

revitalization of a “special partnership,” which finally would not dispose the Ukrainians of the chance to become part of the Euro-Atlantic space.

## References

1. Беззуб І. Україна – НАТО: стан та перспективи взаємовідносин [Електронний ресурс] / І. Беззуб. Режим доступу до ресурсу: [http://nbuviap.gov.ua/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=2751:ukrajina-nato-stan-ta-perspektivi-vzaemovidnosin&catid=8&Itemid=350](http://nbuviap.gov.ua/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=2751:ukrajina-nato-stan-ta-perspektivi-vzaemovidnosin&catid=8&Itemid=350).

Bezzub I. Ukraine – NATO: stan ta perspektyvy vzaemovidnosyn [Ukraine – NATO: the condition and prospects for relations] / I. Bezzub. Retrieved from: [http://nbuviap.gov.ua/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=2751:ukrajina-nato-stan-ta-perspektivi-vzaemovidnosin&catid=8&Itemid=350](http://nbuviap.gov.ua/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=2751:ukrajina-nato-stan-ta-perspektivi-vzaemovidnosin&catid=8&Itemid=350) [in Ukrainian].

2. NATO and Ukrainians: Does Public Opinion Matter? Retrieved from: <http://iwp.org.ua/en/publication/nato-i-ukrayintsi-chy-maye-znachennya-gromadska-dumka>

3. NATO and Ukrainians. Will society influence the prospect of joining the Alliance? Retrieved from: <https://www.eurointegration.com.ua/articles/2015/06/30/7035401/>.

4. THE BUDAPEST MEMORANDUM AND THE RUSSIA-UKRAINE CRISIS. Retrieved from: <https://warontherocks.com/2015/06/the-budapest-memorandum-and-the-russia-ukraine-crisis/>.

5. The law on amendments to the Constitution on the course of Ukraine in the EU and NATO. Retrieved from: [https://espreso.tv/news/2019/02/20/opublikuvaly\\_zakon\\_pro\\_zminy\\_do\\_konstytuciyi\\_schodo\\_kursu\\_ukrayiny\\_v\\_ys\\_i\\_nato](https://espreso.tv/news/2019/02/20/opublikuvaly_zakon_pro_zminy_do_konstytuciyi_schodo_kursu_ukrayiny_v_ys_i_nato).

**Vitalii Berehuta**

*Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University  
Vinnitsia*

*Research Supervisor: I.V. Bohinska, PhD in History, Assoc. Prof.  
Language Advisor: O.O. Odintsova, Senior Lecturer*

## VISEGRAD GROUP MEMBER STATES POLICY IN THE EUROPIAN UNION MIGRATION CRISIS SOLVING

**Introduction.** The Visegrad group is the alliance of the four Central European sovereign states – Poland, Hungary, Slovakia, and the Czech Republic. It was created with the purpose of the EU and NATO integration, but now states coordinate their external policies on different issues for making a common position. The migration crisis in 2014–2015 was the acute issue which affected the relations between Visegrad states and other EU member states and Brussels with its official position on solving the migration crisis in the EU.

**Review of the recent publications.** The issues of the policy of Visegrad group member states have been studied by such Ukrainian and Russian scholars as V. Koltsov [3], S. Soroka [6], A. Chetverikova [7] and other.

**Objectives of the paper.** The purpose of this article is to determine the main features of national migration policies of four states and factors of Visegrad group opposition to the official migration policy of the EU.

**Results of the research.** All states, except for Hungary, are not the final destination countries for migrants. The lack of well-coordinated mechanisms and infrastructure for accepting and integrating refugees and migrants is a consequence of the low attractiveness of the Visegrad Group member states and the small proportion of migrants among the population. Moreover, these countries have lower economic development levels comparing with Austria, Germany or France, and belong to states on the territories of which the migration routes located. This means that the migration crisis has affected these countries less than other European states, and Visegrad states have formed a special position and are trying to defend it at regional and European level basing on the lack of significant experience in migration.

They have a special position on the issue of quota allocation of migrants across the territories of EU member states. In 2016, the EU has adopted a program for the resettlement of the one-tenth part of migrants in different countries. The majority of 160 thousand migrants were received by Western European countries (Portugal and Spain), and minority – by Eastern European states: the quota for the Czech Republic was 2.7 thousand migrants, for Hungary and Slovakia – 2 thousand for each, for Poland – 7 thousand migrants. The policy of the EU for compulsory resettlement of migrants in states for quotas caused the negative reaction of Visegrad group member states. More actively Hungary and Slovakia, less actively Poland and the Czech Republic expressed national opposition and categorical reluctance for doing the resettlement of migrants and refugees and preferred to concentrate their activities for strengthening their internal and external boundaries [3].

