

**„BABEȘ-BOLYAI” UNIVERSITY
CLUJ-NAPOCA
FACULTY OF HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY
DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND SECURITY
STUDIES**

**SECURITY DIMENSION AS TRIGGER AND
RESULT OF THE MODIFICATION OF THE
FRONTIERS OF THE EUROPEAN UNION**

SUMMARY OF THE PHD THESIS

PhD. coordinator:

Prof. univ. dr. HORGA IOAN

PhD. student:

MÉSZÁROS EDINA LILLA

2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Argumentation and introduction in the problems of the thesis.....	1
The study of borders/frontiers and of security.....	5
Review of the literature.....	7
Research objectives and motivation for choosing the subject.....	8
Purpose and research hypotheses, the current situation and goals.....	8
Structure of the study.....	13
Methodology.....	19
The utility of the research and its limitations.....	20
CHAPTER I. Demystifying the concept of security, schools of thought and theoretical approaches.....	22
I.1. The concept of <i>security</i> : a non-traditional approach.....	22
I.2. Security, a socially constructed phenomenon: a constructivist approach.....	25
I.3. Innovations of Copenhagen School: notions of <i>securitization-desecuritization</i> , <i>societal security</i> versus the International Political Sociology of (in) security (School of Paris).....	29
I.3.1. <i>Securitization: a discursive construction of threat</i>	29
I.3.2. <i>Limits of the Copenhagen School and the perceptions of the followers of the Paris School</i>	37
I.4. Why there's a need to securitize migration and frontiers and to use a security rhetoric?.....	43
I.4.1. <i>Tracing the articulation of threat, a discourse analysis</i>	48
CHAPTER II. Security dimension as trigger and result of the modification of the frontiers of the European Community/European Union from the fall of the Berlin Wall and the creation of the Schengen area to the Treaty of Lisbon.....	59
II.1. Security dimension and David Hume's causation theory.....	59
II.2. Defining the border/frontier and their classification.....	62

II.3. <i>Iron curtain vs. lace curtain</i> or the road from the fall of the arbitrary border (Iron curtain) created during the Cold War to Schengen.....	65
<i>II.3.1. Freedom of movement of persons and the abolition of the internal borders or the creation of „Schengenland” (Schengen area).....</i>	<i>68</i>
II.4. Securitization of borders and of migration and the emergence of a new European threat environment: Treaty of Maastricht and the formation of the nexus between immigration and security.....	75
<i>II.4.1. Development of the immigration-security nexus beyond Amsterdam till Lisbon.....</i>	<i>79</i>
II.5. Databases and instruments for registering and monitoring of immigrants in the EU: Schengen Information System (SIS), the Visa Information System (VIS), Eurodac and the creation of the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union, Frontex.....	88
<i>II.5.1. European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union, Frontex.....</i>	<i>98</i>

CHAPTER III. The dilemma of securitization of the southern borders of the European Union: causal link between the human mobility triggered by the Arab Spring and the reform of the area of free movement.....	106
III.1. The phenomenon of migration in the European Union.....	106
<i>III.1.1. Conceptual approach, who are these immigrants and asylum seekers?</i>	<i>106</i>
<i>III.1.2. Brief introduction in the migration theories.....</i>	<i>110</i>
<i>III.1.3. Illegal immigrants and asylum seekers in the EU in numbers, a quantitative analysis.....</i>	<i>113</i>
III.2. Revolutions in North Africa and their migratory effects on the southern borders of the EU, especially on Italy.....	118
<i>III.2.1. What were the real reasons behind these migratory events? Was it a real humanitarian emergency situation?</i>	<i>122</i>
<i>III.2.2. How did Italy respond to these challenges?</i>	<i>123</i>

<i>III.2.3. What was the feedback of the European Union?</i>	126
III.3. The analyses of the cooperation agreements between North Africa and the EU on border control and migration: human rights dilemmas and policy incoherencies.....	129
III.4. How did a matter of external border control evolve into a fray on internal borders? Doomsayers predict the end of the Schengen area?	133
III. 5. Arab Spring the perfect scapegoat for strengthening the area of free movement.....	136
III. 6. Echoes of the Arab Spring: the irregular migratory phenomenon in Malta and Lampedusa and the reform of the Dublin Convention.....	141

CHAPTER IV. Dual character of the securitization of the external borders of the European Union: fences of bridges? A synthesis of the inclusionary and exclusionary practices at the southern and eastern borders of the European Union..... 150

IV.1. The EU’s external borders: surveillance and access points.....	150
IV.2. Spanish-Moroccan security nexus and the <i>principle of selective permeability</i>.....	151
<i>IV.2.1. The metaphor of "Fortress Europe" and "Panopticon/Banopticon Europe".....</i>	<i>154</i>
IV.3. Greek-Turkish security nexus, exclusionary border practices.....	158
IV.4. EU-Russia/Kaliningrad security nexus.....	159
<i>IV.4.1. Which is the eastern border of the European Union and why does it have to be securitized?</i>	<i>161</i>
<i>IV.4.2. Is there a frontier between cultures?</i>	<i>163</i>
<i>IV.4.3. Threats lurking at the eastern border of the European Union with special allusion to the border between EU-Russia/Kaliningrad: a quantitative analysis.....</i>	<i>164</i>
<i>IV.4.4. Kaliningrad –a short introduction.....</i>	<i>167</i>

<i>IV.4.5. Financial instruments of the European Union in Kaliningrad, inclusionary measures</i>	178
<i>IV.4.5. Position and role of the Kaliningrad oblast in the context of the EU-Russian border relations. Inclusionary and exclusionary practices</i>	181
CHAPTER V. The analysis of the EU’s new cutting edge technology in terms of external border control, the Eurosur program and the Smart Borders Initiative	193
V.1. The US-Visit Program and the American Smart Borders	193
V.2. Demystifying the Eurosur Program and the Smart Borders Initiative	196
V.3. The smart borders are anything but smart? Reluctance and criticism towards the EU’s border package and EUROSUR	207
V.4. Future scenarios related to trends in migration and border security	213
<i>V.4.1. A probability scenario</i>	<i>214</i>
<i>V.4.2. An alternative scenario (negative and pessimistic)</i>	<i>216</i>
<i>V.4.3. A preferred scenario (utopian)</i>	<i>217</i>
<i>V.4.4. A scenario of risk factors and the black swan theory</i>	<i>218</i>
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS- The European Union an „e-fortress” and a gated community in becoming?!	222
BIBLIOGRAPHY	227
ANNEXES	256
LIST OF FIGURES	
LIST OF CHARTS	
LIST OF MAPS	
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	

SUMMARY

Keywords: securitization, securitization of migration, security continuum, Copenhagen School, Paris School, Eurosur, Smart Borders Initiative, Frontex, Arab Spring, inclusive-exclusive border, Fortress Europe, gated community.

