

The Impact of the Politics of Race on the 2015-2016 Tsunami of Asylum Seekers in Europe

©Daurius Figueira October 2017

The Reality of the 2015-2016 Wave of Asylum Seekers of Europe

The impact of the tsunami of refugees that swept the EU in 2015-2016 on the electoral politics of the EU is illustrated in the presidential elections of France with Marine Le Pen being a candidate, the number of seats won by Geert Wilders and the PVV in the parliamentary elections of the Netherlands and the rise of the AfD as an electoral force in German electoral politics. The demise of the parties of the centre especially those of the neo-liberal persuasion married to a caricature of European left discourse and the march of the discourse of the parties of the right into the hallowed halls of fascist discourse and its worldview are also developments influenced by the tsunami of refugees to the EU.

But what are the characteristics of this tsunami of humanity that is now present in the EU especially what is the sociology of this resident wave of recent arrivals to the EU? This is of crucial and strategic importance as this resident wave will continue to impact the social order of EU member states and the odds on favourite is that the EU member states will revert to the tried and tested colonial discourse of race and race supremacy to create and fit this newly arrived resident wave in a space designated for them, the banlieues of the EU, from which the political order will continue to be impacted.

In "Still in Limbo: About a million asylum seekers await word on whether they can call Europe home" Pew Research Center September 2017 it is stated that the 2015-2016 wave of refugees to Europe, defined as the 28 member states, Norway and Switzerland, was the largest since World War 2 with some 2.2 million people applying for asylum as follows 1.3 first time applicants in 2015 and a further 1.2 million applicants in 2016. Of this number 53% came from three countries Syria, Afghanistan and Iraq. Some 45% of the 2015-16 wave of asylum seekers were received in Germany whilst Hungary and Sweden were recipient countries of note. The impact on the demography of the recipient countries varied but was most visible in countries where immigrants now accounted for more than 1% of national population as in Sweden and Austria. The list of countries where the 2015-16 wave of asylum seekers accounted for 1% and more of national population is as follows: Sweden 1.5%, Hungary 1.3%, Austria 1.1% and Norway 1%.

The mechanics of handling the 2.2 million asylum applications illustrate not only the burden placed on the state machinery by this mountain of applications for asylum but also the politicisation of the process and the resulting recklessness exhibited by the state. An estimated 885,000 applicants for the period 2015-16 had their application approved by the end of 2016 whilst 75,000 applicants were returned to their home countries or another non-EU country. At the end of 2016 some 760,00 applicants for asylum were awaiting the decision of the state authority of their application whilst some 385,000 rejected applicants for asylum were appealing the decision to reject their application hence they were still present in the country of their application. The whereabouts of some 100,000 asylum seekers whose applications for asylum were denied were unknown.

The wave of asylum seekers of 2015-16 even though those from Syria (650,000), Afghanistan (310,000) and Iraq (215,000) account for some 53% exhibits its geographic and ethnic/race diversity which evokes a processing and selection process premised on a hierarchy of needs from European countries in receipt of applications for asylum. There were 70,000 applicants from Pakistan, 30,000 from Bangladesh, and from Iran 60,000, a range of applicants from the African continent namely: Eritrea 80,000; Nigeria 70,000; Somalia 40,000; Gambia 25,000 and Sudan 20,000 and what is most noteworthy is the range from Europe external of the EU, Norway and Switzerland as follows: Albania 80,000; Kosovo 65,000; Russia 25,000; Ukraine 25,000 and Serbia 20,000. When the number of migrants by nationality of origin are factored in the terrain of preference and its driving political discourse is exposed. At the end of 2016 there are only two nationalities where their asylum seekers awaiting a final determination of their applications for asylum account for some less than 30% of the total applicants by these specific nationalities they are Syria 20% and Eritrea 29% with Gambia being the closet at 42%. The processing of Syrian applicants at the end of 2016 was the prime task at hand followed by the Eritreans with the Gambians next at a distant third and the high processing rate for Syrian applicants was mainly as a result of German activity in this regard. For applicants from Albania the rate is 89% and those from Kosovo, Afghanistan, Iran, Serbia and Russia the rate is in the 70 percentile bracket. Pakistan, Ukraine and Iraq are in the 60 percentile bracket and Somalia, Sudan, Bangladesh and Nigeria are in the 50 percentile bracket. Applicants from Afghanistan face a long wait for a final decision on their applications as those

