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Foreword
Dear Reader,

We are happy to be with you in this first issue of 2021. The past year we left behind, 2020 was not an easy one, bearing witness to conflicts, wars and challenges, including the COVID-19 pandemic. 2021 seems candidate to change the tide. The year that started with inauguration of the new US Administration saw concrete steps from governments across the globe to take concrete measures against COVID 19. All these inspire hope for a brighter future.

This issue of Horizon Insights tried to respond to the events of the period it covers, namely the first quarter of 2021. In this regard, the first article or more precisely the policy brief looks into the security landscape in South Caucasus in the aftermath of the 2nd Karabakh War and offers ways to develop EU bilateral cooperation with the countries in the region, especially in the field of energy. The recommendations that involve construction and extension of the Trans-Caspian Gas Pipeline offers a detailed analysis of pros and cons of different courses of action for Europe.

The second article, also a policy brief, brings together four experts from different fields on an extremely urgent problem. The FTO designation of the Houthis by the leaving US Administration and the various implications based on Yemeni realities are extensively discussed. The policy brief, concluding that Houthis do not deserve nobody's sympathy in the way they played a major role in creation of the world's worst humanitarian crisis, recommends a retreat from the decision. But it shows determined diplomatic efforts should be pursued to bring peace to the war-torn country.

The third and the last article presents a comprehensive literature review analyzing and identifying drivers, actors involved, effects and implications of migration on domestic integration, and its further threats to societies. The issue that has been long securitized by primarily politicians and to an extent media is disassembled for closer look for sound understanding and interpretation. The article shows migration is widely politicized in which migrants and asylum seekers are considered a challenge to the national security and well-being of the country. The findings also underline a correlation between migration and security.

In our last issue, we also have a book review on Adam Przeworski's book « Crises of Democracy ». The author that analyses different cases of democracy failures from the past and present argues economy and inequality are essential factors that determine the durability of democracy. Przeworski's work comes at such a time that that citizens have lost their trust not only in democracy but in nominally democratic institutions in some contexts.

Sincerely yours,
Beyond the Horizon ISSG
The Trans-Caspian Gas Pipeline for Peace-building in the South Caucasus

Robert M. Cutler

1. Executive Summary

Key Points:

• The EU should emphasise the three main successful points of its bilateral cooperation with the countries in the South Caucasus region: energy, security and transportation.

• This includes construction and extension of the Trans-Caspian Gas Pipeline (TCGP, often called ‘TCP’, and which is already a Project of Common Interest), gas from which, in the new geopolitical situation, could transit through Armenia from Azerbaijan to Turkey.

• This pipeline, which can be designed to be hydrogen-ready, would satisfy the EU's energy requirements at the lowest cost possible and without contravening the principles of the European Green Deal.

• The TCP’s first string would enable Armenia to buy gas from Turkmenistan; alternatively, Armenia could be supplied through the Georgian pipeline system if the TCP is constructed through the established Azerbaijan-Georgia-Turkey route.

• Along with the complementary White Stream pipeline for the TCP’s second string, it would enhance (1) security of supply by diversifying routes, (2) sustainability and (3) competition.

• The White Stream (WS) pipeline, under the Black Sea, would feed the Bulgaria-Romania-Hungary-Austria (BRUA) pipeline and other connectors, bringing competitively priced gas from new sources to Baumgarten via the lowest-cost transportation routes.

• The WS pipeline would thereby enable increased competition, increase market integration and facilitate the deployment of renewable energy sources at larger scales, in both the EU and the Energy Community.

• Joint efforts should now be further encouraged on the basis of the new realities in the South Caucasus and Caspian Sea regions, in particular their significant potential to supply blue hydrogen.

• The mid-January 2021 agreement between Azerbaijan and Turkmenistan to develop jointly the mid-Caspian Dostlug oil field, over which they have disagreed for over two decades, erases the last obstacle to constructing the TCP.

• Turkmenistan is the only available non-Russian source of natural gas (and of blue hydrogen) that has the potential to make the transition more efficient and less expensive while at the same time enhancing the security of supply.

• The project’s success will improve the humanitarian situation in the South Caucasus, further enhance EU prestige in the region, and create the basis for establishing a genuine South Caucasus Community with transnational institutions, as Brussels envisioned 20 years ago.

2. Background

The Eastern Neighbourhood has definitively changed with the end of the Second Karabakh War. A 30-year-old constraint on genuine security and cooperation amongst the countries in the region, and with their neighbours and the EU, has disappeared. Real possibilities for the EU to help securitize the region have now opened.

The terms on which the Second Karabakh War was concluded, eliminate the possibility that Armenia may threaten the Azerbaijan-Georgia energy corridor. Those terms also establish the basis for recon-
struction and peace-building in the South Caucasus. Such a breakthrough finds expression in two tri-lateral (Armenia, Azerbaijan and Russia) declarations. The first of these (10 November 2020) contains nine important provisions, and the second (11 January 2021) aims at implementing the ninth of them in particular. This provision concerns the unblocking of all communications in the region including transportation infrastructure. The work is proceeding swiftly. (For details, see Jafarova, 2021.

In the late 1990s, political leaders in the South Caucasus and some surrounding states concluded that it was desirable to establish a pact for stability and cooperation. Such a pact, they thought, could achieve peace and security in the region as well as unleash its full potential for economic development and transformation. The proposal, originally made by President Heydar Aliyev of Azerbaijan at the November 1999 Istanbul Summit of the OSCE, was subsequently supported and extended by President Suleiman Demirel of Turkey, then endorsed by President Robert Kocharyan of Armenia and President Eduard Shevardnadze of Georgia.

It eventually became a proposal for a ‘3+3+2’ agreement (i.e., Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia; plus Russia, Iran and Turkey; plus the EU and the US) to address not just security and conflict-resolution issues but also economic cooperation and democratic reforms. The Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) further elaborated this idea into a proposal for a ‘Stability Pact for the Caucasus’, at the time including the North Caucasus, which was in the throes of the Chechen Wars and their aftermath and spillover to neighbouring regions. (Full disclosure: The author of the present Policy Brief was an ‘External Collaborator’ with the CEPS Working Group on the Caucasus.)

