TALLINN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

School of Economics and Business Administration

Department of International Relations

Chair of International Relations and Political Science

Satu Tamminen

THE CONCEPT OF HUMAN SECURITY IN THE EUROPEAN UNION'S FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICIES - THE MIGRANT CRISIS

Bachelor's Thesis

Supervisor: Assoc. Professor Holger Mölder

Tallinn 2016

I declare I have written the bachelor'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.

…………………………………………………

(signature, date)

Student's code: a130310

Student's email address: satu.tamminen@hotmail.com

Supervisor

The thesis conforms to the requirements set for the bachelor's theses

……………………………………………………

(signature, date)

Chairman of defence committee:

Permitted to defence

....

(Title, name, signature, date)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CHS= Commission on Human Security

CFSP= The Common Foreign and Security Policy

CSDP= The Common Security and Defence Policy

EC= European Commission

ESS= European Security Strategy

EU= European Union

ICC= International Criminal Court

IOM= International Organization for Migration

UNDP= United Nations Development Programme

UNHCR= United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

ABSTRACT

The European Union's core principles include protection and respect of universal human rights, democracy and the rule of law. Thus, it should promote these values in both its internal as well as external policies. The concept of human security was taken as a part of the European Security Strategy in 2003 and therefore, this research examines how visible it is in European Union's security policies, and how it is used in the current migrant crisis. The migrant crisis which started in 2014 has been the most severe since the Second World War and has caused irregular movements into Europe, causing a humanitarian crisis to reach the European Union. The discussion of migration has shifted from human security issue towards national security and this is evident in some of the actions that the European Union is now conducting. This research concludes that the concept of human security is visible in the policies, agendas and actions plans that the European Commission proposes for the Member States, however implementation of these in the individual state level is insufficient and thus causing an insufficient response at the European Union level too. The European Union needs a more coherent response to the migrant crisis with full respect of its commitments to promote rights and freedoms of individuals. The human security concept could work as an organizing framework for the European Union when tackling the migrant crisis without displacing the national security of the Member States.

Title: The Concept of Human Security in the European Union's Foreign and Security Policies - The Migrant Crisis

Keywords: Human Security, European Union, Migrant Crisis, Foreign and Security Policies, Migration, Human Rights

INTRODUCTION

"Europe has never been so prosperous, so secure nor so free. The violence of the first half of the 20th Century has given way to a period of peace and stability unprecedented in European history." (European Commission 2003). This the opening sentence of the European Security Strategy (ESS) adopted in 2003. Since then, a lot has changed not only in the global security environment but also in the European Union's (EU) security environment, which requires both actions and responses from the EU. The end of the Cold War changed the international field. A shift from bipolar to unipolar world challenged the notions of nation state territory and sovereignty and thus domestic politics became more and more integrated with global politics. This new era of globalization brought a new set of universal issues which included notions of human rights, development and security. To address these, states needed a new focus in both their internal and external policies and while sovereign states saw that they were no longer able to response to the economical, political and security dimensions by themselves, they gave up some of their power which created many transnational organizations such as the EU.

As the security environment and the concept of states sovereignty changed, also changed the concept of conflict itself. The traditional interstate wars have been replaced with intrastate conflicts which has created a problem of forced displaced people due to humanitarian crises in the Middle East and Africa for example, which cannot be ignored by the international actors. To tackle these new issues, the concept of human security was adopted in 1994 when it was introduced in the Human Development Report by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Traditional security concepts are no longer enough to address both the old and the new threats to human lives. Human security means the protection of fundamental freedoms of people including aspects of development and national security, while moving away from the state centric conceptions towards security of individuals. The EU adopted human security concept to be part of the ESS in 2003.

Migration has always been part of human history. What is evident in the current migrant crisis, which started in 2014 is that migrants are trying to reach Europe for different

reasons and through different channels, legal but also illegal risking their lives when escaping from political, economical and conflict reasons. Global poverty and conflicts do not obey national frontiers and thus the EU cannot leave these issues to be ignored. Based on the founding principles of the EU, Europe should be a safe haven for people in need (European A…2015, 2). So far the migrant crisis has become the most severe since the Second World War, with more then 60 million refugees worldwide. The need for addressing the migrant crisis is urgent, because there is no end in sight for it.

The purpose of this thesis is to analyze the concept of human security and its promotion and visibility in the EU's foreign and security policies when tackling the current migrant crisis. While the European Commission (EC) has proposed agendas in order to help the crisis, the main problem has been in the implementation by the individual Member States. The discussion of migration has shifted from human security issue to national security issue, jeopardizing the founding principles of the EU. Therefore, the research questions are how the human security concept is visible in EU's policies and how it has been implemented to tackle the migrant crisis? As mentioned, the human security works as a adequate concept to address new security issues and while the EU has taken the concept to its use, it is important to analyze how it is used and how successful has it been. Due to limited scope of this thesis it makes it impossible to analyze how the EU has been acting in order to prevent the migrant crisis to reach its borders, even though acting in a preventive manner is one of the key points of the human security concept. Therefore, this research will concentrate on how the EU has been implementing agendas, action plans and policies to address the migrant crisis within and near its borders.

The objectives of the research are to analyze the application of the human security concept in the work of regional organization, the EU, which is much affected by the current migrant crisis. To achieve this there will be used mapping the definition, and analyzing application and effectiveness of the human security concept in the EU's foreign and security policies in relation to the migrant crisis. The outcome will be a proposal how the EU should work in the context of the human security concept when tackling the migrant crisis. To analyze the research questions and to achieve the objectives there needs to be an understanding of the concept of human security itself, and its position in the EU's policies. It is important to understand the background of the migrant crisis and what policies the EU has been implementing and how the human security concept has been part of them. The research

in this thesis is conducted in qualitative manner by using a case study method. The topic of this thesis is situated in the international relations subfield of security studies. The data collection has been done by assessing official EU documents: strategies and policies, a set of United Nations (UN) documents providing a framework for human security, different working documents provided by the researchers in the field, and books from successful scholars.

First chapter after the introduction will give a historical overview of the changes in international relations as well as the concept of human security from theoretical and practical point, how it can be addressed and how to achieve it while going through the current debates and criticism around it. It will place human security into theoretical framework of two international relations theories; neorealism and Copenhagen School's securitization. Chapter two will give an overview of the research object, the EU, and it will analyze how the human security concept is present in EU's policies by going through the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) the European Security Strategy (ESS) and the European Agenda on Security. To analyze the concept of human security in EU's actions in the migrant crisis it is important to understand the background to it and that is what the next empirical chapter will do, by defining terminology and analyzing the problem. It will analyze the European Agenda on Migration and the European Union Action Plan which the EU has posed to tackle the migrant crisis. Analysis will sum up these parts and conclusion will draw up the research.

1. HISTORICAL AND THEORETICAL OVERVIEW

This chapter will provide both the historical and theoretical overview of the conceptualization of human security in the post-Cold War era. In order to understand human security concepts' development, there needs to be a coherent understanding of the changes in the international arena. After historical overview, this thesis will go deeper into human security concept from its introduction in the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) 1994 report, and theoretical framework by paying closer attention to two international relations security theories; neorealism and securitization, to its current debates. After establishing the theoretical framework this chapter continues by analyzing the human security in practice. This aims to give a better understanding to address the concept when assessing its visibility in the EU's foreign and security policies as well as how it has been implemented when tackling the current migrant crisis.

