



THE REFUGEE CRISIS IN EUROPE AND ADDRESSED SOLUTIONS¹

Adrian OTOVESCU²

Maria-Cristina OTOVESCU³

Abstract: *At the beginning of 2015, the developed European states faced successive waves of refugees (over 100,000 people in the first months of the year), most of them being from Syria and Iraq – countries torn apart by conflicts and internal violence. Unlike the immigrants that leave to seek work, the refugees are forced to leave their own country and benefit by social assistance, offered by the host country. Some states members of the European Community dealt with the intense pressure of the waves of refugees, especially Germany, Italy and Sweden, a fact that led to a crisis in the process of absorption of the immigrants. The EU leaders proposed, as a general solution, the distribution of the refugees according to shares, in each member state of the community space. Other countries, as Hungary, Austria and Romania, advanced the idea of increased security of the national borders, and the stopping of the waves of refugees. The third solution was proposed by Australia, which supported the ceasing of violence and military actions, in the countries that permanently supply the fluxes of refugees.*

Keywords: *the refugee crisis; the Mediterranean Sea tragedy; solutions of the refugee crisis; the legal background of the refugee problem; the strategy of Romania on addressing the immigration.*

Introduction

The refugees are people who had to leave their native place, due to the occurrence of a situation that threatened their lives and that of their families, who requested protection or asylum from another country, whose territory they chose to settle on. Along their way towards another country, they face numerous risk situations and difficulties and,

¹ Parts of this article are detailed in Otovescu, Adrian, 2016, *Românii din Italia. Monografia unui grup de imigranți*, Academia Română Publishing House, Bucharest, p. 66-75.

² Associate Professor, PhD, Faculty of Philology, University of Craiova, Contact Adress: University of Craiova, Faculty of Philology, A.I. Cuza, no 13, Craiova, Dolj; E-mail: adiotovescu@yahoo.com.

³ Associate Professor, PhD, Faculty of Law, University of Craiova, Contact Adress: University of Craiova, Faculty of Law, Calea București no.107 D, Craiova, Dolj; E-mail: otocris@yahoo.com

when they reach another country, they deal with even more difficulties, related to their acceptance/rejection by the native population, or by the interest of the authorities to help them receiving a shelter and to access an effective programme of adaptation and integration within the new society.

The refugee is still a migrant, but not one who willingly choses to look for work in another country, to study or to reunite with his family, but a person determined by the circumstances to find another country to live in, because he cannot return to his own country of origin. Refugees are protected by the international legislation defending the human rights, starting with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the UNO General Assembly, on the 10th of December 1948, and continuing with other numerous international conventions, up to nowadays.

The actual international context is characterized by an increased number of instable and unsecure areas around the world, fact that influences the phenomenon of migration world-wide. If we are referring only to Iraq and Syria, there can be noticed that these countries have experienced permanent conflict and chaos: Iraq, since 1980, when starting war with Iran, then enduring the state of permanent violence for the elimination of the dictator Saddam Hussein, and, in 2003, having to face the invasion of the American and British troops; Syria has been in an internal military conflict for over 6 years, which has made victims reaching hundreds of thousands of deaths, and millions of citizens leaving the country. Both countries constitute a major source of waves of refugees, which are moving towards Occidental Europe, encouraged by the attitude shown, especially by Germany, a country that has out rightly demanded the right to free circulation – a fundamental principle in the international legislation on human rights.

Basically, we can assert that civil wars, terrorist actions, political persecution, oppressive regimes and poverty are major factors that can determine people to leave their own country and seek a better life in other countries.

Poverty is a global social phenomenon that permanently feeds the geographical migration. In 2007, it was estimated that the world poor population was of 4 billion people, representing 72% of the entire world population, and living especially in Asia and in the rural regions, in conditions of malnutrition. For example, around 2.86 billion people were earning between 1.5 and 4 dollars a day, being especially concentrated in Asia and Middle East, which means that those geographic and demographic areas represent an important source of emigration. To them, over 468 million poor people who live in Africa and, other 360 million in Latin America are added.

