

Problems of Regionalization in the Light of the Schengen Zone

25/2018

Political Dialogues

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/DP.2018.017>

Abstract:

Globalization is becoming increasingly challenging in the 21st century. Processes that go beyond the horizontal relations of the basic actors of international relations – states – become multifaceted. The Schengen area is an example of a new regional structure (though still not global). Based on the analysis of both EU activities and documents produced by the EC, the author points to the current limitations and potential possibilities of the Brexit Schengen Area. In the author's opinion, only further extension of the Schengen Area, with equal treatment of all its members, can overcome the deadlock which is relevant to the European Union and thus to a large extent the Schengen Area.

Keywords: Schengen; globalization; future of the European Union

Admission

Globalization processes affect every social structure. One can even put forward the thesis that globalization is an imperative of development, both in the eco-

nomic and political dimension, of contemporary international relations.

Although there are many organizations that have a global dimension (UN-political, WTO-economic, FIFA-sport), they do not constitute a new quality in the dimension of international relations (both the UN and FIFA are international organizations. Only the WTO has certain transnational features).

However, we observe an important new category in relation to regional organizations: the European Union (EU).

We can say with certainty that the EU is the first supranational organization in the world. Although the Member States (forming the Council) still have a significant impact on the nature of the Union, the European Commission is playing an increasingly important role in this organization which is a strictly supranational body.

The definition of transnationality, very accurately, formulated by prof. Janusz Ruszkowski: "In fact, the transnational system begins at the moment of establishing the motives and preferences which guide the states, creating (selecting) transnational institutions,

and then agreeing to delegate to them and allocate on the supranational level specific functions (competences) and powers to decide in her name "and further." Most importantly, transnationality is consciously and voluntarily created by nation-states (...), which means that it offers them much better, more effective instruments for the implementation of national preferences than those that are traditionally in the hands of states" (Ruszkowski 2010: 36).

In other words, the transfer of competences that were previously owned by the state to institutions and the creation of such institutions is a phenomenon of transnationality.

However, this new quality in international relations does not arise in a linear way - without any problems. To some cognitive consternation, the transnational form of regionalization, which is the EU, is characterized by periods of stagnation and even reversal wave, which should be considered, according to Philippe Schmitter, a good integration theory (Schmitter 2002).

The content of this article is the analysis of the development of the EU in the context of the Schengen area as a synergistic structural element for this form of regional integration.

Analytical material is the documents produced by the European Commission and EU Member States, in particular: The Union State Message (Juncker 2017), the White Paper from the Commission on the Future of Europe 2017, Rome Declaration 2017.

The paradigm within which the analysis was carried out are entropic theories (ET)(Prologine, Steingers 1990, Korpikiewicz 1998, Hawking 2000).

As part of these concepts, the author identifies certain properties specific to each system (system) that determine his behavior.

These are: high sensitivity to initial conditions, memory (events from the past, even distant ones, have an impact on reality), openness to exchange with the environment, striving for balance (limited stability), existence for each system of state to which returns and arrow of time (a return to exactly the same situation from the past is impossible, because the initial conditions are different) (Frankowski 2002, p. 24–25).

Here you should explain the apparent contradiction of the last two properties.

The system, periodically, aspires to a certain state, but it is rather a set of close (in terms of phase) situations that allow to indicate similarities, but it is not exactly one and the same state. The reason for the inability to exist exactly the same state from the past in the future is the existence of a time arrow.

A good illustration could be in this case the Roman Empire and an attempt to revive it by B. Mussolini or copying by A. Hitler.

Although we can find numerous similarities between the Roman Empire and the Third Reich or fascist Italy (gestures, symbolism, conquest concepts), the equality between these political systems can not be equated and the identifiable differences are objective and result from the existence of the time arrow.

Although in his work P. Frankowski analyzed international relations as a chaotic system, the approach adopted by the author of the nomenclature of P. Frankowski is narrower and is part of the entropic theory.

The question for which the author seeks answers is: Can the Schengen area become an acceptable standard for the progress of regionalization (as a consequence of globalization), and if not, can the borders of Schengen enlargement be indicated?

1. The Schengen area and its borders

Historically, the Schengen area (SSch) was formally established in 1985.

At that time, the Benelux countries (Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg) joined the agreements concluded a year earlier by France and Germany.

