as a monolithic entity of potential terrorists and criminals only serves to give credence to the ‘culture clash’ narrative and claims of Western hypocrisy. Governments must renew their attention to the rule of law, democratic legitimacy, and the human rights of its Muslim citizens. Eliminating the Schengen Agreement and reestablishing internal borders in its place would not be a sound policy decision but merely a kneejerk response to public pressure, a remedy more pertinent to political optics than European security. Ultimately, redistributing the finances budgeted towards reestablishing border controls would be far more effective to continental security if used to facilitate the socioeconomic integration of new immigrants into European life.

[+The+quantitative+analysis+of+terrorism+and+immigration.+An+initial+exploration,+in:+Terrorism+and+Political+Violence&source=bl&ots=jEfZ7jz129&sig=B32Wbn265HmcdAVmzDCoQXNJwdg&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUK Ewj7u-ji_6LNAhUM64MKHYBkAZ4Q6AEIMjAF#v=onepage&q=terror&f=false](https://books.google.ca/books?id=PNoTdVJUg5YC&pg=PA134&lpg=PA134&dq=Robert+Leiken+Steven+Brooke:+The+quantitative+analysis+of+terrorism+and+immigration.+An+initial+exploration,+in:+Terrorism+and+Political+Violence&source=bl&ots=jEfZ7jz129&sig=B32Wbn265HmcdAVmzDCoQXNJwdg&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwj7u-ji_6LNAhUM64MKHYBkAZ4Q6AEIMjAF#v=onepage&q=terror&f=false)

⁸² d’Appollonia, Ariane Chebel. “Managing Ethnic Diversity after 9/11: Integration Security and Civil Liberties in Transatlantic Perspective.” Rutgers University Press, March 2010.

https://books.google.ca/books?id=PNoTdVJUg5YC&pg=PA134&lpg=PA134&dq=Robert+Leiken+Steven+Brooke:+The+quantitative+analysis+of+terrorism+and+immigration.+An+initial+exploration,+in:+Terrorism+and+Political+Violence&source=bl&ots=jEfZ7jz129&sig=B32Wbn265HmcdAVmzDCoQXNJwdg&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUK Ewj7u-ji_6LNAhUM64MKHYBkAZ4Q6AEIMjAF#v=onepage&q=terror&f=false



Bibliography

“Schengen Area.” European Commission, Migration and Home Affairs: Policies.

http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/borders-and-visas/schengen/index_en.htm

“Germany tells Italy to ‘solve its own problems’ in Tunisian refugee row.” Deutsche Welle. 10 April 2011. <http://www.dw.com/en/germany-tells-italy-to-solve-its-own-problems-in-tunisian-refugee-row/a14980272>

“France blocks Italian trains carrying Tunisian migrants.” BBC World News. 17 April 2011.

<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-13109631>

“The Importance of Safeguarding Schengen.” Speech delivered at European Parliament S&D Conference on ‘Upholding Freedom of Movement – An Improved Schengen Governance.’ European Commission: Press Release. 8 February 2012. http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-12-78_en.htm?locale=en

“State Fragility Around the World: Fractured Justice and Fierce Reprisal.” Gould, Laurie and Matthew Pate. Published by CRC Press, 2016.

https://books.google.ca/books?id=mPUBDAAAQBAJ&pg=PT101&lpg=PT101&dq=ISIS+control+nine+provinces+syria&source=bl&ots=2QrKShNd5U&sig=IXWXCScyEvCGXi-e9dR20iBipxw&hl=en&sa=X&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=ISIS%20control%20nine%20provinces%20syria&f=false

“Record Bombing of Islamic State Tallied by U.S. Air Force.” *Bloomberg*. 5 December 2015.

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-12-05/record-bombing-of-islamic-state-targets-tallied-by-u-s-military>

“Over one million sea arrivals reach Europe in 2015.” United Nations Human Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). 30 December 2015. <http://www.unhcr.org/en-us/news/latest/2015/12/5683d0b56/million-sea-arrivals-reach-europe-2015.html>



“Greece: 50,000 people stranded in refugee camps and detention centres following EU-Turkey deal.” Medecins Sans Frontieres/Doctors Without Borders. 12 May 2016. <http://www.msf.ca/en/article/greece-50-000-people-stranded-in-refugee-camps-and-detention-centres-following-eu-turkey>

“The Refugee Surge in Europe: Economic Challenges.” International Monetary Fund Staff Discussion Note. January 2016. <https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/sdn/2016/sdn1602.pdf>