A report of the World Bank, from 2015, was showing that over 700 million people on the globe were living below the threshold of poverty (with 1.9 dollars a day), that is 9.6% of the world population (as confronted by 13%, in 2012). The coverage of the basic needs – alimentation, dwelling, energy supply, transportation, health services, consumption of non-food goods – have constituted decisive reasons for searching new income sources, and, therefore shifting to better developed countries, more able to offer favourable living conditions.

The tragedy of the refugees on the Mediterranean Sea and the reactions of the European Commission

The increasing of the violence cores and the civil wars from several countries on the globe, as Iraq, Afghanistan, Palestine, Syria, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Congo Republic etc., generated a mass migration of a part of the population of these states. The information offered by the International Organisation for Migration indicates a growth in the number of refugees, from 26.4 million, in 2011, to 33.3 million people, in 2013, in the entire world (International Organization for Migration, 2014, p. 2).

In Libya and Syria only, countries confronted with chaos, due to the violent fights, millions of people left their homes. For example, in Turkey, there are around 2 million Syrian refugees in improvised camps. There is estimated that, in 2014, the forced emigration brought about, internationally, around 60 million people.

The waves of illegal immigrant, who came from some Arab and African countries, on the Mediterranean Sea, over 100,000 people in the first five months of 2015 (according to the data provided by International Organization for Migration), along with the repeated loss of lives (about 1,865 people within the same time interval), after the sinking of over-loaded ships, forced the EU decisional departments to adopt urgent measures of intervention. Moreover, Italy, Greece and Spain acknowledged that they could not face anymore the massive immigration phenomenon, requiring support and financial assistance from the other UE member states. The tragic event that involved the sinking of a ship with almost 950 clandestine immigrants (most of them Libyan), from which only 30 were rescued (on the night of 18th to 19th of April 2015), hurried the reaction of the European Commission that, in an urgent *summit*, on the 14th of May 2015, adopted concrete measure for the management of the immigrant crisis, on the routes from the Mediterranean Sea.

Thus, the *European Agenda on Migration* was shaped, based on a new philosophy and acting policy that was the gradual absorption of the illegal immigrants, designated to replace the rejecting policies, so far promoted through the military protection of the national borders and the repatriation or firm expulsion of the people who had entered clandestinely in the EU space. The inquiry of a group of 20 European journalists and specialists has recently revealed that, from 2000 to the present, the EU countries have spent 1.6 billion euro for the protection of the frontiers, and 11.3 billion euro for the repatriation of the immigrants, the average costs with the expulsion of an immigrant being of 4000 euro (half of them being assigned for the transport towards the countries of origin).

The European Commission put forwards for proposal a system of responsibilities that all the member states are to assume, as related to the impressive number of refugees and people who request asylum. According to Eurostat, only within a year (March 2014 – March 2015), there were registered almost 700,000 requests of asylum, among which: 250,000 in Germany, 82,000 in Sweden (most of the requests, for the both countries, coming from Syrian refugees), 73,000 in Hungary, 63,000 in Italy, 57,000 in France, 31,000 in Austria, 30,000 in Great Britain, the rest of the options being expressed for Holland, Belgium, Greece etc. (Eurostat, <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat>, <http://ec.europa.eu/>

homeaffairs). Since the beginning of 2015, approximately 450,000 refugees have arrived in Germany, 37,000 of them in the first week of September, according to the information presented by vice-chancellor of the country.

The initial proposal of the European Commission (May 2015), to accept 40,000 immigrants that would be annually received on the territory of the EU states members, which were to be divided on quotas, according to the population and the economic power of each state, was, generally, well-received, but it also raised adverse reactions too, especially from the British Prime-Minister and the Hungarian Premier. The later one expressed the idea to build a protective fence, in order to stop the illegal immigrants from the border with Serbia, which he actually put into application. The wired barrier could not face the massive invasion of refugees, from the last decade of August 2015, which entered themselves into the train stations, and, then, formed improvised camps, with the hope to cross in Austria, and afterwards into the other western countries. Young and old, men and women, entire families with children endured for several weeks the difficulties of travelling, the lack of resting conditions, of water and food, with the only thought to restart their lives, in a new society, after having lost everything in their country.