The Schengen Area (SSch) is a geographical space designated by the external borders of countries belonging to it, under which the free movement of people, goods, services and capital takes place, and (what is particularly important) modern technologies (Kozłowski 2017: 138).

The important fact is that the Schengen area is not identical with the European Union (both historically and nowadays).

Currently Switzerland, Norway and Iceland remain members of the Union, which are Schengen members. Conversely, EU countries: Ireland, Romania, Bulgaria and Croatia are not in the Schengen area.

One category is the United Kingdom, which has taken legal action to leave the Union, but has never entered the Schengen area.

The United Kingdom is a separate category for many reasons. Its legal system (in which there is no one normative act – the constitution) relies to a large extent on customs and custom, which is also reflected in the lack of formal controls at the border within the EU, despite the fact that UK is not a member of Schengen.

Another group forming passive Schengen are the open countries. These include: Monaco, San Marino, the Vatican, which have never formally become a party to the Schengen Agreement, but actually respect its provisions.

In the Schengen history one can indicate several stages of development,

both quantitative and (what is more important) qualitative.

The first stage – before the ratification of the convention (1985–1995) – is characterized by the lack of a normative apparatus implementing the Schengen agreement.

In the second (since 1995), when all the signatories have ratified the executive convention, the most important elements were: the creation of the SIS (Schengen Information System), the creation of internal and external border management systems and common measures to control the movement of the population.

The third one was the inclusion of the *acquis* of the European Union in the area of the Schengen *acquis* in 1999 (Kozłowski 2017).

According to the author, the division proposed by K. Kozłowski should be extended to three phases, by indicating a separate period in 1985–95, in which there were no such effective instruments of „managing” the Schengen zone as after the ratification of the convention.

The change of the area of activity of the zone (the number of countries) takes place in stages and does not have to be correlated with the development of the European Union.

In 1995, apart from Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, France and Germany, the Schengen area was also composed of Spain, Portugal and Monaco.

In 1997, Italy, Austria and Monaco joined it.

In 2000, Schengen was extended to Greece. In 2001, the area grew by Finland, Sweden, Denmark, Norway and Iceland.

However, the largest extension of the zone (comparable to 1995) took place in 2007 when as many as 8 countries were

included in the Schengen area (Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, and Slovenia).

In 2008, Switzerland joined the zone, and in 2011 Liechtenstein.

Bulgaria, Romania and Croatia remain outside Schengen.

2. The main threats to the Schengen area

The challenge for Schengen remains its basic internal freedoms: the flow of people, goods, services, capital and technology.

The economic dimension, as in the case of the EU's predecessor, the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), is the first step in the creation of the Schengen Area.

However (unlike the ECSC) free movement of people is present from the very beginning.

It seems that the question of the flow of people is the most important from the point of view of the duration and development of the Schengen area. Both in the internal dimension (concerning citizens of Schengen countries) and external (migration from outside Schengen).

An example of the special significance of this issue in the European dimension is the British decision to leave the European Union.

In the referendum of 23 June 2016, 51.9% of voters voted in favor of leaving the EU (The Electoral Commission 2016)

Among the three reasons why the British at all put the question of the exit of Great Britain (UK) from the European Union, the question of migration is in second place (Mauldin 2016).

According to J. Mauldin, the migration crisis is closely related to the rise of nationalism in the world.

Indeed, the waves of migration from outside the EU are a source of confrontation both in the cultural and religious dimensions, which implies the crystallization of the endemic population in the EU, and consequently the increase in the popularity of nationalist movements.

The use of the concepts of the European Union and the Schengen Area used by the author in a similar manner is justified. The incorporation of the Schengen acquis in the EU confirms the closeness and complementarity of both structures (Kozłowski 2017).

All the more so because it is the EU agencies that are a real implementation tool for Schengen (Fronetx or EASO), and the supranational bodies of the EU (European Commission) occupy official positions on the enlargement of the Schengen area (Juncker 2017).

The Brexit referendum was not directly about Schengen (if only because UK is not a part of it) but through institutional and formal (legislative acts) links with the EU also affects the Schengen Area.

Brexit was motivated, to a large extent, by the influx of people from outside the British Isles.

The reluctance towards the wave of migration includes not only people from outside Europe, but also EU citizens, including Poles (see: Sondaż. Polacy obawiają się niechęci Brytyczyków po Brexicie, Newsweek 2016) .

3. Brexit as a catalyst for changes in the Schengen area

As a result of the referendum (June 23, 2016) in the United Kingdom, the secession took place by the UK against the European Union.