“Full list of Member States’ notifications of the temporary reintroduction of border control at internal borders pursuant to Article 25 et seq. of the Schengen Borders Code.” European Commission: Migration and Home Affairs. Retrieved 25 May 2016. http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/borders-and-visas/schengen/reintroduction-border-control/docs/ms_notifications_-_reintroduction_of_border_control_en.pdf

“Hungary to erect 175-km-long fence along border with Serbia.” *The Budapest Beacon*. 17 June 2015. <http://budapestbeacon.com/politics/hungary-to-erect-175-km-long-fence-along-border-with-serbia/24389>

“Hungary scrambles to confront migrant influx, Merkel heckled.” *Reuters*. 26 August 2015. <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-europe-migrants-hungary-idUSKCN0QV0L720150826>

“Hungary fires tear gas, water cannons at refugees.” *Al Jazeera*. 16 September 2015. <http://www.aljazeera.com/news/2015/09/hungary-tear-gas-water-cannon-refugees-150916140918312.html>

“Slovenia deploys army to Schengen zone border to tackle refugee influx.” *Deutsche Welle*. 23 February 2016. <http://www.dw.com/en/slovenia-deploys-army-to-schengen-zone-border-to-tackle-refugee-influx/a-19066844>

“Germany extends border checks to halt refugees.” *The Local*. 13 October 2015. <http://www.thelocal.de/20151013/ministry-extends-border-controls-to-curb-refugee-flow>

“Merkel defends return to stricter immigration rules.” *Deutsche Welle*. 13 November 2015. <http://www.dw.com/en/merkel-defends-return-to-stricter-immigration-rules/a-18848881>



“Paris Attacks Prompt State of Emergency in France.” *The Wall Street Journal*. 13 November 2015. <http://www.wsj.com/articles/france-declares-national-state-of-emergency-after-paris-attacks-1447457010>

“Sweden slams shut its open-door policy towards refugees.” *The Guardian*. 24 November 2015. <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/nov/24/sweden-asylum-seekers-refugees-policy-reversal>

“Danes, Swedes impose new border checks in fresh blow to open-frontier Europe.” *Reuters*. 4 January 2016. <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-europe-migrants-denmark-sweden-idUSKBN0UI17D20160104>

“Between allure of better life and death at Mediterranean sea.” *The Guardian*. 22 May 2015. <http://guardian.ng/features/between-allure-of-better-life-and-death-at-mediterranean-sea/>

“Migrants fight on Greek island of Kos.” *CBC News*. 11 August 2015. <http://www.cbc.ca/news/world/migrants-fight-on-greek-island-of-kos-1.3186622>

“European Union blasts Greece over migrant crisis.” *EU Business*. 28 January 2016. <http://www.eubusiness.com/news-eu/europe-migrants.1618/>

“Schengen zone: EU gives Greece deadline on borders.” *BBC News*. 12 February 2016. <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-35559159>

“Germany to Extend Passport Controls until EU Border Checks Effective.” *The Wall Street Journal*. 10 May 2016. <http://www.wsj.com/articles/germany-to-extend-passport-controls-until-eu-border-checks-effective-1462892559>

“Council adopts recommendation for continuation of internal border controls.” *European Council*. 12 May 2016. <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2016/05/12-internal-border-controls/>

“Secure EU external borders to help save Schengen passport-free area, urge MEPs.” European Parliament Newsroom. 11 May 2016. <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/news-room/20160504IPR25746/Secure-EU-external-borders-to-help-save-Schengen-passport-free-area-urge-MEPs>



“European border closures ‘inhumane’ – UN refugee agency.” *Reuters*. 23 May 2016.

<http://in.reuters.com/article/humanitarian-summit-europe-idINKCN0YE23N>

“Refugee quotas ‘unacceptable’ for Visegrad states.” *EU Observer*. 4 Septmeber 2015.

<https://euobserver.com/migration/130122>

Vollmer, Ruth and Marc von Boemcken. “Europe Off Limits: Militarization of the EU’s External Borders.” In *Friedensgutachten 2014*. Münster, pp. 126-139.

http://www.friedensgutachten.de/tl_files/friedensgutachten/pdf_eng/fga2014en/Beitrag%201.7.pdf

Van Ostaijen and Peter Scholten, “*Policy populism? Political populism and migrant integration policies in Rotterdam and Amsterdam.*” *Comparative European Politics*, Vol. 12 Issue 6, November 2014.