If we would ask the man of the 21st century¹ that what is his perception about borders, the most certainly he would describe this concept as a spatial demarcation line, a division between territories, cultures, languages, political and confessional systems. However, in most part of the early modern period, as well as ancient times and the Middle Ages borders were not designed as straight lines delimiting political territories and dominions. Leafing through the pages of history if we take the example of the Roman *limes*, the classic dividing line of the Roman civilization from the *barbarian world*, this rather represented a diffuse contact zone between the conquered territories and those who resisted the invasion, than a clear demarcation line.² The term frontier/border seems to have gained importance with the advent of the sovereign states in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries after the appearance of the system of states introduced by the Treaty of Westphalia, when borders have become more visible and began to be considered and discussed in the context of various aspects of state ideology being recognized also by international treaties.³

The emergence of the modern state has brought about the development of economic and political systems of a centre-periphery model. But today we face a paradox situation, on one hand, globalization⁴ and on the other hand preoccupations for security and terrorism, which reaffirm the importance of borders of each state.

¹ See E. L. Mészáros, „Security Dimension of New EU External Communication: The Duplicity of Borders as Surveillance and Access Points”, in: I. Horga; A. Landuyt (eds), *Communicating the EU Policies beyond the Borders. Proposals for Constructive Neighbour Relations and the New EU's External Communication Strategy*, Oradea, Editura Universităţii din Oradea, 2013, pp. 209-212.

² M. Baramova, „Border Theories in Early Modern Europe”, in: *European History Online (EGO)*, published by the Institute of European History (IEG), Mainz, 2010, p. 1, <http://www.ieg-ego.eu/en/threads/crossroads/border-regions/maria-baramova-border-theories-in-early-modern-europe>, accessed 7 July 2014.

³ E. Brunnet-Jailly (ed.), *Borderlands: Comparing Border Security in North America and Europe*, Ottawa, University of Ottawa Press, 2007, p. IX.

⁴ Globalization seems to make borders irrelevant in many ways, turning them into some obsolete and useless structures, it's enough to look at the fact that issues related to trade, migration, environment and health pass over the borders of several countries.

The monitoring of borders/frontiers raises important governing questions for both scholars and key policy makers, demanding profound institutional changes and the re-conceptualization of our perception about the symbolic and functional role of borders and of border areas and boundaries in the international order. Thus it can be ascertained that although the projections of a world without borders have become omnipresent in the last two decades, state borders remain one of the most basic and visible features of the international system.

Due to the political changes of the 1980s and 90s, among which we mention the dismantling of the Soviet Union and the European integration, the frontiers of Europe have undergone major changes. The collapse of the socialist regime in Eastern Europe redesigned the continent geographically, politically, socially and economically. While the Soviet bloc was falling apart in the east, in the west the European integration process was in progress. The Single European Act of 1986 laid the foundation for the Single Market and established the freedom of movement of people, goods, capital and services, and the Schengen agreements abolished customs control within the Schengen area, transferring control to the external borders. The fall of the Iron Curtain brought an opening of borders, but this illusion of soft borders was immediately dispersed by the Schengen and Maastricht moments, which established the strengthening of these external borders.

In the immediate period after the Cold War we witnessed the creation of a complex security environment profoundly changed, in which had produced a shift from risk to threats, namely from the sole risk of nuclear exchanges to multiple threats of global insecurity. In the new millennium the transnational threats increased, United Europe being under constant pressure, being the target of terrorist groups, drugs, weapons- and human traffickers and of illegal immigration networks. As a result to these challenges and threats, the frontiers of the European Union were transformed into security zones, with high-tech instruments and strict normative measures.

Border security has taken on greater importance after the terrorist attacks in the United States, occupying the first place on the agendas of political elites both in the U.S. and the European Union. After these events the EU has found itself face-to-face with a major challenge, namely the creation of a secure environment with strengthened borders, a challenge which in this era of free commerce must deal with the intensive flux of people and goods.

The border security policies must enable the security staff to identify and to filter dangerous substances or persons from millions of travellers and tons of merchandises which cross the frontiers of the European Union daily, especially in the large urban border regions. So we can conclude that the measures of management of the external frontiers of the European Union must meet a double objective: of enhancing security on one side and of facilitating travel and the movement of persons on the other side.

Precisely for this reason, one of the main objectives of this thesis consists in revealing both the *hard* and *soft* practices used by the EU at its external borders, trying to reconcile the realist state-centric and exclusionary border practices with the necessity of developing an inclusionary approach based on collaboration with those situated on the other side of the border. Thus, the European colossus acquires a dual feature: on one hand is trying to distance itself from the surrounding world, while on the other it wants to engage in a policy of good neighbourhood for the assurance of stability.

Among the objectives of the thesis we also find the analysis of the of issues of borders/ frontiers in terms of the main dimensions of European security, seen from the perspective of causality, security appearing as a trigger and result of the modification of frontiers. The research also aims to investigate the future trends concerning the securitization of the EU, predicting a United Europe with soft borders or an e-fortress (security enclave) with hard borders and explaining the duality of the EU's external borders (which can be at the same time both inclusionary and exclusionary).

The main question to which we want to answer in this study has taken as a source of inspiration the title of the famous novel of Henryk Sienkiewicz, Nobel Prize winner, namely: „*Quo vadis*” United Europe, an **e-fortress** and a gated community in becoming or a hospitable and enticing Europe?.⁵ By solving this dilemma we wish to give a prognosis of the direction where the EU is heading in border security and immigration policy matters, underlining that although the global migration policy of the EU is on a good track, the scenario of an *e-fortress*

⁵ See E. L. Mészáros, „'Quo Vadis' United Europe: An E-Fortress in Becoming or the Promise Land "Eldorado", in: *Analele Universității din Oradea, Seria Relații Internaționale și Studii Europene*, TOM IV, Oradea: Editura Universității din Oradea, 2012, p. 173.

