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Abstract: Historically, there have been two major integration trends in Europe, namely the pursuit of political, religious or ideological unity and the pursuit of developing structures for the cooperation of sovereign states. The first one has never been achieved while the other led to the Westphalian system, the Holy Alliance and the Helsinki Accords, upon which the so-called Iron Curtain has fallen. On this basis, a new project for the unification of the continent has just been developed, which is currently under a crisis for economic reasons, as well as due to conflicting positions on the so-called migration issue.
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INTRODUCTION

Contemporary Europe is not the fruit of the European Union or NATO in terms of its legitimacy, it is a direct result of the Helsinki Accords of 1975. Such are its direct roots and founding principles because the legitimacy of the dismantling of the Eastern Bloc in 1989/91 and the overthrow of the so-called Iron Curtain were based on them. Therefore, it would be necessary to begin an analysis of the present situation from this fact in order to understand the sources of the current identity crisis and conflicts existing within the European Union, and between the Union and other states lying on the territory that has been considered European since the reign of Tsar Peter the Great, i.e. the areas located from the Urals to the Atlantic which were joined in 1975 by other countries who signed the Helsinki Accords, that is, both North American States and present countries of the Caucasus and Central Asia.

However, before discussing the sources of the current crisis of the founding principles of the Helsinki Accords in the era of the so-called migration crisis, it is necessary to mention the principles on which the concept of “Europe” was created much earlier, because, apart from the Napoleon and Hitler periods, in history Europe has never been politically united. There were, in fact, times when great empires covered a large part of Europe, for example, the Roman Empire, which comprised a huge share, but not all, of Europe, but which at the same time covered all countries of the Mediterranean basin. Eastern Roman Empire, the so-called Byzantine, was its direct continuator, even though it comprised a smaller area, but with a larger part of the Mediterranean basin on the Asian and African side. In turn, the Carolingian Empire covered only a chunk of the Roman and Germanic European lands.
I. HISTORICAL ASPIRATION OF EUROPEAN COUNTRIES FOR COLLECTIVE SECURITY AND SOVEREIGNTY

While there has never been a permanent unified pan-European state creation, in the past we have had to deal with several long-lasting legitimate security systems that can be considered the precursors of the Helsinki system. Thus, the “Westphalian system” established in 1648 which incorporated all of today’s Europe, with the exception of England, Moscow and the Ottoman Empire. Despite that, these three countries also had close ties with some of the states of the Westphalian system, such as the lasting and more than century-old alliance between France and the Ottoman Empire. The partitions of Poland and the French Revolution, however, marked the beginning of the breakdown of this feudal security system at the end of the 18th century.

On the ruins of post-revolutionary and Napoleonic Europe, the “Holy Alliance” system was created under the special protection of Russia who had already entered the so-called “European concert” during Peter the Great’s rule. The Holy Alliance system began to collapse first during the “Spring of Nations” in 1848, when reviving revolutionary moods led to the emergence of something that could be called “European progressive public opinion”. The Holy Alliance system, after the interim victory of the counter-revolutionary reaction after 1848, began to decline with successive wars in the Crimea, between Austria and Prussia, between France and Prussia and together with the founding of the German Reich, which ultimately contributed to the division of Europe into two ruthlessly fighting camps which resulted in the two worlds wars and later to the Cold War. There was no pan-European security system from the establishment of the Second German Reich until the Helsinki Accords, as the Potsdam Agreement of 1945 cannot be considered a completed and coherent security system.

Subsequent European security systems had several common features: recognition of the principle of full state sovereignty in their territory, recognition of religious and cultural diversity at the level of inter-state relations and striving to stabilize inter-state relations through diplomatic efforts. These systems also marked the end of attempts by the Catholic Church to create a politically unified Europe based on one religion. The Helsinki Accords partly prolonged the processes aimed at ensuring collective security and recognizing, in turn, the ideological diversity and the multiplicity of social systems. Therefore, the Helsinki Accords were a secular continuation of the principles of early security systems in Europe. All these legal and international systems and principles have enabled relatively peaceful development of individual states that signed these treaties. In this context, the achievements but also the ambiguities of the Helsinki process should be assessed today as those that have collided gradually until this day with the striving for closer unification of Europe, which, among others, is manifested in the management attempts by the EU and no longer the national states to address such issues as population migrations, internal security matters and social and economic system while limiting the role of the OSCE.