<http://link.springer.com/article/10.1057%2Fcep.2014.26>

“Polls show most Germans fear refugee burden too great.” *The Local*. 15 January 2016.

<http://www.thelocal.de/20160115/poll-shows-most-germans-fear-refugee-burden-too-great>

“Poll: Germans increasingly skeptical of refugees.” *Deutsche Welle*. January 1 2016

<http://www.dw.com/en/poll-germans-increasingly-skeptical-of-refugees/a-18982943>

Factsheet, Information Centre about Asylum and Refugees.

http://icar.livingrefugeearchive.org/fs_attitudes.pdf

“Swiss vote to ban construction of minarets on mosques.” *The Guardian*. 29 November 2009.

<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2009/nov/29/switzerland-bans-mosque-minarets>

“Poland: Middle East migrants cause EU tensions.” *EU Observer*.

<https://euobserver.com/migration/132881>

“Refugees Welcome Index shows government refugee policies out of touch with public opinion.”

Amnesty International, 19 May 2016. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2016/05/refugees-welcome-index-shows-government-refugee-policies-out-of-touch/>



“Germany to extend passport controls until EU border checks effective.” *The Wall Street Journal*. 10 May 2016. <http://www.wsj.com/articles/germany-to-extend-passport-controls-until-eu-border-checks-effective-1462892559>

Stein, Arlene and Zakia Salime. “Manufacturing Islamophobia: Rightwing Pseudo-Documentaries and the Paranoid Style.” *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 1 February 2015. <http://jci.sagepub.com/content/39/4/378.abstract>

Ramos, Alice et al. “Economic crisis, human values and attitudes towards immigrants.” *Values, Economic Crisis and Democracy*. Published January 2016. https://books.google.ca/books?hl=en&lr=&id=qzR-CwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA104&dq=economy+immigrants+blame+public+europe&ots=40Sq6vIukk&sig=MYeqpM_1kXtrOp4JcH8zopQ4ddE#v=onepage&q=economy%20immigrants%20blame%20public%20europe&f=false

“Austrian Presidential Candidates Neck and Neck in Election Runoff.” *The Wall Street Journal*. 22 May 2016. <http://www.wsj.com/articles/austria-to-elect-new-president-as-immigration-issues-loom-large-1463905093>

“How Far is Europe Swinging to the Right?” *The New York Times*. 22 May 2016. http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/05/22/world/europe/europe-right-wing-austria-hungary.html?_r=0

“Bavarian AfD wants to shut down mosques.” *Deutsche Welle*. <http://www.dw.com/en/bavarian-afd-wants-to-shut-down-mosques/a-19149600>

“Schengen’s Economic Impact: Putting Up Barriers.” *The Economist*. 6 February 2016. <http://www.economist.com/news/briefing/21690065-permanent-reintroduction-border-controls-would-harm-trade-europe-putting-up-barriers>

Departure from the Schengen Agreement: Macroeconomic impacts on Germany and the countries of the European Union.” *Global Economic Dynamics*. https://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/fileadmin/files/BSt/Publikationen/GrauePublikationen/NW_Departure_from_Schengen.pdf



“The Economic Costs of Non-Schengen: What the Numbers Tell Us.” Dr. Anna auf dem Brinke – Policy Paper. 20 April 2016. <http://www.institutdelors.eu/media/costnonschengen-aufdembrinke-jdib-april16.pdf?pdf=ok>

“Schengen’s Stress Test: Political Issues and Perspectives.” Published by Jacques Delors Institute. February 15 2016. <http://www.institutdelors.eu/media/schengensstresstest-berthoncinivitorino-jdi-feb16.pdf?pdf=ok>

The Economic Costs of Non-Schengen: What the Numbers Tell Us.” Dr. Anna auf dem Brinke – Policy Paper. 20 April 2016. <http://www.institutdelors.eu/media/costnonschengen-aufdembrinke-jdib-april16.pdf?pdf=ok>

Callens, Marie-Sophie. “Integration Policies and Public Opinion: in conflict or in harmony?” Luxembourg Institute of Socioeconomic Research and University of Leuven. February 2015. http://www.migpolgroup.com/wp_clean/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/MIPEX_Literature-review_Integration-and-public-opinion.pdf

Ramos, Alice et al. “Economic crisis, human values and attitudes towards immigrants.” *Values, Economic Crisis and Democracy*. Published January 2016. https://books.google.ca/books?hl=en&lr=&id=qzR-CwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA104&dq=economy+immigrants+blame+public+europe&ots=40Sq6vIukk&sig=MYeqpM_1kXtrOp4JcH8zopQ4ddE#v=onepage&q=economy%20immigrants%20blame%20public%20europe&f=false

