Migratory crisis in the European Union: origin, characteristics and measures for countering it

Миграционный кризис в Европейском Союзе: происхождение, особенности и меры противодействия

Crisis migratoria en la Unión Europea: origen, características y medidas para contrarrestarla

Crise migratória na União Europeia: origem, características e medidas para a combater

Written by:
Andrey V. Rybakov [4]
Daniil A. Kvon[5]

Abstract

The present paper studies the mass and uncontrollable streams of migrants into the European Union (EU) starting from 2014. In scientific and public discourse, this phenomenon was called the "migratory crisis". The paper analyzes the causes of forced migration from Africa and the Middle East, which is characterized both by national and global problems. The authors reveal the ambiguous position of EU member states with respect to the illegal migration and identify two basic approaches, which were formed in the course of political discussions concerning this crisis in the context of EU safety. In particular, the research shows the changes in the content of threats to the EU member states, caused by the uncontrollable migration in the recent decades. The article presents a survey of the fundamental characteristics of migratory crisis, the measures developed by the EU structures for its overcoming and the results of their implementation.

Keywords: European Union, migratory crisis, migratory policy, refugees.

Аннотация

В настоящей работе рассматриваются массовые и неконтролируемые потоки мигрантов в Европейский союз (ЕС), начиная с 2014 года. В научном и общественном дискурсе это явление получило название "миграционный кризис". В статье анализируются причины вынужденной миграции из Африки и Ближнего Востока, которая характеризуется как национальными, так и глобальными проблемами. Авторы выявляют неоднозначную позицию государств-членов ЕС в отношении нелегальной миграции и выделяют два основных подхода, которые сформировались в ходе политических дискуссий относительно данного кризиса в контексте безопасности ЕС. В частности, исследование показывает изменения в содержании угроз для государств-членов ЕС, вызванные неконтролируемой миграцией за последние десятилетия. В статье представлен обзор фундаментальных характеристик миграционного кризиса, разработанных структурами ЕС мер по его преодолению и результатов их реализации.

Ключевые слова: беженцы, Европейский союз, миграционная политика, миграционный кризис.

[4] Professor, Department of Philosophy, MAI (NRU), Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor, Moscow Aviation Institute (MAI), 125080, Russia, Moscow, Volokolamskoe highway, 4. Contact e-mail: rybackov@rambler.ru
[5] Associate Professor, Moscow Aviation Institute (MAI), 125080, Russia, Moscow, Volokolamskoe highway, 4. Contact e-mail: docentkvon@yandex.ru

Resumo

Este artigo estuda os fluxos incontroláveis e massivos de migrantes que viajam para a União Européia (UE) desde 2014. Nas duas esferas, pública e científica, esse fenômeno foi chamado de "crise migratória". Este documento analisa as causas que causaram os movimentos migratórios da África e do Oriente Médio, que têm suas raízes em problemas nacionais e globais. Além disso, os autores revelam a posição ambígua da UE no que diz respeito à imigração ilegal, identificando duas abordagens principais que foram criadas durante o desenvolvimento de discussões políticas relacionadas com a crise no contexto da segurança na UE. Em particular, esta pesquisa mostra as mudanças na forma de "ameaças" aos estados membros da UE causadas pela migração incontrolável das últimas décadas. Este artigo também apresenta um estudo sobre as características fundamentais da crise migratória, as medidas adotadas pelas instituições da UE para lidar com ela e os resultados da implementação da mesma.

Palavras-chave: crise migratória, política de imigração, refugiados, União Europeia.

Resumen

El presente artículo estudia los flujos incontrolables y masivos de migrantes que viajan a la Unión Europea (UE) desde 2014. Tanto en el ámbito público como el científico, este fenómeno fue llamado "crisis migratoria". Este documento analiza las causas que provocaron los movimientos migratorios desde África y Oriente Medio, las cuales tienen sus raíces tanto en problemas nacionales como globales. Asimismo, los autores revelan la posición ambigua de la UE con respecto a la inmigración ilegal, identificando dos principales enfoques que se crearon durante el desarrollo de discusiones políticas relativas a la crisis en el contexto de la seguridad en la UE. En particular, esta investigación muestra los cambios en forma de "amenazas" a los estados miembros de la UE provocados por la incontrolable migración de las últimas décadas. Este artículo también presenta un estudio de las características fundamentales de la crisis migratoria, las medidas adoptadas por las instituciones de la UE para afrontarla y los resultados que han tenido la implementación de las mismas.