1.1 Historical background

The end of the Cold War brought changes to the international field. The Kantian notion of perpetual peace was celebrated by politicians and the win of the West was believed to usher the era of peace. However, coming to the 21st century it was clear that the wars have not ended but in fact changed their form bringing new challenges and a new set of complex issues to international relations. A shift from bipolar to unipolar world created a new world order. Questions of nation states' territory and sovereignty became more about global politics rather than states politics and spread transnational attention, actions and cooperation beyond nation states. Issues in the globalized era are universal and include notions such as human rights and individual freedoms, and thus it required a new focus from states to act upon these. New security challenges cannot be solved by sovereign states alone and therefore they needed to give up some of their power which created many transnational organizations such as the EU.

Globalization has not only changed the concept of states sovereignty but it has changed the concept of conflict itself. The traditional interstate wars have been replaced by increasing number of intrastate conflicts with ethnic-cultural tensions and increasingly religious differences (Münkler 2005, 2). Many of the post 1990 wars such as Rwanda and the Balkans have been intrastate conflicts with the common feature of fragmentized state with divided military which might not be under any centralized power (Krieg 2013, 6). These kinds of "New Wars" are characterized with numerous of belligerents and both state and non-state actors. Due to their nature, these conflicts are harder to resolve and most of the time do not include clear winners and loser like in traditional warfare. Another feature in today's conflicts is increasing number of civilian victims and that the conflicts are mainly funded by illegal activities (Krieg 2013, 6).

However, intrastate conflicts have created a new kind of problem in both international and regional terms, a level of forced displaced people is growing and creating humanitarian crises around the globe. This cannot be ignored by the international actors; international organizations, regional actors and other countries that are not even actively being part of the conflict. And thus, these changes in international relations need to be taken into consideration in their own security policies. Leaving behind the East-West rivalry, Europeans are now faced with a new kind of security problems.

First, the definition of security has extended from nation state military and defense issues to cover a larger spectrum of society challenges. Second, the geographical neighborhood of Europe has increasingly continued to demand attention. (Cottey 2012, xvi) After 2011 Arab Spring, hopes for democratic transformations in the Middle East quickly changed into a security threat that Europe is tackling today.

1.2 The concept of human security

These developments in the international arena have changed the notion of national security. Outside military threats and concerns of the territorial integrity need to be redefined as a mean to address new security issues. A shift from traditional national security issues concerning military threats to non-military security threats has taken place and this also means changes in the mindsets of today's security policies. Traditional security concepts are not enough to address both the old and the new threats to human lives; chronic poverty, ethnic

violence, human trafficking, climate change, health pandemics, international terrorism, economic and financial declines. These kinds of threats move beyond national borders and challenge the old notion of security which focused on external military aggressions.

The concept of human security has been developed in order to address these issues while shifting the focus from the security of the state to security of the individuals. Human security means protecting fundamental freedoms and include concepts of development, human rights and national security while moving away from state centric conceptions towards security of individuals (Human Security in…2009). Even though human security empowers the rights of individuals it does not diminish states security, but more their relationship is complementary: *"human security and state security are mutually reinforcing and dependent on each other. Without human security, state security cannot be attained and vice versa"* (Commission…2003, 6).

The concept of human security expanded the notion of security in 1994 when it was introduced in the Human Development Report by the UNDP (Human D…1994). It questioned the realist notion of security by shifting focus to individuals rather than states as a fundamental object of security and it focused on non-military sources of security that exposed individuals to threats which would in the long run create a collapse of state structure (Nuruzzaman 2006, 285). There are two definitions to the human security; a broad definition and a narrow definition. A broad definition outlined in the 1994 Human Development Report includes all that constitutes freedom from want and freedom from fear and takes into consideration human security issues such as hunger, disease, pollution, affronts to human dignity, threats to livelihoods and other harms in addition to straight security threat. A narrow definition focuses on violent threats to individuals and communities.

Human security is a combination of threats of war, genocide and displacement and means freedom from violence and freedom from fear and concerns of the security of individuals. While human security does not diminish the states role in enforcing national security it however states that, secure state is not always equal to people security. This is evident in today's conflicts where more and more people are being killed by their own governments rather than foreign militaries (Human Security B…). When the UNDP proposed a new security agenda it created a shift away from the threat of the superpower rivalry. Four essential characteristics were established in the 1994 report: human security is a matter of universal concern; its issues are interdependent; it is better dealt early than late; and it is

people-centered. Also the seven categories of security challenges were listed: economic; food; health; environment; personal; community and political. These were presented together with six major threats: population growth; economic disparities; migration pressure; environmental degradation; drug trafficking and international terrorism. Human security was described as *"safety from chronic threats such as hunger, disease and repression"* and *"protection from sudden and harmful disruptions in the patters of daily life"* (Booth 2007, 321).

1.2.1 A theoretical framework of human security

As mentioned the concept of human security has been under debate since it was introduced as a political tool in the UNDP report. Theorists try to provide an actual conceptualization for human security and thus, there can be find two security theories in international relations; one being based on neorealism and other on Copenhagen School's theory of securitization. While neorealism keeps emphasis on the states sovereignty within a broadened concept of security, securitization takes a stand on the other end of this dispute, placing emphasis on non-state actors too. Rethinking of security debate is about broadening. However, the security agenda will be as broad or as narrow as the political theory frames it. Since the late 1980s the broadening in security issues has much to do with the inclusion of non-traditional threats (Booth 2007, 161, 162).

The neorealist approach is promoted by Kenneth Waltz, in his work *"Theory of International Politics"* (1979). Waltz argues that international system is dominated by anarchy and that there is no common worldwide government. Neorealism has been one of the most used theory in security studies because it underlines national security and territorial sovereignty. It can be seen that new security threats cannot be explained by traditional security theories. However, in the study of human security, neorealism cannot be ignored. Neorealism looks at international system as being dominated by anarchy, and use of force is acceptable in any cases. National and territorial security leans towards military capabilities and threat is posed by other states, not international organizations or non-state actors.

After the Cold War, neorealism received a lot of criticism concerning its usefulness in international affairs when a new set of threats became more and more dominant. These new threats are not connected to states only and thus they are nearly impossible to be assessed with traditional power politics, mainly because *"they lack of counterpart with which a balance of power could be achieved"* (Bruderlein 2001, 354). However, in today's world the issues are

not so much connected with threats towards states but more towards individuals. The state-centric nature of neorealism causes lack of capabilities to address issues such as intrastate conflicts which mainly dominate the security threats in the world and in the individual level.