Before considering the possible contradictions between the “Helsinki spirit”, “European integration” and the “Atlantic alliance” which manifest themselves, inter alia, in migration issues and the attitude of EU and NATO member states towards non-European, non-EU or non-NATO areas, one should take into account the legitimacy of the very aspirations for even closer European unification. Also, is this
project one of the causes of existing tensions both within Europe and between the European societies and the neighboring societies?

II. EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION: MYTH OR REALITY

If we look at Europe from the point of view of its fundamental, bottom-up differences, the fact that in principle Europe has always been divided into two main parts is striking:

– Coastal Europe vs. inland Europe;
– Europe of the old and bottom-up Christianization process (territories of Roman and Germanic peoples) vs. Europe of the newer and top-down Christianization process (territories of Slavic peoples);
– Europe of religious wars (i.e. Western Europe) vs. Europe of legal coexistence of all monotheistic faiths (individual denominations of Christianity, Judaism and Islam, i.e. Central-Eastern and Eastern Europe);
– Europe of intolerance and late development of interreligious tolerance (i.e. Western Europe) vs. Europe of early tolerance and lower tolerance later on (i.e. Eastern Europe);
– Europe of early subjection (i.e. Western Europe) vs. Europe of repeated subjection (i.e. Eastern Europe);
– Europe of earlier cities, crafts, manufactories, middle class, industry and capitalism vs. Europe of later cities, food exports, nobility, agriculture and social realism;
– Colonial Europe later expanded beyond the Atlantic vs. Peripheral Europe compared to colonial metropolises and later extended to Siberia and Central Asia.

These above-mentioned historical divisions have primarily economic roots, even if they overlap with geographical, political, cultural, religious and ideological data. It is then not surprising that the process of close European integration resulting in the creation of the European Union began on the economic basis and thus only in the area of Western Europe that is coastal, capitalist, colonial and post-colonial. This fact is very significant for our further considerations. Before proceeding to discuss this issue, it is also necessary to take into account the cultural factor that today constitutes, along with economic issues, another important argument for the advocates of closer European integration. Today they say that Europe is also a community of “values”, although they cannot usually agree among themselves whether it is about the so-called Christian values or the so-called secular values. The so-called because it is known that, on the one hand, Christianity is divided into different religions and that even individual Churches today are split up as never before in relation to many fundamental issues, including migration, and, on the other hand, that the religious roots of many Europeans lie outside of Christianity.

As for secularism, it goes without saying that today this principle is quite differently understood by the spokesmen of the right and the left. All the above-mentioned principles differ from each other also due to their attitude to the legacy of the former European colonization, which these days largely result in discrepancies in the point of view on mass migratory movements that have lasted for over one hundred years. Therefore, we have to deal with the diverse sentiments of individual states’ populations toward all of the aforementioned political, social, economic, ideological, religious, demographic and migratory processes.
III. CULTURAL ROOTS OF EUROPE

The concept of Europeanness was most often associated with Christianity and later with the Enlightenment. Today, it is more connected to liberal democracy, and Christianity in turn is identified with the so-called “Judeo-Christian” values, which is the result of, on the one hand, strong blame complex of many Europeans after the tragedy of European fascisms and World War II. However, this situation is also the consequence of the emergence, due to British colonization, of a state based on a new Jewish ideology of Zionism, strongly associated with the Western powers guarding the way to the Indian Ocean and to oil and gas fields. Never before has there been such a thing as Judeo-Christianity, at least since the rejection of the Jewish customs within Christianity by Saint Paul, as real Christianity emerged as a result of the frontal opposition to Judaism on the part of the Church. Judaism and Christianity have common roots, but they share them indivisibly with the third member of the Abrahamic tradition, namely Islam. This fact cannot be ignored even if one really wants to. What is even more noteworthy, monotheism arose in the same Semitic-desert-nomadic area in a dialectic contradiction to the antique traditions, which are also at the basis of civilization in Europe, and which inseparably, historically and culturally unite such areas as Mesopotamia, Persia, Egypt, Syria, Phoenicia, Palestine and Yemen with Greece, Carthage and Rome. So “our common” Europe is only a late-separated northern branch of the entire process of human and cultural development that has evolved since the dawn of time around the entire Mediterranean basin. Consequently, there would have been no rediscovery of the achievements of antiquity after the fall of the Western Roman Empire without the development of the Arab-Muslim civilization, thus there would have been no Renaissance, Reformation and Enlightenment in Europe without the contribution of this civilization [21].