Europe is very possible, a scenario that would be very dangerous both for the European humanitarian and normative tradition and for the human rights values.⁶

This study departs from certain hypotheses through which we want to confute the statements of various scholars, like Jan Zielonka or Chris Rumford, who foresee a Europe with *soft* frontiers. We desire to move the research to another level, according to which we consider the concept of *fortress Europe*, as an expired and outdated term, its place being taken by the concept of *e-fortress*, which instead of traditional measures of border control will use „invisible fences”, non-lethal microwaves, video-equipped (and potentially armed) unmanned dirigibles, off-shore sensors, satellite tracking systems and new biometric technologies for the assurance of the security of the external frontiers of EU.⁷

Jan Zielonka, in one of his studies, entitled *How New Enlarged Borders Will Reshape the European Union* (2001), pointed out that the installation of hard borders in the European Union would be difficult, the EU being a construction without definite borders. Zielonka even questioned the utility of these rigid borders, finding the problems connected to cross-border crime, smuggling, and illegal migration (considered as the main arguments for erecting walls around the EU, and for the construction of hard borders) exaggerated. In his perspective establishing hard borders would put in jeopardy the process of the European enlargement, which would lead to exclusion rather than inclusion.⁸ In his book *Europe as Empire* he comes to the same conclusion, advocating for a United Europe with soft, inclusive borders, drawing the attention of the reader upon the risks of hard borders, which would hamper the trade, and would alienate the EU's current and future neighbours, jeopardizing the existing Western system of freedom.⁹ Zielonka lobbied for an enlarged Europe with soft borders instead of hard and fixed ones.

In Chris Rumford's perception the European colossus recognized that the imposition of hard barriers is likely to create problems for both those EU countries on the periphery (faced

⁶ H. Neisser, „European Migration Policy”, in: B. Gebrewold (ed.), *Africa and Fortress Europe: Threats and Opportunities*, Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2007, p. 140.

⁷ See E. L. Mészáros, „'Quo Vadis' United Europe...”, pp. 173-175.

⁸ J. Zielonka, „How New Enlarged Borders Will Reshape the European Union”, in: *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 39, no. 3, 2001, pp. 508-526, http://econpapers.repec.org/article/blajcmkts/v_3a39_3ay_3a2001_3ai_3a3_3ap_3a507-536.htm, consulted 4 June 2014.

⁹ J. Zielonka, *Europe as Empire: The Nature of the Enlarged European Union*, New York, Oxford University Press, 2007, pp. 1-4.

with increased insecurity beyond the border) as well for the neighbours who find themselves on the other side of the *golden curtain of wealth* (economic disadvantage, curtailment of historical patterns of local trade, movement of people etc.). Thus, the EU is trying to ameliorate these problems by softening the edges of its external borders for example, by increasing networking opportunities with the non-member states and allowing for localized and routine cross-border traffic.¹⁰

Departing from these opinions we are wondering whether the European Union is erecting fences and building walls at its external frontiers, this being a clear return to the realist perceptions, or it's constructing bridges which connects cultures, heading towards inclusionary practices. Concerning this question our answer is ambivalent, considering that the external borders of the European colossus are in the same time heavily securitised police borders, meant to stop every potentially harmful element, and also economic bridges with a role of reducing the enormous economic asymmetries between the EU and its neighbouring regions.

Nevertheless, based on the results of the empirical research, we may conclude, that regardless of the dimension of the inclusionary policies, the external borders of Europe have no tendency of *softening*, but rather *hardening*, giving birth to the so called phenomenon of *e-fortress*, transforming the idea of a *Europe sans frontiers* into a utopian myth, at the same time launching the idea of the transformation of the EU in a *gated community*, a true security enclave protected by high-tech instruments. Through *gated community* we understand a residential development established on a territorial area surrounded by walls, fences or natural barriers, restricted access through a secure entrance, guarded by a professional private security personnel taking advantage of sophisticated technologies and monitoring devices and control.¹¹

Jan Zielonka, in his work *Europe as Empire*, has reached to another conclusion, stating that the EU finally will end up with soft border zones rather than fixed and hard external borderlines envisaged by Schengen, imagining a *maze Europe*¹² rather than a fortress Europe. In our opinion, though in the light of the current demanding security threats is less likely to happen.

¹⁰ C. Rumford, „Rethinking European Spaces: Territory, Borders, Governance”, in: *Comparative European Politics*, Vol. 4, 2006, p. 133, <http://europeization.files.wordpress.com/2011/03/chris-rumford-2006.pdf>, consulted 4 June 2014.

¹¹ A. Gruszczak, „The European Union a Gated Community: The Challenge of Good Security Governance”, Paper to the ECPR Fifth Pan-European Conference, Porto, 24-26 June 2010, pp. 1-2, <http://www.jhubc.it/ecpr-porto/virtualpaperroom/161.pdf>, consulted 3 January 2014.

¹² In such a ‘maze Europe’ different legal, economic, security, and cultural spaces are likely to be bound separately, cross-border multiple cooperation will flourish, and the inside/outside divide will be blurred. In due time, the EU’s

The abundance of the existing databases¹³ and the introduction of new technologies (Eurosur or Smart Borders Initiative) which are aimed at transforming the border monitoring in a 2.0 control, seem to reinforce this hypothesis.

In this research, first of all we will try to decipher concepts such as: *security, securitization, border, frontier, immigrants, refugees, legal and illegal (irregular) migration* etc., realizing also a concise classification of borders, because it is considered that before talking about the actual topic of research is absolutely necessary to clarify the concepts with which we will work throughout the thesis.

Throughout the research emphasis will be placed on theories developed by the representatives of the Copenhagen School, Barry Buzan and Ole Waever, the founders of the *theory of securitization*, and on the paradigms developed by representatives of the School of Paris (international political sociology) led by Didier Bigo. Special attention will be paid to demystifying the term *security*, which is the pillar on which this scientific analysis rests, but in this thesis we shall promote a non-traditional approach to security, which, unlike the traditional approach, which bound it to the use of force military force, highlights new non-military threats. Likewise, the definitions of security and of border security threats have undergone significant changes, also altering the functionality of borders, which are no longer associated with wars, but with the fight against crime and other security threats, such as terrorism and irregular migration.