The best point of departure for this Policy Brief is to revisit briefly the CEPS proposals, in order to evaluate what worked and what did not work. That assessment will assist in guiding the evaluation of the present situation and how, on the basis of established successes, to proceed in the new circumstances following the end of the Second Karabakh War.

The CEPS proposal comprised six ‘chapters’ with detailed policy initiatives. These are not present in the originally published version (Celac, Emerson & Tocci, 2000) but only in the ‘Working Document’ redaction that had limited circulation several months later (Celac & Emerson, 2000). Those six chapters were divided into two groups of three: (1) the creation of an OSCE-backed Southern Caucasus Community (SCC) with a relatively elaborate institutional framework, focussed on the resolution and prevention of conflict; and (2) the SCC’s expansion into a ‘wider Southern Dimension’ comprising Russia-EU-US cooperation, including an expanded platform for Black Sea-Caucasus-Caspian cooperation plus the promotion of investment in oil and gas and related infrastructure.

 MEP Per Gahrton’s (2002) subsequent report, to the European Parliament committee considering such questions, cited the CEPS Working Document’s recommendations and specifically [called] for a conference on investment and economic development in the Southern Caucasus by European institutions.
engaged in the region and in cooperation with banks and firms in the European Union with special emphasis on energy'. This idea to promote the EU's energy cooperation with the Caspian Sea region took the form of the 2004 Baku Initiative and its follow-up 2006 Astana Energy Roadmap. These developments represent the origin for everything that followed, including the whole Southern Gas Corridor. Only the very last of these ideas, concerning the promotion of energy infrastructure, has had any success in the last 20 years. Indeed, its success has been very remarkable. It is by extending further this basis of established success, that new possibilities may be unlocked. Azerbaijan's President Ilham Aliyev proposed on 10 December 2020 a 'six-party platform' (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Iran, Russia and Turkey; see Huseynov, 2021, for details), on the basis of several sets of existing trilateral cooperation frameworks. Such a platform, with the addition of the EU and the US, would resemble the framework of the EU's suggested ‘3+3+2’ framework from 20 years ago. Any EU co-operation in the region, whether multilateral or bilateral, should focus and build on the three main points of past successes. These are energy, security and transportation.

3. The Eu's Options In The South Caucasus Today And In Future

This part of the Policy Brief comprises two sections: (1) humanitarian assistance and economic development and (2) the Trans-Caspian Gas Pipeline (TCGP, also called the TCP). The latter is divided into four sub-sections: (1) the essentials of the TCP, (2) why to build the TCP, (3) how the TCP may promote decarbonisation and (4) peace-building and the geopolitics of Turkmen gas. The last of these sub-sections addresses two geopolitical aspects in particular, these being the Armenian connection and how the TCP can bring gas (and hydrogen) to Central Europe.

3.1 Humanitarian Assistance and Economic Development

The Head of the Mission of the Azerbaijani Republic to the European Union, Fuad Isgandarov, hopes for the EU to participate actively in the region in future. He notes its basis in economic co-operation already established, notably the Southern Gas Corridor and Azerbaijan's contribution to the EU's energy security through it (Stanciu, 2020).

At present, the EU has no mandate for peace-building in the South Caucasus. It cannot engage there directly now. The EU Commissioner for Enlargement and Neighbourhood Oliver Varhelyi nevertheless stated, a month after the military hostilities ended, that the EU plans to provide 10 million euros in additional humanitarian aid to victims of the war and to 'work towards more comprehensive conflict transformation and longer-term socio-economic development' (Caucasus Watch, 2020).

In addition, experts from the European Commission are discussing humanitarian cooperation with Azerbaijan. Both sides are seeking to determine what forms assistance for reconstruction in the Nagorno-Karabakh region are most appropriate. They are also examining the needs of internally displaced persons (IDPs) in order to determine the best way to support them (Lmahamad, 2020).

In the opinion of the Armenian political scientist Andrias Ghukasyan, 'the most important task for Armenia is to achieve independence from Russia in matters of its national security' (Martirosyan, 2021). Here too, the EU can achieve great potential benefit with relatively small leverage. Observation of the upcoming elections in Armenia (scheduled by December 2023 but widely anticipated to take place before then) can be one key, but not the only one.

During the attempted Turkish-Armenian diplomatic rapprochement of 10–12 years ago, Turkey and Azerbaijan offered detailed plans for economic cooperation and development to Armenia, including at the project level. Armenia, however, refused. The EU could promote the adoption of those previous transnational offers for regional cooperation, which would still be on the table. Several EU Member States are already participating in the economic reconstruction and development of Azerbaijan's formerly occupied territories.
3.2 The Trans-Caspian Gas Pipeline

Significant interest has been returning to the Trans-Caspian Gas Pipeline (TCGP, also called the TCP) infrastructure project since the signing, in August 2018 in Aktau (Kazakhstan), of the Convention on the Legal Status of the Caspian Sea (‘Aktau Treaty’). The end of the Second Karabakh War in the South Caucasus accelerated that interest, which has further intensified following the recent signature of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Azerbaijan and Turkmenistan to develop jointly the mid-Caspian Dostlug oil and gas field, over which they had disputed for 30 years (Trend, 2020; BT, 2021).

The TCP project holds extremely important potential for promoting peace, security and economic cooperation and development in the South Caucasus. At the same time, it can satisfy the EU’s energy requirements in the most economical way, and without contravening the principles of the European Green Deal.

This part of the Policy Brief sets out (1) the essential facts of the TCP, (2) why it is a good idea from the security and cooperation standpoint for both the South Caucasus and the EU, (3) how the TCP promotes and satisfies the EU’s foreseen decarbonisation norms and programmes, and (4) how the overall geopolitics of energy and peace-building should include the facilitating role of the complementary White Stream (WS) pipeline for TCP gas under the Black Sea from Georgia to Romania.

3.2.1 Essentials of the Trans-Caspian Pipeline

The TCP is planned to branch off from a connection with Turkmenistan’s domestic on-shore East-West Pipeline. It would cross under the Caspian Sea, feeding into Azerbaijan’s Sangachal terminal. From there, the gas would enter the South Caucasus Pipeline (SCP).