On the Mediterranean corridor of migration towards the European continent, there are permanently moving citizens chased by the internal wars and conflicts from their countries (Syrian, Libyan, Iraqi etc.), their number continuously growing, over-dimensioning the phenomenon of forced migration. Until August 2015, there was thought that the establishing of certain absorption quotas of the immigrants into the EU space, is the main solution to solve the most severe most crisis of illegal immigration, since World War II. For Romania, it was calculated, in a first stage, a number of 2,362 extra-community citizens, among which 1,023 refugees allocated from Italy, 682 from Greece and 657 from the outside EU areas, which needed international protection (*Evenimentul zilei*, June 2015, p. 10). Later on, the national quotas of absorption were recalculated, for the 22 countries that were to receive refugees, our country being registered with 6,300 people.

After the growing wave of refugees of August 2015, which suffocated Macedonia, Serbia and Hungary, the Western Balkans *summit* was urgently summoned in the capital of Austria, with the purpose to discover a fast solution for overpassing the crisis unleashed by the assault of the immigrants, under the circumstance of the European principle of open frontiers. The German minister of the external affairs requested a new plan of redistribution of the immigrants, and the EU leaders offered monetary help, for the solution of problems encountered by the immigrants in the transited states. The proposal was considered insufficient by the minister of the external affairs from Serbia, who pronounced himself in favour of a general plan, appreciating that all the countries, directly affected by the explosive emigration from the Middle East and Northern Africa, needed to get involved.

The measure taken for solving the refugee crisis, through the mandatory allocation of national quotas, divided the EU states and the public opinion from those countries, most accessed by the immigrants. In 2015, a poll from Great Britain unravelled that, in the context of crisis aggravation, more than a half of the population were in favour of

the exit from EU, an unprecedented situation. In a referendum, on 23 June 2016, 51.9% of the participating UK electorate voted to leave the EU. The UK is thus on course to leave the EU on 29 March 2019

Another poll, made concomitantly in France (at the beginning of September 2015), was evidencing that 55% of the citizens did not agree with the receiving of refugees, although the president accepted the share imposed by the European Commission. A poll made in our country, during 10th-15th of September 2015, by INSCOP Research (ordered by *Adevărul* newspaper) showed that 56.2% of the questioned citizens appreciated that “Romania should not receive refugees”, and 35.5% were in favour of receiving them www.adevarul.ro; www.digi24.ro).

Illegal immigration has recently become an explosive phenomenon, a worldwide one. *International Organization for Migration (IOM)* was appreciating, in 2014, that there were 50 million illegal immigrants in the entire world (over a fifth from the total number of the international migrants), among which 11,100,000 in U.S.A. (2011), a country in which, annually, around 3 million people enter clandestinely. In 2013, there were detected approximatively 345,000 illegal immigrants in the EU states (especially from Syria, Eritrea and Afghanistan), estimating that 55,000 migrants are illegally introduced in the community space (International Organization for Migration, 2015, p. 4-5).

The major risks implied by the illegal immigration

Frequently, illegal immigration implies major costs and unpredictable risks, such as frequent transport accidents on illegal routes, organised crime networks for illegally cross of the borders, risks that the migrants become victims of forced/black labour or sexual exploitation, risks of terrorist acts. Moreover, there are not excluded the risks of diseases and epidemic contamination either, if we are to consider the group travelling and the lack of minimal conditions of hygiene. The IOM statistics shows that a the number of 20,900,000 people were victims of forced labour in 2014, which indicates an accelerated increase, confronted by 2005, when there were registered 12.3 million victims. Furthermore, last year, there were recorded 4.5 million victims of forced sexual exploitation (among which 98% were women and girls).