from Iraq which shows the creation and management of expectations by organised crime to move a tsunami of asylum seekers to Europe by first stimulating demand for their services. The reality of the politics of acquiring asylum status in Europe is the furthest reality from the perceptions of those purchasing these services. The pattern is then clear at the end of 2016 that the governing politicians of Europe are not embracing the tsunami of humanity with open arms and the instrument of choice of the politicians is the screening process all applicants are subject to and a hierarchy of preference emerges with applicants from Albania, Kosovo, Afghanistan, Iran, Serbia and Russia being at the bottom of this hierarchy with applicants from Albania being the Dalits of the applicants for asylum in Europe. Whilst the applicants from Syria occupy the apex of the hierarchy mainly as a result of the political imperative of the quest for a fourth term as Chancellor of Germany by Angela Merkel. Amongst the ruling politicians of Europe, the general alarm of European politicians over the tsunami of humanity of 2015-16 a group will embrace a political strategy to engage with the wave in a manner which challenges the supposedly hegemonic discourse of a neo-liberal democracy within the EU driven by the rule of law and the fundamental rights of the individual such as in Hungary and Austria especially. But this neo-fascist discourse that drives the public discourse of the necessary state reaction to the 2015-16 tsunami of humanity is the product of an attempt to exert hegemony over the public reactions to the same said tsunami towards ensuring political sustainability.

The picture of the number of asylum applicants as per the country of application who are awaiting a final decision on their application as at the end of 2016 is illustrative of the political terrain in response to the tsunami of humanity in Europe at the end of 2016. Hungary heads the list with 70,000 applicants 65,000 were awaiting a decision (95%) then Greece with 90% of applicants on hold or 45,000 of 50,000 applicants. Spain, Finland, Austria and Norway occupied the 60 percentile bracket with Austria having 125,000 applicants with 80,000 on hold. France, United Kingdom, Switzerland, Denmark and Sweden occupied the 50 percentile bracket. France has 150,000 applicants with 85,000 on hold whilst Sweden has 155,000 applicants with 75,000 on hold. Germany with 1,090,000 applicants (49%) and Belgium with 50,000 applicants and 25,000 on hold occupy the 40 percentile. The Netherlands with 60,000 applicants and 25,000 on hold

(39%) is the only country in this percentile likewise Italy with 185,000 applicants and 55,000 on hold (28%) is the only country in this bracket and there are no countries outshining the performance of Italy. The picture is clear as Hungary tops the list whilst the ruling politicians of Hungary voice their neo-fascist discourse of the threat to European civilisation whilst others mouth this discourse in member states that don't have a presence of the tsunami. The countries who have received the largest portions of the asylum applications have a heterogeneous response even an asymmetrical response to processing these applications to say the least. Germany, Italy, France, Sweden and Austria in that order were the recipients of the largest number of applications with Germany in a class by itself but the number of applicants on hold varies from the 28% of Italy to the 66% of Austria. The countries receiving less than 100,000 applications were the worst performers led by Hungary with 70,000 applications and 65,000 (94%) on hold and Greece with 50,000 applications and 45,000 (90%) on hold. In the Third world the perception exists that The Netherlands and Norway are open to applications for asylum and both countries project this image of themselves in the world but their reaction to the tsunami of humanity are not comparable. Where The Netherlands received 69,000 applications with 20,000 on hold at the end of 2016 (39%) the second highest completion rate in the study and Norway received 35,000 applications with 20,000 on hold (64%). Norway's coalition government in the period comprised the neo-fascist FRP political party whose public discourse was antagonistic to asylum seekers and Islam at best.

This study focused on applications for asylum of 2015-2016 but persons could have entered Europe and did without applying for asylum under the assault on the borders of Europe by the tsunami of humanity. With the 2,205,000 applications for asylum requiring that these applicants be housed in the country of their application the threat to security is palpable. What constitutes a graver security threat is those who have been denied asylum and have chosen to disappear into the shadow world of living illicitly.

The grave issue presently is that the conditions governing access to and the duration of asylum by the applicant vary from country to country in Europe. Asylum does not necessarily mean permanent residence in the country granting asylum and reunification with the family of the successful applicant including spouse, children and siblings. The nature of the hoops through which the

applicant has to jump is the product of the political discourse of the day and with the rise of the neo-fascist and neo-Nazi political movements political parties of the right have progressively embraced the thunder of the fascist and the neo-Nazi in a bid to maintain their political sustainability. The case of Germany is instructive given the intake of asylum applicants by Germany 2015-2016.