Palabras clave: crisis migratoria, política migratoria, refugiados, Unión Europea.

Introduction

International migration has become a major issue of concern for the international community. As a global phenomenon, it has an effect on all states of the world, making them a place of origin, destination or transit for the migrants. The problem of migration became urgent only when its social-economic and social-political consequences became visible at the international level. Thus, the mass and uncontrollable arrival of migrants from the countries of the Middle East and Africa to Europe in 2014-2016 has become one of the world migratory trends and has got the name of "migratory crisis".

In 2014, the representatives of the European Union (the EU) and the EU member states declared their openness for those, who left their country as a result of political persecution and feared negative consequences of the conflicts taking place in their native countries. However, today during the discussions on the future of migration and the EU policy for granting of asylum to refugees many voices are being raised, which indicate the need of limiting the inflow of foreigners and strengthening of controls at the external borders. Thus, at the end of December 2017, the new chancellor of Austria Sebastian Kurtz spoke against the accommodation of refugees in the EU countries. In his opinion, the decision to give home in Europe to migrants from Africa and the Middle East "was a mistake". "If we continue this way, there will be even more discord in the European Union. The member states must decide if they are ready to house refugees and how many", he stated. He explained that the borders between granting of asylum to refugees and economic migration are blurred. But, on January 8, 2018, Sigmar Gabriel, the German Minister of Foreign Affairs, speaking in Brussels at the conference on EU budget issues, stated that the authorities of the European Union "should now try to stop mass streams of migrants as 2015 became a year, that broke the camel's back". Such a change of rhetoric in public and scientific discourse reflects an evolution of the threats, connected with the migration. Initially, the social and economic threats (problems in the labor market, access to social benefits, etc.) were linked with the mass streams of migrants. In the 1990ies, when in some of the EU states migrants already composed 5-10% of the population, the threats to national culture and identity became

more significant (these included problems with assimilation or integration of migrants, Islamization, the loss of national identity, etc.). Today the migratory trend appears to be one of the major challenges for the national security (as its consequences include the development of the organized crime, terrorism, etc.).

As a result, in the course of discussions two opposite approaches to the definition of this crisis in the context of the safety were formed: 1) the crisis is a challenge, that demands a prompt response; 2) the crisis is a threat, which needs to be countered. The first approach treats crisis phenomena as a problematic situation, which forms a number of tasks. These tasks are to be solved by the European Union, the EU member states, Turkey, the states of the Middle East, including to the countries of destination, transit and the origin of refugees and migrants, as well as the representatives of the international community – the humanitarian organizations.

The second approach treats the uncontrollable migration as a crisis phenomenon with the exceptionally negative effect and destruction, directed toward the EU member states and the European Union as a whole.

The supporters of the first approach (the treatment of crisis as a challenge) are the European Commission, Germany, and Scandinavian states. The followers of the opposite approach are the states of the Vyshegrad Group (Hungary, Poland, Slovakia, the Czech Republic) and Austria.

On the one hand, the European states cannot simply close their borders and ignore migrants because this will make their moral principles doubtful. On the other hand, a substantial part of the local population is not ready to live next to the Moslem migrants. The cause of this xenophobia is not only the cultural and religious differences but also the fear of terrorist acts and radical Islam. The situation is aggravated by the absence of a common position in the EU concerning the settling of the crisis. A number of states in Central and Eastern Europe are dissatisfied with the quota scheme for housing migrants introduced by the official EU institutions. Some of these states do not accept refugees or accept a minimum quantity. Some close their borders, while others, on the contrary, let the migrants enter the EU without control. the migratory agreement between the European Union and Turkey is only a provisional measure. The economic benefits from the influx of potential workforce are leveled by the need for redistributing the budget to the detriment of the citizens of EU member states, for integrating refugees and creating jobs for them. It is obvious that the uncontrollable migration is a complex problem, which contains many internal contradictions, and European Union is now even further from developing an integrated and effective policy in the field of the uncontrollable migration.