As it derives from the title of the research, the entire thesis is marked by duality, on the one hand aimed to analyze the need for security of the Union, which leads to the emergence of frontiers, on the other hand security appears in another aspect, as a result of the emergence of frontiers. This duality will be deciphered by using the causation theory promoted by the British empiricist, David Hume, i.e. the relationship between cause and effect. This phenomenon of causality can be implemented in this work because, after the fall of the Berlin Wall, the reunification of Germany and the process of European integration, the need for security has created new frontiers in the old continent. In 1985 was signed the Schengen Accord, which implemented a decade later abolished the internal border controls within the Schengen area, transferring the control to the EU's external frontiers, which had to be strengthened as Bort

borders will probably be less territorial, less physical, and less visible. They will not look like fortified lines on the ground, but like zones where people and their identities mingle.

In: J. Zielonka, *Europe as Empire*, p. 17

¹³ Like SIS, VIS or Eurodac.

Eberhard noticed „just as the Iron curtain was lifted, bringing in its wake a softening and opening of frontiers, this became, under the auspices of ‘Europe 92’ and Schengen, the external frontier of the EU, which had to be hardened”¹⁴, thus security appearing, therefore, in another aspect, as a result of the emergence of frontiers.

To provide our study a practical character, we have chose to carry out two case studies: one of securitization of migration from the southern border of the Union, showing that migration has become a security issue in the European Union, being perceived as a *security continuum*, linked to minor infractions, organized crime, drug trafficking and terrorism; and the second, a synthesis of inclusionary and exclusionary securitization practices used at the southern and eastern borders of the EU. We believe that both the securitization of migration and of frontiers is a result of the process of the European integration or of the European construction, which has produced through the modification of frontiers, and one of the main reasons for this integration was security. The securitizations of migration and of frontiers, just as the changes in border and migration policies, are the consequences of an *internal security dilemma of Schengen*, and of the development of a unique European identity, which is distinct from the outside world. The process of forming of an identity, of a European security culture, plays an important role in the formation of the European construction. According to this Schengen dilemma, security is seen as a prerequisite for the establishment and expansion of freedom in a given community. Security feeds more security, which in the case of the European Community leads to the change of policies in exclusive and repressive practices intended to avert the European Union from potential real threats (or just perceived) coming from outside.

Wishing to demonstrate that the European Union is turning into a gated community or an e-fortress, in the last part of the research we aim to analyze the latest technologies in terms of control of external borders and migration through the EUROSUR project and the Smart Border Initiative, and, not least, the presentation of future scenarios based on identified areas of knowledge, in order to highlight trends that may have an impact on the security of the community borders.

¹⁴ E. Bort, „Mitteleuropa: The Difficult Frontier”, in: E. Bort; M. Anderson (eds), *The Frontiers of Europe*, London, Pinter, 1998, p. 94.

Looking at the structure of the thesis, it consists of an introduction, followed by five chapters, ending with conclusions and recommendations, respectively selective bibliography and annexes.

The cornerstone of the thesis (**first chapter**) is dedicated to the conceptual delimitation and to the theoretical framing. To demystify the concepts of security and securitization, the *constructivist theory* and the *international political sociology* were chosen, within them a particular focus on the theories developed by the representatives of the Copenhagen School and the representatives of the Paris School. In this chapter we discuss how migration has become a security issue in the European Union, turning into a *security continuum*, which deliberately associates illegal immigrants and asylum seekers with illegal activities, requiring the securitization of migration. United Europe's feedback related to migration and security has three axes, among which are: common asylum and migration policy, cooperation with third states, and strict controls at frontiers. Heavier border controls are meant to enhance cooperation on the external border controls concerning the efficiency of surveillance at the frontiers of the member states measured by the decrease of the number of immigrants. The immigrant, foreigner, i.e. *the other*, represents a source of threat, a factor of risk and distrust, becoming a sort of *resident evil* or *folk evil*, a risk to our jobs, homes, frontiers, cultural identity and to our national or European sovereignty.

Once with the attacks from 11/09/2001 this perception of threat has increased even more, strengthening the link between security and migration, resulting in the *securitization of migration*.¹⁵

In the first chapter, in addition to the theoretical approaches, an analysis of the discourses of securitization of migration and of frontiers was also conducted, highlighting the rhetoric of the decision-makers from different countries of the European Union from the southern borders, like Italy, France, Greece, Spain which are more predisposed to the influx of immigrants, due to their geographical position or historical liaison with countries generating migration. Thereby, will be illustrated concepts like *the saving of lives*, *biblical exodus of immigrants and humanitarian emergency rhetoric*, used by different national or European securitizing actors. The main purpose is to show how this concern, often reported in European external communication documents and

¹⁵ B. Gebrewold, „Introduction Migration as a Transcontinental Challenge”, in: B. Gebrewold (ed.), *Africa and Fortress Europe*, Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2007, p. 10.

speeches, has contributed to politicize irregular migration and asylum, as well as to legitimize the undertaking of restrictive policies and heavy surveillance measures, posing consistency and effectiveness problems to the Union, which are in contradiction with the norms and values on which the EU is supposedly built on.

The second chapter is designed as a bridge between the different parts of the study, where will be deciphered that dual nature of security, this emerging in the position of the trigger and result of the modification of frontiers of the European Community/European Union, using the causation theory developed by David Hume and the principle of action and reaction of Isaac Newton. We believe that the need for security contributes to the change and the appearance of new frontiers, and the modification of frontiers (through enlargement, European integration process, elimination of borders between Member States of the European Community / European Union and the creation of an external border with third countries) as a counter effect that contributes to the generation of other security concerns in the European Union, among which we mention the fear of illegal immigrants, terrorism, smuggling, criminal groups, which called for and justified the enhanced securitization of the external borders. We should mention, however, that here we won't make an analysis of the enlargements or of the European integration process. In this chapter, the main objective is to contextualize the European migration and border policies from an institutional and historical perspective. This chapter deals with political and institutional dimension of the migration-border-security framework, following the path from the fall of the *Iron Curtain* and the creation of the Schengen area to the Treaty of Lisbon.