From the very start of the migration crisis, Visegrad Group did not support the quota allocation system and each state explained the reasons for a deceleration of the process of accepting migrants in its way. Mainly it was explained also by the anti-migration position of the population of these states: it was especially concerned about the possibilities of spreading specific illnesses by migrants, the absence of jobs because of them and their possible impact on culture and a general worsening of living standards in states [7]. They are also willing to use own alternative ways to help for solving the migration issue, for instance, financial assistance in exchange for accepting refugees [1]. In the view of such actions of Group, the EU started processes of taking “sanctioning” measures against Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, because countries accepted only 0-2% migrants of a general quota for each of them [2].

The general position of V4 as a sub-regional entity is determined by migration situation factors in these states and their national migration policies. The feature of Visegrad Group is each member state’s ability to solve its migration tasks in the

context of forming the overall position of the Group. Therefore, it is important to analyze the migration situations in four countries separately.

Hungary's activities are characterized by full resistance to the reception of new migrants and refugees and their penetration into the territory of the state. It partially closed its borders as part of the EU's external borders with Serbia and built fences along the border with Croatia and Serbia. Moreover, Hungary showed its tough position by adoption the law on March 2017, according to which the Hungarian government forbids free movement for migrants around the country. Such an anti-immigration policy is motivated by Hungary's strategic goals in social policy, which aimed at solving demographic and economic problems by improving the standard of living of its citizens rather than migrants [7].

Slovakia and the Czech Republic support the overall migration priorities of the Visegrad Group. The Czech Republic clearly defines them in the strategy of migration policy approved in 2015: the counteracting illegal migration, fulfillment of asylum obligations, stepping up the actions of assisting refugees in states of origin to prevent the flow of migrants to the Czech Republic. Simultaneously, the state emphasizes a review of the Dublin system on the issue of quota allocation and does not refuse its obligations in the sphere of migration and creates programs of refugee integration in the Czech society. However, it has little experience in integration, which is manifested in the partial rejection of new migrants and Muslims by society. One thing that is common in positions of the Czech Republic and the Visegrad Group is the categorical undesirability to increase the flow of people, who come from the "third states" (except Europe and Commonwealth of Independent States).

The migration policy of Slovakia, as in the case of the Czech Republic, is characterized by the implementation of migration principles in national law, including the promotion of integration and legal migration and the strengthening of border control. Due to a cultural factor, Slovakia remains a country where religious issues are an important topic among the population and the political environment. The government refused to provide the education to the Muslim community in Slovakia and agreed to accept only refugees from Syria who are Christians. For such actions, the state was criticized by the Council of Europe, which even mentioned the manual selection of refugees on grounds of religion as discrimination [5].

Poland among the Visegrad Group is the only country where migrants from Eastern European countries predominate, including Ukrainian ones. Like others, Poland categorically does not support the quota allocation system, citing the already high number (at least 1.5 million) of immigrants from Ukraine. Moreover, Poland stays out of the flow of refugees, because of the absence of broad Muslim communities and their social-economical unattractiveness among migrants, and insists that the migration crisis "should be solved, first of all, outside the EU by strengthening external borders and providing humanitarian assistance" [4]. The determining factor of anti-migration policy is negative sentiment of the population, caused by political fears (the influence of supranational authorities on national sovereignty, loss of confidence in government) and the fear of security due to

increasing terrorism and crime, as well as cultural and social fears and economical concerns about the allocation of public resources for crisis management [6].

**Conclusions.** The Visegrad Group's migration policy is characterized by criticism of EU action in regulating the migration crisis. The common position of the four countries as a sub-regional entity is determined by the common factors of migration policy of these states, such as: socioeconomic (economic unattractiveness and lack of experience), political (migration politicization) and value, which is clearly reflected in the anti-immigrant sentiment of the population in all four countries. Formation of supranational opposition of the countries of the group to the EU means a priority of cooperation at the regional level, rather than European solidarity, which significantly affects the deterioration of relations V4 and the EU, and the collegial lack of support for official Brussels actions in solving the crisis means the prospect of the existing of the group as a single sub-regional entity.

### References

1. Вишеградська четвірка пропонує 35 млн євро замість квот ЄС на мігрантів // Європейська правда. 2017. [Електронний ресурс]. Режим доступу: <https://www.eurointegration.com.ua/news/2017/12/14/7075066/>.

Vyshehradska chetvirka proponuie 35 mln yevro zamist kvot YeS [The Visegrad Four proposes € 35 million instead of EU migrant quotas] // Yevropeiska pravda. 2017. Retrieved from : <https://www.eurointegration.com.ua/news/2017/12/14/7075066/>. [in Ukrainian].