Between January and the beginning of December 2014, 4,900 world migrants died, on their way towards the destination countries, 3,200 deaths being registered in the Mediterranean Sea (66% of the total deceases), the maritime emigration corridor becoming, at present, the one with the highest risk, from the entire world. It is followed by the Bay of Bengal, where 11% lost their lives, then the Horn of Africa – 6% and the frontier between U.S.A. and Mexico – 6% (International Organization for Migration, 2015, p. 6-8).

According to IOM, the migrants who lost their lives came, mainly from Africa and Middle East. From 2000 to 2014, on the world transit routes, over 40,000 immigrants died, from which 22,400 are estimated “to have lost their life while trying to reach Europe” (International Organization for Migration, 2015, p. 9).

According to the confession of some refugees, the route from Syria, through Turkey, Greece, Macedonia, Serbia to the western countries of Europe, costs between 1,000 and 6,000 euro/per person, money used for paying the guide that helped them crossing the Mediterranean Sea and the frontiers of the transited European countries. The travelling took place in an organised way (usually approximately 50 people), often on foot, on rather long distances, and, not seldom, after taking the money, the guides abandoned them, many of the immigrants suffering from dehydration and malnutrition. Many refugees did not have identification papers, appearing the possibility that members of the terrorist group Islamic State, which controls wide areas from the territory of Syria and Iraq, may be infiltrated among them.

A recent result of the exodus through the Mediterranean Sea, offered to publicity by the International Organization for Migration on the 1st of September 2015, shows that over 350,000 people (380,000 according to the data offered by UNO, over 500,000 according to the official information supplied by *Frontex* European Agency) crossed the sea in the last eight months (confronted by 219,000 in the entire year 2014), on their way towards the countries from the Western Europe. On this route of emigration, 2,850 people lost their lives or were reported missing, during January-August 2015, according to the UNO High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), which considers that almost 400,000 people will have reached Europe by the end of 2015. So far, about 220,000 people have already arrived in Greece, 115,000 in Italy, over 2,000 in Spain etc.

The immigrant fluxes to the UE developed countries are continuously on-going, on the 10th of September 2015, appreciating that approximately 5,000 refugees, chased from the Middle East, arrived in 24 hours at the border between Serbia and Hungary, and at the beginning of the year, more than 160,000 people illegally crossed the Hungarian frontier. On the 8th of September 2015, the Budapest authorities announced that the police had registered, up to that date, 169,337 “illegal immigrants” and held in custody 955 traffickers of refugee people, while the Office for Immigration recorded 157,646 immigrants. The numbers are not exact, as the statistical information offered by different official sources does not correspond, both at national and European level, because of the impossibility to rigorously register such daily territorial shifts of masses, through different countries.

Political solutions for solving the refugee crisis

In the context of the massive and uninterrupted afflux of refugees (for example, in one day, the 12th of September 2015, it was appreciated to have passed the border from Serbia and Hungary, the highest number of illegal immigrants until that date, of over 4,000 people) heading towards Europe, in the governmental policies, up to beginning of 2016, three solutions for stopping “the world crisis” have been shaped (as the immigrant crisis has recently been called a world crisis, by Julie Bishop, the Australian minister of the external affairs) and, implicitly, to avoid the appearance of a chaotic situation in Europe.:

1. The proportional distribution of those who require asylum in the European countries (based on the mandatory quotas) – a measure that is firmly supported by Germany, to which France and Sweden joined, while the other states members of the EU were

reticent or against it, such as Great Britain, Denmark, Austria, Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovenia and Slovakia, (rejecting the measure on the grounds that it encourages the traffic with people etc.) Other European state leaders declared that do not have the hosting facilities or the necessary logistics to manage operationally the waves of refugees.

We underline that the German authorities expressed their availability to receive approximately 800,000 refugees until the end of 2015 (four times more than in 2014), a situation that increased the waves of refugees from the Middle East, for the discontentment of many EU state members leaders. It should be noticed the statement of the German vice-chancellor, Gabriel Sigmar, who, at the beginning of September 2015, affirmed that his country was able to provide good management for the annual receiving of a half a million of refugees, for several years on.