The purpose of the paper is to study the causes, dynamics, and characteristics of the migratory crisis in the EU and the ways of settling it.

Materials and methods

The principles of the dialectic method and objective historical and system analysis of processes, facts, and institutions serve as a basis of the author's methodology used in the present paper. the author uses the institutional, comparative, and synergetic methods of study. The theoretical base of the study is composed of a wide range of documents: the materials of international conferences, government meetings, summits, official government statements, periodic publications, etc. Special attention was paid to the official concepts and strategies of the European Union and EU member states in the field of migratory policy and safety.

Literature Overview

The issue of the migratory crisis on the European continent has been discussed in the works of F. Balanche and S. Quéré, J. Cienski, D. Dogachan, H. Foy, B. Galgóczi, A. Geddes and A. Taylor, R. Hokovsky, D.G. Papademetriou and M. Benton, J. Leschke and A. Watt, G. McCann, P. Vimont. Among the Russian researchers, the problem of the uncontrollable migration and migratory crisis in the EU has had significant coverage and was examined in different aspects. The general problems of the European migratory crisis with the analysis of its quantitative indices are represented in the works of E.S. Akopyan and V.O. Kozhina, N. Askerova, V.V. Belaya, R.M. Gasanova, L.M. Kapitsa, L.I. Kravchenko, E.M. Shcherbakova. The sociocultural and religious aspects of migratory processes are studied in the works of S.A. Korshunova, A.G. Oganesyan, G.I. Starchenkova. The legal factors of migration are in the focus of study of T.M. Bormotova, I.E. Nikitin, G.Sh. Ibragimova. The national aspects of the migratory crisis have been reflected in the articles of D.V. Grizovskaya, I.V. Likhachev, Yu.A. Maltseva. Finally, migration as a challenge to European and Russian security is analyzed in the works D.R. Amirova, T.M.

Bormotova, A.S. Brychkova and G.A. Nikanorova, V.V. Gayduk, Yu. G. Efimova, A. Nosovich, G.A. Reznik, L.O. Samsonova, T.Yu. Shipicina, E.S. Jankowskaya.

Key findings

Causes of the crisis. It seems that the reason behind the dramatic increase of the number of refugees in 2014-2016 in the EU states (Table 1) is both the global factors and the specific situations in those states, which are the places of origin of the refugees. Special attention should be focused on Syria.