All these common and interconnected pan-Mediterranean roots explain why the Mediterranean, even during the Crusades and the Battle of Vienna, has never been a barrier. For this reason, the alliance between France and the Ottoman Empire, for example, lasted several centuries longer than many alliances between Catholic or Protestant countries. Thus, our roots are derived from the Mediterranean civilization, which gradually moved away from the sea cost after the fall of both Roman empires, north towards the Germanic and then Slavic states, south towards the African countries beyond the Sahara, east towards Central Asia and then later west towards all overseas states colonized by the Western powers.

This long, complicated and full of contradictions, but also of dialectical dynamism, history explains why the system based on the “Concert of Nations” [28] could last long despite consecutive crises, while attempts at closer unification, be it an imperial or ecclesiastical endeavor, proved to be short-lived. Hence perhaps the difficulties of the current process of European integration, which by far exceeded the principle of creative and peaceful coexistence of sovereign states for which Europeans strived for centuries. In this respect, the issue of migration is not so much a great challenge as an external symptom of a much deeper intra-European problem. Europe, geographically, is a peninsula of now-dynamic Asia neighboring the countries of the southern Mediterranean coast and strongly connected in the West with post-colonial areas and in the East with the Eurasian land, the so called “Heartland” in the language of Anglo-Saxon geopolitics [19].
**IV. EUROPE AND ITS NEAR ABROAD TERRITORIES**

Recent migratory movements have taught us a lot not only about the problems related to the processes of foreign integration and the issue of racism, but also to the process of integration of Europe itself. In France, we recently had to deal with the so-called “jungle” in Calais, a camp occupied by masses of migrants trying to go to the United Kingdom [1]. They were mainly immigrants from South and West Asia and countries associated with the former British Empire. Later, with the wave of refugees coming to Europe after the war in Afghanistan, Libya and Syria through Turkey and the eastern coast of the Mediterranean, we had to manage a wave of refugees trying to reach mainly Germany and Scandinavian countries. The French state, in accordance with the decisions made within the EU, created a special point at the station in Munich encouraging newcomers to settle in France. The stand was empty, however, which agitated the national honor of the French people involved in pro-migration movements [5]. France, on the other hand, already from the beginning of the twentieth century, became a natural destination for immigrants from their colonies and former colonies. England, in turn, was a natural destination for immigrants from the formal empire of Her Majesty and Germany, much later, a natural destination for immigrants from Western Asian countries, etc. During the Brexit referendum, the issue of migration had an important place in the election propaganda of the EU opponents, but the concerns were mostly directed against immigration from Eastern Europe that is a white population indeed, but new and little known in the British Isles. Then occurred a strange, in the eyes of the advocates of “white Europe”, objective alliance of many British ultranationalists with descendants of immigrants from South Asia, Nigeria, Jamaica and other countries of the Commonwealth of Nations against newcomers from the eastern part of the Union [15]. In Poland, however, it should be noted that the more numerous migration from Chechnya in the 1990s or currently from Ukraine did not cause such strong reactions like those generated by recent and altogether fewer attempts to settle migrants coming from the Middle East through Turkey. Islam was indeed said to be the cause of resistance to this process on the part of many Poles, but then the question should be asked why twice as many Muslim Chechen refugees in the 1990s caused less concern than suddenly in recent years the Islamic faith of culturally calmer Syrians.