The TCP’s step-by-step expansion has several economically justified scenarios. The first stage, associated with a single pipeline string, is intended to transport up to 15 billion cubic metres per annum (bcma) towards Turkey via the TANAP pipeline as from 2022. The second stage, projected for 2023, would increase total capacity up to 30 bcma, by feeding the WS pipeline from Georgia’s Black Sea coast to Constanta, Romania. From Constanta, the gas would flow towards Baumgarten.

Map 2. The Trans-Caspian Pipeline-TCP (Source: Ministry of Energy of Georgia)
The Trans Caspian Pipeline System will thus consist of two strings. The first string would feed the TAP/TANAP system, thus ensuring supply for the second phase of Trans-Adriatic Pipeline. It would enable the TCP’s second string, which would feed the WS pipeline. This latter will branch off from the SCP, head towards the shore of the Black Sea (with a compressor station located in Georgia near Supsa), and land in Romania.

In this way, the TCP would not only improve the economics of Azerbaijani gas transportation via TANAP, on which the TANAP owners are very keen, but also enable the WS pipeline, leading to increased market integration and competition and better gas-supply security.

No new investments in exploration or development are required. That is because gas from Turkmenistan is readily available through existing shut-in wells that have established production. Turkmenistan would become the most competitively-priced gas on the market in the European Union and the Energy Community. Volumes transiting the Southern Gas Corridor (SGC) would open this corridor to its fullest extent.

3.2.2 Why Build the Trans-Caspian Pipeline?

Turkmen gas is the most viable source for diversification on a significant scale that can increase competition. It is readily available through existing wells having already-established production potential, including shut-in wells that are already connected to the 30-bcm East-West Pipeline within Turkmenistan, which terminates at the shore of the Caspian Sea. The overall transportation scheme maximises the use of pipelines already in operation or pipelines already planned for construction. This, together with exceptionally low production costs, ensures competitive gas prices for shippers.

The TCP’s two strings will contribute to a material reduction of the share of Russian supplies in the affected countries. The WS pipeline’s receiving facilities would be located on the territory of an EU Member State, and the project overall would have a significant cross-border impact. It was conceived as, and remains, an essential part complementing the full Southern Gas Corridor system as originally envisioned. It enables the further material diversification of EU gas supply, without obligating EU customers to pay more for this diversification, and eventually also for low-carbon blue hydrogen.

By increasing competition, the TCP’s positive effects will be fully present in the Energy Community Contracting Parties as well. These effects include the further development of a mature competitive market there and its knock-on triggering of significant investments in other industrial sectors in those geographic regions.

The TCP project thus enhances (1) security of supply, (2) sustainability and (3) competition. First, it enhances security of supply, including through the diversification of routes through appropriate connections. Second, it enhances sustainability, including through reducing emissions, supporting intermittent renewable generation and enhancing the deployment of renewable gas. Third, it enhances competition, including through diversification of supply sources. In all these ways it also stimulates market integration.

3.2.3 The Trans-Caspian Pipeline and Decarbonisation

It is assumed that successful decarbonisation requires both blue and green hydrogen. Taking into account the objectives of the EU’s hydrogen transition, Turkmen gas will remain the only available non-Russian source of natural gas (and of blue hydrogen) that has potential to make this transition more efficient and less expensive, while at the same time enhancing the security of supply.

The TCP can be designed as a hydrogen-ready pipeline, but does not even need to be hydrogen-ready in order to be useful for the EU for the near- and long-term energy transition. The possibility of hydrogen-ready design emerges from the fact that the pipelines connecting with the TCP will, before they reach the EU Member States, pass through several areas that are rich with depleted hydrocarbon production fields. These depleted fields are advantageous for the purpose of carbon storage. Romania, which has recently expressed interest in Turkmen gas, can also implement hydrogen production ac-
companied by carbon capture and storage. (Trend, 2020; BT, 2021)

It is increasingly recognised that green hydrogen fails to be deployed fast enough. In the longer term, Central Asian countries will produce affordable hydrogen from renewable technologies (solar and wind), and the TCP can become a part of the network conducting green hydrogen to Europe. Customers in the EU would get blue hydrogen produced from gas from Turkmenistan as well as from other Central Asian producers.

In view of this, a failure to extend the SGC to Central Asia would mainly eliminate the possibility to diversify significantly from Russian energy supplies. In such a case, Europe would lose the only source of gas that (1) is not linked to world prices, (2) has production and delivery costs comparable or lower than Russian gas, (3) can deliver sufficient quantities that would affect the market dominance of Russian gas, and (4) can compete with hydrogen that Russia says it plans to supply to the EU via its pipelines. These four criteria characterise gas from Central Asia, and from nowhere else.

3.2.4 Peace-Building and the Geopolitics of Turkmen Gas

• The Armenian Connection. Energy supply has a special connection with Armenia's problems. The country is a client state of Russia that some in Moscow would like now to turn into a vassal state. Provision of gas via the TCP would help to break that stranglehold. Indeed, the extension of the first string of the TCP could even pass through the Meghri Corridor, between the main body of Azerbaijan and its Nakhchivan exclave. The Moscow ceasefire agreements provide for creating such direct connections for transportation, although the details are still to be worked out. Security there would be assured by the Border Service of Russia's Federal Security Service (FSB).

Even if, for reasons of domestic political stasis and/or Russian pressure, Armenia does not accept that the TCP passes through its territory, still the EU for its own interests as set out above, should facilitate the TCP's construction through the established Baku-Tbilisi-Erzurum corridor. This would entail the further expansion of the South Caucasus Pipeline, which has been planned for some time in connection with the ramping-up of volumes through the SGC.

Armenia would then be able to buy Turkmen gas via the Georgian gas trunk-line system, which is connected to Armenia, and avoid the delicate political matter of buying energy supplies directly from Azerbaijan. This development would not only help to break the Russian stranglehold on the Armenian economy, but also promote the final shutting-down of Armenia's nuclear power plant at Metsamor, which has long been a preoccupation for reasons of environmental security due to its design.

• Gas for Central Europe from the TCP. The formerly unclear legal status of the Caspian Sea delayed progress of the two-string Trans-Caspian Pipeline. Perceived risks have decreased since the mid-2018 signature of the Aktau Treaty. Investor interest in the Trans-Caspian Pipeline system has correspondingly increased since then. Confidence in the project has returned.