Table 1. The number of illegal migrants in the EU states in 2008-2016

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total for 2008-2016
Total	579 825	563 990	505 130	468 850	433 325	452 270	672 215	2 154 675	983 860	6 814 140
Syria	4 535	4 650	4 095	5 380	17 050	33 090	118 865	859 035	213 080	1 259 780
Afghanistan	49 750	49 685	41 415	45 360	34 105	26 095	48 550	409 275	151 825	856 060
Iraq	37 325	23 425	16 685	12 100	9 290	6 525	10 275	185 315	92 985	393 925
Albania	72 655	68 975	52 370	17 225	18 610	27 325	32 195	50 105	36 135	375 595
Morocco	39 500	32 555	29 675	28 845	27 880	27 255	32 075	41 740	39 470	298 995
Pakistan	13 020	15 475	19 375	32 490	29 665	27 440	24 005	81 850	46 530	289 850
Eritrea	21 030	10 690	7 065	8 070	6 020	10 235	50 795	41 575	23 270	178 750
Algeria	15 735	15 920	19 230	17 955	17 290	15 370	15 415	19 375	23 785	160 075
India	19 495	16 670	14 995	15 125	16 100	15 990	17 285	17 660	16 875	150 195
Nigeria	16 435	16 415	16 895	14 045	12 095	14 365	16 410	20 395	20 545	147 600
Iran	9 550	9 320	10 110	11 065	9 965	8 155	8 465	44 785	33 490	144 905
Ukraine	12 675	11 220	10 875	11 880	12 555	12 675	16 905	23 920	29 785	142 490
Tunisia	14 045	13 880	10 765	24 125	17 525	12 820	16 100	13 390	11 775	134 425
Kosovo (')	0	4 580	5 070	4 210	5 180	14 585	33 785	50 040	9 715	127 165
Somalia	10 835	16 610	14 615	8 820	9 175	8 800	14 250	17 515	12 765	113 385
Bangladesh	7 085	8 870	9 775	11 260	15 360	10 130	10 145	21 575	10 375	104 575
China (²)	16 515	17 060	15 345	11 745	10 020	8 565	8 440	8 215	7 815	103 720
Serbia	13 290	8 335	12 045	9 305	10 420	11 020	14 690	12 875	10 250	102 230
Turkey	13 910	11 760	10 720	10 385	9 290	9 250	8 700	9 855	9 605	93 475
Russia	9 960	10 330	9 020	9 365	10 205	15 100	10 935	8 295	9 600	92 810
Brazil	14 580	18 570	14 350	10 640	7 285	6 105	5 590	5 190	6 260	88 570
Unknown	5 260	4 695	4 830	3 795	2 980	5 620	5 435	38 055	9 240	79 910
Vietnam	7 850	12 955	9 215	6 475	5 805	4 975	4 860	6 210	6 270	64 615
Senegal	9 630	8 995	7 495	5 835	4 905	5 040	5 350	7 385	6 055	60 690
Bolivia	17 435	14 830	8 880	6 370	3 455	2 610	2 200	1 710	945	58 435
Egypt	6 725	5 845	5 735	5 235	5 100	5 840	7 640	6 935	7 995	57 050
Palestine	7 330	11 030	9 475	4 175	3 015	1 980	3 245	8 640	3 155	52 045
Georgia	5 005	7 180	5 325	4 285	5 335	4 990	6 355	5 385	5 185	49 045
Sudan	2 425	2 715	6 275	3 405	2 085	2 355	6 670	13 500	7 270	46 700
Ghana	4 880	4 040	4 365	4 040	3 720	4 555	4 875	5 625	5 005	41 105

Note: coverage for the EU changes over time. 2008: excluding Luxembourg, Portugal and Sweden. 2008-2012: excluding Croatia. 2012-2014: excluding the Netherlands. The selection of the top 30 nationalities is based on the cumulative number of persons for the entire period covering 2008-2016 (subject to data availability).
(') Under United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244/99.
(²) Including Hong Kong.

The civil war in Syria started in 2011 and has already forced more than 1.2 million people to seek asylum in Europe (see Table 1). First, the refugees settled in the neighboring countries, such as Turkey and Jordan, but then for some reasons moved further north. In 2015 the number of Syrian refugees reached its peak. The Syrian tragedy has a number of reasons: natural cataclysms; a demographic boom and a shortage of resources; the Civil War, military actions, and terrorism; the internationalization of the conflict.

As far as other states are concerned, the basic reasons for mass flight are: poverty and the high level of unemployment (Albania, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Kosovo, Nigeria, Eritrea, etc.); unstable political situation, large-scale acts of terror (Iraq, Pakistan); persecution on sectarian basis (Eritrea, Iraq); the incapacity of central power to guarantee security (Libya, Afghanistan, Iraq); the activity of terrorist groups (Nigeria, Afghanistan, Iraq); the suppression of opposition (Iran) (Dogahan, 2017).

The global factors include the following: the effect of spontaneity; the development of information technologies; population explosion; the presence of diasporas in the European states; the worsening of conditions in the neighbor-countries (Turkey, Jordan); the reduction of financing camps for the refugees; the decrease of humanitarian aid in the crisis regions; the lack of prospects of regulating conflicts in the immediate future; the closed nature of the Persian Gulf

states; the appearance of new routes of migration; the opening of borders by Turkey (Ibragimova, 2017; Novikov, 2018). It is obvious that the problems mentioned above are very well known and none of them separately could serve as the cause of the crisis. But, together, they have led to mass uncontrolled migration.