It is significant that the first meeting of the European Parliament (EP) after Brexit.



The position of the EU expressed by the presidents of: European Parliament (EP) Martin Schultz and the European Commission (EC) Jean-Claude Juncker unequivocally presented the expectation, by these bodies, for the UK to immediately take formal steps to leave the Union (Council of EU 2016).

From the point of view of the entropic theory (ET), the Great Britain's exit from the European Union is a division described as a bifurcation that determines both the future of the EU and Schengen.

The most important effect of bifurcation is the appearance of two new qualities.

This means that both the Union of 27 states and the United Kingdom after the secession will not be the same as they were before.

Otherwise, although UK citizens would like to maintain the benefits of EU membership in full, this is impossible from the ET point of view.

In the new external conditions, completely different internal conditions appear.

4. The European Union in the face of the Secessionist crisis in Great Britain

4.1. White Paper of the European Commission

The White Paper of the European Commission of March 2017, in which 5 scenarios for Europe are presented, is a form of reaction to changing conditions, as a result of Brexit (European Commission 2017). Of the six areas of EU policy, the Schengen Area has a special place. It is directly connected with security and migration.

Plan No. 1

The first scenario, defined as „Continuation” is impossible to implement (in the TE context), for example due to other internal conditions: a reduction in the number of Member States from 28 to 27; smaller budget. In the assumptions, „Continuation” is: „Gradual strengthening of cooperation in the management of external borders; progress towards a common asylum system, improving coordination on security issues” (European Commission 2017). The European Border Guard and Coast Guard will be the main instrument for shaping the SSch (European Commission 2017). The other four scenarios are a proposal for reaction to changed conditions (Brexit) and take into account the new EU reality.

Plan No. 2 “Nothing but the single market”

This is a proposal in which one of the basic freedoms defining the SSch – the freedom of movement of persons – is radically restricted. It is assumed that bilateral agreements between Member States will have a decisive influence on security policy; the lack of a migration policy common to the entire EU. In this variant, checks are planned at internal borders (European Commission 2017).

Plan No. 3 “Those who want more, do more”

This option takes into account that part of the EU countries that want more European cooperation (integration). Enhanced cooperation would mean establishing a joint prosecutor's office, establishing a common area of justice in civil matters and exchanging all information in the context of the fight against organized crime and terrorism (European Commission 2017).

Plan No. 4 “Doing less but more efficiently”

The essence of this proposal is the separation of certain important points from the point of view of the European Commission and the intensification of cooperation, read unification, precisely in these spaces. The key, from the point of view of the Schengen Area, would be full control of external borders by the European Border Guard and Coast Guard (European Commission 2017).

Plan No. 5 “To do much more together”

This scenario is probably the most revolutionary. The biggest qualitative change is the proposal to establish a European Defense Union, which would be complementary to NATO. In the SSch area, this is a repetition of the proposal from option 4 (European Commission 2017).

4.2. Message of Jean-Claude Juncker on the state of the Union 2017

It is customary that every year, the President of the EU Commission, before the European Parliament, describes: the state of the Union, EC achievements in the passing year and presents priorities for the next year.

This is the beginning of the process of working out the Commission’s work program.

The speech of J. C. Juncker on 13 September 2017 was of a special nature. It had to take into account Brexit and anticipate the possible EU effects of this decision.

An interesting approach to the EC President’s speech was a creative approach to the concept of the Union’s future and proposing a “sixth scenario” based on three principles: freedom, equality and the rule of law (Juncker 2017).

President J.C. Juncker also referred to the Schengen Area.

He stated that only the immediate opening of the SSch to Bulgaria and Romania could strengthen and protect the borders of the Union.

In his opinion, it is also necessary, after the country fulfills the conditions, to admit Croatia to SSC (Juncker 2017)..

J. C. Juncker also pointed to the necessity of joining the EU in a credible perspective countries in the Western Balkans (Juncker 2017).

The message of the EC President met with a quick response.

The German Interior Minister Thomas de Maiziere, the Dutch Prime Minister Mark Rutte and the Austrian Chancellor Christian Kern officially undermined the possibility of immediate admission of Bulgaria and Romania to the Schengen area (Monolowa 2017).

Even more far-reaching conclusions, after the address of J. C. Juncker, the *The Times* reports.