Map 3. Meghri Corridor (Source: Wikimedia)
The main project driver for the TCP is the diversification of delivery routes: two entry points to the EU, which will result in the reduction of perceived risk. This is important for so sizeable a supply source as Turkmenistan, to which Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan may potentially be added. For Germany and Austria, the WS pipeline also affords lower transportation costs than the route via Turkey.

The unpredictability of political developments in Europe and Eurasia requires further efforts towards diversification of supplies. This fact increases the TCP’s cross-border impact yet further. Recent events, not excluding Gazprom’s efforts to maintain control of reverse gas-flow in Bulgaria, increase the significance of the WS project to the point where it should exceptionally be considered as a Project of Common Interest.

Like the first string of the TCP, which feeds the TANAP and TAP pipelines, the WS also provides for security of supply, sustainability and competition (in the same manners as described above) for Central and Eastern Europe. This is an especially imperative issue insofar as chances for the successful completion and entry into service of the NordStream Two pipeline continue to decrease day by day.

The WS pipeline would transport gas produced in Turkmenistan and elsewhere in the Caspian Sea region. This gas would be destined for Baumgarten and surrounding markets. It would branch off from the SCP, which runs from Azerbaijan to Georgian-Turkish border. It would include an onshore pipeline from the SCP connection-point to the Georgian Black Sea coast, where a major compressor station will provide the high pressure required to transmit gas to Constanța, Romania, across the Black Sea.

The WS pipeline will be connected to the Bulgaria-Romania-Hungary-Austria (BRUA) pipeline and possibly with other connectors. In this way, it will bring competitively priced gas from new sources to Baumgarten via the lowest-cost transportation routes.

The WS pipeline provides for the internal diversification of routes, but advantages to the EU do not stop there. Further benefits from the WS pipeline include increased competition, since Turkmenistan’s highly price-competitive gas provides a new source and a new route, which likewise improve the security of gas supply. Moreover, the greater competition also enables further market integration, while facilitating the deployment of renewable energy sources at larger scales in the EU as well as in the Energy Community.

4. Policy Recommendations

**Recommendation 1.** The EU should therefore take steps to realize the construction of both strings of the TCP, even if Armenia declines the opportunity for the extension of the first string across its territory, because this is in the EU’s own energy-transition interest, as discussed in detail above.

Central Asian gas has four remarkable advantages for Europe that are found nowhere else. First, it is Europe’s only source for gas that is not linked to world prices. Second, its production and delivery costs are comparable to or lower than those of Russian gas. Third, it can deliver quantities sufficient to affect Russia’s market dominance. Fourth, it can compete with the hydrogen that Russia says it plans to supply to the EU via its pipelines.

The TCP project enhances (1) security of supply, for example by diversifying of routes through appropriate connections; (2) sustainability, for example by reducing emissions, supporting intermittent renewable generation and enhancing the deployment of renewable gas; and (3) competition, for example by diversifying supply sources. In all these ways, it also stimulates market integration.

The EU’s strategic partnership with Georgia was extended to a new level when Georgia agreed in 2017 to co-finance, within the PCI framework, the critical Front-End Engineering Design (FEED) study necessary to advance the implementation of the transportation infrastructure for Turkmen gas, i.e. the TCP and the WS pipeline. In 2018, the Council of the European Union (2018, emphasis supplied) ‘reiterated Georgia’s key role as a partner for European energy security and stressed the country’s transit role’ for Caspian energy, ‘notably via the Southern Gas Corridor, including its extension to Central Asia, and the Black Sea.’ The ‘extension to Central Asia’ meant the TCP, and ‘the Black Sea’ meant the WS
pipeline. At the same time, the EU ‘welcomed the fact’ that the Georgian Oil and Gas Company became a shareholder in the Trans-Caspian Pipeline project company.

The TCP is already a Project of Common Interest, and its Estonian-domiciled project promoter company W-Stream Caspian Pipeline Company Ltd is recipient of an INEA Grant (INEA, 2021). The Pre-FEED and FEED studies need to be completed as soon as possible. Since the EU needs gas diversification as soon as possible, interim solutions such as the shorter, smaller ‘platform option’ pipeline (which Turkmenistan has never accepted and will never accept) need to be discarded in favour of the fully-fledged, shore-to-shore, large-volume pipeline.

**Recommendation 2.** Joint efforts should now be further encouraged on the basis of the new realities in the South Caucasus and Caspian Sea regions, in particular their significant potential to supply blue hydrogen.

Meanwhile, recent political events in Georgia have only strengthened the country’s European direction. Prime Minister Giorgi Gakharia (Interpress, 2021) stated earlier this year that amongst the country’s ‘top foreign policy goals’, as reflected in newly-adopted legislation, ‘Georgia is preparing to apply for full EU membership in 2024.’

The next five years will be crucial for the South Caucasus. Transportation and other communications links are being established between Armenia and Russia through Azerbaijan’s existing infrastructure. There is a chance for increasing prosperity in Armenia.

Crucial is Armenian domestic public opinion, reflected and inflamed by the country’s political class and diaspora. Armenia is 99.9 percent ethnic Armenian since the 1987 ethnic cleansing and forced expulsion of roughly 250,000 Azerbaijanis living mainly in Yerevan and southern Armenia. This took place well before the First Karabakh War, which resulted in the Armenian military seizure of the Nagorno-Karabakh region and surrounding districts, and which is the origin of the region’s present-day ills.

**Recommendation 3.** The EU should find ways to moderate the hyper-nationalism that has characterised Armenian political life for the last three decades.

As Jirair Libaridian, once advisor to former Armenian President Levon Ter-Petrosyan, has noted, for well over 20 years, Armenian domestic political life has been characterised by a certain hyper-nationalism that led to the recent disaster. The recently-created quasi-official cult of personality around Garegin Nzhdeh is both a symbol and a symptom of that political malaise.

Libaridian (2020) has described how the Armenian government behaviour ‘relie[d] on dreams rather than hard facts and started by the conclusion that corresponded to our dreams, and then asked only those questions that confirmed our conclusions.’ In perhaps the most acute indictment, he diagnosed: ‘We adjust political strategy to our wishes, to what will make us feel good about ourselves rather than take into consideration the simple facts that collectively make up the reality around us.’