In our opinion this *Iron Curtain*, under the auspices of the security centred provisions of the Schengen Convention and, later, that of Maastricht, has turned into a *lace curtain*, intended to exclude the citizens from the other side of the border. Therefore, in this chapter we pay a special attention to the analysis of the creation of the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union, Frontex and of databases for recording and monitoring of immigrants, such as, the Schengen Information System (SIS) Visa Information System (VIS) and the Central European Automated Fingerprint Identification System (Eurodac), and their contribution to the transformation of immigration and border control into a 2.0 control.

The third chapter presents one of the case studies, namely the securitization of migration at the southern border of the European Union, driven by the Arab Spring, tracking a causal link

between the event-cause of migration and the consolidation of the area of free movement. We inform the readers that this analysis has its limitations, because it will not insist on a thorough particularization of the uprisings in North Africa, these events are considered in this study as triggers, catalyst events that led to the migratory which effects have shaken the pillars of the European border regime.

We will make a brief introduction in the phenomenon of immigration in the EU and in migration theories, there will be a conceptual delimitation and we will raise the veil over the existing cooperation agreements on migration and border control between the EU and Africa. We will also perform a quantitative analysis focused on the number of illegal immigrants and asylum seekers in the EU. Special attention will be paid to the analysis of EU's migration policy in terms of the *EU's New Global Approach to Migration*. This new approach, adopted in 2011, was a result of the migratory phenomena initiated in the context of the Arab Spring, entitled a "win-win" policy and proclaimed to be a policy beneficial to all. For these reasons we will examine it from a critical perspective, assuming that European principles and the real policy of the Union does not always match. Here we will consider the attitude of citizens and of the European leaders to the phenomenon of migration.

We will go through various statistics, especially those supplied by the Eurobarometer, concerning how the perception of the citizens of the European Community has changed towards the immigrants over the years: after that in the 70s and 80s they were received with open hands, nowadays they have reached the status of the *persona non grata*. We don't exclude the possibility that the fear of migration and the need of enhancing the feeling of security towards real or perceived threats coming from outside can be considered as one of the basic arguments against future enlargements of the EU, and in support of this statement is sufficient to consider the situation of Turkey

At the end of the chapter also will be described a recent migratory event from 2013 at the shores of Malta and Lampedusa, another case of securitization of migration, which is perceived as an echo of the Arab Spring, contributing to the introduction of new reforms, but this time not to the Schengen area, but the Dublin Convention.

As it can be seen, the main objective is to demonstrate the existence of causality between the migration phenomenon triggered the Arab Spring and the reforms in the Schengen area, considering that the management of the event by Member States (France and Italy) and the

supranational institutions of the EU enrolls in the securitization of migration and of borders scenario, which is a result of the modification of the European Union's frontiers and of the internal security dilemma of Schengen deciphered in the previous chapter.

In the *penultimate chapter*, the reader can familiarize with a synthesis of inclusionary and exclusionary practices used at the southern and eastern borders of the European Union, in order to highlight the dual nature of borders, which are access and surveillance points at the same time points. We will reveal the inclusionary and exclusionary border management measures by presenting briefly three case studies, namely that of Ceuta and Melilla (part of the Spanish-Moroccan security nexus); the erection of a fence along the Evros River (part of the Greek-Turkish security nexus); Kaliningrad question (part of the EU-Russia border relations).

As the third chapter is entirely devoted to the presentation of the securitization of migration at the southern borders of the Union, in this part more attention is bestowed to deciphering the inclusionary and exclusionary measures from the eastern border through the prism of the EU-Russia/Kaliningrad security nexus. As in the previous chapter here we will also perform a quantitative analysis, highlighting the threats that lurk at the eastern border of the European Union with a special hint to the border between EU-Russia/ Kaliningrad.

In order to demonstrate that the EU is turning into an *e-fortress* or a *gated community*, in the *last pillar* of the research we have proposed to examine the viability of the EUROSUR project (European Border Surveillance System) and of the Smart Border Initiative¹⁶ just as the presentation of future scenarios in order to highlight trends that may influence the security of the borders of the European Union.

Both the EUROSUR and the Smart Borders Initiative are oriented towards the reduction of the illegal migration and terrorist threats through transforming the Mediterranean Sea in a heavy security zone, by putting the basis of the largest database of digital fingerprints from the world, hand in hand with the enhancement of surveillance of all the passengers crossing the external frontiers of the EU. As it is revealed in the Communication from the European Commission to the European Parliament and the Council of Ministers the migration waves at the external borders of the Union are on the rise, and it is estimated that their number will grow considerably in the upcoming years. Only at the air frontier of the

¹⁶ European Commission, Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council, „Smart Borders - Options and the Way Ahead”, *Official Journal of the European Union*, Brussels, 25.10.2011, COM(2011) 680 final, 25.10.2011, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0680:FIN:EN:PDF>, consulted 1 August 2012.

EU is expected an increase of the crossings from 400 million (data from 2009) to 720 million in the 2030. This situation cannot be solved by the simple hiring of extra border personnel, but it requires a more complex set of instruments. The Commission strongly believes that the solution would be the introduction of the European Border Surveillance System and of the Smart Borders Initiative. According to the Commission this *smart package* would open the way to a new generation of border control backed up by more efficient cutting edge technologies.

EUROSUR promises enhanced security of the land and maritime borders of the Union using innovative technologies like unmanned air drones, off-shore sensors and satellite tracking systems. The Smart Borders Package has two components, foreseeing the creation of an *Entry and Exist System (EES)* and of a *Registered Traveller Programme*. The first one would register the movement of all the persons which enter and exit the Schengen area, expanding the biometric control of identification to all the non-EU citizens (even to those who currently do not make the object of visa requirements), in order to help the border police to identify the *overstayers*¹⁷. But since such biometric controls at the borders would lead to longer waiting lines, the creation of the Entry/Exist System is closely linked to the establishment of a Registered Travel Programme, which would allow that pre-checked persons who don't present a security risk to cross the borders faster than their unregistered counterparts.

