

TALLINN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

School of Business and Governance

Department of Law

Svetlana Zhehtunova

**EUROPEAN MIGRATION CRISIS. SECURITIZATION  
PROCESSES - CASE-STUDY: GERMANY AND POLAND.**

Master's thesis

Supervisor: Assoc.Prof. Holger Mölder

Tallinn 2017

I declare I have written the master's thesis independently.

All works and major viewpoints of the other authors, data from other sources of literature and elsewhere used for writing this paper have been referenced.

Svetlana Zhehtunova.....

(Signature, date)

Student's code: a141806

Student's e-mail address: [svetlana@nirgiservis.ee](mailto:svetlana@nirgiservis.ee)

Supervisor Assoc.Professor Holger Mölder

The thesis conforms to the requirement set for the master's thesis

.....

(Signature, date)

Chairman of defense committee:

Permitted to defense

.....

(Title, name, signature, date)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	4
INTRODUCTION.....	5
1. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	9
1.1 Securitization and Politicization.....	9
1.2 Principles of Securitization.....	10
1.3 Securitization of migration.....	13
1.4 Securitization of migration in Visegrad group, Germany and France.....	16
2 MIGRATION CRISIS IN EUROPEAN UNION.....	20
2.1 What is migration? .....	21
2.2 Review and the reason of the crisis.....	22
2.3 Member States in European crisis.....	24
3 INFLUNCE OF EUROPEAN MIGRATION CRISIS ON EU.....	31
3.1 New challenge for migration policy of EU.....	32
3.2 EU – Turkey Agreement.....	33
3.3 Migration crisis – possibility in achievement positive result.....	36
4 CASE – STUDY: GERMANY AND POLAND.....	39
4.1 Multiculturalism: Germany and Poland.....	40
4.2 Securitization: Germany and Poland.....	45
CONCLUSION.....	49

REFERENCES.....51

APPENDECES.....60

## **ABSTRACT**

Migration policy is one of the most important issues nowadays. Europe faces a very serious problem with refugees. At the moment these people not only seeking asylum because of the war, but they also try to improve their economic situation. The main problem is creating the balancing act between identifying and helping those in need with the implementation of a migration policy which does not overwhelm individual nations or create the conditions for conflict in countries which take them in.

This thesis pertains to the analysis and understanding of the migration crisis and the problem of development and implementation of a successful policy around it within the context of the European Union. Today it is evident that the European migration policy has failed to solve both problems of the refugees, and in addition has been ineffective coping with the causes of the problems.

As a consequence this has led to issues around the security. The conditions of securitization are considering in possibility of success if they are divided into three parts such as internal, external and social. The threat of the migration crisis is not only one of a huge influx of refugees but also the threat posed to the sovereignty and values of each Member State.

Keywords: Migration crisis, European Union, Securitization, refugees, multiculturalism.

## INTRODUCTION

Since 2011, when war began in Syria, the Migration Crisis started following the Arab Spring and the outbreak of civil war in Syria when thousands of people left their homes to escape the war (Heather Y Wheller, 2016. European Migrants Crisis 2011 – Present Day). In 2011 the whole world could observe the influx of refugees, which is increasing each year. Only for the last 2016 this number is about 1, 8 million of people who is crossing the irregular channels in a searching of shelter from the war conflicts, violence, and unstable situation in the East or people who is just searching for a better life. After the Second World War Europe faced such a fast growing influx of refugees for the first time. The refugees became the most difficult issue to solve.

The question of refugees became the sensitive political question, which increased the political and social opinions in this refugee's problem. The reaction from the side of European Commission is showing their incompetency in solving this problem and enhance the situation between Member States. Thus there is no any adequate reaction for the issue of crisis.

Current situation in Migration Policy of EU in last months 2015–2016 is more inclined to think that this sector in on the way to collapse. Lack of solidarity are split between members states of EU is increasing. Existing measures are implemented insufficiently. Thousands of people still cross the external borders every day and their destiny is still not looking positive. This problem cannot be solved either, because there is no distribution system implemented.

Dublin agreement found to be ineffective in the critical and real situation since it is not able to provide equitable distribution of the flow of refugees on entire territory of EU. Considering the current situation, it could be that Europe will not still have any solution even in 2017, besides Member states cannot agree on distribution of quotas.

The questions about migrants who has passed the EU zone will be considered according to the Common European Asylum System. According to the Dublin Convention the Member State is responsible for migrants who has submitted the application in EU country, they entered first.

The Dublin Convention was created in 1990, but it could come into force only after all Member States will sign it, therefore the Convention was approved by all Member States in 1997. The full title of the Convention is *The Convention determining the State responsible for examining applications for asylum lodged in one of the member state*. But it renewed the name Dublin Convention, because this Convention was signed in Dublin (Refugee Council, 2002). In this Convention were taken into consideration the values of Single European Act, with the aim of freedom of movement without any internal borders and with creating of the internal market between member states.

The Dublin III is a present Dublin Regulation and this regulations are based on Dublin Convention, in this system the obligations related to asylum seekers were set up. According to the art. 3.1 of Dublin Convention: “Member States undertake to examine the application of any alien who applies at the border or in their territory to any one of them for asylum” (Dublin Convention, art. 3.1). The meaning is that Member State is responsible for asylum seeker, because he/she first entered to this Member States. However, some Member States can examine applications without any obligations, just to prevent that applicant from passing several European Countries for searching of a better life.

On the 18<sup>th</sup> of February 2003 Dublin II Regulations was established, which introduced clear and specified criteria and mechanism of Member States responsibilities for checking the asylum seeker. The main target of this regulation was to avoid the interference in the system, when the countries are sending refugee from one country to another, according to this regulation the evidence is that only one country responsible for asylum seeker (EUR-Lex, Dublin II Regulation). That is very important in theoretical meaning, because then countries are following the regulations, that is making the system more precise and correct. However in the practice its showing that this system has weak sides. Some countries are not registering the refugees, for example Italy, and let people go further to another country, such as Germany and Sweden. That is of course one of the negative side of this regulation, but it is clear that countries such as Greece and Italy cannot take this increasing influx of refugees and handle it by themselves according to the Dublin II Regulations. And it is clear enough that this countries won't be following those regulations.

At the moment the asylum questions are regulating by Dublin III Regulation, which was established in 2013. The principle is the same as in Dublin I Regulation and in Dublin II

Regulation that Member States that were first entered by asylum seeker are responsible for examining the application. However there is one addition that says that he/she can go to another country if they have a family there, so the reunion is possible in this case or, for example, if the person is not in a good health condition (Cecilia Wikström). Also, for the better examining of asylum seekers Eurodac system was implemented. According to the fingerprints system all migrants should have to register and this data goes to Europe database. Thus, Member States can easily check if it is the first country that refugee entered and therefore this Member State responsible for refugee's applications. However, this system is not working lately in some countries, because receiving non-EU countries sometimes do not take fingerprints from refugees that is why it is impossible to establish the first country of arrival. The huge influx of refugees to European country made the Dublin system inapplicable. The main deficiency of Dublin system is lack of regulations regarding border countries. They are suffering the most from flow of migrants and cannot cope with this migration issue properly. One of the most important issues for EU is to find a decision regarding not equal burden on some countries, meaning that other Member States should try to help solving the problem of external borders according to solidarity.

The Dublin system of allocation of responsibility for refugees based on a principle of coercion and do not achieve the target, meaning that this system is not working very well for States nor for asylum seekers. According to the survey only 3% got the positive application in fact of successful Dublin transfer, but most of the refugees are getting their positive application in other countries, but not in the country they entered first (Guild, Costello, Garlick, Moreno-Lax 2015, 47).

The hypothesis of the topic is based on the threats of security of European Union, brought by this crises, as well as not-controlling influx of migrants and the lack of adequate respond. The internal disagreement and misunderstanding of Member States is jeopardizing safety of all European people who is not feeling protected in their own home anymore. The main idea of this thesis is based on the conclusion that the issue of securitization in the European Migration Crisis is positive. This will be explained in the Chapter IV (Case Study: Germany and Poland), where examples of two countries proved that securitization is positive, only the statement of the process is different.

The first chapter will be based on theoretical question and weather this theory could be brought to practice.



The second chapter will describe the basic understanding of crisis itself: What is the danger? This chapter will be based on the empirical framework by answering the questions what is migration and what is the reason causing it.

The third chapter dedicates to the new challenges and will cover some possibilities in achievement of positive results. There are common conditions and rights for all Member states which should follow the common asylum system, but still there is no common agreement between EU countries that could make a process more effective and correct, in order to satisfy the country needs.

The forth and the last chapter will be dedicated to a case study showing the overviews of two countries towards this crisis, there reactions and outcomes. Also the question of security will be explained and based to the securitization theory will be analyzing the securitization issue in practice. The comparison of the two countries will be conducted by analyzing – Germany and Poland.

# **1. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

This chapter will be dedicated to the Securitization theory in international relations, which was created by Barry Buzan, Ole Weaver and Jaap de Wilde by The Copenhagen School. The securitization theory appeared in 1980s and referred by scholars in 1990s. They define “security” as “the move that takes politics beyond the established rules of the game and frames the issue either as a special kind of politics or as above politics” (Buzan, Weaver, Wilde 1998, 23). In other words securitization is the action of transformation issue in the subject security, in order to legitimize the use of this special dimension against this actions. The main idea of this chapter is to see if the European Union faces the new threat in a matter of European Migration Crisis and explain what is announced as a security threat. The migration was the used process, but today this process became one of the most discussed topic in society. Also in this chapter the principles of securitization will be explained, as well as actors who involved in this process. The theoretical framework will complete the review of securitization theory, showing the impact securitization on migration.

## **1.1 Securitization and Politicization**

Securitization theory is the issue of social question implemented into the security questions, where the extraordinary matter is using in a matter of security. Securitization on the international level means presenting an issue as urgent and existential, as so important that it should not be exposed to the normal haggling of politics, but should be dealt with decisively by top leaders prior to the other issues (Buzan, Weaver, Wilde 1998, 29). Politicization means when the issue becoming open, the matter of choice, when the issue is arise, where decision should be taken and should approach with responsibility (Iban, 29). To put the meaning in more simple words, the issue require to be discussed when it takes attention of a lot of people so then this issue needs to be politicized and further if the issue is becoming the issue of security then

this issue becomes securitizing.

In the securitization theory the issue divided into three processes: non-politicized (where state is not interested in dealing with issue and this issue not as a public issue, debate and make a decision), to politicize (where the issue becoming part of social policy, where need decision of a high leaders and need resources allocation) and to securitized (where issue becoming a priority and found as existential threat, require emergency decisions and justifying actions outside the normal bounds of political procedures) (Ibid, 23). This is very important issue in regards of this process, because it is very important to define the threat itself and if there is a threat, it is necessary to take all appropriate measures to prevent it. In case if the issue has moved from non-politicized there is a question weather this issue became politicized or securitized. This connection between politicization and securitization is not always meaning that the issue will go through the state. Politicization as well as securitization could be seen in different categories.

## **1.2 Principles of Securitization**

In order to understand how does securitization work, it is necessary to understand what principles are involved in the meaning of securitization. Such questions as: Who is speaking? Under what issue? If that issue is a threat? For whom it may refers? Why this issue appeared? What is result and under what circumstances, need to be addressed.

In general security means survival in appearing of existential threat, but there is no general understanding what is existential threat, what is constituting this threat and what is not. It is necessary to note that this threat is not always an existential threat, but it could be presented like that. It depends on how it can be used. There is a concept of international security with this specific meaning, which is implied in most usages of the word (Buzan, Weaver, Wilde 1998, 27). The meaning of this issue, should be important itself, that it could be a priority key of the securitization process.

Announce of security is the main key to legitimize the force using, but most important is that state mobilizes in order to cope with the appear threat. Traditionally, by saying “security”,

a state representative declares an emergency condition, thus claiming a right to use whatever means are necessary stop or prevent this threat (Buzan, Weaver, Wilde 1998, 21). Therefore the security threat can be seen depending on the label this threat was presented. If the audience have seen the threat which was presented as threat, it is not necessary to prove the existence of this threat, the actions to prevent this threat should be taken urgently.

However this will only work in this case if the audience accepted the issue, but if this acceptance is failed it means that an actor should follow all other concept of securitization. If the some case presented to the referent object this won't be a securitization – this will be a securitization move, but it will be securitize only if audience accept it (Buzan, Weaver, Wilde 1998, 25). If the audience will not accept the issue as a threat it means securitization move. So basically in securitization process could be pointed two level: first it's a statement about the threat and second the threat is accepted by auditorium. The successful securitization consists of three main components: existential threat, emergency action and effects in interunit relations by breaking free of rules (Ibid, 26).

Another essential principle in the theory of securitization is a speech act words, it is a very important instrument to produce the claimed effect in action. According to Holger Stritzel in the theory of securitization, putting a lot of attention to the meaning side (semantic), but not much attention to the speaker, because is not always possible to know what audience is suitable for a case, why this audience and what will follow, is there are few audiences and when assured an audience to put securitization into the successes. According to Thierry Balzac the positive result could bring the securitization a successful acceptance by audience and also who is speaking, it could be heard differently from elite or from scientific people. In another words, the applicant of the statement about threat should know his audience very well, should also know the contest in which this threat statement should be presented. Among all the conditions of the speech act, it is very important to comply the form of security, to be more exactly the grammar of security to construct a plot that includes existential threat, point of no return and a possible way out (Buzan, Weaver, Wilde 1998, 33).