2. ЄК у вівторок розпочне процедуру проти трьох країн ЄС через біженців – ЗМІ [Електронний ресурс] // Європейська правда. 2017. Режим доступу: <https://www.eurointegration.com.ua/news/2017/06/12/7067052/>.

YeC u vivtorok rozpochne protseduru proty triokh krain YeS cherez bizhentsiv – ZMI [The EC is launching proceedings against three EU countries on Tuesday because of refugees – media] // Yevropeiska Pravda. 2017. Retrieved from: <https://www.eurointegration.com.ua/news/2017/06/12/7067052/>. [in Ukrainian].

3. Кольцов В. Міграційна криза як передумова і вияв євроскептицизму та наднаціональної опозиційності до ЄС у країнах Вишеградської групи / В. Кольцов // Вісник Львівського університету. Серія філософсько-політологічні студії. 2018. Вип. 17. С. 187-194.

Koltsov V. Mihratsiina kryza yak peredumova i vyiv yevroskeptytsyzmu ta nadnatsionalnoi opozytsiinosti do EU u krainakh Vyshehradskoi grupy [The migration crisis as a prerequisite and manifestation of euro-scepticism and supranational opposition to the EU in the Visegrad countries] / V. Koltsov // Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu. Seriiia filosofsko-politologichni studii. 2018. Vyp. 17. S. 187-194.

4. Польща виступила проти додаткових квот на біженців [Електронний ресурс]. Zn.ua. 2015. Режим доступу : [https://dt.ua/WORLD/polscha-vistupila-proti-dodatkovih-kvot-na-bizhenciv-192552\\_.html](https://dt.ua/WORLD/polscha-vistupila-proti-dodatkovih-kvot-na-bizhenciv-192552_.html).

Polshcha vystupyla proty dodatkovykh kvot na bizhentsiv [Poland opposed the additional refugee quotas]. Zn.ua. 2015. Retrieved from: [https://dt.ua/WORLD/polscha-vistupila-proti-dodatkovih-kvot-na-bizhentsiv-192552\\_.html](https://dt.ua/WORLD/polscha-vistupila-proti-dodatkovih-kvot-na-bizhentsiv-192552_.html). [in Ukrainian].

5. Словаччина та відлуння глобальної міграції // ХВИЛЯ. [Електронний ресурс]. Режим доступу : <https://hvylya.net/analytics/geopolitics/slovachchina-ta-vidlunnya-globalnoyi-migratsiyi.html>.

Slovachchyna ta vidlunnia hlobalnoi mihratsii [Slovakia and the echo of global migration] // HVYLIA. Retrieved from: <https://hvylya.net/analytics/geopolitics/slovachchina-ta-vidlunnya-globalnoyi-migratsiyi.html>. [in Ukrainian].

6. Сорока С. В. Польша в контексті особливої позиції країн Вишеградської групи щодо міграційної політики ЄС [Електронний ресурс] / С. В. Сорока. Одеса, 2018. С. 209–211. Режим доступу: <http://dspace.onua.edu.ua/bitstream/handle/11300/10611/Soroka%20SV%20Prav%20ta%20inst%202018%20t1-4.pdf?>.

Soroka S.V. Polshcha v konteksti osoblyvoi pozytsii krain Vyshehradskoi hrupy shchodo migratsiinoi polityky EU [Poland in the context of the specific position of the Visegrad Group countries on EU migration policy] / S. Soroka. Odesa. 2018. S. 209–211. Retrieved from: <http://dspace.onua.edu.ua/bitstream/handle/11300/10611/Soroka%20SV%20Prav%20ta%20inst%202018%20t1-4.pdf>. [in Ukrainian].

7. Четверикова А. С. Положение стран Вишеградской группы в условиях обострения миграционного кризиса в ЕС / А. С. Четверикова. Контуры глобальных трансформаций: политика, экономика, право. 2017. С. 130–143.

Chetverikova A. S. Polozheniye stran Vishegradskoy gruppy v usloviakh obostreniia migratsionnogo krizisa v YeS [Situation of the Visegrad Group countries in the context of aggravation of the migration crisis in the EU] / A. S. Chetverikova. Kontury globalnykh transformatsiy: politika, ekonomika, pravo. 2017. S. 130–143. [in Russian].

***Alona Bilozor***

*Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University  
Vinnytsia*

*Research Supervisor: I. H. Panina, PhD in History, Senior Lecturer.  
Language Advisor: Ya. V. Hryhoshkina, PhD in Philology, Ass. Prof.*

## **THE EXTERNAL MIGRATION IN POLAND IN THE PROCESS OF EUROINTEGRATION**

**Introduction.** The modern processes of globalization are difficult to imagine without migration of labour force. There are many reasons of this phenomenon, but unemployment and low wages are the main factors. The migration processes go with