The routes of migration. The goal of refugees is to enter the territory of the European Union and to obtain asylum. The territory itself can be located outside the European continent, for example, on the islands or in the enclaves in North Africa, that belong to the EU member states (Maltseva, 2016). After the refugees I get there, they apply for asylum and it becomes rather difficult to deport them. First, international law forbids to send out asylum seekers without the preliminary study of their application, and considering the total quantity of refugees and migrants, this occupies much time. In the second place, the legislation of the EU and separate EU member states creates limitations for the deportation of migrants and refugees, even after they are refused the granting of asylum (Samsonova, 2016).

The next goal of refugees is to enter those EU states where they can find work or good social benefits and in the course of time settle well in life. This is the reason that they do not stop in the nearest European countries - Spain, Italy, Greece, and Hungary. They seek further north and west, mainly to Germany and Sweden.

Frontex (European Border and Coast Guard Agency) has identified 7 main routes for refugees and illegal migration: West African, West Mediterranean, Central Mediterranean, East Mediterranean, Balkan and East European. The passability and popularity of each of the routes depend on many factors – from the climatic conditions to the restrictive measures of the law enforcement institutions of the EU member states. Special consideration should be given to this problem (Amirova & Khramova, 2016).

Measures for countering the crisis. In April 2014, during the election campaign, the President of the European Commission Jean-Claude Juncker unveiled his vision of a solution to the migration crisis by formulating five priorities in this area. These were: 1) the creation of the united European system of asylum granting, in which the criteria and the procedures of granting of the refugee status will be identical for all EU member states; 2) the activation of assistance to the states, which experience the greatest difficulties due to the sudden and mass arrival of refugees; 3) collaboration with the countries of the origin of refugees and assistance to these countries for the purpose of eliminating the causes of the crisis; 4) the expansion of possibilities for the controlled and organized migration into Europe in the interests of the future development of continent; 5) strengthening the protection of the outer boundary of the EU and combating the criminal groups, which specialize in the illegal trafficking of migrants. Further detailing of these priorities was reflected in the tasks, outlined for the new composition of European Commission, which started to work in November 2014 (Geddes & Taylor, 2015).

In April 2015, the ministers of foreign and domestic affairs of the EU member states supported the plan of actions proposed by European Commission consisting of 10 points: 1) the activation of patrol operations in the Mediterranean called "Triton" and "Poseidon"; providing additional funding and equipment of for these operations; the expansion of the patrol territory; 2) seizure and destruction of the vessels, used for the illegal trafficking of migrants; 3) the coordinated work of the European law-enforcement institutions, national border guards, and migratory departments aimed at identifying the traffickers and their monetary flows; 4) the mission into Italy and Greece of specialists for rendering aid to local services in the work with the applications submitted by the refugees; 5) the organization of fingerprinting of all migrants; 6) the development of the mechanism of the relocation of migrants in the case of critical situations; 7) the preparation of a pilot project on the voluntary migration to the territory the EU; 8) the development of the mechanism of rapid expelling of illegal migrants; 9) collaboration with the countries bordering on Libya; 10) sending into the countries of the migratory risk of liaison officers for the purpose of collection and analysis of data concerning the current situation there (Likhachev, 2018).

Following the development of the priorities, on May 13, 2015, the European Commission published the European Agenda on Migration, where the necessary measures both for preventing the uncontrollable influx of migrants and the improvement in the entire system of migratory processes control were defined. In the immediate future, the Agenda included the following measures: the activation of operations at sea; the adoption of the Pan-European scheme of migration of those, who obviously need international protection; the development of the system of the urgent relocation of refugees from

the countries with the highest migratory load, first of all from Greece and Italy; the development of the network of the points of the reception of the refugees, where registration and identification of those arrived would take place. A more long-term plan had to be focused on four directions: the decrease of motives for the uncontrolled migration; the improvement of border control (increasing the role and power of the European border agency Frontex; molding of a clear universal policy the European Union concerning the granting of asylum; developing a new policy concerning legal migration by retaining the attractiveness of Europe for the economic migrants and maximizing the benefits from the migration for the EU member states.