The possibility of successful securitization also depends on who is securitizing, because a person who securitizes and refers object is playing the main role in successful securitization, so the success will depends on the position of the actor, from influence's actor. Meaning that actors who has power are taking a high position (leaders). Those actors could be

divided into three groups: the referent object (this could be an existential threat and need to legitimate), the second is actor who is securitizing, make a statement about threat – speech act. The third one is a functional actor, who is very much influence on a decision of security, even if he is not an actor who is securitizing (Buzan, Weaver, Wilde 1998, 23).

After recognizing who is an actor in this process, it is very important to understand the different sectors and analyze them. Meaning it is not possible to have equal decision in all sector, they should look independently from each other, each sector has its own meaning and each sector is important. According to Buzan there are five different sectors, such as: military, political, economic, environmental and societal.

Military sector is trained and called upon to support routine world order activities, such as peacekeeping or humanitarian intervention and this could be count as an existential threat. (Buzan, Weaver, Wilde 1998, 22). It can arise a very important question for the state about the ability to secure their citizens.

In the political sector existential threats could be defined in terms of the constituting principle such as sovereignty, sometimes ideology of the state. Sovereignty can face existential threat by anything that questions recognition, legitimacy or governing authority. EU can have existential threat in a matter of the migration process. Also could be announced as existential threat when destroying society rules, norms and institution (Buzan, Weaver, Wilde 1998, 22).

In the economic sector, it is quite difficult to find the referent objects and essential threat. Many companies could be under existential threat if they are facing bankruptcy or for example experiencing changes in the law, so then a company could act illegal by and unviably. But companies in the market economy can come and go and only rarely do they try to securitize their own survival. The survival of the population can see as an existential threat, but if the economy doing worst or better cannon be seen as an existential threat (Buzan, Weaver, Wilde 1998, 22).

The societal sector is dealing mostly with collective identities. This sector is very much connected with migration crisis and can influence it. The identities can function independently of the state, such as nation and religion, so it is easy to securitize it. For example declaring that culture of the state is under the threat, which will have a negative result, meaning the collision between two cultures: west and east. Collective identities naturally evolve and change in response to internal and external developments. Such changes can be seen as invasive or

heretical and this can be pointed as existential threat or they may be accepted as part of the evolution of identity. Thus, whether migrants or rival identities are securitized depends upon if the holder of the collective identity take a relatively closed-minded or a relatively open-minded view of how their identity is constituted and maintained (Ibid, 23).

In the environmental sector, the range of possible referent objects is very large. This could various from the survival of individual's species, habitant to the planetary climate, biosphere (Ibid, 23). This sector is very easy to securitizes, because the survival of the population not only in one continent is a paramount issue.

The process of securitization is mostly based on the speech act. When the actor has started the speech act, it is already securitization move and the actor is hoping for the positive result such as acceptance the presence of the threat. Maybe the threat is not wearing a very danger character, but if the actor will tell that this problem is very serious, the audience could accept it like it is, so the actor are assure the audience to get all necessary instruments to prevent this threat. The brightest example is the European Union, where the main target is to provide security for people and to depute the solidarity as a common Union. The new order has challenged traditional way of thinking about security and called for new concept of European security. Depending on how the actor will do this speech act the problem could be dramatized. (Waever, Busan 1993, 23).

### **1.3 Securitization of migration**

Nowadays the migration became an important issue and the main feature of this issue is security policy, which can be explained in two ways: the language of the security in migration (how politicians use this language) and how this issue is using in the debates of the migration. This two factors are related to each other and mutually completed each other. Thus, western society is imagining migration as a potential threat, because of this they have developed their fears about security, welfare and their identity. Migration has been increasingly presented as a danger to public order, cultural identity, domestic and labor market stability, thus it has been securitized (Huysmans 2000, 752). The question of proceeding common migration policy, how

migrants can suit to cultural, social, identical, economic criteria of distributing the rights and obligation equally among the European citizens is still open. The obvious reason is that migrants are very often accused of illegal actions, such as terrorism, criminal.

Some authors such as Huysmans 2000, Ibrahim 2005, Togral 2011 are pointed that the racism is playing one of the main role in processes of securitizations (E. Farny, 2016). According to Ibrahim the securitization of migration could be said as follows: “discourse through which relations of power are exercised” and is “racism’s most modern form” (Ibid.). The receiving country will always be looking at their culture, race as a top and in this way accepting migrants from their society and processes of immigrations. Migration is seen as threat and this bring not only for action to prevent criminality and terror, but also protect and keep social-political values (Ibid.). The racism and xenophobia views are present in all Member States and that is evident. However according to Miles (1994) and Wieviorka (1994), the specific form of racism is not common for all Member States. National policies against racism and xenophobia, the historical and political context in which racism and xenophobia have emerged, differ considerably across the Member States (Huysmans 2000, 764). It does not exclude the fact how securitization actors are present this, fanning fears and doubts towards the “Others”. Thus, keeping the society is extremely important due to the fact of that the security identity of the European integration process is based on a fear of the return of the balance of power system which is fragmented and ruled nineteenth century Europe and culminated First and Second World Wars (Huysmans 2000, 755).

The process of securitization of migration can be analyzed in three levels, international, global and local. At the global level, the securitization of migration occurs in a limited extend, because of different institutional regulations and political conditions, it exists in the relations among different international actors. The appearance of the migration as a security threat does not establish a common strategic priority for all actors. The global securitization of migration appeared as a consequence of terrorist attack 9/11. This was due to the direct reaction of the US through the infamous war of terror declaration. It was united with unipolarity that embody the international system, the US managed to securitize the international terrorism. However, such securitization had another side, where cultivating an understanding that every Muslim and Arab could be as potential threat (Themistocleous 2013).

Determination to “regional level” relates to entities and actors which act according to set up framework, with common institutional conditions. A perfect example of such regional level is European Union, where the process of securitization is according to common institutional framework, which is formed together with all member states of European Union. However to reach a successful process of securitization is almost impossible due to three main reason. The first one is different political and economic interests. The second reason results from the different impact of migration on each state and the third reason is heterogeneity among the audience. The heterogeneity is due to the fact that locally, the securitization of issues varies greatly from one country to another, thereby creating different perceptions among the audience (Ibid.).

Comparing to the global and regional level the securitization of migration locally is basically happening in the most states, generally with intensive influx of migration. The securitization actor on this level could be intrastate or intragovernmental institutions, political parties, individuals or others. The securitization occurs by one actor or group of the people, such as political parties, media, and religious organizations. The most common arguments used by the internal securitizing actors, are related to the fields of economic, social connection and political stability. The migrants who is coming to the host country are becoming a competitive to the locals. In one side this is a cheap labor, but from other side increasing unemployment due to the unfair competition in the labor market. In social and political sectors the securitizing appearing due to the fear of changing demographic and cultural traditions of the country (Ibid.)

The author of this master thesis will analyze the migration crisis in the frame of securitization on regional level as European Union and on a local level. Visegrad group, Germany and France will be analyzing as an example on a local level.

#### **1.4 Securitization of migration in Germany, Visegrad group, and France.**

During the debating of proposal for new immigration bill the securitization issue arose because of the events of September 11th. This bill was confirmed and regulated immigration for the first time in post-war Germany, where previous wave of immigrants was seen as guest



workers, asylum and refugees. The impetus of the new bill with the war of terror first found its counterpart in anti-terror legislation. The Law of Fighting Terrorism (Terrorismusbekämpfungsgesetz, was created 9 of January, 2002) dedicated six articles from 24 articles directly to non-citizen or “foreigners” and asylum seekers. ”Foreigners” can be linked to the terrorism activity. This is indicative a direct linkage between terrorism and migration in a German case (Diez, Squire 2008, 573).

However, even if this law passed it is still was declared unconstitutional by Germany’s Constitutional Court, because for this bill has been counted when each Land will vote unanimously (Ibid). Eventually this bill was approved and even with the strict conditions in getting residence permit and easy departure of immigrants.

Angela Merkel the German chancellor has played an important role in flow of refugees to Europe. The migration policy of Angela Merkel the policy of opening doors for all migrants who is escaping from not stable situation in their countries has got a lot of debates and how Germany is playing the role of liberal political hegemon (Benner 2016). However she was protecting this open door policy to prevent the humanitarian catastrophe, which is happening now. Even if refugees are crossing the borders on EU, they are located in camps in terrible conditions, where they experienced lack of normal food, shelter, children who need to study and cannot get a normal education for this period of times in the camps. The dominating factor of Germany as a “welcoming country”, country of “solidarity” and “responsibility” are coming among the Merkel’s policy. A lot of volunteers from the Germany are trying to help refugees in different situation, showing them companionship and solidarity. However the increasing flow of migrants became a necessary part of the adoption of the agreement between Turkey and EU to stop the flow of migrants and to take an actions of securitization of migration in Germany. Lately, was made some actions to preventing this influx such as “temporary” border control on the Austrian border, so then it was a question of about Germany as warm and welcoming country (Knipp 2015). Angela Merkel has still insist with her open door policy and declared that she will carry out her “damned duty” for helping refugees, despite that a lot of German people want to limit the entrance of migrants (Newton 2016). In summit which was held in Turkey in 2015 Angela Merkel after the Paris’s attack was declared: “We live based on shared humanity, on charity. We believe in...every individual’s right to pursue happiness, catching the terrorist is Europe’s duty, also to innocent refugees who are fleeing from war and terror” (Walker and

Troianovski 2015). Obviously, the securitization issue is still an open issue as far the policy of welcoming state Germany and human rights policy are playing the major role.

Another attractive country for migrants is Sweden. The idea of Swedish welfare state is to have a weak side in globalization, but strong side of national sovereignty and welfare benefits of a country, such as good social packages (Poku, Graham 1998, 189). The Swedish security policy was concentrated first in military security concerns, the impact was a Cold War, such as arms race and proliferation of nuclear arms (Ibid, 189). In the 1980 the main issue of Sweden was the hunt of submarines. This military threat was the main issue and was the top priority of security state, because it was connected with foreign powers, borders and espionage (Ibid, 189). However, the Cold War wasn't only the one problem in securitization of migration, but the Sweden itself is perfect actor in external and internal image, with the high level of human rights. The securitization of migration was very closely connected with human rights since World War II and it was almost impossible to securitize of the policies in a decades (Ibid, 189).

Sweden has a very loyal policy towards the migrants and as Germany has an "open – door" policy with very attractive social benefits. For example, children connect illegal migrant families will have support from the government, unemployment will get a very good social package (769 dollars while they are looking for a job) and families will get free housing (Gholam 2016). The welfare system of Sweden should be sure that everyone has their housing, that there is no homeless people. The reason of such benefits is because the economic migrants are making Sweden richer country, so basically their slogan is – as much migrants as richer Sweden (Ibid, 2016). Political system was very loyal and tolerant to the migrants. Such kind of open – door policy became very vulnerable towards the Swedish society. Because of the increasing influx of migrants there became more violence and even murdered between migrants and citizen. People don't feel secure in their own country. Until the time policy has stayed the positive policy towards migrants and doesn't make any securitization move to start to protect the state. As it was written in subchapter 1.3 - in December was said that Sweden has got temporary removal from European Commission from their obligations of migrants relocation, because of the highly increased influx of migrants and Sweden is no longer can deal with this and need some time to solve this problem (Commission proposes....2016).

After months of fretting, police finally introduced border controls on the Swedish side of the bridge between Sweden and Denmark: the last symbol of Europe's unravelling free

movement project (Nelson 2015). That kind of action of securitization was very painful for Swedish society, because it was the end of their welcoming country. When the Sweden faced to this huge not stop influx of refugees the Swedish Parliament has adopted legislative changes about asylum seekers and people who is applying the residence permit. From 1 June if the person who is applying for asylum have got rejection they no longer can apply for accommodation. Also this law had touched the limitation of asylum possibilities such as granted residence permits and the possibilities to reunion with the family of applicant (Migrationsverket 2016). This law will be valid three years and probably later they will make it permanently.

The European migration crisis has divided Europe into two part – one part is solidarity and human rights in interest to help people who is suffering from war and unstable situation in their countries and in another part such as human tragedy as a security issue (Gigitashvili 2016). The Visegrad group (Poland, Slovakia, Hungary and the Czech Republic) rejected the decision of mandatory quotes and stated that this action will not solve the main problem of increasing influx of migration. This countries showing their xenophobic, anti-immigrants mood and also invoking the Europe to make the migration crisis as a main security issue. Visegrad countries are using the language which spread a mood of fear and mobilized people against migrants, enabling them to take extraordinary measures amid the refugee influx (Ibid, 2016).