Copenhagen School theorists such as Barry Buzan promote a broader concept of security. As said the post-Cold War era challenged the old notions of security and security became more complex and interdependent concept in international relations. In his book *"People, States and Fear"* (1983) Buzan points out that the concept of security was too narrow during the Cold War and he argued for a broader framework of security (Buzan 1983, 8). Buzan added new dimensions to security such as five sectors of security; political, military, economic, societal and environmental. According to Buzan all these sectors work together and are interlinked and interdependent. Buzan also adds dimension of regional security and thus undermines the individual states. He also broadens the ideas of insecurity, threats and vulnerabilities. He addresses this as states international security strategy and national security strategy. Buzan argues that neither of the options will work alone, but combining these security policies will work on multiple levels. (Buzan 1983) More recent contribution by Buzan to international relations theories is concept of securitization, which was coined by Ole Wæver. He argues that *"by definition, something is a security problem when the elites declared it to be so"* (Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde 1998, 54). Securitization is when something becomes declared as a security issue and the public approves it. Securitization works as an analytical tool to address security issues and thus widens the security agenda.

Both Waltz and Buzan address security from states perspective. However, the Copenhagen School based on more critical security studies broadens the notions of security by addressing other aspects of security beside states sovereignty and territory. The difference between these two theories is in the way they analyze the object of security. In other words, what is the object of security and how to make it secure. Thus, this is evident in the ongoing debate of identifying the primary subject of security. Although the human security concept stresses the security of the people, the states' role as both a provider and threatener of security cannot be removed from the concept.

1.2.2 Human security in practice

The political level introduction happened in the 1994 UDP report. It adopted the broad definition, which include both aspects; the security dimension (freedom from fear) and the development aspect (freedom from want). What it comes to how human security can be addressed in practice it leans to two pillars: protection and empowerment, which creates a hybrid approach. These two building blocks cannot be treated separately, they are mutually reinforcing and needed in all situations of human security. Protection is defined by the Commission on Human security (CHS) as *"strategies, set up by states, international agencies, NGOs and the private sector to shield people from menaces"* (Commission…2003, 10). This requires a top-down approach, with the acknowledgement of people facing threats beyond their control and thus requires protecting people in a systematic, comprehensive and preventive way and states have the primary responsibility to implement these (Human Security in…2009, 7). Empowerment defined by the CHS as *"strategies that enable people to develop their resilience to difficult situations"* (Commission…2003, 10). Empowerment requires a bottom-up approach and tries to develop regional individuals and communities to enhance human security for themselves (Human Security in…2009, 7). The main element of human security is to focus on prevention in order to minimize the insecurity and to create long-term solutions.

The main criticism concerns the definition of human security itself. Debate between the broad approach (freedom from want) and the narrow one (freedom from fear) has still remained unsolved even after years of the UNDP report. The role of the state is unclear due to the fact that it can either improve the security of its citizens or threaten it. While the end of the Cold War changed the security thinking from national security to more universal, the September 11 attacks brought it back and helped it gain its position. Critics say that the human security concept is not easy to be adjusted as a policy instrument; it is vague conceptually and thus does not give any priority. Academic criticism concerns that human security concept has no analytical purpose and it cannot be measured. Furthermore, what it comes to the debates concerning the definition of human security, the broad definition is seen too expansive and thus it does not provide a clear research agenda. Some argue that there is no real difference to the universal declaration of human rights and it promotes a false sense of priorities in nation's security agendas (Booth 2007, 323).

Supporters of the concept of human security argue that it represents a new paradigm in

security which focuses on threats in daily life and takes aspects beside military violent threats. Threats such as hunger and crime, which dominate most of the world's existence, are taken into consideration and when realizing these threats as a part of security it might help the Western world to feel more responsibility towards the developing world. Human security has already changed the security thinking, it has for example, introduced new security policy issues such as ban on anti-personnel mines (Ibid.). Non-military factors should be taken more into account such as poverty, disease and political violence. Many of the 1990s political, ethnical, religious and economic tensions increased the number of fragile states in the world and created many intrastate conflicts as a result (such as Rwanda, the Balkans). Poverty, underdevelopment and lack of economic prospects can be seen as main drivers of conflicts (Human Security: G.... 2011, 1).

The concept of human security has been said that it cannot be used as an academic or analytical tool, due to it is too broad and fails to establish a hierarchy of goals and thus is not able to set priorities. The main ongoing debate concerns, how wide should the definition of human security be. Should the focus be in the narrow definition or take into consideration also the wider aspects of development. The UN and Japan have adopted the use of the broad definition focusing on non-military threats too while the narrow definition is promoted mainly by the Western governments, such as many of the EU countries, focusing on protecting individuals from war and violence (Human Security: G…2011, 2). Supporters of the narrow definition see that it can be better applied as a foreign policy tool than the broad definition which can recognize many well-being threats as security risks and thus human security loses its analytical aspect.

As the human security concept focuses on individuals, it can be argued that it diminishes states' role and thus its sovereignty. However, human security and state sovereignty should not be looked as one over another, their relationship should be more complimentary as in human security compliments the security of the state rather than replaces it. It is noteworthy that states have an important role in promoting and ensuring human security or they can also diminish it. Since the September 11 attacks, the following counterterrorism has limited the rights of the individuals and turned focus more into state security. However, the concept of human security has managed to gain its position in the security policy agendas. Fostering human security in fragile states is crucial instrument for preventing potential threats in those areas (Ibid. 1).

Human security differs from other concepts such as human development and human rights. To development, human security adds the dimension of security, emphasizing well-being of humans, but also values relating to security, stability and sustainability of development goals. Human security concept underlines the core rights and freedoms which are fundamental for human life. It does not differentiate different kinds of human rights but, moreover address these in multidimensional and comprehensive way, giving a practical framework to identify specific rights in specific situations (Human Security in…2009, 12).

To achieve human security and address set of complex issues is through collaborative, responsive and sustainable actions. These needs to be: 1) people-centered, 2) multi-sectoral, 3) comprehensive, 4) context-specific, and 5) prevention-oriented. All needs to be addressed by a hybrid approach which leans on two main pillars; protection and empowerment. When assessing human security, it can be divided into three phases: 1) Analysis, Mapping and Planning, 2) Implementation, and 3) Impact Assessment (Human Security in…2009, 15, 16).

When assessing the EU's responses to the migrant crisis in Phase I: Analysis, mapping and planning, it is needed to address the needs, vulnerabilities and capacities of affected communities in origin, transit and destination countries. These strategies should be done with protection and empowerment framework in co-operation with all communities. Analyzing, mapping and planning should also identify the root causes of insecurity and establish comprehensive responses, which include short, medium and long-term strategies. Phase I should ensure coherence of the goals and responsible sharing among the actors. Phase II: Implementation should in fact implement the established policies and agendas in cooperation with local partners in affected communities and monitor the stressfulness of those. Phase III should assess the implementations of the policies, how have those worked and have they really addressed the human insecurities and improved the livelihood of the people.

2. HUMAN SECURITY IN THE EUROPEAN UNION'S POLICIES

There have been changes in the EU's efforts to respond to both the old and the new security threats, one of them being attempts to involve the concept of human security. The following chapter will assess the visibility and usage of the human security concept in the EU's policies. This will be done in order to gain background knowledge, which will be needed later when assessing the case study. To analyze the concept the following external policies of the EU will be taken into account; The Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), and the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP), which have been working as a main policy instrument for the EU in the field of safety and security. Through these two policies the EU seeks to promote and maintain both external and internal stability. After that the European Security Strategy (ESS) will be analyzed, which outlines a common focus for the EU in the field of safety of the EU citizens. To conclude, there will be an analysis of the European Agenda on Security, which will cover the next five years, from 2015 to 2020. While the EU has taken a leading role in promoting peace and security, there can be seen criticism towards lack of political strength in EU's actions regarding the high expectations set out in the ESS.