Here and there we have to deal with a similar reality: every nation prefers to feel like a host in their own country, but for every nation there exist foreign groups that are “less alien” than others. It has something in common with religion and skin color only to a lesser extent than with history, geography and imagination. The British, like the French, the Dutch or the Spaniards, are to some degree accustomed the peoples of their former empire, the Germans to the peoples of the former Ottoman Empire or Afghanistan, Poles to the nations of the former Russian and Austrian empires, etc. Europeans, on the other hand, have rarely had common, state and state-legal history, while the peoples of the former colonies nonetheless belonged for a long time to the same state formation as the metropolis population, that is to the same legal and political culture, no matter how the very fact of colonial oppression is looked at. This fact manifests itself even in moments of tensions, for example, Polish-Ukrainian, French-Algerian or British-Indus, etc. The French nation to the present day is, therefore, de facto stretched to overseas areas, and skin color or religious affiliation does not pose such a big problem outside open racist circles.
Thus, the Algerian comes from a similar legal culture as the Frenchman from the Seine, while his so-called “cousin” from French-speaking Quebec is brought up, despite common language and origin, on British legal culture. French culture has a tradition of strong uniformity and its citizen must, therefore, demonstrate external cultural traits as little as possible. Hence, the repeated scandals in France with the so-called Islamic scarf. Unlike England who has never dreamed of a full visual unity of behavior and attire, where the external view of otherness is much more respected, but where a more monolithic collective behavior is required just like in Germany. Every nation is the result of its long history and each has developed some of its own principles of coexistence and integration or assimilation of otherness. For this reason, inter alia, apart from economic problems, the process of European unification is today in crisis. Moreover, it is because the current European structures strive for a uniform migration policy and integration in countries where the traditions of migration and integration are entirely different.

It seems normal to the Frenchman that the Guadeloupian, the Breton or the Malian is of “French “origin because the language and the republican tradition count the most. Although the situation becomes worse when it comes to competition for a job position! If there is a game between Germany and Senegal, however, the Frenchman usually cheers for Senegal due to common language and history. Nowadays, the economic crisis nonetheless leads to a high growth of unemployment and, consequently, strong competition in the labor market between former residents, descendants of old and newcomers. At the same time, however, Western Europe needs young workers in order to pay pensions to aging societies [14]. Competition in the labor market is useful for employers to reduce income and force those seeking employment to compete. The so-called clash of civilizations is mainly a battle for workplace, worthy wages and development opportunities for individuals, classes and countries. The issue of terrorism and religious integrity certainly plays a role but many Western Europeans remember, for balance, the horrors of colonial wars as well as acts of terror committed by a kind of leftists or neo-fascists as part of the Gladio plan, among others [11]. They also know that integration of extremist Northern Irish, neo-evangelical or Zionist religious movements is not much different from integration of Islamist movements.

V. UNION OR HELSINKI EUROPE?

The Helsinki Accords were only an apparent compromise between the world of capitalism and the world of socialism, as the social rights and the social development principle, which formed the basis for the legitimacy of the socialist system, were included in the treaty only marginally. Therefore, this treaty could be used as an argument by the Western powers against their rivals from the East. This treaty covered, however, the issue of relations between European states and Mediterranean and developing ones, and established the principles of social policy for immigrants, which figures in the text of the treaty [24]. The principle of ever stronger cooperation of sovereign states is also included. This treaty allowed the Western powers to enforce the free movement of people and ideas in the name of which the dissidents in the Eastern Bloc rebelled against the dominant communist parties. This principle, however, is based on a certain ambiguity which takes revenge nowadays. The flow of people does not necessarily mean the right to emigrate, but this is not thoroughly specified in the Western propaganda. A momentary and free
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movement does not necessarily mean the right to permanently settle in a given country. When the Helsinki Accords were signed, this ambiguity was convenient for the capitalist countries. They aimed to disorganize the states in the competing camp, both on the basis of the legitimacy of the regime accused of breaking individual freedoms and on presenting their system in the eyes of the world as an oasis of freedom striving for border-free free movement of individuals. This later led to more and more disruptions in the population movements. Rules are always universal and cannot be limited definitively to only one group of states, which the West must accept today with some bitterness.