According to Copenhagen School of security the issue of security could be securitizes through the speech act and the feedback from the audience could be positive in case of the real threat. As long as threats are socially constructed in a speech act, there is no guarantee if the threat is real or not (Ibid, 2016). Political leaders sometime dramatizes the situation as it is now, they can blame the migrants in such insecure issue as crimes, unstable economic, unemployment. The securitizing actor always trying to protect the society and even if the threat or not and how essential it is. The Visegrad group are politicizing and securitizing the migration issue and keep the xenophobic mood in society and in this way the government has the right for extraordinary measures (Ibid, 2016).

The Visegrad Group have created the migration issue as an external threat and that became the main aspect of securitization of migration in Eastern European countries. Moreover, the terrorist attack in Paris have connected the migrants with terrorist and this influenced on the other opinion of some European States. As it was mentioned before in subchapter 2.3 the racism is also playing the main role in securitization migration and Visegrad group, there is a great

example in a view that all Muslim are a threat for their society. The former prime minister of Poland has stated that: “Muslim would bring parasites and diseases to the citizens” and the same time the Prime Minister of Slovakia has stated that: “The only way to eliminate risks like Paris and Germany (terrorist attacks) is to prevent the creation of a compact Muslim community in Slovakia”. So in the end the President of Czech Republic, Milos Zeman, was blaming the Muslim from Egypt are financing some refugees for controlling Europe (Ibid, 2016). Such statement sound very strange from some leaders who is in a part of European Union. Political leaders are trying to put the issue of migration as issue of internal security of state. The main factor also playing media, which is highlighting the refugee problem as a potential threat and creating the migrants as the main enemies. This all factors allowed governments to take security measures such as build a fence, reject quota relocation system, rejection to take Muslim refugees and strict control on borders and in countries (Ibid, 2016). This effort probably connecting with previous events as terrorist attacks in USA 9/11 and attacks in Paris, but all this attacks were investigated and proved that migrants are not connecting with such action – as for USA it was visitor who came to USA on a temporary visa and in Paris that this attacks were made by migrants were not proved. The Syrian refugee’s crisis is perceived as a threat, but cannot considered objectively (Ibid, 2016).

## 2. MIGRATION CRISIS IN EUROPE

Firstly it is necessary to understand what does the migration mean and then focus on the main problem such as refugees in European Migration Crisis. The migration itself is not new to Europe. People are travelling, changing their places of living for the reason of improving their well-being, united with the families. In today's situation there is a lot of refugees who is forced urgently to leave their permanent place of residence due to wars and other armed conflicts or disaster of global significance. The scale of that crisis causes uncertain reaction in the world. For some people this crisis shows ineffective policy of Common Migration Policy, where migration policy structure, that should regulate and follow the established laws is weak in organization.

One of the factors of today's crisis is combining of illegal and legal migration in one big migration flow. That's why it causes so many people arriving to the European countries. Refugees are not crossing the borders of any other country just for the reason of hiding from the threat in the countries, they are running to developing countries, where they can get all benefits, but doesn't it put into threat the receiving state itself? It is important to take into consideration terrorist attacks numerous in Paris, Brussel, Nice.

Legal and irregular migration are parts of migration flow, which have the rights for norm and law regulations of receiving countries. One of the main issue of European Union is to make sure that the human rights and security structure could work well together for people and states. Member states had agreement of common values, but today they cannot agree to work and act with common norms and laws, for example in Eastern Europe, where economical question is above the common values, such as common migration policy. European Union is not able to deal with crisis more purposefully and the sluggish actions brought the crisis of misunderstanding and solidarity into Europe.

This chapter is dedicated to the main aspect of crisis and gives a review of current situation in general. In order to cover this subject, the Chapter will answer the following questions: what is migration crisis? Why this arise? What is respond of Member States? How do they react on it?

Different kinds of resources were used in this Chapter such as: media, public opinion,

official documents, press – release of European Union Committee, statistics in combining with author opinion in order to present a better understanding of the current situation.

## **2.1 What is migration?**

In order to define the meaning of migration the subchapter 2.1 will show the difference between legal and illegal migration. It will provide a better understanding of the concept of migration and refugees.

The migration is a movement of people from one part of region to another or movement of people from one country to another. The movement could be by group of people (small or big groups) and could be the distance or near distance. Migration processes are connecting with crossing internal and external borders and the target is to change the territorial location and place of living. This location changing could carry permanent or temporary character.

People who is relocating are calling migrants – the migration can occur between the continents and between the states, as well as inside of the state. Migration of people may be connected with unfavorable economic situation of the country as well as it may be due to the civil war or environmental catastrophe.

Refugees - people who is leaving their place of living due to extraordinary circumstances such as war, natural disasters, if they persecuted because of their race, religion, political opinion and don't want to stay in the country because of the fear. According to UNHCR the whole group could be count as a refugees and all groups could be replaces by above circumstances to the safe place and consider that any individual case can be a refugee.

Asylum-seeker – a person who is searching a protection from persecution or from the serious damage in the country, who currently waiting for a positive decision of refugee status according to national and international rules. In case of rejection the asylum application a person should leave the country.

## **2.2 Review and the reason of the crisis**

Exodus of refugees from Africa and the Middle East grown up in the end of 2016. Significant number of refugees is in the age under 18. There are a lot of children and they are unaccompanied children. Most of them escaping from Syria, Afghanistan and Iraq. Increasing number of refugees who is coming to Europe are causing a lot of problems. This implication for Europe can be extremely unpredictable and quite dramatic. Almost the entire flow of refugees mentally not conjugate with the European way of life, traditions and way of thinking. Many of them don't know language, culture, rights, less educated or uneducated at all. This means that fast integration is unlikely and employment status is not possible at all due to a sufficiently high level of existing unemployment among the local population. Many refugees are very angry because they lost what they had before such as home, family and relatives, source of income.

First of all this means that most of this people are net liability and their content is obviously no cost recovering prospects. Secondly, social and cultural alienation of refugees will force to create reservation, but this is very dangerous, because it entails an inevitable increase in crime from petty crimes to terrorist attacks. Brussel intensively seeks to unify procedures for admission and expulsion of refugees, while European Union countries do not always comply with this rules.

The influx of asylum seeking increased to 40% in the second quarter 2016, if compare the time in 2015. The number reached about 305 700 people, comparing to 88 100. The three top asylum seeking are Syrians (45 000 more than in 2015), Afghanis (22 800 increase compare to 2015) and Iraqis (19 800 increase compare to 2015). To be more exact, comparing to 2012 the influx were more or less stable, but from 2013 the influx started to increase and reached a high scale: in 2013 EU had 431 000 applications, in 2014 627 000 applicants and in 2015 the number of applications much increased and reached about 1, 3 million applications, so in 2016 the applications is about 1, 8 million in general (Asylum quarterly report 2016). This numbers are official only. The number of unofficial is unknown. The most attractive countries are Germany, Italy, France, Greece, Hungary and Austria (Ibid). The number 1, 8 million of reached applicants seems to be very high and dramatic, but nothing will compare with the number of people left their country. Syrian people asking for refugee status in neighbor countries such as Turkey, Lebanon, Iraq, and Jordan – the number is about 9 – 10 million people (Ibid). There are few routes which are attractive as for regular and irregular migrants by sea and land. The routes are covering Mediterranean Sea in a west, east and central parts. Greece and Italy are the most

attractive arrival and crossing points to another EU countries. Migrants who have chosen a land are going through Turkey or Balkans. Many refugees are choosing routes in a target to step in any of 26 member states which are belonging to the Schengen zone, which means, once a person entered one of this participating countries its guaranteed the free movement without any passport control, all this countries are sharing common rights for travelling and movement. That is why the welfare European states with guarantee social security, better lives and where human rights are in priority became more attractive as other countries.

The result of the solving problem is mostly negative than positive. It reveals more problems and one of the problem is a humanitarian aid to refugees who really need support. This put the European government in a doubt to deal with the influx of refugees, but also all 28 Member States have showed their disagreement in correct and effective refugee's issue. The difference between migrants groups had raise the issue about correct status and necessary protection of migrants, because the movement of migrants can carry the different meaning if people are forced to change the place of living because of war or they search for a good life, which are economic migrants.

One of the main regulation in the European Asylum system is a Dublin Regulation, which shows the incomplete system in regulating the law. This system is creating inequality between European states, when one European country is more responsible to deal with asylum claims than another. The main reason why this question arise right now is because of the lack of handle a problem with asylum claim where migrants claimed first to figure out correctly in counting the capacity to take refuges. Basically the country like Greece faced this problem individually. Lesbos, a Greek island has a population 86 000 people and the ability in reception is 2800 people, so in 2015 this island got more than 350 000 people. Thus, it's very difficult to follow all regulations to provide migrants with basic conditions, such as living, but also follow all applying procedure rules, but almost not possible. This inability and unwillingness to act with huge migrants flow in a national level, put in question of existence of Schengen area in general (Bagdonas 2015, 9).

The movement of applicants is fixed in European database according to the procedure rules, because without identification of the flow of applicants, it is not possible to know where applicants have claimed and where applicants currently are.

Moreover, there is a contradiction in asylum system. The financial burden of some



member states, which cannot follow all the rules in the European Asylum system, it means that there is a big difference in financial position between European states. Basically the applicants can apply for the same rights in any country, however the well-being of asylum applicants could be different (Bagdonas 2015, 12-13). In the difference of economic situations of each member states and difference of asylum system, which is unique for each state, it is also possible that some states can be held accountable for human rights violation and for the consistency of the implementation of the rules of the Common European Asylum System (Langford 2013, 218). However the most suffering countries are receiving countries, which don't have a stable financial position, basically they are not under international protection model, because human rights in European Union's ideology should be above of everything and all states should be able to provide with all necessary points including financing.

### **2.3 Member States in European crisis**

The European migration crisis also divided opinions between European Member states, which means that not all of them are agree with common values of Common European Asylum system. Not all states can offer asylum seekers the protection they need according to the obligations, that is why the difference in opinions between member states varies dramatically. As a result, the member states are not able to come to the common decision. This subchapter will give an overview of different opinion of member states and explains why EU cannot come to the common solution between member states. Moreover, some Member states are facing the dilemma of whether they should support or not the countries that have broken common rules and agreements. It occurred first during the Greece debt crisis and recurred with the EU-wide refugee crisis (Veebel 2015, 29). This brought to the decision that Greece will realize the strict economic reforms and will follow of EU's rules. There is of course some positive moments that EU announced about funding for migration crisis in amount of 1, 7 billion euro for 2015 – 2016, to help Member states who is most affected during this crisis, to increase financing in some EU agencies related to this crisis and also helping organization such as UNHCR to provide support to refugees and also tackle the root causes of the crisis in the Middle East and Africa, similar

fund has been created for Syria (Managing the EU migration crisis 2016).

One of the main group who opposed to all European quotas is a Visegrad Group. This group consist of Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia (Visegrad). The Visegrad group is fully supporting the EU in a hard controlling of external borders and working hard in this matter with the third countries (non – EU), but they are against the relocation system. The argument that in proper controlling of EU borders will increase a lot irregular migrants, which could stabilize situation such as uncontrolled entering to the EU zone. The most struggling country against relocation scheme is Hungary. The flow of refugees overload the asylum system, especially when their economy is weaker comparing to other countries, which can simply accept a large number of refuges. Hungary received 175 000 applications in 2015, that is 133 000 asylum applications more than in 2014, also the important fact is that they had the biggest number of asylum application per million inhabitants in Europe (Asylum in EU Member States, 2016). The result of this fast growing flow of migrants to Hungary, this country was declared as a frontline state, but in the Justice and Home affairs Council, it was voted against the accepting quotas, which should share between European States and it was identified as a migrant frontline state (Traynor, Kingsley 2015). Hungary was very sure that they have the rights to reject this quotas system in the Court of Justice of EU. As Viktor Orban prime minister of Hungary have stated that: “We will decide who we want to let in who we want to live with. The quota doesn’t make sense as it doesn’t solve anything” (Zalan 2015). Also 2 of September was a referendum in Hungary where people could decide if they agree to open the doors to migrants or not. Apparently people who came to vote was less than 50%, which means that referendum is invalid. According to the Political Capital about 8, 3 million citizen, could come to vote, but much less appeared. Hungary became the transit area for migrants during crisis on the way to Germany and other attractive countries, it should also be taken into consideration the fact, that in result to so many applicants are staying in Hungary. Hungary have built the fence with Croatia and Serbia, so the majority of citizens approved this authority actions, while human right organizations criticized this (BBC, 02.10.2016). In Poland the number of application (10255) did not so much increase, if could compare to Hungary, but however compare to 2014 it was 83% more (Asylum in the EU Member States 2016). Poland did not participate in relocation scheme during the year 2015. Moreover, Poland’s new government, elected on an anti-immigrants platform, declared that it could no longer participate in the relocation scheme due

to possibility that migrants may include terrorist (Bagdonas 2015, 16). Czech Republic has got 1235 applications and its 625 applicants more than in 2014 (Asylum in the EU Member States 2016). The society in the Czech Republic is notably divided on refugees due to the fact that 1156 applied in this country with the population about 10 million inhabitants. Earlier this topic about migration issue wasn't debate as it is now, the migrants make only 4 % from all population in Czech Republic, and migration issue became the most important topic now. They still working as well against the quota proposals of European Commission. The last one from this Visegrad Four is Slovakia, the country which got the lowest number of applications. Slovakia received only 270 applicants, but they were very choosy in their preferences, so they wish to receive only Christian asylum seeker (Bektas 2015).