2.1 The Common Foreign and Security Policy

After the Cold War, the EU shifted its focus from mainly economic issues towards a global political entity, which is a part of not only securing the safety of Europe but also a part of global security agenda. The Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), established in the Treaty of Maastricht in 1992, enable the EU to speak and act as one entity in global affairs. EU's Foreign and Security Policy seeks to *"preserve peace and strengthen international security; promote international cooperation; develop and consolidate: democracy, rule of law and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms"* (European Union Foreign & Security Policy). The establishment of CFSP added a new framework to the EU's external policies, giving more room for a common involvement. The objectives of the

CFSP (Article 21.2 TEU) include safeguarding the EU's values, fundamental interests, security, independence and integrity. Preserving peace and preventing conflict in order to strengthen international security is done in accordance with the purposes and principles of the UN Charter. The EU promotes supporting the human rights and principles of international law (EUISS…2016).

The Annual report, latest one from 2014, from the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy to the European Parliament on the main aspects and basis choices of the CFSP, addressed issues concerning this thesis such as migration, multilateral order and support to democracy, human rights, international humanitarian law and the rule of law. The report was endorsed by the Council in June 20, 2015. The report acknowledges that there is a need to further improve the links between the EU's internal and external policies and migration policy needs to be a much stronger part of the Union's external policy. The EU tries to place migration on its political, economical and social agendas in cooperation with its neighboring countries. Migration is seen as a global, complex and multilateral phenomenon that requires comprehensive, coherent and long-term responses from the EU.

While the EU has established certain ethical values as its core principles, it needs to be evaluated how these are conducted in its security policies, can it fulfill its objectives and to what extend the international law and the internal law of the EU works together. It is evident that the EU acknowledges the integration of security, economic, political and social dimension and that all of these are present in threats facing the EU. However, the EU and the EC lack the coherence in order to achieve its aims and promote ethical values. One of the problems is that the EU places the promotion and respect of human rights at the core of the EU's external action and thus it is problematic how to deal with the migrant crisis which affects both internal and external dimensions of the EU.

2.2 The Common Security and Defence Policy

The CFSP is in very close association with the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP), as being a segment of the CFSP. The CSDP is a coherent and comprehensive political,   diplomatic,   economic,   humanitarian,   civil   and   military   instrument

(Handbook…2015, 68). With the former name, the European Security and Defence Policy, the CFSP were given a new dimension in the Lisbon Treaty which entered into force in 2009. It aims to provide for the EU an operational capacity for missions of peacekeeping, conflict preventing and strengthening international security in accordance with the principles of the UN Charter.

The CSDP is an operational framework to address security issues and it creates an important aspect in the EU's security policies and thus, it cannot be left ignored when assessing the human security approach. The CSDP has both civilian and military operations across the globe. The civilian missions include: strengthening missions; monitoring missions and executive missions. These include capacity-building, third-party observation and implementation of an agreement. During 2015 there were no civilian missions established (EUISS 2016).

The military operations range from executive missions with training to capacity-building activities. They are implemented by the Council decision and with either invitation of a host state or by the UN Security Council resolution under the Chapter VII. In 2015, there were two military operations created, one placed in the Central African Republic and the other in Southern Mediterranean Sea (EUNAVFOR MED) (EUISS 2016). The operation in Southern Mediterranean was launched on 22 of June, in order to prevent further losses of lives at sea, to tackle the root causes of the humanitarian emergency in cooperation with the countries of origin and transit and also to fight against the human smugglers. The main actions taken under this operation have been to identify, capture and dispose vessels of the smugglers and traffickers (European E…). Military operations are sometimes needed when ensuring and returning human security. However, the CSDP has been used in targeting the migrant smugglers which of course saves lives at the sea in a preventive manner, but in the end has little to do with ensuring the secure transit of the migrants.

2.3 The European Security Strategy

Officially the EU took the human security concept as part of its security strategy in 2003. The European Security Strategy (ESS), adopted by the European Council on 12-13 December 2003, provided framework for the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP)

and the Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP). Titled as "*A Secure Europe in a Better World*" analyses and defines for the first time EU's security environment, key security challenges and political implications. The ESS framed out five key threats: 1) Terrorism, 2) Proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), 3) Regional conflicts, 4) State failure, and 5) Organized crime.

It was seen that after the US-led invasion in Iraq 2003, which split the EU Member States, a common strategic vision was needed at the EU level. The ESS address the interdependence of global security challenges, by linking security and development issues and emphasizing the key threats interlinking these. Preventive engagement to crisis management and improving neighboring region's security (Balkans, the Mediterranean, and Southern Caucasus) was seen as an important aspect of the security. The demands of the EU's more active, coherent and capable role in the changed security environment emphasized cooperation because none of the threats could be solved alone by the EU. (A Secure…2003)

"*Report of the Implementation of the European Security Strategy: Providing Security in a Changing World*" was released in 2008 to reinforce the ESS. The following report of 2010 "*Internal Security Strategy in Action – Five Steps Towards a More Secure Europe*" posed a five strategic objectives to better security in Europe. These were: 1) Organized crime, 2) terrorism, 3) cybercrime, 4) border security, and 5) disaster response. The following report of 2015 "*Fighting terrorism at EU level*"*,* an overview of Commission's actions, measures and initiatives which covers the years 2015-2020, and focus on issues such as: creating a legal framework for cooperation; developing common systems such as the Schengen Information System (SIS); and financing member states in the field of internal security through the Internal security fund. (A Human…2004)

The ESS and its reinforcing reports places global security as a centerpiece of a European security strategy. It states that "*the post Cold War environment is one of increasingly open borders in which the internal and external aspects of security are indissolubly linked*" (A Secure…2003). Demands in the ESS concern the need for the EU to be more active and more capable. This is something that the EU needs to be in tackling the migrant crisis.

2.3.1 The European Agenda on Security

The European Agenda on Security replaced the previous Internal Security Strategy (2010-2014). Implemented in May 2015, the European Agenda on Security set out how the EU can bring added value in order to support the Members States to ensure security (The European…2015, 2). The Security Agenda covers the next five years from 2015 to 2020 and highlights the fact how *"Europeans can live in an area of freedom, security and justice, without internal frontiers"*. This shared agenda between the EU and the Member States is supposed to lead *"an EU area of internal security where individuals are protected in full compliance with fundamental rights"* (Ibid.2). It acknowledges that many of today's security threats are caused by instability in the EU's neighborhood, such as radicalization, violence and terrorism, which are international threats and thus, stretch out national borders. To tackle these threats the EU needs more effective and coordinated response at the Union level. Even though each Member State holds the prior responsibility for their security, it is clear that they cannot longer act successfully on their own.