The European Agenda on Migration is being realized through the measures described in the special implementation packages. The first of them was presented on May 27, 2015. It contained a plan for countering illegal trafficking of migrants, in particular, a tripling of funding for operations at sea, ensuring the registration of migrants and fingerprinting. It also implied the involvement of the EU in the relocation programs for refugees located in camps under the auspices of the UNHCR (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees) in Turkey, Libya, and Jordan. It was proposed during a two-year period to move into Europe 22.5 thousand people, who obviously needed international protection. The most discussed and disputable among the EU members, first of all among the states of central Europe, was the proposal to distribute 40 thousand refugees from Greece and Italy among other EU members. Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and Slovakia were against the distribution of asylum seekers according to a fixed quota scheme.

The second implementation package appeared on September 9, 2015. It included the following activities: relocation of 120 thousand refugees from Greece and Italy (in addition to the 40 thousand, announced in May) in other EU member states depending on the population, GDP size, the number of previously submitted asylum applications, the level of unemployment; the introduction of a permanent distribution scheme; creating a list of safe countries, the citizens of which are usually not granted asylum; the establishment of a Fund for emergency situations in Africa to assist the countries of migrants' origin. In addition, there was launched a project to create refugee centers in Greece and Italy, where they should be registered and fingerprinted (Bormotova & Nikitina, 2016). Thus, in the course of a two-year period, 160

thousand refugees located in camps in Greece and Italy should have been distributed among the EU member states. However, according to the data of the European Commission, by the end of December 2017, the EU states had accepted from this number a little more than 32 thousand. Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia and the Russian Federation refused to accept illegal migrants. As a justification of their decision, they pointed to the desire of refugees to be based, first of all, in the richer EU states, as well as to the noticeable anti-Moslem moods in their countries (Shipitsina, 2014).

The third implementation package (from December 15, 2015) concerned the formation of the European Border and Coast Guard (EBCG) as a replacement of Frontex.

The European Commission tried to provide adequate funding for the implementation of these activities. The funding of migratory crisis regulation was increased considerably. Due to this, the expenditures of the EU for the migration control measures in 2015-2016 amounted to € 10 billion. The following step consisted in the joint actions with the third countries affected by the migratory crisis. In October 2015 a meeting was held with the leaders of the Western Balkan States, during which a plan was approved to regulate the streams of refugees through the territories of those states to the EU. In November 2015, the meeting of the EU and African leaders took place (Grizovskaya, 2016).

Today, the key partner of the European Union in the countering the migratory crisis is Turkey, where 3 mln Syrian refugees are located and from where goes a busy route of the migrant trafficking to Europe. In November 2015, the European Union signed an agreement with Turkey about cooperation in the stemming of illegal migration and providing assistance to Syrian refugees and to the Turkish communities, which accept them. €3 billion were allocated for the financial aid to Turkey (Akopyan & Kozhina, 2016). The agreements implied that all the illegal migrants newly arrived from Turkey had to be returned. At the same time, the European Union undertook to organize migration in the EU of one Syrian refugee for each accepted by Turkey illegal migrant, who had already obtained temporary refuge in Turkey (Reznik & Amirova, 2016).

Preliminary results and further prospects. The Governments of several EU member states, the press, and experts used to criticize the European structures for slow and ineffective coping with

the problems related to the migration crisis, accused them of low competence and short-sightedness in decision-making, and the absence of a strategic approach. However, the EU structures have managed to slow down the unregulated arrival of migrants in Europe. According to the information of Frontex, in April 2016 as compared to March, the number of illegal immigrants who arrived in Greece decreased by 90%. The number of migrants registered in Italy decreased by 13% compared to March 2016 and by 50% compared to April 2016.