The neighboring countries are trying to protect themselves inside by building big fences, secure themselves, but it cannot solve the problem at once. It only creates more tension and misunderstanding between member states as well as undermining the credibility of the idea of solidarity, because the refugee is a person who is seeking help from persecution on various grounds such as religion, nationality, race, war and the idea of this international protection is to protect such person, but not create the unfriendly attitude. This protection doesn't make any sense, if people are chosen only according to their nationality or race and how they will fit in the society. Romania is a country that agrees with opinion of Visegrad Four even if it not the member of this group.

There are countries which are the most frontline countries: Italy, Greece and Bulgaria. They are also the hot places in migration flow, where the most migrant crossing this countries. Greece has got 11 370 applicants in 2015, that is 375 applicants more than in 2014 (Ibid.) The number of received applications is more than the number of asylum applying, so total number of migrants who came to Greece is about 850 000 in 2015 (Mixed migration... 2016). According to the new agreement between Turkey and EU: all new irregular migrants crossing from Turkey to the Greek islands as of 20 March 2016 will be returned to Turkey, for every Syrian being returned to Turkey from the Greek island, another Syrian will be resettled to the EU (Press Release, European Commission 19.03.2016). A lot of refugees are stuck in the Greek islands when the agreement was signed. Greece is now planning to make the new shelters for the refugees with capacity of 1000 people each. As far as EU members cannot agree on quota distribution issue, all this people including children should stay in this camps. Italy has got 83

245 applications and that is 19590 application more than it was in 2014 (Asylum in the EU Member States...2016). Same problem was with Italy as Greece when they faced the issue of the huge influx of migrants wishing to enter other European countries. Bulgaria has got 20165 applications in 2015, which is 9360 applications more than in 2014 (Ibid). Croatia has got only 140 applications, but it was registered 555 761 asylum who just pasted the board and went to another countries. They just let them through without stopping and checking them, that was the main reason why Hungary made a fence to prevent overflow (Ibid.). Slovenia is under the massive flow of migrant as Hungary, and as a result Slovenia made a fence with Croatia to prevent such flow, which was reach in October 2015 12 616 person per day (Ibid.). Malta has got 1695 applications in 2015, which is 330 applicants more than in 2014 (Ibid.). Malta is a small island that is a reason why it was never in a top countries of relocation system.

Sweden and Austria are the most active countries who are participating in relocation asylum seekers and the number of influx migrants is already red. Sweden has got 156 110 applicants in 2015, that is 81130 more than in previous year 2014 (Asylum in the EU Member States 2016). Sweden always was very welcoming country regarding migrants, but sharply increasing this flow push them to think and change the attitude towards the migrants, also it was a factor of violence among the migrants. In December, it was said that Sweden was temporary removed from their obligations of migrant's relocation, because of the highly increased influx of migrants and Sweden needs some time to solve this problem (Commission proposes...2016). Austria has got 85505 applicants and that is 60000 more than in 2014 (Ibid.). Austria is very tolerant to the migration relocation scheme, but due to high influx of migrants Austria has asked the same time out as Sweden. Austria following the second after Sweden in asylum applications per million inhabitants (Council Implementing...2016). The parliament of Austria has set up new asylum law that allows to stated that this country is an emergency state, because of the sharply increased number of asylum seekers (Huggler 2016). That is mean that asylum seekers will have claims assessed, before entering to the country, where all refugees will be rejected and turn away (Huggler 2016).

United Kingdom has got 38370 applications in 2015, which is 6250 applications more compare to 2014 (Asylum in the EU Member States...2016). Besides this UK was approved with additional points by Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union regarding a special status in matter if they wish to participate in the relocation system or not, Denmark and Ireland

has the same privilege, but however those three countries are in the resettlement scheme. Denmark has got 20852 applications, where 6290 application more than in previous year 2014 (Ibid.). Ireland has got the lowest applications compare to UK and Denmark, in 2015 3270 compare to 2014 1830 applications (Ibid.). Ireland is the same conditions as UK and Denmark, where they can chose if they want to participate in relocation system or not, however the Ireland took 600 refugees according to relocation system from Greece and Italy in summer 2015.

The special place could be given to Germany in relation to the migrants. The human rights are playing the main role in this country. Germany has got 441800 applicants in 2015, which 270000 more than in 2014 (Asylum in the EU Member States 2016). Germany was one of the countries who agreed to give as much as possible asylum seekers an international protection than the other countries. Also they stated that Germany will take all Syrian refugees who will apply in their country. This statement was criticized by many Member states and people (Connolly 2015). France has got 70570 applications and that is 19590 applications more than in 2014 (Asylum in the EU Member States 2016). Spain has got less applications than Germany and France 14600 applications. Spain has a desire to share the support for asylum seekers.

Netherlands, Belgium and Finland took a part in relocation system and also to give the international protection to the asylum seekers. Netherlands has got in 2015 43035 applications, its 21255 more applications that in 2014 (Asylum in the EU Member States 2016). Importantly, the Dutch government was reported to hold discussions on the creation of a mini-Schengen that would consist of the Benelux, Germany and Austria (Bagdonas 2015, 16). The Netherlands is country who is agree to receive 3900 asylum seekers form Italy and Greece, also 21.10. 2015 the Dutch Government has ordered to translate the constitution on Arabic language, because in their opinion each person who is going to live here should know the rules and right of this country (Science Forum....2016). Belgium has got 38990 application in year 2015 (Asylum in the EU Member States 2016). Belgium always has showed the willing in taking part in the relocation system. Finland has got 32150 applications in year 2015 (Asylum in the EU Member States 2016). Finland is very welcoming country, which respect any kind of religion, cultures, race. With the 5, 5 million population there living 4% of migrants. This country was never against relocation scheme, therefore their contribution to the relocation system is very significant.

As for Luxembourg their contribution is not so large, they don't have any desire to participate in it. Luxembourg has got 2360 applications in 2015. This country has never been in priority in sharing scheme and never participates in any solution in solving the problem. The same situation with Cyprus and Portugal. Those countries are standing aside from this relocation scheme.

Baltic countries are not willing to receive asylum seeker and besides they did not receive a lot of application. Mostly because it's a significant burden for them and high costs that they cannot afford, in general. The desire of the asylum seekers is not so high either, because they are very well aware of the small social benefits. Latvia has got 330 applications in 2015, Lithuania 275 and Estonia 225 accordingly.

Taking a look at all of this countries it is easy to make conclusion that not all Members States are acting according to the European common migration values, trying to protect people in need. Only few countries can support this policy even if the burden is very high, the priority is to fulfill the obligation. Now even there is another side of the coin, not only countries are economically stable and just cannot carry this burden. There is a big difference among this countries in supporting this problem and trying to help and prevent this cause, some countries do not fulfill the obligations in quotas and already made a decision to build a fence with neighboring countries, but not between the EU members in whole, basically they cooperate only with each other and thinking about their secure only, but not about how to secure the other countries. Such unwillingness between the states make the EU weak and vulnerable, but also undermines the credibility of the EU itself.

### **3. PROSPECTIVES AND CHALLENGES OF MIGRATION CRISIS IN EU**

Europe is faced with crisis like never before. The existing legal and institutional framework cannot regulate the increasing influx of refugees and this crisis has showed big problems in understanding between Member States and has showed the weak places in common migration policy. Schengen system has shaped when faced with such crisis. Some Member States cannot follow the Dublin Regulation on basic of Common Migration Policy and Convention, because they cannot regulate the migration flow. For example Italy and Greece which do not register migrants and allowed them to move to another countries. This put a big economic and social burden to such countries as Germany, Sweden, Benelux, Austria and Finland.

Since the crisis has started the European Union was trying to prevent and handle this crisis. The migration issue turned to the issue for European Council. While some discussions on this matter were contentious and unproductive, the EU made a number of significant decisions (Lehne 2016). It was adopted the relocation system from Greece and Italy, the agreement between EU and Turkey to reduce flow of migrants and financial support in the Middle East (Ibid). However, the fulfilment of those obligations were going very slow and meanwhile the influx of asylum-seekers were increasing.

The states do not act as they should act with solidarity and trying to protect themselves individually by making a fence on their borders. The bright example of this action as it was said before Hungary with a fence along Croatia and Serbia borders and they were subjected to harsh criticism by other Member States.

This Chapter will answer the questions: How crisis influence economic? What are the challenges and what EU can offer to solve this crisis? This Chapter is written from empirical structure of work to the master thesis. The author of this thesis will use different sources of information such as opinions of leaders, press releases and other authors opinion.

#### **3.1 New challenge for migration policy of EU**

Migration is playing an important role in the future of EU as a whole. While the European migration policy has been criticized by other states over Europe appeared other challenges, which arise new problems and difficulties in effectiveness of decisions making – practically and politically.

From the practically view the all scale of migration crisis should not be underestimated. Migrants are moving from different countries, they have different profiles, some using this situation in order to change their lives, irregular migrant are using dangerous routes. For Italy, Greece, Croatia and Hungary – the EU states are in the frontline – the volume and speed of flow just overreached their asylum system and at this time their economic is very vulnerable and weak (Metcalf-Hough 2015).

Sometimes it's quite difficult to identify people who is really in need and who is not. The definitions of asylum-seeker or refugee are covering people who is escaping from such problematic countries as Syria and other danger conflicts, but not for the other people who is seeking the international protection because of unstable economic situation, bad ecological conditions and poverty. The difficult character of existing migration models and policy is presenting a big challenge to the international, regional and legislative framework (Ibid). To act according to human rights conditions with people who is coming from problematic countries through the illegal routes and who is applying for asylum in the end are getting negative feedback and should live the country. Receiving EU countries are faced with the major challenge in a process of returning people back and in rejection of asylum-seeker, because of the unsafe conditions in countries where people are coming from (Ibid).

Also the important challenge is economic burden for receiving countries, when they should support refugees and give them full social package at a time of their staying in the country, this is not what countries want to deal with. It's also important issue for them what will be period of their staying in this countries and how long they should support refugees. The financial costs of integration can be seen in longer economic processes and other expenses – according to the previous migration wave as soon the migrants will be providing with all necessary support as soon they will find a job and start paying taxes (Ibid). This is one side, but from the other the migrants are a big competitive in not welfare states and perceived as not welcome guests in their countries.



Another important key element is the moving migrants to the final point of destination. Gone through all this difficulties in movement from one place to another, migrants are ready to resettle in one place and help to invest into the country by their labor. Meaning, migrants are still very attracted to the country with economics and improving demographically.

The European public opinion is divided and this is touching as migration policy of Europe and integration refugees to the society. Also putting the negative opinion media, which always announcing that migrants are a big threat for European citizens, thus anti-migration policy is the main issue for Europe. Even governments that have been more welcoming have found winning their voters around to a more measured approach to migration on on-going challenge (Metcalf-Hough 2015). The last few months there is can be seen a necessary response from the EU, even if their some misunderstanding in political, social and economic sectors.

### **3.2 EU – Turkey Agreement**

During one of the visit to Turkey Donald Tusk the European Council President has announced that agreement between those two countries is working. In 2016 the amount of irregular migrants to the European countries are became much less compare to the previous years. Basically this agreement is a visible view of progress in political level. That is also not mean that European Union is trying to put all obligations to Turkey, that is mean that the world is ready to act together, of course should not be miss that factor that each country is following by their own interest, the Turkey in this case to be member of Schengen Agreement. In 15 of July, 2014 in Strasburg in the European Parliament, the President Jean-Claude Juncker has made the new agenda plan “A New Start for Europe”. In this agenda not only new plans for different sectors were mentioned, but also the solutions to regulate and handle the migration crisis. He stated: “On a basic of our shared values, we need to protect those in need through a strong common asylum policy. The newly agreed common asylum system has to be fully implemented and divergences in national implementation removed. I also intend to explore the possibility of using the European Asylum Support Office to assist third countries and Member States

authorities in dealing with refugees and asylum requests in emergency situations, where appropriate on the ground in a third country that is particularly concerned” (A New Start for Europe 2014). In this way, Juncker has urged for a close work with countries. So then, the Turkey got the financial support from EU. In a deeper meaning, the financial support for Turkey was given for holding illegal migrants from entering to EU, Turkey in this case like a burden between East and Europe. The main point for European Commission the fulfilment Migration Plan with concrete steps. For making this agenda successful the cooperation concentrated on funding requirement (European Commission, Press Release 2015). Moreover, there is a need in requirement of adaptation the new legal framework and the Turkey is very suitable country. The European Commission has announced about EU-Turkey Joint Action Plan and the new statement took effect in 20<sup>th</sup> of March 2016. In this plan was agreed: returning all irregular migrants to Turkey, replacement system for one Syrian to another, meaning if one Syrian will be returned the other Syrian could apply for asylum-seeker in EU, strong protection system from Turkey (EU-Turkey Statement: Questions and Answers 2016).