As regarding the division of countries of the refugees arrived in the EU space, the European Commission elaborated a mechanism of solidarity among the community states, in May 2016², on addressing the relocation of 40,000 refugees, and, in August, other 120,000 (except for the economic immigrants). The refugees were to be distributed on proportional and mandatory quotas, according to specific criteria (such as the GDP and the population of each country, the previous number of requests for asylum, the unemployment rate). In the situation that a state did not desire to participate to the mechanism of refugee redistribution (due to objective causes, such as natural disasters), it needed to participate to the EU budget, with a financial contribution of 0.002%, from its GDP.

On the 9th of September 2015, the president of the European Commission, Jean-Claude Juncker, presented a document about the condition of the Union, in which he proposed a concrete plan for relocation, based on mandatory quotas, of 120,000 refugees from Italy (15,600), Greece (50,400) and Hungary (54,000), to other 22 states members of the EU, in variable proportions (the other 6 countries were exempt from receiving the quotas of refugees, being already affected by the phenomenon of illegal immigration).

Most of the refugee devolved upon Germany (31,443 people), France (24,031) and Spain (14,931), and the fewer were to be transferred to Malta (133), Cyprus (247) and Estonia (373). For Romania the imposed share was of 4,646 refugees, from which 2,091 from Hungary, 1,951 from Greece and 604 from Italy.

The scenario for 160,000 refugees implied an increase of the national quotas, during the following years, especially as regarding Germany, France and Spain. For Romania, it was mentioned the number of 6,351 refugees that it would be received. Moreover, the European Commission considered necessary to allocate 780 million euro in the EU budget, to finance the implementation of the refugee repartition plan (for example, it was provisioned 500 euro for the transport of each refugee, transferred from Italy, Greece and Hungary, along with 6,000 euro for each person hosted by the other states members of the EU). In addition, the European Commission also proposed the constituting of a fund of 1.8 billion euro, for stopping the emigration from Africa.

The press release, published on the site of the European Commission, informed that, starting from the beginning of 2015, approximately 116,000 illegal migrants came in Italy, more than 211,000 in Greece and over 145,000 in Hungary, a situation that would explain their absence from the list of the relocations.

The reactions to the proposals of Jean-Claude Juncker were against, one of them even extremist. The system of repartition on quotas, of the asylum seekers were mainly accepted, but on certain conditions, such the establishing of the number of refugees on volunteering quotas, freely agreed (as related to the possibility of hosting from each country), and not the mandatory ones, a position preferred by Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovenia, Latvia and the Romanian officials (justified through the capacity of management of a strict number of 1,785 immigrants).

It must be remembered that the EU leaders considered only the assigned quotas of the refugees, but not their willingness/acceptance of being residents of a country or another, their main orientation being towards the wealthy countries;

2. The security of the national borders has been increased and a more rigorous checking at the border crossing points has been introduced. Hungary installed a barb-wired fence of 175 km at the border with Serbia, a country that provided the transport of the refugees towards Hungary, Austria reintroduced the checking at the frontier with Hungary Romania, fearing that the refugees would change their route through the country, adopted a supplementary plan to secure the borders with Serbia.

The attempt of the Hungarian authorities to block, in a first phase, the circulation of trains with refugees towards Austria, caused a revolt of the thousands of migrants from the Eastern Station from Budapest, along with manifestations of solidarity with them, in Wien, Munich and Berlin, and, later, in London or Paris. Eventually, a first group of 3,500 refugees was allowed to leave towards West, the rest of them remaining to wait in the public places. In the end, at the half of September 2015, Hungary closed its border with Serbia, stopping the entering of the refugees on its territory, and making them open a new route, through Croatia, Slovenia and Austria, after violent confrontations between the Hungarian authorities and the refugees blocked on the Serbian territory. On the last ones, there were used water cannons and tear gas, resorting to physical violence. Over 39,000 refugees reached Croatia, in less than a week.