However, there is no fundamental change in the situation. The causes of the crisis have not been eliminated. The number of forced migrants in the world is estimated at 60 million people. A number of conflicts, in particular in Syria occur in close proximity to the EU. The countries of the first destination cannot guarantee the appropriate reception of refugees. If in 2014, 50% of Syrian refugees in Turkey, Jordan, Lebanon lived below the poverty line, in 2015 it was already 70%.

The implementation of anti-crisis measures inside the EU goes slowly. At the same time, 6 refugee reception centers have been created in Italy and 5 centers in Greece. International teams take part in their work helping the local authorities (Brychkov & Nikanorov, 2016). Certain progress has been made in organizing the registration of migrants. Thus, in January 2016, 78% of migrants in Greece and 87% in Italy were fingerprinted.

At the same time, the results of the implementation of the schemes of the refugees' urgent relocation from the camps outside the borders of the EU are insufficient. The distribution of migrants requires long-term preparation. However, the fact is that not all EU states agreed to take part in it. By May 2016, 909 asylum seekers from Greece and 591 from Italy had been relocated (Korshunova, 2017). By April 2015, 5677 people had been relocated from non-EU member states, including 79 people from Turkey. The results of repatriation of migrants, who were refused asylum in Europe, are also sufficiently modest. According to the information of the European Commission, by May 2016, 175 refugees had been relocated from Italy.

In January 2016, the European Commission published a report on the responses to the challenges of the crisis and the priorities for the next years. The report contained a conclusion about the inevitability of the continuation of migratory crisis and the need, in connection with this, to radically change the entire system of migratory management in Europe (Gayduk & Suleimanov, 2014).

The primary tasks consisted of the following: the guarantee of the functioning of the mechanism of return to their home country of those who were refused the granting of the refugee status; the further development and improvement of the universal relocation scheme and the agreement of the EU member states on this question (the states, which refuse to accept refugees will be obligated to pay into the European funds 0.002% of the GDP). The tasks also include the creation of the European Border Forces and Coast Guard. The plans also include the restoration of the normal functioning of the Schengen area, i.e., the cancellation of border control by the states who join the Schengen area (Yankovskaya, 2014). Shengen has not only political and ideological value for the European Union but quite a pragmatic meaning as well. Thus, the possible losses of transportation services are estimated at €1.7-1.75 billion per year and of the tourism industry at €10-20 billion.

In April 2016, the European Commission began the discussion about the deep reform in the field of asylum granting and migratory policy in general. In this message, the basic task remained the restoration of order on the EU borders and in the procedures of granting the refugee status. At the same time, the discussion dealt with the revision of the Dublin agreements, according to which the responsibility for the refugee is laid on the country of entrance. Another task was to influence the main causes of migration and to improve the existing tools of legal migration, which is considered to be an efficient means of countering illegal migration. In fact, Europe needs migration in order to prevent the shortage of workers and to guarantee economic development. According to the forecasts, by 2060, the active population of the European Union will decrease by 10% or by 50 mln people, while the portion of pensioners will grow from 17.1% to 30%. It is important to consider the fact that already today there are enough grounds for the conclusion about a certain positive influence of the inflow of refugees on the European economy. Thus, according to a number of estimations, additional public expenditures have ensured 0.2% increase of the GDP. In the medium-term, this effect will grow due to an increase in the supply of the workforce. Among the mechanisms of legal migration, the most discussed issues are the application of the voluntary migration schemes for those, who need international protection; the development of the

mechanism of admittance to the EU territory for humanitarian reasons; the use of private sponsorship for the relocation of refugees; the improvement of the existing channels of legal migration – the reunification of families, the admittance of highly skilled migrants, students, scientists, etc. It is also proposed to develop the mechanisms of encouraging the migration of business people, who intend to introduce innovative technologies (McCann, 2017).