One of the most important point in this system is a scheme of replacement and that says in agreement as following:

*“All new irregular migrants crossing from Turkey into Greek islands from 20<sup>th</sup> of March 2016 will be returned to Turkey. This will take place in full accordance with EU and international law, thus excluding any kind of collective expulsion....For every Syrian being returned to Turkey from Greek islands, another Syrian will be resettled from Turkey to the EU taking account the UN Vulnerability Criteria....” (EU-Turkey Statement 2016).*

This point related to irregular migrants who is coming from Greece to Turkey in matter of trying to cross European border illegally. Probably they were trying to get asylum and it was rejected according to European common procedure for positive decision in getting asylum and those migrants won't have any priorities in getting asylum. This replacement system between EU and Turkey will help to prevent irregular migration flow.

There is an important issue regarding the humanitarian assistant. Turkey and EU are agreed that Voluntary Humanitarian admission Scheme will activated and they will be work

together to improve the humanitarian conditions inside of Syria and in borders closed to the Turkey (Ibid). However, as it was said above everyone is following their own interest, so Turkey agreed to work with EU on few conditions. First is a visa free regime, second is a custom system and the third is the will of Turkey to be a part of European Member State. This process is already going for about 10 years and still there is no result on final decision.

This agenda was confirmed by European Commission, so all steps should be checked. At the moment the Commission only introduced three reports about of Action Plan between Turkey and EU. In one of the visit to Turkey, Donald Tusk has stated: “I would just like to add that, and it is not only a formal and political assessment but it is also my very private, personal feeling also after today’s visit, that today Turkey is the best example for the whole world on how we should treat refugees. No one has the right to lecture Turkey what you should do” (Remarks by President Donald Tusk, Press Release 2016).

There is another side of this Action Plan in Parliament, because there is feeling some controversy inside of the house and the first one if Turkey following all requirement regarding human rights and if a Turkey is a safe and trustworthiness partner.

However, the premises on which the deal was constructed – namely that Turkey is a safe place for refugees – was flawed. In the months following the deal, Greece’s asylum appeals committees ruled in many instance that Turkey is not a safe partner, because not fulfil all obligation in providing protection to the refugees (Kondylia Gogou is Amnesty International’s Greece researcher 20.03.2017). In a Greece islands the human life is not taking into consideration and cost of the deal is laid bare (Ibid). Not allowed to leave, thousands of asylum-seekers live in a tortuous limbo. Women, men and children languish in inhumane conditions, sleeping in flimsy tents, braving the snow and are sometimes the victims of violent hate crimes (Ibid).

### **3.3 Migration crisis – possibility in achievement positive results**

The Council of European Union confirmed the strategic plan for response migration crisis and for improvement the Common Asylum Migration system. In this lies of action should

be implemented such issues as: preventing illegal migration, addressing urgent humanitarian needs, saving lives at sea and targeting criminal networks, strengthening the EU's external borders, reinforcing internal solidarity and responsibility, providing legal avenues, return and readmission of illegal migrants (Finding solutions to migratory pressure 2016). This solutions came just after the pressure of all Member States, because of the overwhelmed migrants. However the changes should be made not as response for this crisis, but in whole system of Common Asylum.

The first meeting of the European Council was held on the 23th of April 2015 and the leaders agreed for four main actions and this meeting came just after the dramatic situation in Mediterranean, where dead people in target to reach European Union (Special Meeting of the European Council 2016).

In the first action was included destroy the smuggler's vessels before they can be used, cooperation with Europol against the smuggling network, assistant of third-countries' migration authorities. Second is the proper sea border control in the central part of Mediterranean, third action is cooperation with the countries of origin and transit and program of return illegal migrants. The last one action is protection of refugees who need protection in the EU framework and resettlement in EU (Ibid). This meeting was in general based on solutions of preventing the illegal migration and fight with the smuggler, was offered also the relocations system, but states can take a part in this action if the willing to take a part.

On the 27<sup>th</sup> of May 2015 the European Commission adopted the first solutions for improving processes in solving migration crisis, according to the Agenda of Migration, which were announced as a plan 13.05 (Ibid).

Mostly, the main task of this plan was a strong cooperation between Member States and proving the principles of Common Asylum System. In current migration crisis was revealed some shortcomings such as mistrust between the Member States in the case for example relocation system, because of the "unfair" realization of this plan. Thus, it is necessary to contribute to the common values in common asylum system, realize better control in the applications between Member States according to all legal framework for asylum-seeker. The agenda brings together the different steps the European Union should take now, and in the coming years, to build up a coherent and comprehensive approach to reap the benefits and address the challenges deriving from migration (Communication from the Commission...2015).

Another step in creation of system working it is Dublin system. This should be sharing among all Member States. The practice has shown that system doesn't work properly and need some improvements (Ibid, 13).

Return system is not working properly either, this related to the migrants whom asylum applications were refused. Smuggling networks often play on the fact that relatively few return decisions are enforced and only 39, 2 of return in 2013 were effectively enforced (Ibid, 9).

The relocation scheme was also proposed, which should bring the internal assistant between Member States. EU countries should act with solidarity and responsibilities. The receiving Member State will be responsible for checking applications according to all rules. The relocation system based on criteria such as GDP, size of population, unemployment rate and past numbers of asylum seeker (Ibid, 4) – Appendix 1.

Relocation means a distribution among Member States of person in clear need of international protection. Resettlement means the transfer of individual displaced persons in clear need of international protection. This scheme should cover all Member States and this scheme will consist of a single European pledge of 20 000 resettlement places (Ibid, 19) – Appendix 2.

According to the latest European Commission press release of relocation and resettlement system it was stated that it has a positive results, however it had shown some slow results in the system, probably it's emerged with quota relocation system between Member States and some were rejected this plan. This temporary setback in an otherwise positive trend confirms that further effects are needed to increase the number of transfers per month and to sustain a steady relocation pace (Relocation and Resettlement.....Press Release 2016).

Even if the relocation system is a very good plan for solving migration crisis, it still requires some additional tools to make is successful and do not repeat in future. The EU government should be more effective in protection migrants, especially woman and children who really need protection, no matter in what status they are. It's doesn't mean to allow everyone to enter the EU, but should be fulfil all obligations regarding asylum protection according to all norms and rules and all Member States should act together.

The Member States should implement the long-term strategy forwarded to regulate this migration crisis and prevent this in future as it was said before including as part of wider international effort to maximize the benefits and minimize the human and economic costs of global migration (Metcalf-Hough 2015). The principles of burden sharing should be as key to

solidarity. Government should put adequate support in funding for region where most migrants are concentrated. And of course the main issue it finish the war conflicts in countries of origin.

This subchapter had an overview about government acting towards their implementation of the Agenda for migration. Due to constantly emerging issues, it is impossible to find the right solution, but based on the current issues, it is possible to identify weaknesses in system and find correct solutions.

## **4. CASE – STUDY: GERMANY AND POLAND.**

This Chapter will be dedicated to the case-study with the example of two countries – Germany and Poland. Those two countries have different attitude towards the migration policy. The situation with current migration crisis proves it. In this Chapter author is trying to compare those countries and to find the reason why those countries have different opinions and actions toward refugees. The multiculturalism in Germany and Poland was chosen as a reason that today's attitude to the refugees is already implied in a concept of multiculturalism in general, hence the attitude towards refugees has not changed much. Also the author will try to analyze the securitization process of those two countries. Germany has the policy of opening doors meanwhile Poland is a more closed country for different cultures. The reason could be in the history of past years, for example multiculturalism. The last subchapter is dedicating to migration policy and perspectives of Germany and Poland and will be based on a comparison of the two countries.

The reason why author of this thesis have chosen Germany and Poland as a case studies, because these two countries are very different in their migration policy. These two countries before the World War Second have had similar attitude to migration even if the economically they were different. Nowadays the migration policy and multicultural issue is very different then it was before, now Poland is a very conservative country towards to other people such as a refugees with different religion, culture, because this could be a threat for the nations, thus not ready to have an open-door policy as Germany. However this could be another issue too, such as economic burden. Germany and Poland is very different in economical level, because Germany is a welfare state, meanwhile Poland has a weak side of economic and not ready to carry this burden.

As a sample of case – study the author of this thesis wanted to show how different can be two European states, which shares common values as a European Union should present to the world. The values where needed to help people who really need in help. Thus, migration crisis shows the weakest part of each country, which country can be loyal and tolerant to the refugees, what securitization processes involved in a solving of securitization issue, how different these countries as Germany and Poland respond to this crisis.

Poland is in Visegrad Group, thus it is not only Poland has this negative opinion towards refugees, but also other countries from this Visegrad Group such as Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovakia. The author of this thesis wanted to point how different opinion among member states and what is their priority can be.

#### **4.1 Multiculturalism: Germany and Poland**

Multiculturalism is a multifaceted concept, therefore research should go as a separate topic, but the purpose of this sub-chapter is to prove that today's attitude towards refugees is based on the adaption of a particular culture in receiving country. Is the country and its citizens ready to accept another religion, culture, a society different from them and whether this adoption will carry a threat to the country?

In the speech 14 of December 2015 in Karlsruhe Angela Merkel was announced that: "Multiculturalism leads to parallel societies and therefore remains a "life lie", or a sham. The challenge is immense. We want and we will reduce the number of refugees noticeably" (Rick Noack 14 December 2015, Washington Post). This is not a contradiction of herself according to the earlier speech in 2010, where Angela Merkel repeat her words: "Of course the tendency had been to say, "Let's adopt the multicultural concept and live happily side by side, and be happy to be living with each other." But this concept has failed, and failed utterly" (Ibid, 2015). The refugees who will need a help will get it, announce Angela Merkel, but not everyone will fulfill to that criteria, German authorities are expected to grow up the deportation of refugees who is not fulfill those criteria as refugee status (Ibid. 2015).

The German people are expecting that when refugees will come to their country they should learn the language, step to their society and their working life. Shortly they should easily integrate.

Multiculturalism is playing a positive role, but according to Merkel it can lead to isolation of migrants (in this case refugees) from the German society, if for example they will build some suburb around the Germany, thus refugees will not get the possibility to integrate properly in to society, because they will be living by their community – good example of this



case is Paris and the Turkish community in Germany (Ibid, 2015). However in 2015 Germany has opened the doors for about 1 million refugees, where they are living in temporary accommodations (Ibid, 2015).

Multiculturalism is a shape of tolerance, in principle it is possible according to German migration policy, however migrants in this issue never be German native, because the origin is coming from the root of origin. German is German, because he was born to the German, as for example with a French (George Friedman. Merkel, Muslim and the problem of Multiculturalism Dec. 15, 2015). Behind the willingness to accept perpetual distinctions was the unwillingness to allow the stranger to be become one of them (Ibid.).

Regarding the current situation with refugees, the Europeans are required to accept the refugees only on a temporary conditions, they have to be the welcomed guests and when the situation in conflict areas will allow to come back them in to the place of their origin, they should come back (Ibid). Thus migration policy in Germany which in the beginning was announced as an “open door” policy at the moment seems that is failed (EADaily 09.12.2016). According to the statement, that Merkel announced already in 2010 that multicultural policy failed. Germany after World War II has accepted a lot of guest worker (it will be describe more clearly below) and the believe that different cultures can live together “side by side” didn’t work (Zoltan Kovacs 16 Dec, 2016). This statement is confirmed that European society has identity and this fact impossible to ignore (Ibid.).

Now Europe, in particular, Germany is increasingly inclined to the fact that Europe adopted many migrants without requiring them to integrate and this led to the result that to this days the communities live apart from the German society as was mentioned above (Kenan Malik 04.05.2015. Крах мультикультурализма). This also provokes a risk in the situation with the current European Migration crisis.

“Multiculturalism, political correctness and mass migration are responsible for terror attacks in Europe” – said interior minister of Poland, Mariusz Blaszczak and he added that, governments should protect their citizens (Virginia Hale 16.07.2016. Poland: Multiculturalism, Immigration, Political Correctness responsible for Nice attack). That was followed after attack in Nice made by Tunisian who were living in France. Also Mr. Blaszczak has added that the result of terror attacks is a years of multiculturalism (Ibid.). Muslim refugees for Poland are associated with terrorism. Poland compare to Germany in previous time was close country for

totally another culture and traditions meanwhile Germany was always a welcome welfare state. Probably the reason is not that these two countries have different points of view, but in the economic stability of those countries. Germany was a state that always needed guest workers, however in Poland there is a tendency that Polish people used to leave their country to get more benefits from welfare country.

According to minister Blaszczak by rejecting mass migration government hopes to avoid the mistakes made by many Western governments (Ibid). He is also announced that: “newcomers from Africa and Middle East simply do not integrate. European values and culture cannot coexist with values and cultures of newcomers and multiculturalism is a “wrong” as a concept” (Ibid). In Poland a lot of people are thinking that Muslim people in their country are supporting “Islamic State”. 12% of the Poles believe that the majority of Muslim in Poland are supported by extreme groups and another 23% said that there are many such supporters the extremism. And only 12% believe that such supports are “very few” (Proshkin 2016. Франция и мультикультурализм). Moreover the negative attitude of Poland to a Muslim have 66% of people and only 19% of people have the positive attitude to them. A more negative attitude only among Hungarian and Italians – 72% and 69% (Ibid). So by this percent, it is possible to see that Poles are seeing Muslim people as a threat of their identity, however the Germans have the positive attitude to Muslim as far they used to live with the Turkish communities a years, but the factor that those communities don’t want to integrate in German society (Ibid).