We are, however, quite sceptical about this initiative, because there is already some criticism articulated at its address, being perceived as way too expensive and inefficient project, of which introduction is not based on an urging social need, being entitled as cheap, loose copy of the American US-VISIT and SBINET Programs, and last but not the least a result of the insistences of the interest groups from the security industry. The introduction of personal information, just as the exchange of personal data with third countries, might result in the future in the violation of personal data protection. For this reason it is considered necessary to address these European proposals related to border surveillance both from a migration perspective, and also from the angle of data protection. This will focus on the impact of initiatives related to the rights of refugees and how the EU is preparing to respond to illegal migration, while highlighting the impact of proposed monitoring measures on the right to privacy.

¹⁷In view of European authorities, illegal migration is caused mostly by people (residents of third countries) who enter the EU legally with a valid travel document and/or visa, but then overstay.

Besides analyzing the smart borders package of the European Union, in the latter part of this study we will present some future scenarios related to trends in migration and border security. In this framework will present four scenarios:

1. *A probability scenario*, which shows the image of a united Europe without major political, economic and demographic changes, the European policies related to border security and the approach of migration remaining consistent;
2. *An alternative scenario (negative and pessimistic)*, in which due to factors such as economic decline and/or collapse of the euro area, violent conflicts, ageing of population in the developed world, will lead to the reinstallation of borders within the Schengen area and the restriction of legal migration channels;
3. *A preferred scenario (utopian) entitled frontier-utopia*, which requires the undertaking of drastic or unusual policy measures in areas such as migration or the protection of borders/frontiers, the European attention is directed towards human rights and freedoms instead of security concerns;
4. *A scenario of risk factors and the black swan theory*, which aims to introduce some unpredictable factors, assuming a divergence from current trends. Consequently, due to voids created, the frontiers of the European Union can become permeable. In such a hypostasis the movement of persons is uncontrollable and transnational organized crime and smuggling is flourishing.

The conclusions include the main research results of the thesis and some recommendations for policy makers in the European Union concerning the future management of borders and migration.

The bibliography includes both primary sources (official EU documents, interviews, speeches, online newspaper articles) and secondary sources (books, articles in edited volumes, electronic articles) and we tried to consult the most up-to-date research publications in the field.

As shown in the previous lines, the problem of borders and of security has been the subject of many debates, representing a concern of many researchers, however none of the sources consulted by us so far has addressed the issue from this perspective of duality. The novelty of the thesis is precisely this duality, the entire research study being analyzed in terms of causality (security emerging as a result of the modification of frontiers), and that it wants to give

a forecast on where the EU is heading and not a historical account of the securitization of frontiers and of immigration policy. In our reflection both the securitization of migration and of frontiers, are the results of the European integration and the modification of borders and of the internal security dilemma of Schengen. Such an approach couldn't be found in any of the sources consulted to date. Therefore, being in the property of such information and after the proper completion of the work is left to the competence of the readers to decide whether the research has achieved all its objectives, and if it really has an innovative character bringing something new to the research field of borders and of security.

SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS

- Commission of the European Communities, Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, „Examining the Creation of a European Border Surveillance System (EUROSUR)”, COM(2008) 68, 13 February 2008, http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/justice_freedom_security/free_movement_of_persons_asylum_immigration/114579_en.htm, consulted 20 September 2012.
- Commission of the European Communities, Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, „Preparing the Next Steps in Border Management in the European Union”, *Official Journal of the European Union*, COM (2008) 69 final, 13 February 2008, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2008:0069:FIN:EN:PDF>, consulted 5 June 2014.
- Commission of the European Communities, *Euro-Barometer* 1, Brussels, July 1974, http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb1/eb1_en.pdf, p. 23, consulted 29 May 2013.
- Commission of the European Communities, *Eurobarometer* 34, *Public Opinion in the European Community*, December 1990, p. 77, http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb34/eb34_en.pdf, consulted 29 May 2013.
- Commission of the European Communities, *Eurobarometer* 38, *Public Opinion in the European Community*, December 1992, p. 44, http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb38/eb38_en.pdf, consulted 28 May 2013.
- Commission of the European Communities, „Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and the Council concerning the Visa information System (VIS) and the Exchange of Data between Member States on Short-stay Visas”, Brussels, 28.12.2004 COM (2004) 835 final, 2004/0287 (COD), http://www.europarl.europa.eu/registre/docs_autres_institutions/commission_europeenne/com/2004/0835/COM_COM%282004%290835_EN.pdf, consulted 8 July 2014.
- European Commission. “Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council. Smart Borders - Options and the Way Ahead”, *Official Journal of the European Union*, Brussels, 25.10.2011, COM(2011) 680 final, 25.10.2011, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0680:FIN:EN:PDF>, consulted 1 August 2012.
- European Commission. “Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. A Dialogue for Migration, Mobility and Security with the Southern Mediterranean Countries”, *Official Journal of the European Union*, COM (2011) 292 final, 24.5.2011, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0292:FIN:EN:PDF>, consulted 16 May 2013.

Frontex European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union, „The Eastern Borders Risk Analysis Network Annual Overview 2011”, Warsaw, October 2011, http://www.frontex.europa.eu/assets/Attachments_News/eb_ran_annual_overview_2011_for_public_release.pdf, consulted 1 August 2013.

„The Schengen Acquis - Convention Implementing the Schengen Agreement of 14 June 1985 between the Governments of the States of the Benelux Economic Union, the Federal Republic of Germany and the French Republic on the Gradual Abolition of Checks at their Common Borders”, in: *Official Journal*, 22/09/2000 P. 0019 – 0062, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:42000A0922%2802%29:en:HTML>, consulted 5 May 2014.

REPORTS, SPEECHES, INTERVIEWS

A. D. F., Maroni, „Ci aspettiamo trentamila arrivi, in *Il Messaggero*, Interviste - Ministro Roberto Maroni” [We are waiting thirty thousand arrivals, in *Il Messaggero*, Interviews - Minister Roberto Maroni], 30 July 2008, http://www.interno.gov.it/mininterno/export/sites/default/it/sezioni/sala_stampa/interviste/Interviste/2100_500_ministro/0982_2008_07_30_intervista_maroni_al_messaggero.html_767715713.html, consulted 30 August 2013.