Malchow-Møller, Nikolaj et al. “Attitudes towards immigration – perceived consequences and economic self-interest.” 2008 <http://www.econ.ku.dk/jrm/pdffiles/malchow-m%C3%B8llermunchschrollskaksen2008.pdf>

Cochrane, Christopher and Neil Nevitte. “Scapegoating: Unemployment, far-right parties and anti-immigrant sentiment.” 2014. <http://individual.utoronto.ca/cochrane/research/CEP2014/Scapegoating.pdf>



Karger, Howard. “The Bitter Pill: Austeristy, Debt, and the Attack on Europe’s Welfare States.”

University of Queensland, Australia School of Social Work and Human Services, 2014.

https://www.wmich.edu/hhs/newsletters_journals/jssw_institutional/individual_subscribers/41.2.Karger.pdf

“Ban criticizes Hungary over treatment of people at border.” Ráidíó Tellifís Éireann News. 16 September 2015. <http://www.rte.ie/news/2015/0916/728116-migrants-crisis/>

“Jamal Zougam: Madrid bomb suspect.” *BBC News*. 2004.

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/3515790.stm>

Jordán, Javier. “Evolution of Jihadism in Spain Following the 3/11 Madrid Terrorist Attacks.” In *Perspectives on Terrorism*, Vol. 1. No. 3. (2007).

<http://www.terrorismanalysts.com/pt/articles/issues/PTv1i3.pdf>

d’Appollonia, Ariane Chebel. “Managing Ethnic Diversity after 9/11: Integration Security and Civil Liberties in Transatlantic Perspective.” Rutgers University Press, March 2010.

https://books.google.ca/books?id=PNoTdVJUg5YC&pg=PA134&lpg=PA134&dq=Robert+Leiken/Steven+Brooke:+The+quantitative+analysis+of+terrorism+and+immigration.+An+initial+exploration,+in:+Terrorism+and+Political+Violence&source=bl&ots=jEfZ7jz129&sig=B32Wbn265HmcdaVmzDCoQXNJwdg&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwj7u-ji_6LNAhUM64MKHYBkAZ4Q6AEIMjAF#v=onepage&q=terror&f=false

“Terrorists Cross Borders, Europe Sees Anew That Its Intelligence Does Not.” *The New York Times*. 23 March 2016. <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/24/world/europe/as-terrorists-cross-borders-europe-sees-anew-that-its-intelligence-does-not.html>

“Report on Muslims in Britain.” Minority Rights Group International, 2002.

<http://minorityrights.org/wp-content/uploads/old-site-downloads/download-129-Muslims-in-Britain.pdf>



Freeman, Gary P. “Immigrant integration, political radicalization and terrorism.” Handbook on Migration and Social Policy. 2016.

[https://books.google.ca/books?id=3nKNCwAAQBAJ&pg=PA268&lpg=PA268&dq=Marshall+1965;+Hammar+1985\).+gary+freeman&source=bl&ots=md5Qx-c1Jk&sig=dB5PcYOS3YqF2XB2s4apEkIL2oI&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiotrPSrovNAhVXV1IKHRuDCcMQ6AEIGzAA#v=onepage&q=Marshall%201965%3B%20Hammar%201985\).%20gary%20freeman&f=false](https://books.google.ca/books?id=3nKNCwAAQBAJ&pg=PA268&lpg=PA268&dq=Marshall+1965;+Hammar+1985).+gary+freeman&source=bl&ots=md5Qx-c1Jk&sig=dB5PcYOS3YqF2XB2s4apEkIL2oI&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiotrPSrovNAhVXV1IKHRuDCcMQ6AEIGzAA#v=onepage&q=Marshall%201965%3B%20Hammar%201985).%20gary%20freeman&f=false)

“Report on Muslims in Britain.” Minority Rights Group International, 2002.

<http://minorityrights.org/wp-content/uploads/old-site-downloads/download-129-Muslims-in-Britain.pdf>

Frey, Bruno S. “Terrorism and Business.” University of Zurich and Federal University of Technology Zurich. 2007. <http://www.crema-research.ch/papers/2007-12.pdf>

Frey, Bruno S. and Simon Luechinger. “How to Fight Terrorism: Alternatives to Deterrence.” University of Zurich. November 2002.

<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.9.1833&rep=rep1&type=pdf>