The Agenda sets out three priorities; terrorism, organized crime and cybercrime and actions taken by the EU to address these priorities can make a real difference. It drives for better information sharing and more cooperation using all the EU tools and policies in order to address both internal and external dimensions of security (Ibid. 2). The Agenda is set on European core values and thus all actors need to work together based on five key principles. These are (The European…2015, 3):

1) Ensure compliance with fundamental rights,

2) Guarantee more transparency, accountability and democratic control,

3) Ensure better application and implementation of existing EU legal instruments,

4) Provide more joined-up inter-agency and a cross-sectorial approach,

5) Bring together all internal and external dimensions of security.

The fifth principle acknowledges the fact that these threats are not limited only to the outside or inside of the EU borders, they are cross-border and thus the internal security of the EU and global security are dependent and interlinked. Its success is dependent on cooperation with international partners and preventive engagement with third countries is needed in order to respond to the causes of these security issues. The Agenda on Security stresses the

importance of using the already existing policies on security such as the Common Security and Defense policy and enforcing EU's relations with international organizations such as the UN.

Even though the Agenda priorities notions of fundamental rights, transparency and democratic control, towards the end the main focus, however is on the EU's internal security policies. The achievement of full compliance with fundamental rights can be seen as not achieved the objective concerning the current migrant crisis and the Agenda looks more like legitimizing oppressive laws and policies in both the EU and national level (Jones 2015).

3. A CASE STUDY

This chapter will work as an empirical part of this thesis providing a case study towards the concept of human security in the EU's policies will be assessed. First, this chapter will provide a closer look of the background and the development of the migrant crisis, which started in 2014, giving definitions to terms and a framework of the international law. Then, this thesis will go deeper into the actions taken by the EU in order to tackle the migrant crisis. This will be done by going through the European Agenda on Migration and the European Union Action Plan which was drawn from the European Agenda on Migration and the European Agenda on Security. After this there will be an analysis in order to answer the research questions by looking at how the EU has been able to face an actual human security issue reaching its borders, how the EC has reacted and how the individual Member States has been following these implementations.

3.1 The migrant crisis

The migrant crisis, which started in 2014, has created the biggest migration movement since the Second World War. With the term "Migrant Crisis" is referred to both the migrants and the refugees, as well as with the term ¨migration¨. In this thesis the term migrant is used as an umbrella term for all three groups: migrants, refugees and asylum seekers, while all refugees are considered migrants but not all migrants are considered as refugees. Migrants and refugees are now fleeing into Europe from Africa, the Middle East and South Asia and thus, have caused the greatest challenge for European leaders and policymakers since the 2008 financial crisis (Park 2015). The neighboring countries, Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq, Egypt and Turkey were the first ones to feel the migrant crisis pressure. It is clear that already unstable region could not handle the situation by itself and therefore migrants needed to continue their journey to Europe. Europe and more importantly the Mediterranean has become the most dangerous destination and also border crossing according to the International Organization for Migration (IOM). Due to the rise of the right wing and nationalist parties in

many Member States and fears of the spread of the Islamic terrorism, the EU has been more focused on securing its borders rather than protecting the rights of migrants and refugees which are stated in the international law. So far, it has remained unclear how the EU Member States are able to tackle the crisis and are they capable of implementing lasting asylum and immigration reforms.

According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) the current migrant crisis is the most severe since the end of the Second World War, with over 60 million refugees worldwide. With no end in sight, migration might turn into a norm, because of the push and pull factors for migration has and will multiply. The push factors include political crises, civil wars, ethnic and religious cleansing mainly done by extremist organizations due to lack of economic prospects. The EU has a duty to take in migrants, especially those who are in need of international protection. In 2015, over million irregular migrants crossed EU's external borders, creating a need for the EU to asses their migration policies and their effects.

There are unclear definitions of terms which refer to migrants, asylum seekers and refugees. However, defining and recognition between these three groups is crucial not only in this thesis but in the practical and legal aspects as well. Differentiation of these groups needs to be clear because they are entitled to different levels of assistance and protection under the international law. In this thesis the term refugee refers to people fleeing armed conflict or persecution and who have been permitted asylum. They are defined and protected in international law, such as, the 1951 Refugee Convention. Refugees are entitled to have assistance from states, the UNHCR, and other organizations. Protection of refugees includes safety from the threats they have fled, access to asylum procedures which are fair, respect of their basic human rights; right to live in dignity and safety, while helping them to find long-term solutions. The primary responsibility belongs to the states. The 1951 Convention defines a refugee and their rights as well as which states should accept refugees. The core principle in the international law is that refugees should not be expelled or returned to countries and situations where their life and right for freedom could be under threat. (Edwards 2015) An asylum-seeker is a refugee whose claim has not yet been evaluated. The national asylum system makes the evaluation whether or not an asylum-seeker is qualified for international protection. If the refugee status is not admitted they can be sent back to the countries which they are originally from (Asylum…).

Migrants are people who decide to move in order to gain better life, through education or profession, family reunion or other reasons. Migrants do not face threats in their home countries and if they decide to return they are under the protection of their own government. In legal perspectives distinction between migrants and refugees is important for individual state governments. Migrants are under the immigration law and process in the country to which they decide to move to, while refugees are under refugee protection, which is defined in the national legislation as well as in the international law. (Edwards 2015)

The problem has been caused when both the migrants and the refugees are now fleeing to Europe through same routes, causing a harder border control as well as assessment of these people. Greece and Italy, countries which were also most suffered from the economic crisis, have served as a route to Europe. Countries for example Hungary have also been exposed to difficulties with migrant flows situated in the EU's eastern border. All EU Member States are under the Regulation (EU) No 604/2013 – called the Dublin Regulation, which poses the responsibility to examine migrants' asylum applications. This EU regulation

"establishes the principle that only one Member State is responsible for examining an asylum application. The objective is to avoid asylum seekers from being sent from one country to another, and also to prevent abuse of the system by the submission of several applications for asylum by one person. The objective and hierarchical criteria are therefore defined in order to identify the Member State responsible for each asylum application".
(Dublin Regulation)

Asylum seekers thus need to remain in the entry-point country which evaluate the application however, there are hierarchical order varying form family considerations to health issues. Refugees who enter further into Europe are faced with a deportation back to the country through which they entered the EU. While the EU is tackling with the migrant crisis, policymakers want to reform the Dublin Regulation in order to establishing a common European asylum policy. Because in reality none of the entry-point countries have followed the Dublin Regulation due to the high number of migrants and they are letting them pass through to other countries in Europe and thus the Dublin Regulation will most likely be re-assessed by the EC.

Irregular migration term defined by the IOM is:

"movement that takes place outside the regulatory norms of the sending, transit and receiving countries. There is no clear or universally accepted definition of irregular migration. From the perspective of destination countries it is entry, stay or work in a country without the necessary authorization or documents required under immigration regulations. From the perspective of the sending country, the irregularity is for example seen in cases in which a person crosses an international boundary without a valid passport or travel document or does not fulfil the administrative requirements for leaving the country. There is, however, a tendency to restrict the use of the term "illegal migration" to cases of smuggling of migrants and trafficking in persons".