According to Bruno Waterfield, Germany and France want regulation that would allow free movement on internal borders to 4 years (Waterfield 2017).

The current provisions regulating the functioning of the Schengen Area allow for temporary border controls for a period of only 6 months and its possible extension by a year (twice by 6 months).

5. Proposals of the European Commission in the light of entropic theory

Both the White Paper on the future of Europe (March 2017) and the Message on the Union (September 2017) may cause some consternation, especially among EU Member States, regarding the Commission’s plans, but also uncertain-



ty about the future of the EU (in particular the Schengen Area).

The reference may be here to the revocation of the EC to the manifesto of Altio Spinelli and Ernesto Rossi (European Commission 2017).

The Ventotene Manifesto was a declaration calling for breaking the hegemony of nation states in Europe and for creating one pan-European federation in the future (Spinelli, Rossi 1941).

From the SSch's point of view, it can be said that A. Spinelli's and E. Rossi's position is shared by the EC, and can only mean strengthening the freedoms related to the movement of goods, services, technologies and people in the EU.

However, it is difficult to indicate facts confirming the rationality of such views. On the contrary.

The above-mentioned positions of Germany, France or the Netherlands question the legitimacy of expanding and strengthening the SSch; rather, they express the view that: how the EU and Schengen are going through a structural crisis.

According to the author, the more transparent, allowing for a better understanding of the processes taking place in the Schengen area (which are very much in line with the processes in the EU itself) may be operationalization in the ET area.

If we assume that the European Union and the Schengen Area are inherently open structures, then we can indicate their properties.

5.1. Exchange as a condition of existence

The basic property of open systems is their imperative of exchanging between their own structure and the environment. In a world determined by the increasing gradient of entropy, only exchange

(in the energy, material and information space) allows existence in conditions far from equilibrium.

This ability is referred to as dissipation (Progogine, Stengers 1990).

When analyzing processes occurring within the European Union (also relevant for the Schengen Area), we can indicate its three dimensions mentioned above in a direct way.

5.1.1. Material dimension

The first of the SSch's freedoms is the exchange of goods.

In the criteria of entropic theories: dissipative structures exchange matter. In the case of the Schengen Area, it will primarily be the free circulation of goods.

Such a prosaic example is the access to any products from SSch in any part of the Zone: French cheeses, Italian clothing or Polish vegetables.

This dimension was also the foundation of the European Coal and Steel Community, which regulated common policy in relation to these raw materials (coal and steel).

5.1.2. Energy dimension

The basis for existence in the animated world is energy exchange (exchange of other organisms, substances and minerals with the energy provided by food).

In the case of socio-political structures such as the EU, this kind of exchange is observed in relation to the common energy policy, in relation to the share of renewable energy in the overall balance of energy sources or in the construction of Nord Stream 2.

As in the case of material exchange, here too, the ECSC, when regulating the issue of coal production (energy carrier), reacted as a dissipative structure.

5.1.3. Information dimension

Undoubtedly, this is the most important of the three exchange levels that characterize dissipative structures.

The creation of the Schengen Information System (SIS) allowed the actual implementation of the freedom of movement of persons in particular. Certainly, it can be said that it was a necessary condition for its implementation.

How fulfilling this criterion is important for SSch (dissipative structure) we observed in cases of reaction of some EU countries to the migration crisis.

In fear of the uncontrolled influx of people, checks were made at the Italian-Austrian or German-Danish border. Poland reacted in the same way during the European Championships in 2012.

These states could not afford the uncontrolled flow of potential bombers – they limited the possible consequences of insufficient information resources about people.

5.2. Enlargement as the imperative of the existence of Schengen

5.2.1. New bifurcation

The proposals presented by the President of the European Commission, in the context of ET, find rational foundations. After the Brexit the EU situation has changed in a qualitative way. The competent commission read out the premises.

The first of the proposed scenarios was, and still remains, impossible to implement.

The Secession of Great Britain, which is still in progress (it is necessarily a phased shot) has changed all three parameters of the EU exchange (the same Schengen).

It seems that both J. C. Juncker and all EU member governments are aware of this: the EU can not remain what it was before Brexit.

There are two different approaches (possible future bifurcation) on the future of the European Union.

The first can be described as the increase in the importance of nation states and the Union's limitation only to the economic dimension.

The following countries are representative of this attitude: Hungary, Poland.