However today European Migration Crisis is showing that countries are able to change their tendency of attitude to the refugees and is a great example - Germany.

Here is a point to look through over history a little bit and it will give understandings why such different attitude have those two countries. The history of multiculturalism in Germany became after World War II, when country experienced the lack of workers and the people who were able to do it. In the post-war decades, the authorities of the Germany (in past FRG) signed treaties with several countries on attracting foreign workers: in 1955 – with Italy, in 1960 – with Spain, in 1961 – with Turkey. Up until 1968, guest workers from Morocco, Portugal, Tunisia and Yugoslavia arrived in Germany (Клаудия Превецанос 29.10.2011. Как гастарбайтеры из Турции стали мигрантами). At this time the Turkish group the biggest group of migrants in Germany and respectively all of them are Muslim. Most of them are relatives of immigrant workers who came to Germany in the 60s of the last century under the

agreement on hiring workers signed between Germany and Turkey (Ibid). The assumption that guest workers will leave the country after two years didn't work. Most of the people stayed in the country for permanent living (Ibid).

In World Cup in 2006 Germany presented two new faces to the world – Afro –German football player Gerald Asamoah in the publicity campaign “Du bist Deutschland” (William A. Barbieri, Jr. The Oxford Handbook of Modern German History 2011, 795). German patriotism and enthusiastic support of its diverse roster of representatives on the soccer pitch helped create the impression how Germany can and willing to support the multiculturalism culture and how they find the new identity as a tolerant and inclusive society affirming of its immigrants character (Ibid, 795). Doesn't it look impressive showing its loyal policy towards migrants and call in such way to act another – tolerant and loyal? The opposite reaction of such an open policy forced to reconsider the views and once again think about the correctness of such policy – these are terrorist attacks in Europe. The German Chancellor, Angela Merkel, declared it time to relinquish the failed utopian dream of the multicultural society (Ibid, 796). The extent when the Germany became the multicultural society it's a complex and that is a politicized issue, which is from the soccer field to the fundamental debates over German identity. This research is require the number of topics about multiculturalism, history and ethnic diversity in modern Germany, the current demographic constitution of German society, the politics of ethnic and religious identity and the institutional responses of the state, the position of Germany with respect to broader historical processes such as European integration, contemporary ethical debates about the rights and wrongs of patriotism and tolerance (Ibid, 796).

Nowadays, Poland possesses perhaps the most culturally homogenous society in the whole of Europe population of 38 570 186 million people who are overwhelmingly Polish-speaking by language, and overwhelmingly Roman Catholic by religion, and overwhelmingly patriotic in their political views (Davies Norman 1986, 79. Poland's Multicultural Heritage). Today's Poland is very different from this Poland which was in thousands years before World War II. It was multinational state with a vast territory. In fifteen to seventeen centuries Poland was much bigger then Russia and there were living not only Poles, but also a lot of Ukrainians, Belorussians, Lithuanians, millions of German people and biggest Jewish community in the world (Ibid, 79). However this came to end during World War II, when were killed a lot of millions Poles and in 1936 – 1956 more than 20 million people who lived in Poland were

deported forcibly. So like this appear new country with the new territory, with new political regime. Create Poland for Poles were a dream of Roman Dmowski, the politician who announced first this statement in Tsarist Duma. The statement was the following: “One Nation, One Faith, One Republic and One Culture”. Same time in XIX century while the Germany was a country with multicultural policy where were a lot of nationalities – Poland was the country where the identity of Poles were above all (Ibid, 79).

20 of July 2011 was agreed a one very important document according to the Migration Policy in Poland. The name of the document is “The Polish Migration Policy: current state of play and further actions”. This strategy is very important, because there says that Poland should be more open to the refugees and immigrants, who has needed skills and not causing integration problems (Karolina Grot 07.12.2013. An Overview of the migration policies and trends – Poland).

The strategy is to keep a coherent immigration policy. It is targeted on labor migrants and their position on a labor market as well as those that aim to settle in Poland with their families permanently. Other outcome of new migration strategy is the fact that international students should study in the Polish universities, because it is a potential for integration, for the immigrants students with high qualification (Ibid).

Possible to say that Poland has a very long history in multicultural policy, which should be analyze deeper, than in this subchapter, however the author of this thesis wanted to point out that two European countries, could be very different in a sense of mentality. Problem lies in another issue that Poland wants to be a multicultural country and Germany less multicultural. The European Migration Crisis shows the weakest part of each country, how those countries can be loyal and tolerant to another religion, but at the same time Europe as a whole Union can be an easy victim for barbarians who are the part of the multiculturalism, meaning terrorist.

## **4.2 Securitization: Germany and Poland**

Refugee issue is playing one of the main roles in European States. Today the migration issue for the EU countries became the issue of security. As it was mentioned already before in the subchapter 1.3 the security issue emerged after the terror attack in 9/11. It changed the way

the western world perceived the migration from Islamic world. This has sparked anti-immigrants and anti-Muslim sentiments and movements to gain momentum across Europe. (Hasan Basmisirli 2016, Securitization and de-securitization of migration policies of Germany and Turkey according to leadership rhetoric). The Muslims began to be perceived as a threat to the national security of the state (Ibid). The security issue is not connected anymore with a military conflict, but with a threat of inside states, concerning the identity of the state and perception of Muslim as a threat of terror within the state.

This subchapter will not cover the theory, because the theory of securitization was described in the Chapter 1 (Theoretical Framework). In this subchapter the author will describes how Germany and Poland are putting theory into practice. What are the main actions taken by these two countries and how to launch the securitization process?

Securitization is a process, which a regular political issue, has been changed and transformed by the speech and acts of political actors by creating new security threats (Ibid). The analytical work was mostly adopted in such issues as migration, health, human and minority rights and most recently the “war on terror” (Ibid).

Germany is one of the countries who is trying to persuade the European countries to act responsibly towards the refugees, towards people who is escaping from the war. Germany in the charge of Merkel prepared the quote system according to that system European countries should accept refugees, but some countries are disagree with that quote system (Ibid). In Germany the big opposition is coming from the anti-Islamic far-right-parties (Ibid). Because of those far-right-parties the program for the reception of more refugees was rejected, because those parties are strongly believe that this refugees are the core of terrorism and they are sure also in another thing that it is a big threat to their identity (Ibid). The migration “open door” policy in Germany and humanitarian aid for refugees emerged of the anti-Islamic movement such as Pegida (Patriotic Europeans against the Islamisation of the Occident). Pagida the anti-Islamic was established in 2014 in Dresden and the main aim of this movement this is a fight and protect against immigration. According to researcher, the Pegida movement is based on a strong skepticism of democracy, and a feeling of powerlessness opposite political elites, but also a fervent desire for a strong national identity (Dario Sarmadi 06.01. 2015. Anti-Islam protests “tearing apart” German society). The group’s deputy leader, Tatjana Festerling said: “We don’ have time for decency anymore. If we don’t grab our pitchforks and fight the

Islamisation of Europe, we are lost. Refugees should be forced to register at police stations, and ultimately we need to look at deportation. If they keep crossing the borders and you can't arrest them, shoot them. Our borders should be closed and infiltrators should be arrested or, as a last resort, shot. It's about fences, it's about infrastructure, it's about military. You have to be serious if you want to be taken seriously" (Hasan Basmisirli 2016, Securitization and de-securitization of migration policies of Germany and Turkey according to leadership rhetoric). This xenophobic mood followed after the criminal actions which were made against German people.

Another far-right-party with anti-Islamic mood is Alternative for Germany (AfD). This party is consider itself as a voice of anti-immigration. This party rejected Islam (Ibid). 1 of May 2016 in congress of AfD party they have stated that Islam shouldn't be in the part of German society and voted against wearing veils and minarets in Germany (Ibid). This party is a serious opponent to the Angela Merkel welcoming policy. The public opinion regarding this party is raised to 14% and that gave the signal that anti-immigration policy in Germany will take the main part (Ibid). The Merkel's "open door" policy started to get the negative feedback towards refugees. Konrad Adam who is a spokesman of AfD party said that their party has a "fundamental sympathy for the Pegida movement" (Soeren Kern 13.12. 2014. Germans rise up against Islamization) and the leader of AfD party Bernd Lucke concluded the speech in a following way in interview: "Many people in Germany have legitimate concerns about the spread of radical ideology, which promotes violence against non-Muslim, robs women and girls of their natural rights, and seeks to require the applications of Sharia law. That citizens are expressing these concerns in nonviolent demonstrations is good and right. It is a sign that these people do not feel that their concerns are being taken seriously by politicians. It is an incentive for all politicians to act more decisively at a time when political Islam is challenging and calling into questions our rule of law. That Pegida protesters have advertise their goals in an exclusively peaceful manner is to be welcomed. Because the rules of law, tolerance and freedom of religion are fundamental Western values, the Pegida movement must leave no doubt that it is precisely these values that it seeks to defend" (Ibid).

This two oppositions as AfD and Pegida movement are playing the negative role in the welcoming policy of Angela Merkel, who is trying to be tolerant to the refugees who is suffering at the moment most of all, especially children. This anti-Islamist policy becoming more popular and increasing votes of this oppositions. AfD and Pegida already prevented Merkel to accept

more refugees (Hasan Basmisirli 2016, Securitization and de-securitization of migration policies of Germany and Turkey according to leadership rhetoric). Their argument can be considered a securitization of the migration issue because of the indirect affect on German policy of immigration (Ibid). According to theory of securitization the issue first should have a speech and only after this the audience should take a decision if it is needed to be securitized. In Germany the case of securitization it is possible to see that the securitization issue didn't have the effect on a political level. The racism and xenophobia views are present in all Member States and that is evident. However according to Miles (1994) and Wieviorka (1994), the specific form of racism is not common for all Member States. National policies against racism and xenophobia, the historical and political context in which racism and xenophobia have emerged, differ considerably across the Member States (Huysmans 2000, 764). So basically the securitization issue is based only in not acceptance another religion in this case Islam in to the German society. The AfD and Pegida constructed the Syrian refugee's crisis as a threat to the German culture and national identity (Hasan Basmisirli 2016, Securitization and de-securitization of migration policies of Germany and Turkey according to leadership rhetoric). The speeches of Angela Merkel express refugee's problem in humanitarian issue (Ibid). The chancellor said that: "There no doubt some refugees who have fled war zones pose a security threat to Germany, but the country was already a target for Islamic terrorism before the many refugees came to us" (Cynthia Kroet 13.04.2017. Angela Merkel: "No doubt some refugees are a security threat). So according to this statement Germany wasn't a securitization issue, because no actions wasn't taken to prevent it accept EU-Turkey agreement. However this agreement seems not working very well. The approval of Merkel was emphasized by the fact that helping Syrian refugees this is a responsibilities and part of European ideals and norms (Hasan Basmisirli 2016, Securitization and de-securitization of migration policies of Germany and Turkey according to leadership rhetoric). After the not good trial of "Europe – wide quota system to share refugees" the new deal followed – EU-Turkey agreement, which was already described in subchapter: EU – Turkey agreement.

The Poland case is showing politicization and securitization of migration not only in Poland, but in Visegrad group. Such kind of anti-immigrants and xenophobic moods are helping to take a decision on high level such as government (Givi Gigitashvili 05.04.2016. Securitization the Syrian refugee influx: How Visegrad group countries use language to turn

migrants into threat). Terrorist attack in Paris became a push to blame refugees in terror and to present them as a threat for national security (Ibid). Thus migration became the question of internal and cultural security of the country (Ibid). The leaders are announced that refugees are the challenge for internal security and that the state is not security. Pumping situation also media by saying that refugees are the threat for country, but that is not objective point of view, because it looks like hysteric, but not the constructive decision (Ibid). Not possible to blame all Muslims, that they are terrorists.

Former Polish prime minister has announced that refugees bringing to Europe parasites and disease: “There are already signs of the emergence of very dangerous diseases which haven’t been seen in Europe for a long time: Cholera on Greek island, dysentery in Vienna, various types of parasites, protozoa, which aren’t dangerous in the organisms of these people but which could be dangerous here” (Vanessa Gera 14.10.2015. Right-wing Polish leader Kaczynski says migrants carry diseases to Europe). The Member of Polish parliament of Law and Justice Party Witold Waszczykowski said in one of the interview: “An individual, who will arrive in Poland must demonstrate that he or she can integrate in our culture and society, therefore, we can place greater hopes that Christian refugees have more potential to assimilate. Security is more significant than any beautiful ideals” (Ibid). Thus from this statement is clear enough that the migration (refugees) are the threat of national identity. All above statement are showing the anti-Immigrants policy, which based only on own identity and culture, that Poland only for Poles. President of Poland Andrzej Duda is supporting government in decision to renege on a deal to accept thousands of refugees amid security concerns.