Learning the news about the desperate situation of the blockage and abuse made by the authorities or aggression of refugees on the territory of Hungary, other groups of refugees from Syria resorted to an alternative route towards the occidental countries: from Turkey, to Georgia, near the Black Sea, then crossing the western territory of Russia and entering Norway (this country having a legislation that does not provision the checking of the identity documents, for those who cross the border on bikes).

3. The fight against the terrorist group of the Islamic State has been intensified through the massive bombarding of the territories occupied by ISISm in Syria and Iraq. This solution was proposed by Julie Bishop, the head of the Australian diplomacy, who requested the European states to become involved as quickly as possible in the forces of the coalition, along U.S.A. and Australia, for applying extended and decisive air raids to the terrorist movement from Iraq and Syria, which was destroying the two states and was causing the

mass exodus of their dwellers in Lebanon, Jordan, Turkey, or other neighbouring countries. (<http://agerpres.ro/externe/2015/08/31/australia-cere-europei-sa-atace-statul-islamic-pentru-a-opri-refugiatii-04-38-20>).

In this way, they would be able to stop the wave of refugees at leaving point (in their origin societies), and not at destination, avoiding that terrorist elements would enter Occident countries, and eliminating the burden of the transit countries, which have to endure the consequences of being daily crossed by the migratory fluxes.

The solution seen by the minister of the external affairs of Australia was shaping as the most realist and efficient under those circumstances, when the European countries, menaced by the aggravation of the immigrant crisis, were looking for radical solutions and consensus in their actions. The first leader to respond the request of the Australian leader was François Hollande, the president of France, who, on the 7th of September 2015, announced the preparations for launching air attacks against the militants of the Islamic State group, from Syria.

The legal background for regulating the refugee issue

The management of the refugee waves, which arrived in several societies of the EU space, is an issue that concerns the entire European community, and it is not only a strictly national one, which affects directly the states on whose territory large groups of refugees settled. The harmonisation of the national legislation with the one from EU, should create a unitary legal background for approaching the problem of the refugees or asylum seekers, of the immigrants in general, but not all the states members agreed on. There were the permissive measures, adopted by EU, on addressing the control of the immigrants, that provoked the dissatisfaction of Great Britain, which decided, through referendum, to exit EU, and, consequently, to manage the problem of the immigrants according to its own interests (through a severe policy of limitation and rigorous control of the yearly fluxes of immigrants).

The recognition of the right to free circulation of the people and the facilitating of the refugees' journey constitute basic norms in the international law and primary values, promoted by the democratic states. There must be mentioned that, starting from 1959, it was signed, at Strasbourg, by the governments of the states members of that period, the *European Agreement on the Abolition of Visas for Refugees*, which Romania ratified through Law no. 75, from the 16th of March 2001.

In art. 1 of the Agreement, it is stipulated that the refugees are to be exempted from the "formality of visas" when entering and exiting the territory of some countries, on the condition that they possess a valid travelling permit, and do not overpass three months of stay. As it is known, the international legislation specifies that they should be provided with a dwelling, food and other temporary material conditions, by virtue of the human solidarity spirit.

On the 1st of December 1980, the *European Agreement on the transfer of responsibilities for Refugees* entered into force, in which there is mentioned the preoccupation of the signatory states to mention, "in a liberal and humanitarian spirit, the conditions in

which the responsibility of issuing a travelling permit is transferred, from one signatory side to the other” (Moroiianu Slătescu, Marinache, Șerbănescu, 2007, p. 349).

On world level, there is functioning, starting with the 1st of January 1951, a High Commissariat for Refugees, founded on the basis of the decision of the UNO General Assembly, its headquarters being established at Geneva, in Switzerland. Its purpose is to protect the refugees internationally, through the support of the governments and organisations that deal with the social assistance and the facilitation of the refugees’ voluntary repatriation, or their harmonious integration within the new socio-cultural environment and national community. “Normally, the state is responsible with the protection of its stable citizens, but in the case of a mass of refugees, it is overwhelmed with the complexity of their problems. In such circumstances, the international community is the one that deals with their situation, through the adopting of certain legal instruments, and the granting of social assistance” (Otovescu, 2008, p. 262).