The increase of nationalist tendencies in the Netherlands, Belgium, France and Germany has a significant impact on the strength of such a position, on the scale of the entire Union.

Although, it must be emphasized, in the "old union" nationalists still remain outside the control of power (the exception Austria and Italy). Similarly in the European Parliament, where the majority have EPP (European People's Party), whose MEPs are advocates of further integration.

The second trend, represented by Germany and France, is oriented towards ever closer integration, even at the expense of some weaker or contesting such countries (for example: Poland and Hungary).

In this constellation of positions, the proposal of the President of the Commission concerning the immediate enlargement of Schengen to include Bulgaria and Romania and the definition of a real framework for joining the EU for Western Balkan states is the third view.

In terms of the entropic theory criteria, one can demonstrate the far-reaching rationality of J.C. Juncker's concept.

5.2.2. Striving for balance

The most important attribute of the dissipative system is to strive for a state that provides stability. It is of course far from equilibrium (this can only be achieved with full entropy when all states are possible), but an important feature is that such structures arise because a certain kind of fluctuation becomes dominant – it takes on the character of trend (Prigogine, Stengers).

It should be emphasized once again that the state of complete equilibrium is impossible to achieve in conditions of variable entropy in the contemporary world.

If in such categories we look at three different visions of EU development:

1. Limitation only to the economic dimension,
2. Narrow cooperation and deepening
3. Further expansion, each of them is probable. They are a kind of fluctuation that can become dominant.

It seems, however, that only one of them can become the basis for the development of the EU (thus the Schengen Area) in the future. This is the third vision.

Exchange through open structures with the environment (dissipation) in three areas (material, energy, information) is a condition for their duration and development.

From this point of view, the concept of a two-speed Europe (Bielecki 2017), (creating a union within the Union, which is the content of Vision No. 2) condemns the EU to failure.

Enhancing cooperation in the Euro zone, which means integration above all among the founding countries of the Schengen Area, can only bring benefits

in the short term. A foreseeable consequence, which will result from an increase in the diversity of standards between Eurostrefa and other EU members, will be a new secession and bifurcation.

Equally worrying is the prospect of maintaining only stable economic ties within the EU (Vision No. 1).

It seems that this is an attempt to take into account the concerns of some EU Member States regarding the threats resulting from political integration, for the subjectivity of nation states.

The affirmation of national values was the plane of lateralization during the accession process in both Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary (Prażuch 2015) – they constituted the program element of some of the right-wing groups in these countries.

To some surprise, it is also an increasingly important element of political struggle in almost all EU Member States today (Bielecki 2017 a).

The consequence of the growth of the particular national interests of the Member States will certainly be differentiation and further: disintegration of the Union (atomization) or division (bifurcation).

Vision No. 3, J.C. Juncker, is the path of further development of the Union, and thus of the Schengen Area.

After Britain's exit from the EU, only loss compensation (in three dimensions: material, energy and information) can allow, if not development, at least the further functioning of the Union. Enlargement of the Schengen area for Romania, Bulgaria and Croatia is such an action.

Of course, it is difficult to compensate for the departure of Great Britain, even in terms of population (WB is 64.8 million citizens, while Romania, Bulgaria and Croatia have a total of 31, 23 million



people (Życie w UE 2018)), the more difficult it would be to offset losses in the economic dimension. It should also be remembered that it is not possible to return to the state from before Brexit.

However, progressive and creative action, extending the Schengen area, from the TE point of view, is a desirable and unique action, within the framework of the entropic theory paradigm, creating a chance for SSch survival.

Conclusions

The key question from the point of view of this article on the universality of the Schengen Area requires a paradigmatic context.

According to the author, the modeling within the entropic theory allows in a satisfactory way to indicate the basic threats to SSch and a functional analysis of its possible states in the future.

Undoubtedly, the threat to the continued existence of the Schengen Area is its incoherent internal standards in the material space, such as: different living standards, differences in direct payments for farmers, restrictions on the services market (the directive on posted workers).

Although SSch is formally founded in the liberties of the free movement of goods, services and people, the impact of the European Union on these areas is (indirectly) decisive for the Schengen Area.

Further, it should be noted that countries that are also members of the EU and the Schengen area have applied (apply) double standards to other members of the area.

Poland became an EU member in 2004, and the Schengen Area in 2007.

In spite of their participation in both organizations, some countries ap-

plied restrictions on access to their labor market to Poland: Germany and Austria abolished them only in 2011 (Piątkowska 2011).