This worldview, Libaridian wrote, still imprisons Armenian society, which remains unable to re-cognise how or why the defeat occurred, and is, in his words, ‘incapable even of formulating questions that might lead to real answers.’ The EU could make a real contribution to regional security and peace-building by inducing the Armenian political class to see their own neighbourhood as it really is. Can the EU offer Armenia any strategic vision? This is difficult to say, but there is one major contribution that perhaps only the EU can make. It is the following.

**Recommendation 4.** The EU should play a most constructive role by convincing the Armenian political class and Armenian society fully to recognise Azerbaijan’s territorial integrity.

For even the pro-EU parties in Armenia were uncompromising advocates for the independence of the so-called ‘Nagorno-Karabakh Republic’ during the Second Karabakh War. The EU can promote this evolution of the Armenian perspective not only through its own humanitarian activities, but also by encouraging economic cooperation with Azerbaijan, especially over energy. Only this sort of ‘reality therapy’ hold the promise for transforming peace-building in the South Caucasus into lasting security and prosperity (Cutler, 2020).
The conjuncture is propitious for the EU to play such a role. As the Azerbaijani Head of Mission to the EU remarked (Stanciu 2020), Baku hopes for the more active engagement of European partners. The EU itself, he observed, was a post-World War II peace-making process based first upon the recognition of physical borders and then the progressive transcendence of these borders to create a common space. ‘This is best model for the South Caucasus, where we can do same; and this model should be used by all South Caucasus countries.’

**Recommendation 5.** Just as the EU started with coal and steel through the European Coal and Steel Community, so also the South Caucasus has in fact started with natural gas through the Southern Gas Corridor. The EU should continue to build upon this success with the crowning jewel of the Trans-Caspian Pipeline, including the White Stream connection under the Black Sea, with a view towards hydrogen. This project unites the EU’s energy-security interest with the political and economic interests of the South Caucasus region.
The Implications of Designation of Houthis as a Foreign Terrorist Organisation?

Joseph Votel, Baraa Shiban, R. David Harden, Onur Sultan

1. Background

On November 16, 2020, a report in the Foreign Policy disclosed the Trump administration was planning to designate Ansarallah, the Iran-backed Houthi militia as foreign terrorist organization as part of its scorched-earth policy against Iran. Reportedly, efforts of UN officials like Griffiths and Guterres, and some other partners like Germany and Sweden did not succeed in dissuading the Trump Administration.

On January 10, 2021, The US Secretary of State, Mike Pompeo, announced the Department of State would notify Congress of his intent to designate Ansarallah or the Houthis as a Foreign Terrorist Organization (FTO) and a Specially Designated Global Terrorist (SDGT) entity alongside three of its leaders Abdul Malik al-Houthi, Abd al-Khaliq Badr al-Din al-Houthi, and Abdullah Yahya al Hakim.

To answer the concerns that had been made by international bodies, think-tanks and allies, the statement in the US Department of State guaranteed the US Department of Treasury would be ready to provide licenses pursuant to its authorities operating in Yemen and to those of international organizations such as UN, non-governmental organizations as of January 19, the date such designation would be effective from.

This policy brief aims to explore implications of the decision by the Trump Administration in its last 10 days in power and make policy recommendations based on the findings of the authors.

2. The Precarious Situation in Yemen

Yemen remains the worst humanitarian disaster in the world. The war that has doomed the past of the country has become a lasting phenomenon threatening its future also. According to ACLED data, between 1 January 2015 and 12 December 2020, the war has claimed the lives of at least 133,130 Yemenis.

The UN's Integrated Food Insecurity (IPC) Phase Classification Initiative that provides analysis of food insecurity and acute malnutrition situations across the globe illustrated in its latest report that 13,479,500 (45%) of 30,041,712 Yemenis live in IPC Phase 3+ or crisis, emergency and famine conditions. The report further forecasted, with the same rate of deterioration of conditions within the country, the number of Yemenis living in Phase 3+ conditions would go up to 16,147,00 (54%) within the next 6 months. Accordingly, the number of people suffering from famine conditions (Phase 5) could reach up to 47,000. This practically means return of famine that had been averted 2 years ago when action had been taken on five priority issues: protecting civilians, access for humanitarian workers, funding, the economy and progress toward peace.

As can be seen in Figure1 below, the majority of those in IPC 3+ levels live in the areas controlled by Houthis.

---
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Since the beginning of 2020, the UN Agencies and international institutions have been sounding the alarm bells for Yemen based on two main reasons. The first is Houthi interference into international humanitarian operations in the form of diversion, obstruction and stealing of international aid, and threatening of international aid workers.

The second reason is the budgetary constraints those organizations have. In May 2020, U. N. Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator (OCHA) Mark Lowcock said the UN aid organizations had received $3.2 billion in 2019 and in 2020 they needed $2.4 billion for their operations. The pledging conference for Yemen on June 2, 2020 fell one billion short of the target. Despite prior warnings from UN officials that 30 of 41 major aid programmes in the war-torn country would close in the next few weeks without additional funding and that the WFP had halved rations in northern areas since April for the same reason, the plight in Yemen did not generate the required funds.

There are also problems regarding honoring of pledges. Lowcock, attributes reasons for averting famine two years ago to swift honoring of pledges. Accordingly, in 2018, the donors swiftly met 90% of the U.N.'s funding requirements which enabled increase of monthly aid from 8 million to 12 million people. Fast forward to September 2020, the U.N. appeal received only 30% of the pledges totaling to some $1 billion.