Conclusion

On the whole, migration, according to Eurobarometer, has grown into a most painful problem for Europeans, leaving behind the economic difficulties and unemployment. The analysis carried out in the present paper reveals the complexity of the problem of migratory crisis. First, it is a humanitarian crisis, which is accompanied by the deaths and sufferings of tens of thousands of people. In the second place, it is a management crisis which concerns the protection of outer borders and the mechanism of asylum granting. Thirdly, according to the expression of Martin Schulz, the ex-head of the European Parliament, it is the crisis of solidarity, since it is solidarity that lies in the basis of the unity of the European Union, and it turned out that it proved to be extremely difficult to find a universal solution of the problem of the mass inflow of refugees, which would make it possible to evenly distribute the load of migration on individual countries. Fourthly, the migratory crisis threatens the fundamental achievements of the European Union, first of all, the existence of the freedom of movement (such EU members as Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Norway, Slovenia, Hungary, Sweden have resorted to the restoration of control on the internal boundaries of the European Union). Fifthly, under the conditions of crisis, the radical political forces are usually activated (for example, the French far-right party "The Popular Front" in the first round of the local elections in December 2015 got 28% of the votes, and the "Alternative for Germany" in Bundestag elections on September 24, 2017 got 12.64%. It means that today we are witnessing the radicalization of a substantial part of the population, which can result in an increase of xenophobia, racism and the reformatting of the political space of the EU member states.

Thus, it is possible to state that the genesis, development, and consequences of the migratory crisis have formed an entire set of problems, whose solution even with all resources and solidarity of the EU member states is an extremely complex problem, especially considering the delayed impact of the crisis.

References

Akopyan, ES & Kozhina, VO (2016). Migration crisis in Europe. Bulletin of the International Institute of Economics and Law. 23 (2), 25-31.

Amirova, DR & Khramova, AI (2016). Regulation of migration processes as a factor of ensuring national security. Modern scientific research and innovations. 62 (6), 889-893.

Bormotova, TM & Nikitina, IE (2016). Problems of the approximation of national legislations of the EU member states in the issues of migration policy. Ethnosociety and Interethnic Culture. 1, 51-54.

Brychkov, AS & Nikanorov, GA (2016). European Migration Crisis and the Security of the Russian Federation. Problems of Security of Russian Society. 2, 15-22.

Dogahan, D (2017). Refugee Crisis in Europe (2015-2016): The Clash of Intergovernmental and Supranational Perspectives. International Journal of Social Sciences. 6(1), 1-8.

Gayduk, VV & Suleimanov, AR (2014). Migration features of contemporary ethnic conflicts. Questions of national and federal relations. 1, 110-119.

Geddes, A & Taylor, A (2015). In the shadow of fortress Europe? Impacts of European migration governance on Slovenia, Croatia and Macedonia. Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies. 42(4), 587-605.

Grizovskaya, DV (2016). Mechanisms of socio-cultural integration of migrants: the experience of Germany. The symbol of science. 7(2), 102-104.

Ibragimova, GS (2017). Migration Crisis: The Legal Aspect. Problems of Modern Science and Education. 10, 83-85.

Korshunova, S (2017). Modern migration policy of Europe: integration vs multiculturalism. Problems of social and human sciences. 2, 122-127.

Likhachev, IV (2018). Scandinavian model of social policy in relation to migrants (on the example of Sweden). Bulletin of the Magistracy. (2018), 1 (3), 88-90.

Maltseva, YA (2016). The concept of "refugee" in German media texts. Sign: the problem field of media education. 5, 39-43.

McCann, G (2017). Migration and Public Policy in a Fragmenting European Union, Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review. 24, 6-25.

Novikov, SV (2018). Strategic Analysis of the Development of High-Technology

Manufacturing Facilities. Russian Engineering Research. 38(3), 198-200.

Reznik, GA & Amirova, DR (2016). Migration as a threat to the national security: international and national aspects. Internet journal "Naukovedenie". 8 (6).

Samsonova, LO (2016). European Union policy in the field of combating illegal migration in the context of Russia's national security. Historical and Socio-Educational Thought. 4(1), 19-26.

Shipitsina, TY. (2014). Interrelation of Border Security and Migration Policy of the State. Scientific and Information Journal: Army and Societies. 4(41), 9-14.

Yankovskaya, ES (2014). The system of national security and international migration. Herald of the St. Petersburg Academy of Law. 25 (4), 79-84.