The problem of the refugees was regulated in Romania too, through Law no 122/2006 and the Government Decision no. 1596/2008, on the share of absorption of refugees, established for 40 people each year, and the main criteria that they have to meet, to be able to relocate in our country (Necula, Mircea, 2010, p. 21-22). It must be noted that the institution that deals with the situation of the refugees, in Romania, is the Ministry of Administration and Internal Affairs, and that it has been elaborated a *National Strategy on Immigration for 2015-2018*. Moreover, the number of the people relocated in Romania raised to a few thousands, according to the agreements established within the EU, during 2016.

The analysis of the legal status of the refugee/asylum seeker, evidences that it is founded on the obligation to be given protection and assistance, by the authorities of the refuging state. The protection refers to “the right to enter” into the country of asylum, the right to have a “protected stay” and a “privileged legal situation”, compared to other categories of foreigners (Cloșcă, Suceavă, 1995, p. 356).

The European and international conventions on addressing the protection of the refugees’ rights do not condition observing on the number of people who request asylum, but they establish the legal background for the treatment of the people from such a circumstance. Nonetheless, the problem of the refugees from the Europe of 2015 and 2016 was generated by the fact that certain countries of transit, as Greece, Macedonia and Hungary were suffocated by the massive fluxes of people, while other countries of destination, as Germany and Italy, could not absorb such a great number of refugees, who came in successive waves.

Conclusions

The absorption of the refugees on the territory of the EU states was unavoidable, in the circumstances that a selection of the immigrants is practically impossible (in order to make the distinction between those who fled from the war or the political persecution, from the extra-community space, and those who emigrated to work, in Europe), along with the repatriation in their countries, now devastated by war, because of the the fact that they do not have a place to return to.

As a matter of fact, the reduction of emigration from the conflictual and insecure areas implies a basic and long-term solution, such as the ceasing wars and violence, the reconstruction of dwellings destroyed by war, the insurance of minimal living conditions and, later on, the socio-economic development of the destabilised countries. Certain political leaders perceived the invasion of refugees as a great threat for the EU project, while others regarded it as a solvable problem, as the German chancellor, Angela Merkel, asserted. Nonetheless, for the political world and the public opinion, the wave of refugees from August 2015 produced strong emotional reactions and contradictory attitudes.

Nowadays, European countries, and especially EU, which represents a significant actor on the international political stage, are looking for appropriate solution to face simultaneous challenges, as the rational distribution of the refugees, the terrorist menace of the Islamic State and the expansionist tendency of the Russian Federation. The later one, after the illegitimate annexing of Crimea and the support given to the pro-Russian separatist forces from the Eastern Ukraine, involved military and politically in Syria, supporting, along with Iran, the dictatorship of Bashar Al-Assad (through the displacement of fighting equipment and over 1,000 soldiers, on the Syrian territory).

References

- Cloșcă, I., Suceavă, I. (1995). *Tratat de drepturile omului*, Europa Nova Publishing House
- Moroianu Slătescu, I., Marinache, E., Șerbănescu, R. (2007). *Principalele instrumente internaționale privind drepturile omului la care România este parte*, 9th Edition, rev., I.R.D.O. Publishing House, Bucharest
- Necula, C., Mircea, R. (2010). Resettlement of the refugees in Romania, *Journal of Community Positive Practices*, 3-4/2010
- Otovescu, A. (2016). *Romanians from Italy. The monograph of a community of immigrants*, Romanian Academy Publishing House, Bucharest
- Otovescu, C. (2008). *The international protection of the human rights*, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, Bucharest
- *** International Organization for Migration (IOM). (2015). *Global Migration Trends: an overview*. 2014, Geneva