In the current conditions, an incoming famine is estimated soon to hit Yemen. On 11 November, UN World Food Programme (WFP) Executive Director David Beasley warned about this saying the WFP had cut aid to 9 million Yemenis from each month to every other month since April 2020, and that it
would cut rations additionally for 6 million in January [2021]. If no additional resources were found the WFP would completely run out in March. Such is the capacity and conditions UN bodies have to deal with to reach Yemenis in need with aid.11

Another factor that works against Yemeni lives is the inflation or the volatility of the Yemeni Riyal. In the country where 80 to 90% of the staple food, medicines and fuel are imported, any depreciation directly translates into inflation and lower purchasing power.12 To depict the magnanimity of the depreciations; the YER/USD ratio was around 215 YER/USD before war. It increased to range of 250-290 between 2015-2017. Due to mainly depletion of foreign reserves, Central Bank of Yemen decided to float the YER in August 2017 that caused 40% value loss. Its value decreased to 590 YER/USD in March and 600 YER/USD in August 2019.13 At the end of 2020, the Yemeni Riyal saw another collapse and the exchange rate reached the level of 880 YER/USD.14, 15

So, within 6+ years in war, YER lost its value by more than 300%, severely decreasing purchasing power of the Yemeni households.

3. The Houthis

The Houthis – a network of small militias with a strict hierarchy – today rule Yemen’s capital Sanaa and several of the country’s northern provinces.

To govern the territory they control, the Houthis run a network parallel to the official state structure that encompasses all sectors of government. The system has many parallels with a gang cartel running a city.

At the top is the “kingpin” Abdulmalik Al-Houthi, surrounded by his trustees. Based on reports from his trustees, the kingpin sets the agenda on a day-to-day basis and is the ultimate authority. Under this close circle are the general supervisors, who do not interact with the public and are usually anonymous. Like the “lieutenants” of a gang cartel, they often have aliases.

On the ground, a network of supervisors who interact with the public and control turf report to these general supervisors. Each supervisor has his own turf that he protects from others, and armed groups run by different supervisors might even clash with each other. These supervisors are a collection of religious fanatics, former criminals, and opportunists. In exchange for authority over their turf, the Houthi leadership expects them to fulfil three main tasks. First, to pass a percentage of any revenue collected up the chain. Second, to recruit for the organization. Third, to run an active indoctrination campaign.

On a daily basis, these Houthi supervisors harass women over their clothing, shut down restaurants and cafes that do not segregate between genders, and enforce a ban on music in weddings and ceremonies – even universities are not allowed to have graduation parties.

They survive through extorting money out of stores and businesses and running oil black markets. Their money-making schemes have attracted criminals and opportunists, who joined the group to profit from the system. People who do not adhere to their moral code can be arbitrarily detained, forcefully disappeared, or tortured to death, without any interference from the judiciary.

Also on the ground is the Houthis’ network of “watchers” – informants who serve as the eyes and ears of the organization. These informants provide information to Houthi officials at various levels, including in some cases directly to al-Houthi’s inner circle.

They also play a censorship role, reporting on individuals and entities who criticize the organization or its leader, including posts on social media, articles and any kind of activity. As a result, journalists are imprisoned, newspapers confiscated, and TV stations closed. People living under the Houthis therefore live in an environment of fear.

The Houthi network is extremely violent and oppressive. In 2015, Reporters Without Borders ranked the group as second only to ISIS in violations against journalists. Human Rights Watch has documented the Houthis policy of hostage-taking, their killing of immigrants, and their constant use of landmines.
and blocking of aid including during the COVID-19 pandemic. When the conflict erupted in Yemen, the Houthis used dissidents as human shields, holding them in weapon depots being bombed by Arab Coalition forces.

The Houthis have not just established violent, cartel-like control over parts of Yemen, but also promote their sectarian and intolerant ideology. Anyone who criticizes the system is quickly denounced as a traitor, mercenary, or American or Israeli spy. This is in line with the Houthis’ ideology, which doesn’t see them as fighting a tribal war in Yemen but instead waging a struggle against the imperialist states of Israel and the US. Under this worldview, the Houthis’ domestic opponents are portrayed as stooges. Likewise, the Houthis portray Saudi Arabia as an agent of the US and Israel.

The Houthis have disseminated this ideology in the territory they control, including through schools, making significant changes to the education curriculum. They run summer camps to teach their doctrine and run courses that are mandatory to all public employees and school children. In schools, universities, and other institutions, people must pledge allegiance to Abdulmalik Al-Houthi instead of pledging allegiance to the constitution and the Republic of Yemen. Last month a video went viral on social media depicting members of the police academy pledging allegiance to Abdulmalik Al-Houthi and chanting the infamous Houthi chant “Allah is great, death to America, death to Israel, damn the Jews, victory for Islam,” all while performing a Nazi salute.

The Houthis promote a sectarian and hostile ideology. The organization started persecuting Jews, Bahá’ís and other minorities the moment they came to power. They soon drove millions of Yemenis out of their homes. The Houthis also started a policy of demolishing their opponents’ properties. Their TV channel Al-Masirah epitomizes this hostile propaganda and is not dissimilar from al-Qaeda’s public messaging.

The supervisors recruit children from their schools to serve on the frontlines and prey on the vulnerability and poverty of their families. They use money extorted from the public to keep their recruitment efforts alive. And because there is only a limited amount of money they can extort and tax, this year they started confiscating private businesses and banks.

Humanitarian agencies have also suffered from extortion and the diversion of aid. International non-governmental organizations working in Yemen today cannot run a workshop or carry out a trip to the field without obtaining security clearance from the top Houthi intelligence services. The World Food Programme in December 2019 and April 2020 publicly highlighted the theft and diversion of aid after they exhausted all channels of communication with the Houthi leadership. In early 2020, the Associated Press issued a damning report detailing the corruption, theft and blackmail exercised against UN agencies. The UN has no option but to comply with the Houthis, or risk their programs being shut down.

4. Motivations Behind the Move and Repercussions

Earlier this month, Morocco normalized ties with Israel. In exchange, the United States agreed to recognize Moroccan sovereignty over Western Sahara. This announcement continues the trend of an
Arab-Israeli rapprochement outside of a final status settlement with the Palestinians.

This agreement, along with the earlier “Abraham Accords” normalizing Israel’s relations with the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain and Sudan, are positives in a region too often known for war. Fortunately, more peace deals are likely as the Middle East emerges from the post-World War II era.

In its effort to promote regional peace and build an Israeli-Sunni alliance against Iran, the U.S. is rushing to offer Saudi Arabia a gift in exchange for a normalization deal with Israel. With this designation, the administration seeks to sanction the Houthis, weaken Iran, strengthen Saudi Arabia, and bolster the exiled Yemeni government.