The irregular migration poses varying issues to both the states and the migrants, leaving them with insecurity and vulnerability under the international law. Lack of regulations when dealing with migrants, in both from state's citizen's perspective as well as from the migrant's perspective, is jeopardizing the human security. The regulations need to address both the concerns of the states as well as protection of the rights of irregular migrants (Koser 2005, 2). In Europe, the discussion has shifted from protecting the rights of the migrants to concerns of national security because of the fears that irregular migrants pose a threat to states and societies.

3.2 European Union's response

To tackle the migrant crisis within the EU borders, the EC created two documents prioritizing the fight against migrant smuggling. The European Agenda on Security in April 2015 and the European Agenda on Migration in May 2015. The European Agenda on Security enhanced cooperation against the smuggling within the EU and with third countries and set it as a priority. The European Agenda on Migration identifies fight against migrant

smuggling as a first priority in order to *"prevent the exploitation of migrants by criminal networks and reduce incentives to irregular migration"*. (EU Action…2015) Leaning on these two frameworks the EC presented in May 2015 an Action Plan to create a operationalized response against migrant smuggling (Irregular…2016, ii). The Action Plan from 2015 to 2020, created a comprehensive approach which included all relevant actors, including stakeholders and institutions at different levels. One of the key issues in the migrant crisis has been the migrant smuggling, which has caused death of more than 300 in the first two months of this year alone (Mediterranean…2016). This has also created irregular entry, stay and transit to the EU. The management of migration with the respect of the fundamental rights of irregular migrants should be a priority. However, tackling with the migrant smuggling is a case that deals with criminal law and organized crime, therefore creating a more complex issue.

3.2.1 The European Agenda on Migration

The migrant crisis has created an unbearable humanitarian crisis to reach the EU's external borders, creating a need for action at the EU as well as the Member State level. No Member State can tackle the migrant crisis alone – it jeopardizes the security of its own nationals as well as the migrants. With the European Agenda on Migration, the EU aims to create better tools to manage migration in the medium and long-term (European...A 2015). The migrant crisis is not only a shared problem, but also a shared responsibility among the Member States, transit and origin countries. This Agenda combines both internal and external policies with a new comprehensive approach based on mutual trust and solidarity. The Agenda on Migration proposed by the EC set a framework for a common European response combining both internal and external policies, while cooperating with different actors; international organizations, civil society, regional and national agencies outside the EU. The Agenda on Migration is based on four pillars: (European...A 2015)

1)   Reducing the incentives for irregular migration: addressing the primary causes of irregular migration, defining actions for better application of return policies,

2)   Saving lives and securing external borders: better management of external borders, and solidarity towards Member States located there,

3)   Strengthening the common asylum policy: EU´s asylum policies needs to be based on solidarity towards those needing international protection as well as among the Member States, whose full application of the common rules must be ensured through systematic monitoring,

4)   A new policy on legal migration: focus on keeping Europe attractive to workers that the EU economy needs.

The Agenda on Migration intends to create a coherent and comprehensive approach to address both the benefits and the challenges caused by migration. However, the duty is to protect those in need. In order to prevent more human suffering caused by the migrant smuggling, the EU needs to address all its tools and also focus on the root causes of the migration. The Agenda states that there is a need for clear and well implemented framework to legally entry into the EU, which would reduce the push factors of irregular migration and stay (Ibid. 6). This would enhance the security of the European borders as well as the safety of the migrants. The EU should offer protection to those in need, but at the same time it needs to draw guidelines to migrants when they do not meet the criteria to stay.

3.2.2 The European Union Action Plan

The EU Action Plan against migrant smuggling sets out specific actions how to implement the two agendas adopted by the EC, The European Agenda on Security and The European Agenda on Migration. The Action Plan includes "*concrete actions to counter and prevent migrants smuggling, while ensuring the protection of human rights of migrants*". It takes a multidisciplinary approach and involves actors from regional, national and international level. (EU Action…2015, 2) Human lives could be saved by weakening the need for smugglers. Thus, it is needed to create more open, safe as well as legal ways to migrate into the EU. At the same time the EU needs a stronger common framework for return migrants who are not entitled to reside in Europe (Irregular…2016, 2).

The development within the EU's law and policies towards immigration control and security governance has gained attention in the recent years. Securitization of migration and immigration control to its security objectives, while conducting border and immigration controls, is done by using security and crime governance methods (EU Action…2015, 8). Concerning the human security concept the Action Plan includes stronger cooperation with

the third countries in order to address the root causes of irregular migration. It states that the focus should be on border management, youth employment and mobility. The first part of the document address targeting the smugglers, however towards the end aspects of improving human security and livelihood takes a bigger stand. Improving the coherence of the external actions of the EU, Member States will maximize the impacts.

3.3 Analysis

As it can be seen from the previous chapters, global poverty and conflicts do not obey the national frontiers and thus, the EU cannot solve the migrant crisis by itself. However, based on the founding principle of the EU, Europe should be a safe haven for people in need. The human security concept was introduced to a wider audience in 1994 UNDP Human Development Report and since then it has remained as a relevant concept to address the current security issues in the world. Many of the Western countries, including the EU, included the narrow definition of human security; freedom from violent threats to individuals and communities, to their foreign and security policies. Officially the EU included human security concept to their policies in 2001 ESS. Since then, notions of human security have been part of many EU's foreign policy agendas.

When addressing the human security concept in EU's actions in the migrant crisis, it needs to bear in mind that in the new global context the EU's security policies should change more from concentrating on states' security to human security. In the post-Cold War security environment, current security capabilities which consist mainly of military forces, cannot address the actual security needs in the world. The human security concept takes into consideration the current security issues to human beings and the acknowledgement of this is visible in the ESS. The seven key threats laid out in the ESS cannot be handled by pure military means because none of them is purely a military issue. Also, these threats are not reality only for Europe, but they are global. As mentioned before, population displacement is a typical feature of the so-called "new wars" and one of the contributors creating threats such as migration are authoritarian states and this is visible when considering the origin countries of the migrants: Syria, Iraq, and Afghanistan.

The Statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC) defines forms of intolerable insecurity as; genocide, torture, inhumane treatment, slavery, crimes against humanity and

other forms of violations of the laws of war. Right for food, healthcare and housing are part of the human security concept however, their legal status is less elevated (A Human…2004, 8). The situation in the origin countries of the migrants is inhume. The human security approach as a part of the EU's foreign and security policy means that it should contribute to the protection of each individual in need and not only focus on the military state defense of nation states and the EU's borders. This is something that has happened in the aftermath of the migrant crisis, when public pressure has overruled the humane actions. After all, Europe needs to act in a way that respects its international commitments and values, while securing its borders.