The continuation of this policy is the new EU directive on posted workers.

Obviously, it is in conflict with the freedom of movement of services and goods (and indirectly also people), which is the foundation of SSch (Nowe przepisy o delegowaniu pracowników 2018).

Interestingly, J. C. Juncker insisted on tightening the regulations in this area, despite the negative position resulting from the reports ordered by the EC (Nowe przepisy...2018).

These examples are representative for the lack of a clear, clear, equal policy of applying the rules adopted by the members of the Schengen Area.

The multiplicity (as many as 6) proposed by the EC (personally by its President J. C. Juncker) scenarios confirms this state.

The necessity to enforce uniform standards in the matter of the flow of goods and services to all members of the SSch is an imperative determining the future of the Zone.

One cannot ignore the role of the European Union in this matter, which recognizes the Schengen acquis and at the same time undermines some of its basic provisions.

The information issue looks the most promising.

The condition of information exchange both within the system and between it and the environment is crucial for its existence.

Here, in an almost canonical manner, Schengen implements the ET assumption.

Establishment and development of the information system (SIS) is, according to the Polish Police, one of the most



important achievements of the European Union (Co to jest system informacyjny Schengen 2018).

Indeed, without exchanging information about people staying in the Schengen area (both its citizens and people outside it) SSch would not function in a real way.

Further development of the information system (SIS II) is a necessary condition, but not enough for the existence of Schengen in the future (Prigogine, Stengers).

SIS creates only an equilibrium in which the remaining freedoms of movement are realized: goods, services, people and technologies.

In the changing conditions of entropy (both external and internal), there is one imperative for the Schengen area – further geographical extension and development and unification of areas defined as the free flow of goods, services, people and technologies.

It is difficult to define the boundaries of the area of Schengen activities so indicated.

Some point, which is also confirmed by ET's assumptions, is the statement by F. Fukuyama: „It is not necessarily true, however, that liberal democracy is a political system that is best suited to solving social conflicts per se. The ability of a democracy to resolve conflicts peacefully is greatest when these conflicts arise between „interest groups” that combine a more general and earlier consensus about basic values or rules, and when conflicts are of an economic nature „ (Fukuyama 1996).

We can say that the possible extension of the Schengen Area requires an environment very close to the SSch. It results from the principle of implementing entropy and energy expenditure at the lowest possible level (Prigogine, Stengers).

Reality seems to confirm this principle directly: opposition to the „immediate” adoption of the Schengen Area of Bulgaria and Romania is conditioned by the need to adapt these countries to EU standards.

The EU goes even further in its official positions. The lack of cohesive (democratic) standards with the European Union completely excludes Turkey from Schengen or EU membership.

Summing up, it can be stated that the future of the Schengen area is uncertain. To a large extent, it is correlated with the future of the European Union, which in connection with Brexit and its consequences further complicates the future of SSch.

In terms of entropic theory, it can be stated with certainty that one of the conditions for the continued existence of the Zone is its internal development (extending and guaranteeing the free movement of goods, services, people and technologies to all SSch members without exemptions) and external (admission to SSch of Romania, Bulgaria, Croatia and further west Balkan countries).

The Schengen area is a good example of the phenomenon of regionalization and the problems associated with this process, which is complex and does not run linearly and the final effect is uncertain.

Regionalization is part of the integration processes in the space of international relations that must respond to more general phenomena – globalization.

Recent facts in the space of international relations (introduction of duties on steel and aluminum by the USA and counter-reactions of the EU and Mexico and Canada) testify to the reversion of the regionalization.

It is an open question whether the „customs war” between the US and the

EU will strengthen or rather weaken – the Schengen area.

According to the author, this will largely depend on the Union's ability to respond to the rapidly changing reality and the ability to identify the common space of interests of the Schengen States.

Bibliography

Monographs:

Fukuyama F. (1996), *Koniec historii*, Zysk i ska, 1996.

Hawking S. (2000), *Krótką historia czasu*, Zysk i S-ka, 2000.

Korpikiewicz H. (1998), *Koncepcja wzrostu entropii a rozwój świata*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 1998.

Prigogine I., Stengers I. (1990), *Z chaosu ku porządkowi*, Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1990.

Ruszkowski J. (2010), *Ponadnarodowość w systemie politycznym Unii Europejskiej*, Wolters Kluwer 2010.