5. Repercussions

The Houthis control Yemen’s capital, Sana’a, along with the main ports and crucial infrastructure necessary for the survival for most of Yemen’s civilian population. This FTO designation would prohibit material support—including all trade of food, medicine, sanitation supplies, humanitarian aid, and other basic commodities—in the Houthis-controlled areas, during a global pandemic Yemen is already experiencing pockets of famine; the Yemeni currency, the riyal, would continue to devalue, and household purchasing power would crater.

There are other unanticipated risks. For example, the United Nation would have challenges in mitigating a potential massive oil spill off the Red Sea from the dilapidated FSO Safer oil tanker—a spill potentially four times greater than was the Exxon Valdez—if it cannot negotiate with the Houthis. This spill would close the main port of Hudaydah thus further disrupting food supplies. Yemen is already the world’s worst humanitarian crisis, and an FTO designation could very well lead to widespread famine as mentioned before.

The Trump administration has pushed Saudi Arabia to normalize diplomatic relations with Israel before Trump departs the White House and is offering the FTO designation, which—for Saudi Arabia—could blunt Houthi domination of northern Yemen. But Saudi Arabia and Israel would be better served by negotiating peace for peace under the incoming Biden administration, rather than plunging Yemen into an uncontrolled humanitarian collapse. This Faustian bargain fails on many levels.

First, Saudi Arabia will need to reboot its relationship with the Biden administration. In the run-up to November’s election, President-elect Biden has been clear that the tragedy of Yemen must end. There also is a congressional consensus that Saudi Arabia bears substantial culpability for Yemen’s continued war, and a bipartisan recognition that an FTO designation would further destabilize the country.

Instead of helping to resolve the civil war in Yemen, the Saudi kingdom would deepen the crisis with this FTO designation. It would have millions of starving Yemenis on its long, porous border—and an empowered Houthi insurgency that likely would increase its use of Iranian weaponry to quicken the pace and sophistication of attacks against Saudi infrastructure, cities and ports. Just as Hezbollah and Hamas became stronger after their 1997 FTO designation, the Houthis would seek a similar growth in military power and regional influence.

With regard to Israel, its growing realignment with the Sunni states is irreversible. Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, however, will need to course-correct with the incoming Biden administration—and the U.S. president-elect surely has not forgotten Netanyahu trying to embarrass him on his 2010 trip to Israel by announcing further settlement construction in the West Bank. The Israeli prime minister also sought to humiliate then-President Obama and Vice President Biden by delivering a 2015 speech in opposition to the Iranian deal to a joint session of Congress as a foreign dignitary without a White House invitation. Netanyahu should start by recognizing that the risky incentives the Trump administration is offering to Saudi Arabia are antithetical to long-term U.S. and Israeli strategic interests.
Third, Iran will use a Houthi FTO designation to its advantage, which is particularly counterproductive given that the Biden administration will soon renegotiate to curb Iran’s march to the nuclear bomb. Iran’s goal is to shape the region through a “Shia Crescent” of power from Beirut through Damascus, Baghdad and to Sana'a, buttressed by home-grown nuclear capabilities. A deeper Houthi alliance in Yemen allows Iran to project destabilizing threats to Saudi Arabia along its southern flank. With Iran negotiating from greater regional strength, the United States will find it harder to curtail the clerics more-pressing nuclear ambitions.

6. Conclusion and Policy Recommendations

Attempting quick and straightforward solutions to problems with deep underlying tensions too often leads to strategic disappointment, and Yemen has repeatedly proven this to be true. Now is the time for a political reset — and the United States, not a direct combatant in the civil war, but certainly an important and influential leader in the region, must play an important role.

This role must include encouraging all sides toward a more inclusive political process that reduces violence and raises Yemeni and international voices, and moves toward specific and achievable objectives over time. Solutions that purport to be either speedy or simple are, in fact, quite dangerous. To that point, the current administration’s consideration of designating Ansar Allah (the Houthi movement) as a foreign terrorist organization (FTO) will not help advance the United States or the other various participants in this conflict toward a durable strategic settlement.

The Houthi movement has provoked and prolonged the conflict in Yemen and now presides over a starving population and a country whose infrastructure is quickly disappearing. They deserve no one’s sympathy. But designating them as a terrorist organization at this time would not serve global interests or hasten the end of the conflict. Instead, it would complicate the political process and resolution of the humanitarian disaster. It would also undermine the credible and effective counter-terrorism programs that the US relies upon to keep terrorists at bay.

With most of the Yemeni population living in areas under the Houthi movement’s control, designation as an FTO will disrupt the delivery of critical humanitarian assistance for millions of people. FTO designation will slow or stop international agencies that pay aid workers to provide Yemenis essential services. And the designation will further complicate the efforts of the U.N. special envoy to advance negotiations and move forward with what everyone knows will be a lengthy process to normalize and rebuild Yemen.

FTO designation is a useful tool in counter-terrorism kit-bag. It is most effective when focused on specific individuals or groups and then linked to other counter campaigns. It focuses resources, brings to bear many other non-military means that limit freedom of action, and cuts off external support for those designated. It has, however, second- and third-order effects that can work against longer-term objectives and interests, including those particulars discussed above. The big idea is to advance interests, not make the situation worse. We should be mindful of these effects as we consider our options in Yemen.

Yemen’s current situation begs for a broadly supported and dynamic political process, and our actions going forward must be aimed principally at this purpose. FTO designation will not help and will likely make a bad situation even worse.
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How does migration affect national security?
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Abstract

Migration, especially in the last decade, has become a pivotal and challenging issue affecting national security in Europe. It is a complex issue due to its internal and external implications. This study presents a comprehensive literature review analyzing and identifying drivers, actors involved, effects and implications of migration on domestic integration, and its further threats to societies. The study shows migration is widely politicized in which migrants and asylum seekers are considered a challenge to the national security and well-being of the country. The findings also underline a correlation between migration and security, the latter being defined based on perception of the former as benefit, burden or a mixture of both.
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Introduction

In an area of growing security concerns, migration and security are two terms often used synonymous and interrelated to each other. More precisely, migration emerged as an inseparable part of a wider security concept re-defined after the Cold War when the political changes associated with globalization began. The since-then fluid migration concept does not cease to reflect changes in nature and way of thinking. It has become pivotal in debates on global politics. It is also part of the security studies offering an alternative reading after the fall of the Iron Curtain and the dissolution of the Soviet Union. Nowadays, governments, the media, and analysts increasingly portray migration as a security threat. In many cases, migrants are described as “invaders,” a “threat” to western civilisation, cultural and religious identity. However, Swing (2016) strongly noted that “We cannot and should not stop people from migration. We have to give them a better life at home. Migration is a process, not a problem.” In recent years, millions of people have moved from one country to another. Generally, migration may impact social and internal security and may pose a threat. However, “the state is the referent object needing protection from threatening forces, particularly that of war (Krause and Williams, 1996, p.230; Peoples and Vaughan-Williams, 2010, p.23).”