Hayes, Ben; Vermeulen, Mathias, „Borderline, The EU's New Border Surveillance Initiatives. Assessing the Costs and Fundamental Rights Implications of EUROSUR and the “Smart Borders” Proposals”, A Study of the Heinrich Böll Foundation, Berlin, June 2012, pp. 1-83, <http://www.boell.de/en/content/borderline-eus-new-border-surveillance-initiatives>, consulted 25 September 2012.

United States Government Accountability Office, „Homeland Security: US-VISIT Pilot Evaluations Offer Limited Understanding of Air Exit Options”, Report to Congressional Committees, August 2010, pp. 1-82, <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-10-860>, consulted 20 September 2012.

ONLINE PRESS ARTICLES

Abrahams, Jessica, „Malta Needs EU Help to Cope with Its Immigration Crisis,” in: *The Guardian*, 4 August 2013, <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/aug/04/malta-needs-eu-help-immigration-crisis>, consulted 10 March 2014.

Agazzi, Isolda, „Young Tunisians look beyond Switzerland”, in: *Swissinfo.ch*, 28 February 2011, <http://www.swissinfo.ch/eng/young-tunisians-look-beyond-switzerland/29606030>, consulted 18 March 2012.

Donadio, Rachel, „Italy Lashes Out at European Union over Immigrants”, in: *The New York Times*, 11 April 2011,

http://www.nytimes.com/2011/04/12/world/europe/12italy.html?_r=1, consulted 1 April 2012.

Mara, Darren, „Germany tells Italy to Solve Its Own Problems in Tunisian Refugee Row”, in: *Deutsche Welle*, <http://www.dw-world.com/dw/article/0,,14980272,00.html>, 10 April 2011, consulted 1 April 2012.

Montefiori, Stefano, „Italia e Francia alla UE: cambiare Schengen” [Italy and France to the EU: changing Schengen], in: *Il Corriere della Sera*, 27 April 2011, http://archiviostorico.corriere.it/2011/aprile/27/Italia_Francia_alla_cambiare_Schengen_co_8_110427021.shtml, consulted 12 April 2012.

BOOKS

Anderson, Malcolm; Bort, Eberhard, *The Frontiers of the European Union*, Houndmills, Palgrave Macmillan, 2001, 235p.

Anderson, Malcolm, *Frontiers. Territory and State Formation in the Modern World*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1996, 255p.

Bărbulescu, Iordan Gheorghe; Răpan, Daniela, *Dicționar explicativ trilingv al Uniunii Europene. Trilingual Dictionary of the European Union. Dictionnaire explicatif trilingue de l'Union européenne*, Iași, Polirom, 2009, 801p.

Bourbeau, Philippe, *The Securitization of Migration. A Study of Movement and Order*, London, New York, Routledge, 2011, 166p.

Brager, Bruce L., *The Iron Curtain. The Cold War in Europe*, Philadelphia, Chelsea House Publishers, 2004, 162p.

Broeders, Dennis, *Breaking Down Anonymity. Digital Surveillance of Illegal Migrants in Germany and the Netherlands*, Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 2009, 230p.

Brouwer, Evelien, *Digital Borders and Real Rights. Effective Remedies for Third-Country Nationals in the Schengen Information System*, Leiden, Boston, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2008, 566p.

Brunnet-Jailly, Emmanuel (ed.), *Borderlands: Comparing border security in North America and Europe*, Ottawa, University of Ottawa Press, 2007, 393p.

Buzan, Barry; Hansen, Lene, *The Evolution of International Security Studies*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2009, XVI, 384p.

Buzan, Barry, *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post Cold War Era*, Colchester, ECPR Press, 2009, Second Edition, 318p.

Buzan, Barry; Waever, Ole; Wilde, Jaap de, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, London, Lynne Rienner Publisher, 1998, 239p.

Golunov, Serghei, *EU-Russian Border Security: Challenges, (Mis)Perceptions and Responses*, Abingdon, New York, Routledge, 2013, 185p.

Münster, Rens van, *Securitizing Immigration. The Politics of Risk in the EU*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2009, 177p.

Peoples, Columba; Vaughan-Williams, Nick, *Critical Security Studies: An Introduction*, London, New York, Routledge, 2010, 182p.

SCIENTIFIC ARTICLES IN EDITED VOLUMES

- Andersen, Stine, „Non-Binding Peer Evaluation within an Area of Freedom, Security and Justice”, in: Ronald L. Holzacher; Paul Luif (eds), *Freedom, Security and Justice in the European Union. Internal and External Dimensions of Increased Cooperation after the Lisbon Treaty*, New York, Springer, 2014, pp. 29-49.
- Baldaccini, Anneliese, „Extraterritorial Border Controls in the EU: The Role of Frontex in Operations at Sea”, in: Bernard Ryan; Valsamis Mitsilegas (eds), *Extraterritorial Immigration Control. Legal Challenges*, Leiden, Boston, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2010, pp. 229-257.
- Balzacq, Thierry; Bigo, Didier; Carrera, Sergio; Guild, Elspeth, „The Treaty of Prüm and EC Treaty: Two Competing Models for EU Internal Security”, in: Thierry Balzacq; Sergio Carrera (eds), *Security versus Freedom? A Challenge for Europe's Future*, Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2006, pp. 115-137.
- Balzacq, Thierry, „Constructivism and Securitization Studies”, in: Myriam Dunn Cavelty; Victor Mauer (eds), *The Routledge Handbook of Security Studies*, London, New York, Routledge, 2010, pp. 56-73.
- Bigo, Didier, „Frontier Controls in the European Union: Who Is in Control”, in: Didier Bigo; Elspeth Guild (eds), *Controlling Frontiers. Free Movement into and within Europe*, Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2005, pp. 49-100.
- Bigo, Didier „Globalized (in)Security: the Field and the Ban-opticon, in: Didier Bigo; Anastassia Tsoukala (eds), *Terror, Insecurity and Liberty. Illegal Practices of Liberal Regimes*, Abingdon: Routledge, 2008, pp. 10-49.
- Bigo, Didier; Guild, Elspeth, „Policing at a Distance: Schengen Visa Policies”, in: Didier Bigo; Elspeth Guild (eds), *Controlling Frontiers: Free Movement into and within Europe*, Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing Company, 2005, pp. 233-264.
- Bigo, Didier, „International Political Sociology”, in: Paul D. Williams (ed.), *Security Studies: An Introduction*, Abingdon, Oxon, Routledge, 2008, pp. 116-129.
- Gebrewold, Belachew, „Migration Theories and African Migration to Europe”, in: Belachew Gebrewold (ed.), *Africa and Fortress Europe: Threats and Opportunities*, Aldershot, Ashgate Publication, 2007, pp. 85-107.
- Haddad, Emma, „Danger Happens at the Border”, in: Prem Kumar Rajaram; Carl Grundy Warr (eds), *Borderscapes Hidden Geographies and Politics at Territory's Edge*, Minneapolis, London, University of Minnesota Press, 2007, pp. 119-137.
- Holzacher, Ronald L.; Luif, Paul, „Introduction: Freedom, Security and Justice after Lisbon,” in: Ronald L. Holzacher; Paul Luif (eds), *Freedom, Security and Justice in the European Union. Internal and External Dimensions of Increased Cooperation after the Lisbon Treaty*, New York, Springer, 2014, pp. 1-13.
- Horga, Ioan; Landuyt, Ariane, „Communicating the EU Policies beyond the/Its Borders”, in: Ioan Horga; Ariane Landuyt (eds), *Communicating the EU Policies beyond the Borders. Proposals for Constructive Neighbour Relations and the New EU's External Communication Strategy*, Oradea, Editura Universității din Oradea, 2013, pp. 5-23.
- Houtum, Henk van; Pijpers, Roos „The European Community as a Gated Community: Between Security and Selective Access”, in: James Wesley Scott (ed.), *EU Enlargement, Region*