Articles:

Frankowski P., (2002), *Stosunki międzynarodowe jako system chaotyczny*, „Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska”, vol. IX.

Kasporwicz D. (2012), *Europejska (de) konstrukcja – ewolucja programowa partii skrajnie prawicowych wobec kwestii europejskich*, „Annales Universitatis Paedagogicae Cracoviensis. Studia Politologica”, 7.

Kozłowski K. (2017), *Prawny oraz organizacyjny wymiar funkcjonowania strefy Schengen*, „Studia BAS”, No. 3 (51).

Prażuch W. (2015), *Postawy elit politycznych Europy Środkowej wobec integracji z UE w okresie przedakcesyjnym*, „Rocznik Integracji Europejskiej”, No. 9.

Schmitter Ph. (2002), *Neo-neo-functionalism*, working peppers.

Internet sources:

White Paper on the future of Europe: five scenarios, URL: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/white-paper-future-europe/white-paper-future-europe-five-scenarios_en, (accessed: 20.05. 2018).

Bielecki J., *Unia Europejska: Śmierć Europy dwóch prędkości*, URL: <http://www.rp.pl/Polityka/304109912-Unia-Europejska-Smierc-Europy-dwoch-predkosci.html>, (accessed: 02/05/2018).

Bielecki J., *Europa: skrajna prawica zwiera szyki*, URL: <http://www.rp.pl/Unia-Europejska/301229937-Europa-Sskrajna-prawica-zwiera-szyki.html>, (accessed on 02/05/2018).

Co to jest system informacyjny Schengen (SIS), URL: <http://www.policja.pl/pol/sirene/sis/12473,Co-to-is-System-Informational-Schengen-SIS.html>, (access: 30.05.2018).

Council of the EU, *Statement of the EU on the UK referendum*, 381/16. URL: <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2016/06/24/joint-statement-uk-referendum/pdf>, (access: 10/04/2018).

Declaration of the leaders of the 27 Member States and the European Council, European Parliament and European Commission, Roman Declaration, URL: https://europa.eu/european-union/eu60_pl, (accessed: 10/04/2018).

Juncker, J.C., *Message on the Union in 2017*, URL: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/state-union-2017_en, (accessed: 29/05/2018).

Juncker J. C., *Message on the state of the Union 2017*, URL: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-17-3165_en.htm (access: 10/04/2018).



Francuskie media: to koniec Europy 27 państw, URL: <https://www.forbes.pl/wiadomosci/francuskie-media-to-koniec-europy-27-panstw/vsb4z2h>, (accessed: 02/05/2018).

European Commission, *Europe without borders. Schengen area*, URL: https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/e-library/docs/schengen_brochure/schengen_brochure_dr3111126_en.pdf, (accessed: 20/05/2018).

Mauldin J., *3 Reasons Brits Voted For Brexit*, URL: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/johnmauldin/2016/07/05/3-reasons-brits-voted-for-brexit/#44fa801f9d6a>, (access: 30/05/2018).

Monołowa E., *Daremne apele Junkcera . Trzy kraje nie chcą Bułgarii w strefie Schengen*, URL: <http://forsal.pl/artykuly/1071525,daremne-apele-junckera-trzy-kraje-nie-chca-bulgarii-w-strefie-schengen.html>, (access : 28/05/2018).

New regulations on the posting of employees - the most important changes, URL: <http://www.infor.pl/prawo/praca/praca-za-granica/77775,3Nowe-przepisy-o-elegowaniu-pracownikow-najwazniejsze-wmiany.html>, (access: 01/06/2018).

The Electoral Commission, *EU referendum results*, URL: <https://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/find-information-by-subject/elections-and-referendums/past-elections-and-referendums/eu-referendum/electorate-and-count-information>, (access: 22/04/2018).

Piątkowska, M., *Jak się Europa przed Polakiem otwierała*, URL: <http://gazetapraca.pl/gazetapraca/1,67527,9535543,Jak-sie-Europa-przed-Polakiem-otwierala.html>, (access: 01/06/2018).

Waterfield B., *France and Germany want right to pause free movement 'for years' over terror and migration fears*, URL: <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/france-and-germany-demand-right-to-suspend-schengen-zone-over-terror-and-migration-fears-3v6v3vnqf>, (dostęp: 01.06.2018).

Życie w UE, URL: https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/figures/living_pl, (dostęp: 01.06.2018).