The gender of the asylum applicants was not given in the Pew Center study but this is a grave issue as the flow of asylum seekers into Germany 2016-2016 was predominantly male. With some 74% of asylum applicants in Germany being male the question of family reunification arises and more importantly how politics has impacted the rules applied to asylum seekers especially with regards to family reunification. Germany between 2016 to 2017 changed the rules applied to asylum seekers with specific emphasis on making family reunification very difficult. An asylum seeker classified as “persecuted” can be granted asylum and can progress to family reunification. An asylum seeker classified as: “in potential serious danger/subsidiary protection” can be granted asylum but cannot exercise family reunion for the period March 17,2016-March 16,2018. Since 2016 some 230,000 applicants have been placed in this category. Then there is the “contingent refugee” where you are not allowed family reunification as long as you remain dependent upon the state you have then to find work, learn the language and develop a German language skill level that allows you to function in mainstream German society. In fact, the range of residency conditions is arcane to the point where legal advice is necessary unravel it and learn how to work with it to your benefit. What is clear is that being a refugee does not involve permanent residence in Germany as the residence permit has an expiry date thereby requiring renewal enabling expulsion from Germany. Minors who fled to Germany can be joined by their parents but not their siblings even though they are also minors. Persons who are legally entitled to migrate to Germany are faced with the barrier of German language skill wound up with legal and bureaucratic hurdles. Then there were reports in the Greek media on the German political action to ensure joint action with the Greek government to slow down the process of family reunification involving women and children with the right under German law to travel to Germany. An action allegedly taken in the context of the thousands of refugee women and children trapped in the camps of Greece. The situation in Turkey is in fact worse as the German deal with Turkey to end the

flow of refugees from Syria through Turkey to Europe has resulted in Syrian women and children having the right to travel to Germany to reunify their family cannot enter Turkey to report to the German embassy in Ankara for processing. This reality is illustrated by the estimate of the German Foreign Ministry of up to 300,000 persons awaiting permission to travel to Germany. What Germany is faced with is groups of males bonding on the basis of commonalities living dependent on the state whilst they inhabit the spaces created by their legal relationship to the law and practise of the application for asylum and thereafter. Males socialised by social orders other than Germany faced with the shock of dislocation, adjustment and an uncertain future in a social order that is increasingly hostile and institutionally racist. With many faced with the further shock of the denial of family reunification which intensifies the isolation of alienation. Do you then surrender and become docile? Do you yearn for the discourse, worldview and culture you left and then seek to replicate it in Germany in an attempt to define yourself? Do you then choose to walk on the wild side tasting the choices the social order affords as crime, organised crime and extremism? Do you then evolve a survival strategy of walking the transition zone that links licit to illicit lifestyles where walkers of this transition zone evolve, intensify and enable the threats posed? The reality is then intensely complex and will further reveal itself as it impacts the social order on a progressive basis through its evolutionary stages.

The decision born out of hubris by Angela Merkel posed a grave threat to victory in the September 2017 general election requiring political actions that sent the message to the German electorate that the welcome mat was now shelved by taking joint political action to shut down the human pipeline and the Islamic horde in Germany will be dealt with. The discourse of asylum entitlement propagated by organised crime pushed the wave of migrants into a tsunami of humanity fully briefed on the strategy of reaching the country of choice in Europe to then apply for asylum. The politics of race in Germany demands that the path to absorption of the refugees in the German social order be governed by the need to limit as far as possible their presence in Germany hence the assault on family reunification. But the most potent instrument in the arsenal of the politics of race was in existence and operation before 2015 and is being further weaponised: the instrument of the denial of opportunity. This potent instrument will swell the

ranks of the black underclass, transform spaces into banlieues and consign the inhabitants of these spaces to the ranks of the working poor at best. The spawn of this instrument will then find acceptance in the spaces dominated by organised crime for such is the order of the politics of race of Europe. Which is a return to the source as the threat was framed and enabled by the strategy of organised crime acting in concert with political hubris. And the saga continues in the pipeline from North Africa to Europe a pipeline created to move illicit drugs where the traffickers are paid by Europe to not traffic migrants to Europe. In response the Moroccan and Tunisian pipelines are now open to deepen the extortion of Europe by organised crime.

The gravest threat unleashed on Europe by the hubris that infects ruling politicians in what is supposed to be a democracy will now take root and fester in Europe heightened and aggravated by the politics of Europe. A politics which inhabits a reality of its own making. Organised crime has now expressed its power to impact the politics and the social order of Europe on a sustainable basis and the response of the political elite continues to be myopic, self-centred and visionless thereby further enhancing the power of organised crime in Europe and in concert the exploitation of the poor and powerless will continue and escalate threatening the hegemony of the very concept of democracy with extremist discourse, worldview, forms and institutions.

http://www.pewglobal.org/2017/09/20/a-million-asylum-seekers-await-word-on-whether-they-can-call-europe-home/?utm_content=buffer9aded&utm_medium=social&utm_source=twitter.com&utm_campaign=buffer

<http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/hardened-german-rules-leave-refugee-families-split-a-1165162.html>

<http://www.dw.com/en/refugee-family-reunification-in-germany-what-you-need-to-know/a-40449409>