- Building and Shifting Borders of Inclusion and Exclusion*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2006, pp. 53-63.
- McDonald, Matt, „Constructivism”, in: Paul D. Williams (ed.), *Security Studies. An Introduction*, Abingdon, Routledge, 2008, pp. 59-72
- Tsoukala, Anastassia, „Looking at Migrants as Enemies”, in: Didier Bigo; Elspeth Guild (eds), *Controlling Frontiers. Free Movement into and within Europe*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2005, pp. 161-193.
- Waever, Ole, „Securitization and Desecuritization”, in: Ronnie D. Lipschutz (ed.), *On Security*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1995, pp. 46-86.

ELECTRONIC ARTICLES

- Brie, Mircea; Horga, Ioan, „The European Union External Border: An Epistemological Approach”, in: *Romanian Review on Political Geography*, 11th year, no. 1, 2009, pp. 15-31, http://rrgp.uoradea.ro/art/2009-1/03_OK_Brie&Horga.pdf, consulted 7 June 2014.
- Camperi, Giuseppe, „The Arab Spring and the Crisis of the European Border Regime: Manufacturing Emergency in the Lampedusa Crisis”, in: *EUI Working Papers RSCAS 2011/59*, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies Mediterranean Programme, 2011, pp. 1-30, <http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/19375>, consulted 30 August 2013
- Carrera, Serio; Guild, Elspeth; Merlino, Massimo; Parkin, Joanna „A Race Against Solidarity the Schengen Regime and the Franco-Italian Affair”, in: *CEPS Liberty and Security in Europe*, April 2011, pp. 1-30, <http://www.ceps.eu/book/race-against-solidarity-schengen-regime-and-franco-italian-affair>, consulted 20 March 2012.
- C.A.S.E. Collective, „Critical Approaches to Security In Europe: A Networked Manifesto”, in: *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 37, no. 4, December 2006, pp. 443-487, <http://apps.eui.eu/Personal/Researchers/bueger/Documents/Case%20manifesto%20as%20published.pdf>, consulted 13 October 2013.
- Ceccorulli, Michela, „Migration as a Security Threat: Internal and External Dynamics in the European Union”, in: *Garnet Working Paper*, no. 65/09, April 2009, pp. 1-30, <http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/garnet/workingpapers/6509.pdf>, consulted 29 August 2013.
- Ceccorulli, Michela, „Saving the Lives’: Analysis of a Discourse on Irregular Migration in the Mediterranean”, in: *EU Grasp Working Paper*, no. 27, December 2011, pp. 1-26, <http://www.eugrasp.eu/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/EU-GRASPworkingpaper27.pdf>, (link is not functional any more), consulted 29 August 2013.
- Gruszczak, Artur, „The European Union a Gated Community: The Challenge of Good Security Governance”, Paper to the ECPR Fifth Pan-European Conference, Porto, 24-26 June 2010, pp. 1-24, <http://www.jhubc.it/ecpr-porto/virtualpaperroom/161.pdf>, consulted 3 January 2014.
- Gruszczak, Artur, „The Securitization of the Eastern Borders of the European Union: Walls or Bridges”, Paper to the UACES 40th Annual Conference *Exchanging Ideas on Europe: Europe at a Crossroads*, Bruges, 6-8 September, 2010, pp. 1-27, <http://www.uaces.org/documents/papers/1001/gruszczak.pdf>, consulted 13 October 2013.
- Houtum, Henk van; Scott, James, „Boundaries and the Europeanisation of Space: The EU, Integration and Evolving Theoretical Perspectives on Borders”, in: *EXLINEA State of Art*

Report, Berlin, Nijmegen, December 2005, pp. 1-28, <http://www.ctc.ee/implemented-projects/border-research-exlinea>, consulted 4 May 2014.

Huysmans, Jef, „The European Union and the Securitization of Migration”, in: *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 38, no. 5, 2000, pp. 751-777, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1468-5965.00263/pdf>, consulted 27 August 2013

Zaiotti, Ruben, „The Beginning of the End? The Italo-French Row over Schengen and the Lessons of Past Crisis for the Future of Border Free Europe”, in: *European Union Centre of Excellence (EUCE), Dalhousie University, Occasional Paper*, no. 12, June 2011, pp. 1-28, http://www.academia.edu/1591178/_The_Beginning_of_the_End_The_Italo-French_Row_over_Schengen_and_the_Lessons_of_Past_Crises_for_the_Future_of_Border_Free_Europe_, consulted 31 August 2013.