There can be found three reasons why the EU should promote more the human security concept. First, the EU as a promoter of democratic values and the rule of law should also promote common humanity. Protection of human security should be based on morality and all human lives should be equally worth and not lose its value in situations of crisis, which has happened at least at the level of discussion in the EU. Second reason is based on legislation. As all Member States of the EU has signed and ratified the UN's Universal Declaration of Human Rights they have also a legal obligation to protect these rights. The third reason has to do with the Europeans self-interest. The lives of Europeans are not secure before lives of others are. (A Human…2004, 9, 10)

After assessing the human security concept in EU's foreign and security policies by going through the CFSP, the CSDP, the ESS and the European Agenda on Security it can be seen that the notions of promoting of values such as human rights and fundamental freedom is part of them all. However, further improvement of links between internal and external policies needs to be more present in CFSP and after that the EU is able to adjust more human security based policies and the CSDP offers an operational framework to conduct these. One of the issues when addressing the migrant crisis, which is much connected to universal human rights, is that the EU places promotion and respect of human rights more to the external policies of the EU rather than internal. And thus makes it problematic to deal with the migrant crisis when it affects both EU's internal and external policies. Also, even thought the CFSP created a common framework for the EU's foreign policy, the Member States still hold their sovereignty and thus the CFSP is not working as it should.

The European Agenda on Migration and the Action Plan, which implements both the European Agenda on Migration as well as the European Agenda on Security, were created to

tackle the migrant crisis. It is clear that the EC has created a common framework to tackle the crisis in the EU level, even though it has mainly been addressing it as a migrant smuggling issue. It is clear that Europe must invest to human security in order to have security themselves. This has been noticed by the EC however, the role of national parliaments in the area of freedom, security and justice can be argued to be too dominating and might end up causing damage to the EC's work (The European…2015, 2). When dealing with the migrant crisis the national governments have taken a leading role, and while some of the countries have contributed more than others, no government should act unilaterally. It can be seen as a failure of the EU for not being able to create a common response to the migrant crisis. Lack of co-operation reflects the absence of shared values and principles upon which the EU has been built on (Khalaf 2016). Before, the security of others outside own national borders were considered more as an ethical human rights and development issue without linkage to the security of Europeans (Ibid. 28). The connection between migration and security was acknowledged in the 5 years Programme for EU Justice and Home Affairs law and policy by the European Council in 2004, called the Hague Programme (Mitsilegas 2015, 29). While every sovereign state has its rights to control its borders, it also has a responsibility for irregular asylum seekers and refugees, who are in need and have a right to seek protection. Currently, the irregular flows of migrants pose challenges to the Member States concerning the controlling and managing of the migrants as well as ensuring their safety and fundamental rights.

Europeans need to see migrants as a victims of the threats of human security, such as political, economical and the personal situations, due to which they decide to migrate and unfortunately some through the wrong channels. Hence, leaning on these reasons, the EU should adapt and adjust a human rights-based migration policy, which would be based on the same principles when dealing with a humanitarian crisis outside the EU borders. The Member States need to continue their work in saving lives at sea; responding the high numbers of arrivals; targeting criminal smuggling networks; granting protection for migrants through resettlements and long-term political action to tackle the reasons driving for irregular migration. A collective legal action from the EU is needed in order to protect the rights of the people in need of protection whether as a refugee or as an asylum seeker. The actions taken by some of the Member States today, such as building fences, using tears gas or setting up detention camps is not a solution nor will it prevent migrants reaching Europe. The rise of

right-wing parties as well as both public, media and political hate talks about migrants should not become a norm in the discussion of migration.

An adequate conceptualization of human security for the EU would be to link human security with national security, not one over another. The Member States need to acknowledge that the EU will not be safe until the neighborhood of Europe is. Currently the lack of will is also causing the lack of cooperation which is connected to the scale that this crisis has taken. While the human security approach highlights the preventive actions it is clear that neither the international community nor the EU has been acting in that way in the origin countries of the migrants such as Iraq and Syria. The migration crisis is not ending in the near future and the EC has been addressing it through human security approach; ensuring safety of the migrants as well as taking into a consideration the security of the EU. However, the lack of common approach in Member State level makes it difficult to address these policies in action. Even though the EU is not for blame causing the crisis in the first place, it has not been acting in a preventive manner. Before the migrant crisis, many of the EU policymakers thought migration as a human security issue, but now the discussion as well as the implementation of new policies has turned to see migration as a national security issue. As Khalid Kosher, Senior Fellow from the Brookings Institution, states *"the risk of securitizing migration is that you risk legitimizing extraordinary responses."* (Park 2015).

What the EU need is a permanent system for dealing with migrants and shared responsibility amongst the Member States. The EU need not only to relocate migrants who have already reached the EU soil but also protect and help the people in need of international protection in third countries too. To achieve this, the EU need to work more closely with international community, such as the UNHCR. The duty of the international community is to recognize people in need and ensure their safe journey to Europe. The EC has started a process of developing risk assessments and mapping guidelines for disaster management as well as guidelines assessing Member States' risk management capability. By cooperation a coherent European response could be created during crises situations which would be more effective, efficient and would not cause double efforts within the EU and create situations like this again (European A…2015, 9).

In EU's policies as well as public and political talks, it is important to separate the current migrant crisis from the broader debate on irregular migration. Even though in the current migrant crisis some of the asylum seekers and refugees have been taken into Europe

by migrant smugglers, it is evident to notice that they do not lose their protection rights because they have not come through official asylum channels. Under the Article 14 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights *"Everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution"*. Both the Member States and the Union has a duty to respond and act under the international law. However, there can be seen a failing EU policy respond to the migrants crisis. The EU is lacking both will and unity in addressing the migrant crisis which has split the Member States. The European Commission Agenda on Migration highlighted the duty to protect people in need but so far the EU is assessing the migration crisis through the security of Europe, not security of all human beings. At first the scale of the migrant crisis surprised the policy leaders, however it has continued over two years and thus the scale and the speed of people arriving should be known.

CONCLUSION

The EU included the human security concept to its security policy agenda in the 2003 ESS, by linking the security and development issues and giving a framework for the CFSP and CSDP. When assessing the visibility of the human security in EU's policies it can be noticed that it is included in many working documents, policies and agendas that the EC has produced. The human security concept works as an adequate framework to address current security issues in the world, which goes beyond traditional security notions towards security of the individuals. The EU works as a promoter of universal human rights, democracy and the rule of law and thus it is part of its founding principles.

The EU should promote human security concept; first, as a promoter of democratic values it should promote common humanity, second all Member States has ratified the UN's Universal Declaration of Human Rights and thus they have a legal obligation to promote these values, third the lives of Europeans will not be secure before the lives of the others are. All human lives should be equally worth, both the Europeans as well as the migrants. Also human lives should not lose their value in the situation of crisis, and this is something that has happened in the outcome of the migrant crisis. Before, the migration was linked with human security issues but now it has become more and more about national security. Closing borders and detaining migrants into inhumane circumstances is crumbling the founding principles of the EU.

What it comes to the migrant crisis the EU has mainly been addressing the irregular smuggling of migrants into Europe as one of the main problem and has concentrated its efforts in targeting the migrants smugglers in the Mediterranean. This indicates both the urgent need of saving lives of the refugees but also a way to prevent irregular migration inside the EU. This is evident in the European Agenda on Migration and The EU Action Plan. Europe needs to act in a way that respects its international commitments and values while securing the borders. To achieve this, the EU need to act in a consistent and clear way through common policy. Both the EU and the Member States need to act in a way that respects the international and ethical obligations, solidarity and shared responsibility. Migration should be

placed in both the external and internal policies of the EU.