Two case-studies of Germany and Poland in securitization process are very different, if in Germany the securitization is not politicization, in Poland the security of refugees issue is politicization. The audience agreed with speeches of political elites and leaders that country should be securitized. However Poland cannot securitized refugee issue on international level, but only on national level. Germany who appears to be a big player in today arena can actually securitized issue in international level, however the open-door policy and tolerant attitude to the refugees it is not the high priority to securitized it internationally. Merkel’s policies d involve securitization but not in the sense that the Copenhagen school requires - the securitization is not constructed in political discourse of Merkel (Hasan Basmisirli 2016, Securitization and de-securitization of migration policies of Germany and Turkey according to leadership rhetoric).



Chancellor is arguing that helping refugees that is a basic of Human Rights and giving the shelter a people in need that is a value of European civilization (Ibid). However the anti-immigrants policy in Germany is very strong among German and that is making indirect securitization (Ibid). The securitization of migration in Germany appears in the speeches of opposition. In Poland the situation is absolutely opposite.

According to this analyze can be concluded that Germany and Poland are securitizing differently – Poland securitize on a governmental level and Germany just announcing that migration issue is a threat, however this threat is not accepted as a security issue by audience. It is evident that refugee issue exist in both countries, however they are making decision differently, mostly it depends from their previous historical background, that is why the way of thinking is absolutely different.

## CONCLUSION

In this thesis the author was trying to research important issues of the European Migration policy. The author was trying to find out why there is no strong platform for creating the strong community in Europe among Member States. The refugees who is looking for a better life and hoping that they still will get a support, this is the one side of humanity and for them it doesn't matter how they will reach the final destination, how hard it will be and what they should experience during those dangerous routes. On the other side the European government guided by their principles should act within the laws infringing human rights.

The European migration crisis contains a lot of tasks which should be solved as soon as possible. Each tasks should be considered separately and the absence of common asylum values will make situation more complicated.

European Law is based on the protection of asylum seeker according to the Convention. There are different issues on which EU should work harder and need more attention. The first one is a trip to Europe, the routs to reach Europe are still very dangerous because of the human trafficking and smuggling. It should be properly controlled to minimize the risks. The Dublin system should be updated. It should respond to all conditions and requirements for fruitful cooperation between Member States.

The agreement between EU and Turkey is also causing a lot of questions weather this union is able to bring positive results. Even if this agreement will not be in fact acceptable, European Union should still concentrate on Asylum seeker. The first thing what should be done is a liquidation causes of the crisis. Thus, the protection of asylum and refugees should be provided. The long-term strategy in solving the problem should be adopted as well as the proper relocation and resettlement scheme based on solidarity and security of all Union.

The crisis is carrying the issue of security. In this thesis the author described the method of securitizations, by reflecting the issue of political question in the security as a result to securitize it. Two case studies were described in this thesis, showing how Germany and Poland securitized themselves as well as the level of securitizing.

EU was fighting with financial crisis during previous years. The Union is still

recovering after the crisis, but then another migration crisis appeared, because of the Arab Spring and its effect on a world. The EU has suffering the most in this crisis and now the Member States should act together, because the further problems could be even more unalterable. The policy should be based on a common values. We should always remember that the main reason the EU was created is to promote the common values.

## REFERENCES

Asylum quarterly report (2016). First time asylum applicants and first instance decision on asylum applications: second quarter 2016.

[http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Asylum\\_quarterly\\_report](http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Asylum_quarterly_report)  
(16.09.2016)

Archick, K, Margesson, R. (2015). Europe's Migration and Refugee Crisis.

<http://www.fas.org/?sgp/crs/row/IF0259.pdf> (20.09.2016).

Banulescu-Bogdan, N., Fratzke, S. (2015). Europe's Migration Crisis in Context: Why Now and What Next? – Migration Policy Institute.

<http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/europe-migration-crisis-context-why-now-and-what-next>  
(22.09.2016).

Basmisirli H. (2016). Securitization and de-securitization of migration policies of Germany and Turkey according to leadership rhetoric. Research gate (15.03.2017).

Bunikowski D, 06.03.2016. Finland's Immigration Crisis.

<http://www.gatestoneinstitute.org/759/finland-migrant-crisis> (25.11.2016).

Benner T, 02.03.2016. Europe's lonely liberal hegemon. Angela Merkel's migration policy isn't driven by morality.

<http://www.politico.eu/article/merkel-shock-refugee-crisis-germany-policy-europe/>  
(25.11.2016).

BBC (2016). Соглашение ЕС – Турция по беженцам признано работающим.

[http://www.bbc.com/russian/international/2016/04/160423\\_europe\\_turkey\\_migrants](http://www.bbc.com/russian/international/2016/04/160423_europe_turkey_migrants)  
(08.11.2016).

Convention on the Status of Refugees. (1951).

[http://unhcr.ru/fileadmin/files/docs/Documents/конвенция\\_о\\_статусе\\_беженцев\\_28\\_июля\\_1951\\_год.pdf](http://unhcr.ru/fileadmin/files/docs/Documents/конвенция_о_статусе_беженцев_28_июля_1951_год.pdf) (12.01.2017).

Dimitriadi, A. (2016). Deals without Borders: Europe's foreign policy on migration – European Council On Foreign Relations

[http://www.ecfr.eu/publications/summary/deals\\_without\\_borders\\_europes\\_foreign\\_policy\\_on\\_migration6054](http://www.ecfr.eu/publications/summary/deals_without_borders_europes_foreign_policy_on_migration6054) (29.09.2016).

Eurostat News Release (2016). Record number of over 1.2 million first time asylum seekers registered in 2015. Syrians, Afghans and Iraqis: top citizenship

<http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/299521/720332/3-04032016-AP-EN.pdf/> (15.09.2016)

Elischer S, (15.09.2015). The EU's Migration Diversion. Outsourcing the Refugee Crisis.

<http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/niger/2015-09-15/eus-migration-diversion> (05.05.2016).

European Commission (2016). Managing the Refugee Crisis: Responding to Humanitarian Crisis.

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/EU\\_Emergency\\_Support/Fraphic\\_Provision\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/EU_Emergency_Support/Fraphic_Provision_en.pdf) (11.12.2016).

Ernst and Young Limited (2016). Managing the EU migration crisis, From Panic to planning.

<http://www.ey.com/Publication/vwLUAssets/ey-managing-the-eu-migration-crisis%24FILE.ey-managing-the-eu-migration-crisis.pdf> (26.09.2016).

European Commission, Press Release Database (19.03.2016). EU-Turkey Statement: Questions and Answers.

[http://europe.eu/rapid/press-release\\_MEMO-16-963\\_en.htm](http://europe.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-16-963_en.htm) (22.10.2016).

European Union (2015). The EU in brief.

[https://europa.eu/europaen-union/about-eu/eu-in-brief\\_en](https://europa.eu/europaen-union/about-eu/eu-in-brief_en) (26.01.2017).

Europese Raad Raad van de Europese Unie. (13.04.2016). Report by President Donald Tusk to the

European Parliament on the March European Council meeting.

<http://www.consilium.europa.eu/nl/press/press-releases/2016/04/13-tusk-report-european-parliament/> (27.01.2016).

European Union, External Action. (09.09.2015), Strasborg. Speech by HR/VP Federica Mogherini on Migration.

[https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/6037\\_en](https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/6037_en) (28.01.2017).

EUR-Lex Access to European Union Law. (2003). Dublin II Regulation.

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=URISERV%3A133153> (28.01.2017).

EUR-Lex Access to European Union Law. (2016). Regulation (EU) 2016/399 of the European Parliament and of the Council.

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex%3A32016R0399> (07.11.2016).

European Council, Council of the European Union. (18.03.2016). EU – Turkey statement.

<http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/meetings/european-council/2015/04/23> (09.11.2016).

European Commission. (2015). Communication from the commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European economic and social committee and the committee of the regions. A Europe agenda on migration.

[http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/sites/antitrafficking/files/communication\\_on\\_the\\_european\\_agenda\\_on\\_migration\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/sites/antitrafficking/files/communication_on_the_european_agenda_on_migration_en.pdf) (10.12.2016).

European Commission. Press Release Database. (2016). Relocation and Resettlement: Member States need to sustain efforts to deliver on commitments.

[http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release\\_IP-16-3614\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-16-3614_en.htm) (10.12.2016).

EADaily. (2016). Четвёртый срок Меркель – 2: конец мультикультурализма и фактор России.

<http://eadaily.com/ru/news/2016/12/09/chetvertyty-srok-merkel-2-konec-multiculturalizma-i-faktor-rossii> (04.03.2017).

- Friedman G. (2015). Merkel, Muslims and the Problem of Multiculturalism.  
<https://geopoliticalfutures.com/merkel-muslims-and-the-problem-of-multiculturalism>  
(03.03.2017).
- Gasanov, R.M, (2016). European Migration Crisis: Causes, Effects and Prospects for Resolution.  
Saratov State University, Saratov.  
<http://www.scienceforum.ru/2016/pdf/26233.pdf> (29.09.2016)
- Gholam N, The Failure of the Swedish Establishment.  
<http://www.gatestoneinstitute.org/7860/sweden-establishment> (02.01.2017).
- Greenwood C. Professor (2008). Sources of International Law: An Introduction by Professor  
Christopher Greenwood.  
[http://legal.un.org/avl/pdf/ls/greenwood\\_outline.pdf](http://legal.un.org/avl/pdf/ls/greenwood_outline.pdf) (22.11.2016).
- Guild E, Costello C, Garlick M. and Moreno-Lax V. (2015). Enhancing the Common European  
Asylum System and Alternatives to Dublin. CEPS Paper in Liberty and Security in Europe. No.  
83.  
[https://www.ceps.eu/system/files/CEPS\\_LSE\\_83\\_0.pdf](https://www.ceps.eu/system/files/CEPS_LSE_83_0.pdf) (29.01.2017).
- Grot K. (2013). An overview of the migration policies and trends – Poland.  
<http://migrationonline.cz/en/an-overview-of-the-migration-policies-and-trends-poland>  
(08.04.2017).
- Gogou K. (2017). The EU – Turkey deal: Europe’s year of shame.  
<https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2017/03/the-eu-turkey-deal-europes-year-of-shame/>  
(16.03.2017).
- Gera V. (2015). Right-wing Polish leader Kaczynski says migrants carry diseases to Europe.  
<https://www.usnews.com/news/world/articles/2015/10/14/right-wing-polish-leader-migrants-carry-diseases-to-europe> (16.03.2017).

Human Rights Watch (2016). Europe's Migration.

<https://www.hrw.org/tag/europes-migration-crisis/> (06.11.2016)

Huggler J, 27.04.2016. The Telegraph. Austria passes emergency law allowing asylum-seekers to be turned away at the border.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/04/27/austria-passes-emergency-law-allowing-asylum-seekers-to-be-turne/> (22.10.2016).

International Court of Justice. Statute of the International court of Justice. Art. 38 (1, B).

<http://www.icj-cij.org/documents/?p1=4&p2=2> (10.12.2016).

Juncker Jean-Claude. (2014). A new start for Europe: my agenda for jobs, growth, fairness and democratic change.

<http://www.eesc.europa.eu/resources/docs/jean-claude-juncker---political-guidelines.pdf>  
(08.11.2016)

Kirkegaard, J. (2016). How Europe will fail to address the migration crisis in early 2016

<http://voxeu.org/article/europe-s-migration-crisis/> (01.11.2016).

Krjuchkov I, 20.03.2016. Европе грозит «Кипрнаш». Чем опасна для ЕС миграционная сделка с Турцией.

[http://www.gazeta.ru/politics/2016/03/20\\_a\\_8133503/shtml](http://www.gazeta.ru/politics/2016/03/20_a_8133503/shtml) (22.10.2016).

Knipp K, 14.09.2015. Opinion: Germany reintroducing border control marks a turning point in the refugee crisis.

<http://www.dw.com/en/opinion-germany-reintroducing-border-controls-marks-a-turning-point-in-the-refugee-crisis/a-18712319> (26.11.2016).

Kovacs Z. (2016). Chancellor Merkel's call for a ban on the burqa and why it mattered to this week's



EU Council meeting.

<http://abouthungary.hu/blog/chancellor-merkels-call-for-a-ban-on-the-burqa-and-why-it-mattered-to-this-weeks-eu-council-meeting/> (04.03.2017).

Kroet C. (2017). Angela Merkel: “No doubt” some refugees are security threat.

<http://www.politico.eu/article/angela-merkel-no-doubt-some-refugees-are-a-security-threat/> (15.03.2017).

Lambert H., McAdam J. and Fullerton M. (2013). The Global Reach of European Refugee Law. Cambridge University Press 2013.

Lehne S. (2016). How the Refugee Crisis Will Reshape the EU. Carnegie Europe.

<http://carnegieeurope.eu/2016/02/04/how-refugee-crisis-will-reshape-eu-pub-62650> (07.11.2016).

Metcalfe-Hough, V. (2015). The migration crisis? Facts, challenging and possible solutions – Shaping policy for developing

<https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/9913.pdf> (15.09.2016)

Mallaby S. (2015). Borderline Chaos: The EU’s New Challenge. Council on Foreign Relations.

<http://www.cfr.org/europe/borderline-chaos-eus-new-challenge/p36981> (08.11.2016).

Malik K. (2015). Крах Мультикультурализма. Общины против общества в Европе.

<http://www.globalaffairs.ru/number/Krakh-multiculturalizma-17450> (07.03.2017).