While the Western countries, unlike the countries of Eastern and Central Europe, most often do not believe that newcomers from their former colonies or overseas territories are completely foreign, their current mass influx has cumulated together with the mass influx of citizens from the new EU member states at the time of a long-lasting crisis in the labor market, constitutes a major problem these days, of mainly social and economic nature. It should be connected to the new problem created when the United States launched its intervention in Afghanistan so as to provoke a Soviet invasion, which Zbigniew Brzezinski later admitted to in a famous interview for the French newspaper “Le Nouvel Observateur” [12]. They recruited volunteers from the entire Muslim world to fight the Soviet Union and communism, and were trained according to more effective in battle, according to the CIA advisers, ideological norms in force in Saudi Arabia who has always been the most faithful ally of the USA. After the collapse of the USSR, these armed groups, first left in Afghanistan to their own fate, without resources and thus full of frustration, were later used for other purposes. They began attacking all so far secular and socializing Muslim states one by one, which caused further tensions, wars and migrations. The invasion of Iraq has spread the phenomenon of young angry masses without life prospects even more. Migrants from the states affected by these wars are now driven naturally to the richer and calmer countries that wake their imagination, i.e. to their former metropolis or, in the case of Western Asia, towards the Germanic countries more strongly connected to this area. These migrants come from countries where both traditional and modern models collapsed largely as a result of, first of all, earlier modernization and later wars with socializing states,

1 For this reason, in many Western countries, both among activists of anti-racist movements and among descendents of immigrants and immigrants themselves, there are many people who oppose the principle of open borders in the name of protecting the labor market against a flood of cheap labor forced to compete on the labor market with the settled down local population, as well as avoiding a brain drain to the disadvantage of poorer states trying to educate their local intellectual, scientific and technical staff. In France, for example, live more dentists from Benin than in their own country, which proves that countries of the poor South often in fact finance the education of their own elites who will then supply the economy of more developed countries for free.

2 It is necessary to take into account that the anti-occupation resistance movement against the American troops first achieved many successes and was characterized by a nationwide and secular program. It was properly disorganized only due to al-Qaeda, an armed group that suddenly arrived in Iraq, which had not existed in this country before. Many Iraqis suspect the invader of bringing to their country this economic organization, which later spread to the territories of Libya, Syria, Yemen, Nigeria, Mali, Yugoslavia, Algeria and many other states, becoming at the same time the source of another terrorist mutation known under the code name “Daesh”. See: <http://www.iris-france.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/2007_alqaïda.pdf>
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which strengthened new ideologies that had arisen in this vacuum created by the First Afghan War, i.e. so-called Islamism. This ideology, neither traditional nor modern, constitutes a kind of patchwork of ill-chosen elements that seem local and global.

This whole situation raises the question of whether European countries accepting large numbers of new migrants will be able to integrate them this time. All the more so because integration takes place through the labor market, which is practically the only possible option for this process to succeed according to given country standards. Today, however, the labor markets are still disorganized due to the constantly changing trends in the globalized market and the existing neoliberal standards within the EU and the OECD, which collide with the economic norms in force in the dynamically developing countries of East Asia and Eurasia. Hence the question that should be asked today, namely whether the diversity of historically developed traditional channels of communication between former colonies and the former metropolis can still function and allow further political, economic, social and cultural integration? Does the issue of migrants not show that even today Europe could function as a real community but on the condition of a development of historically tested system of sovereign states that are able to cooperate both with one another and with the rest of the world? Does this principle not contradict the closer form of integration which the leaders at the level of the European Union are striving for in the situation of globalization under the leadership of economically and strategically weakened superpower from across the Atlantic today? The issue of migration cannot be separated from the issue of European integration and from the question of rightness at the current moment in history of the principles of neoliberalism and neoconservatism and from the question of the right to economic development of demographically dynamic poorer states that require, for this reason, economic norms different than those introduced by the wave of disintegration of the post-war bipolar system. The aging Western Europe, despite all the tensions and contradictions, needs immigration of young people from countries with which it is bound by history and thousands of social and economic ties, while Europe lying more in the East has neither the same needs nor the same history. Therefore, only such integration in Europe is real, which recognizes the principle of national sovereignty and the system of collective security, allowing each state to maintain closer forms of cooperation with those states with which it has greater ties, whether those countries are European or not. From this perspective, it can be acknowledged that the migration crisis has nonetheless become a positive moment because it allowed to reveal and rehabilitate the idea of diversity in the approach to overseas nations and wise internationalism of factually existing nations in Europe in place of rigid ideology of forced unification within a supranational and unitary organism.
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