The objective of this research was to analyze the visibility and impact of the human security concept in the EU's policies using as a case study the current migrant crisis. As stated the human security concept has been part of the ESS since 2003 and is part of the policies that the EC has been producing when tackling the migrant crisis. To answer the research questions it can be concluded that that the human security concept is visible in the EU's policies, and has been used when tackling the migrant crisis. However, both lack of implementation, will, and legislations are causing its failure and in many cases the internal aspects overcome the external ones. The EC has been trying to gather all the Member States under one framework in addressing the migrant crisis but so far it has not succeeded and many Member States has taken different aspect towards migration. Europe should act as a unite community to achieve the best outcome for both the EU as well as the security of human beings. The human security concept could work as an adequate framework for the EU, emphasizing both the security of the individuals as well as security of the Member States.

REFERENCES

A Human Security Doctrine for Europe – The Barcelona Report of the Study Group on
Europe's Security Capabilities (2004). Barcelona.
http://www.lse.ac.uk/internationalDevelopment/research/CSHS/humanSecurity/barcel
onaReport.pdf (3.5.2016)

A Secure Europe in a Better World: European Security Policy. (2003). Brussels: Council of
the European Union https://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/78367.pdf
(2.5.2016)

Asylum-seeker. *s.a.* United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
http://www.unhcr.org/pages/49c3646c137.html (2.5.2016)

Booth, K. (2007). Theory of World Security. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bruderlein, C. (2001). People's security as new global stability. *s.l.*
http://www.hpcrresearch.org/sites/default/files/publications/353-366_Bruderlein.pdf
(2.6.2016)

Buzan, B. (1983) People, states, and fear: The national security problem in international
relations. United States: University of North Carolina Press.

Buzan, B., Wæver, O. and de Wilde, J. (1998) Security: A new framework for analysis.
Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Commission on Human Security. (2003). Human Security Now. New York.
http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/91BAEEDBA50C6907C1256D1
9006A9353-chs-security-may03.pdf (2.5.2016)

Cottey, A. (2012). Security in 21st Century Europe. 2nd ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillian

Dublin Regulation. (2003). EUR-Lex

Edwards, A. (2015). Refugee or migrant - Which is right? United Nations High
    Commissioner for Refugees, 27 August 2015. http://www.unhcr.org/55df0e556.html
    (2.5.2016)

EU Action Plan against migrant smuggling (2015-2020). (2015). European Commission, 27
    May 2015. http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/e-
    library/documents/policies/asylum/general/docs/eu_action_plan_against_migrant_smu
    ggling_en.pdf (2.5.2016)

EUISS Yearbook of European Security. (2016). European Union Institute for Security Studies
    (EUISS). http://www.iss.europa.eu/publications/detail/article/euiss-yearbook-of-
    european-security-2016/ (3.5.2016)

European Agenda on Migration: Why a new European Agenda on Migration? (2015).
    European Commission, 13 May 2015. http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-
    do/policies/european-agenda-migration/index_en.htm (2.5.2016)

European Commission. (2003). The European Security Strategy.
    https://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/78367.pdf (02.4.2016)

European External Action Service
    http://www.eeas.europa.eu/csdp/missions-and-operations/eunavfor-med/index_en.htm
    (3.5.2016)

European Union. Foreign & Security Policy *s.a.* European Union
    http://europa.eu/pol/cfsp/index_en.htm (3.5.2016)

Handbook on CSDP Missions and Operations – The Common Security and Defence Policy of the European Union. (2015)./Eds. G. Glume, J. Rehrl. Vienna: Armed Forces Printinc Centre. http://eeas.europa.eu/csdp/structures-instruments-agencies/european-security-defence-college/pdf/handbook/final_-_handbook_on_csdp_missions_and_operations.pdf (3.5.2016)

Human Development Report. (1994). *The United Nations Development Programme*. New York: Oxford University Press 1994 http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/reports/255/hdr_1994_en_complete_nostats.pdf (3.5.2016)

Human Security Backgrounder. *s.a.* Human Security Report Project. *s.l.* http://www.hsrgroup.org/press-room/human-security-backgrounder.aspx (02.5.2016)

Human Security: Genesis, Debates, Trends. (2011). Center for Security Studies (CSS), ETH Zurich. http://www.css.ethz.ch/content/dam/ethz/special-interest/gess/cis/center-for-securities-studies/pdfs/CSS-Analysis-90-EN.pdf (2.5.2016)

Human security in Theory and Practice: An Overview of the Human Security Concept and the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security. (2009). United Nations Human Security Unit. http://www.un.org/humansecurity/sites/www.un.org.humansecurity/files/human_security_in_theory_and_practice_english.pdf (2.5.2016)

Irregular Migration, Trafficking and Smuggling of Human Beings. (2016). Eds. S. Garrera, G. Elspeth. Brussels: Centre for European policy Studies https://www.ceps.eu/system/files/Irregular%20Migration,%20Trafficking%20and%20SmugglingwithCovers.pdf (3.5.2016)

Jones, C. (2015). Full compliance: the EU's new security agenda. s.l. Statewatch http://statewatch.org/analyses/no-268-eu-security-agenda.pdf (3.5.2016)

Khalaf, R. (2016). How has the EU mismanaged the migrant crisis? Financial Times, 12
March 2016 http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/a3d7f394-e6dd-11e5-a09b-
1f8b0d268c39.html#axzz47aoNM12n (3.5.2016)

Krieg, A. (2013). Motivations for Humanitarian Intervention: Theoretical and Empirical
Considerations. Netherlands: Springer.

Koser, K. (2005). Irregular migration, state security and human security. International
Organization for Migration, September 2005
https://www.iom.int/jahia/webdav/site/myjahiasite/shared/shared/mainsite/policy_and_
research/gcim/tp/TP5.pdf (2.5.2016)

Mediterranean Update – Migration Flows Europe: Arrivals and Fatalities. (2016).
International Organization for Immigration, 2 February 2016.
http://missingmigrants.iom.int/sites/default/files/Mediterranean_Update_02_February_
2016.pdf (2.5.2016)

Mitsilegas, V. (2015). The Criminalisation of Migration in Europe – Challenges for Human
Rights and the Rule of Law. *s.l.* Springer International Publishing.

Münkler, H. (2005). The New Wars. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Nuruzzaman, M. (2006). Paradigms in Conflict: The Contested Claims of Human Security,
Critical Theory and Feminism. Sage Publications.
http://cac.sagepub.com/content/41/3/285.full.pdf+html
 (02.5.2016)

Park, J. (2015). Europe's Migration Crisis. Council on Foreign Relations, September 23.
http://www.cfr.org/migration/europes-migration-crisis/p32874 (2.5.2016)

The Annual report from the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs

and Security Policy to the European Parliament (2015). Brussels: Coucil of the
European Union. http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-11083-2015-
INIT/en/pdf (3.5.2016)

The European Agenda on Security. (2015). Strasbourg: European Commission
http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-
security/index_en.htm (3.5. 2016)

Waltz, K.N. (1979) Theory of international politics. New York: Random House USA.