Newton J, 29.02.2016. “I’ll do my damned duty on refugees”, says Merkel as it emerges nine out of ten Germans want limits on migrants coming to country.

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3469535/I-II-damned-duty-refugees-says-Merkel-emerges-nine-ten-Germans-want-limits-migrants-coming-country.html> (03.01.2017).

- Nelson F, 12.11.2015. How Sweden, the most open country in the world, was overwhelmed by migrants.  
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/sweden/11992479/How-Sweden-the-most-open-country-in-the-world-was-overwhelmed-by-migrants.html> (05.09.2016).
- Noack R. (2015). Multiculturalism is a sham, says Angela Merkel.  
[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2015/12/14/angela-merkel-multiculturalism-is-a-sham/?utm\\_term=.309d92cd5c1f](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2015/12/14/angela-merkel-multiculturalism-is-a-sham/?utm_term=.309d92cd5c1f) (03.03.2017).
- Nornan D. (1986). Poland's Multicultural Heritage. Hokkaido University.  
<http://eprints.lib.hokudai.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/2115/7953/1/KJ00000034106.pdf> (08.04.2017).
- Official Journal of the European Union (2012). Consolidation Version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. C 326/197, p.154.  
[http://eur-lex.europa.eu/resource.html?uri=cellar:2bf140bf-a3f-4ab2-b506-fd71826e6da6.0023.02/DOC\\_2&format=PDF](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/resource.html?uri=cellar:2bf140bf-a3f-4ab2-b506-fd71826e6da6.0023.02/DOC_2&format=PDF) (27.01.2017).
- Poku, N. and Graham T. D. (1998). Redefining Security. Population Movements and National Security. Edition: Praeger. Westport, Connecticut. London.
- Proshkin O. (2016). Франция и мультикультурализм.  
<http://24news.com.ua/16369-franciya-i-multiculturalizm/> (07.03.2017).
- Prevecanos C. (2011). Как гастарбайтеры из Турции стали мигрантами.  
<http://www.dw.com/ru/как-гастарбайтеры-из-турции-стали-мигрантами/a-15491726> (09.03.2017).
- Refugee Council Briefing. (2002). The Dublin Convention on asylum applications: What it means and how it's suppose to work.  
[https://www.refugeecouncil.org.uk/assets/0001/5851/dublin\\_aug2002.pdf](https://www.refugeecouncil.org.uk/assets/0001/5851/dublin_aug2002.pdf) (28.01.2017).

Stokes, B. (2016). Fear of terrorism, Muslim, and refugees is driving the parties of the right and left further apart than ever before.  
<http://foreignpolicy.com/2016/07/22/the-immigration-crisis-is-tearing-europe-apart/>  
(12.10.2016).

Syria Regional Refugee Response (2016) – Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan 2016 – 2017.  
<http://data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees/regional.php#> (22.9.2016).

Schengen visa info. Schengen Agreement.  
<http://www.schengenvisainfo.com/schengen-agreement/> (05.11.2016).

Smith H.W. (2011). The Oxford Handbook of Modern German history. Germania. Oxford University Press. ISBN 978-0-19-923739-5. P. 815.

Sarmadi D. (2015). Anti – Islam protests “tearing apart” German society.  
<http://www.euractiv.com/section/justice-home-affairs/news/anti-islam-protests-tearing-apart-german-society/> (15.03.2017).

The Local, 04.01.2016. Borders controls were recently reinstated between Denmark and Sweden. But The Local looks into why so many new arrivals would still rather seek asylum east of the famous Öresund bridge.  
<http://www.thelocal.se/20160104/why-do-refugees-prefer-sweden-to-denmark> (05.01.2017).

The Editors of Encyclopedia Britannica. International Refugee Organization.  
<https://www.britannica.com/topic/International-Refugee-Organization-historical-UN-agency>  
(10.12.2016).

The Refugee Convention. (1951). The Travaux preparatoires analyzed with a commentary by Dr. Paul Weis  
<http://www.uhcr.org/4ca34be29.pdf> (10.01.2017).

Tampere European Council (1999). Presidency Conclusions.

[http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/tam\\_en.htm](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/tam_en.htm) (26.01.2017).

United Nations Human Rights. (1967). Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees.

<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/ProtocolStatusOfRefugees.aspx>  
(10.01.2017).

Volk A. (2015). European Migration Crisis in terms of inefficiency of Political Institutions.

<http://human.snauka.ru/2015/12/13423> (26.11.2016)

Waters A, 08.03.2016. Angela Merkel's open-door policy for migrants faces test in Germany state election.

<http://www.washington.com/news/2016/mar//angela-merkels-open-door-policy-for-migrants-faces/> (28.11.2016).

Walker M, Troianovski A, 09.12.2015. Behind Angela Merkel's Open Door for Migrants. Backlash against German chancellor's pro-refugee policy mounts despite months of diplomatic arm-twisting.

<http://www.wsj.com/articles/behind-angela-merkels-open-door-for-migrants-1449712113>  
(05.01.2017).

Wikström C. The Dublin III Regulation.

<http://ceciliawikstrom.eu/en/politics/migration-and-asylum/the-dublin-iii-regulation/>  
(29.01.2017).

Wheller Y. H. (2016). European Migrant Crisis 2011 – Present Day.

<http://www.totallytimelines.com/european-migrant-crisis/> (16.03.2017).

## APPENDIX 1

Relocation (State of play as of 28.02.2017)

13 546 have been relocated since the launch of the scheme (European Commission. Relocation and Resettlement – State of Play. 28.02.2017).

<b>Member States</b>	<b>Relocated from Italy</b>	<b>Relocated from Greece</b>
Austria	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
Belgium	58	338
Bulgaria	<b>X</b>	29
Croatia	9	10
Cyprus	10	55
Czech Republic	<b>X</b>	12
Denmark	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
Estonia	<b>X</b>	87
Finland	504	560
France	282	2476
Germany	1070	1556
Hungary	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
Ireland	<b>X</b>	320
Latvia	9	219
Lithuania	<b>X</b>	229
Luxembourg	61	164
Malta	46	50
Netherlands	475	1011
Poland	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
Portugal	275	810
Romania	45	523
Slovenia	23	101
Slovakia	<b>X</b>	16
Spain	144	707
Sweden	39	<b>X</b>
Liechtenstein	<b>X</b>	10
Norway	415	249
Switzerland	471	78

Total:	3936	9610
--------	------	------

Resettlement (State of play as of 28.02.2017)

14422 people have been resettled under both schemes so far (European Commission. Relocation and Resettlement – State of Play. 28.02.2017).

<b>Member State/ Associated State</b>	<b>Total resettlement under the 20 July Scheme, including under the 1:1 mechanism With Turkey</b>	<b>Total resettled under the 1:1 mechanism with Turkey (since 4 April 2016)</b>
Austria	1643	x
Belgium	597	102
Czech Republic	52	x
Denmark	481	x
Estonia	20	20
Finland	293	248 (outside of 20 July scheme)
France	1200	522 (228 within 20 July scheme + 261 outside of 20 July scheme)
Germany	1403	1403
Ireland	520	x
Italy	673	117
Latvia	10	10
Lithuania	25	25
Luxembourg	x	98 (outside of 20 July scheme)
Netherlands	1000	673
Portugal	12	12
Spain	289	57
Sweden	491	278 (269 within 20 July scheme)
United Kingdom	2200	x
Iceland	50	x
Liechtenstein	20	x
Norway	2924	x

Switzerland	519	<b>x</b>
TOTAL	<b>14 422</b>	A total of <b>3565</b> people were re-settled from Turkey under the 1:1 mechanism, <b>2799</b> of whom through the scheme of 20 July.

## Appendix 2

Asylum applicants (including first time asylum applicants), Q4 2015 – Q4 2016.

	Q4 2015			Q1 2016			Q2 2016			Q3 2016			Q4 2016			Q4 2016	Change in %		Applicants per million population <sup>(1)</sup> Q4 2016	Last 12 months
	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.		between Q3 2016 and Q4 2016	between Q4 2015 and Q4 2016		
<b>EU-28</b>	171 895	158 665	108 770	101 110	113 955	106 085	109 640	103 420	123 955	118 970	138 110	123 310	82 620	74 690	62 985	220 300	-42	-50	432	1 258 865
Belgium	6 020	5 725	5 220	2 840	1 515	1 370	1 190	1 185	1 075	1 275	1 665	1 420	1 665	1 525	1 555	4 740	9	-72	419	18 280
Bulgaria	3 545	2 415	1 695	1 965	1 195	1 040	1 105	1 115	1 425	1 545	2 815	2 075	2 570	1 755	815	5 140	-20	-33	718	19 420
Czech Republic	130	135	140	110	180	130	150	95	105	110	125	130	145	100	105	345	-4	-14	33	1 475
Denmark	3 635	5 030	2 670	1 650	910	470	405	370	470	400	295	305	350	285	260	900	-10	-92	157	6 180
Germany	60 355	59 615	48 270	59 070	74 865	67 300	67 865	61 295	80 750	78 665	94 350	78 425	34 270	27 745	20 550	82 565	-67	-51	1 005	745 155
Estonia	20	10	10	0	5	10	20	35	15	15	10	20	25	25	5	55	18	29	40	175
Ireland	265	290	210	215	195	140	155	140	155	165	195	220	185	225	260	670	16	-12	142	2 245
Greece	1 045	1 170	1 315	1 170	1 470	2 955	3 700	4 280	4 255	4 010	3 530	5 125	6 270	7 625	6 715	20 610	63	484	1 911	51 110
Spain	1 490	1 765	1 230	1 105	935	890	1 165	1 325	1 510	1 025	1 225	1 320	1 760	1 935	1 565	5 260	47	17	113	15 755
France	8 060	7 370	9 485	6 120	6 960	6 980	6 650	6 545	6 865	6 590	7 655	7 465	7 435	6 680	7 550	21 665	0	-13	325	83 485
Croatia	25	20	15	45	60	165	195	105	100	95	230	365	400	265	190	860	24	1 310	205	2 225
Italy	10 420	8 345	6 105	7 495	7 680	7 395	7 980	9 220	9 910	11 060	11 455	12 460	13 495	13 615	11 195	38 305	10	54	631	122 960
Cyprus	240	260	205	225	240	200	185	180	165	230	220	275	355	405	260	1 020	40	45	1 202	2 940
Latvia	70	10	5	10	15	10	40	5	45	25	30	25	55	60	30	145	85	74	74	350
Lithuania	35	25	30	10	10	25	10	15	45	40	65	40	100	55	15	170	18	98	59	425
Luxembourg	385	425	440	270	135	110	130	125	175	140	200	205	285	175	205	660	21	-47	1 149	2 160
Hungary	615	325	230	435	2 175	4 575	5 810	4 750	4 745	1 865	1 400	1 120	1 200	730	630	2 555	-42	118	260	29 430
Malta	235	195	160	110	140	180	115	140	185	155	190	175	240	165	125	530	2	-10	1 222	1 930
Netherlands	10 120	6 360	3 515	2 680	1 920	1 330	1 110	1 115	1 260	1 690	1 905	1 995	2 170	2 070	1 700	5 940	6	-70	350	20 945
Austria	12 275	11 930	7 280	5 925	5 110	3 345	4 170	3 860	3 190	3 075	3 260	2 605	2 595	2 360	2 455	7 410	-17	-76	852	41 950
Poland	1 430	1 270	1 145	680	965	1 230	1 315	1 550	1 655	1 185	940	850	680	635	615	1 925	-35	-50	51	12 305
Portugal	70	65	75	60	55	180	75	190	175	95	60	175	165	115	120	400	22	96	39	1 460
Romania	90	85	65	40	90	100	85	50	80	115	140	195	420	280	290	990	119	310	50	1 880
Slovenia	25	45	35	15	270	205	30	55	35	40	120	115	90	190	140	420	53	297	204	1 310
Slovakia	15	15	160	5	5	10	15	15	5	5	20	15	10	20	20	45	2	-76	8	145
Finland	7 005	5 715	1 830	1 010	855	360	385	340	350	360	475	510	335	315	310	960	-29	-93	175	5 605
Sweden	39 055	36 585	13 830	4 155	2 715	2 235	2 035	2 050	2 105	2 105	2 365	2 395	2 425	2 220	1 985	6 630	-3	-93	673	28 790
United Kingdom	5 220	3 475	3 395	3 705	3 295	3 150	3 550	3 255	3 110	2 905	3 160	3 280	2 935	3 120	3 325	9 380	0	-22	143	38 785
Iceland	55	45	35	50	35	45	45	55	35	40	65	175	200	255	115	570	101	320	1 717	1 125
Liechtenstein	20	10	15	0	5	5	10	10	5	10	0	10	10	5	10	25	14	-45	638	80
Norway	8 660	8 155	1 030	415	255	300	245	215	265	265	305	280	280	235	420	935	10	-95	180	3 485
Switzerland	4 745	5 680	4 865	3 620	2 700	1 990	1 740	1 880	2 325	2 470	2 435	2 175	2 090	1 960	1 760	5 810	-18	-62	698	27 140

<sup>(1)</sup> Relative to population as of 1st of January 2016

Source: Eurostat Statistics Explained (16.03.2017).