At the end of the Cold War, nations have sought to address the new security concerns differently due to the changing nature of the global environment and numerous calls to adapt and shift the focus from the traditional national defence dimension towards a new security concept. Until the early 1990s, the international agenda was characterised by political and security confrontations between the West and the East. The bipolar world order was focused more on conventional warfare rather than international migration. After the fall of the Berlin wall, “security studies in the post-Cold War era have moved away from the state-centric approach, broadening the definition of security to include a number of potential threats (Krause and Williams, 1996, p.230; Lohrmann, 2000, p.5).” The threshold of violence and threat reasonably has to be clear. At present, scholars address mostly non-conventional threats identifying potential problems and suggesting a direction for the future. A new security environment is more complex and ambiguous.

Barry Buzan, “the founder of the Copenhagen School of security studies, argues that security studies should not only focus on the military sector, but should be further developed to encompass societal, environmental, economic, and political security (Peoples and Vaughan-Williams, 2010, pp.22-23).” Nowadays, international migration is one of the security matters when the government consciously increases awareness and explains the ambiguity of understanding security. Among scholars of
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strategic studies, Buzan stands out and notes that “the concept of security now encompasses not just the protection of a state or society against foreign military attack but also the protection of an independent identity of that state or society from forces of change that challenge (Buzan, 1991, pp.447-50).” Thus the connection between forms of international migration and security must be seen within the context of the effects of globalisation and states’ attempts as sovereign actors to manage these “new” issues and trends cooperatively.

Looking the current developments, western societies are undergoing a “social and political revolution” (Buzan, 1991, pp.447-50) caused by migration creating social security effects. These effects have a substantial impact and increase the pressure on the integration of migrants at the individual and national levels. The security nexus includes several factors, such as push and pull different actors and facilitating entities and constraints. Lee (1966, pp.47-57) emphasized empathetically that “the push factors of migration lie in the social, economic, and political conditions in sending countries.” For instance, in Italy, “the migration dilemma has become a very debatable issue among ordinary Italians, political decision-makers, and a topic of debate and a source of the agenda of different scholars (Lindly, 2014, pp.1-23).” Apart from that, developed societies are in a strong demand for low-skilled works in sectors searching for not much-trained labour force. Thus, the phenomenon of migration elevates the internal conflict and differences between migrants and natives. “As Buzan points out, migration threatens communal identity and culture by directly altering the ethnic, cultural, religious, and linguistic composition of the population (Buzan, 1991, pp. 447-50).” For instance, the leader of Lega Nord (the North League) in Italy, Mr. Salvini, emphatically noted, “the uncontrolled immigration brings in chaos, uncertainty, anger … crime and violence (Horowitz, 2018).”

This article provides a framework for thinking about the relationships between migration and national security. It will develop and explore primary and secondary sources and research studies, providing a broader theorization of the link between international migration and national security. First, the paper will identify the main drivers and current trends of why people decide to move. Later, the impacts of migration and the attitude of media and public opinion will be analysed. The penultimate section will assess and present different views of society towards migration, which may be a value or not. The final section is a conclusion that presents and underlines observations addressed through three questions emphasising the migration-security link.

**Why do people move?**

Migration is not new, and it is as old as humanity. In antiquity, humankind started to move from one continent to another. Our ancestors were faced with numerous natural, geographical, extreme climate changes and conflicts among people. They were looking for better living conditions and food security. There are many identified cases in the history of humanity when people were moving to other places. For instance, “the map of Europe is the product of several major early migrations involving the Germanic people, the Slavs, and the Turks (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2020).” These are not the only movements visible in creating populated areas, including different ethnicities. “And in the courses of 400 years – from the latest 16th through the 20th century – the Americans, Australians, Oceania, the northern half of Asia, and part of Africa was colonised by European migrants (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2020).” Migration continues in the 21st century when climate change, economic conditions, and deadly conflicts are driving the massive exodus of migrants and refugees. Civil wars in Libya and Syria alone are responsible for more than half of migrants in the world. “Since 2012, the Syrian civil war has produced 12 million displaced people, one-fifth of the world displaced, and over half of the country’s population (Guehenno, 2016).”

National security and migration are two widely used terms in politics. Both of them have a broad range of definitions, and they are often used to fit the specific narrative. The term national security does not have an agreed or universal term. Some definitions describe a global understanding of national security. At the same time, others identify it as the protection of the nation’s sovereignty. While migration is a challenge but remains an issue to identify who is a migrant. A number of unlimited definitions
have been provided. Various scholars and institutions have concluded that the concept of international migration differs distinctly because of their academic background and patterns of how they approach the problem. For instance, "the UN defines migrants as any person who is moving or has moved across the international borders or within the state away from his/her habitual place of residence, regardless of (1) the person's legal status; (2) whether the movement is voluntary or involuntary; (3) what the causes for the movement are; or (4) what the length of the stay is (UN Migration Agency, 2020).” As we see, the term migrant refers to a foreign person moving into or within the country. While migration is a process of moving across national borders regardless of length or status.

The scope and flow of migration
The data and analysis show a substantial increase of people moving vertically from south to north and horizontally from East to West. There are clear evidence and a substantial increase in people moving from their country of origin to Europe. For example, the IOM (2020, p.3) noted "the number of international migration is estimated to be almost 272 million people globally (3.5% of the world's population) in 2019," while "the UN Department of Economics and Social Affairs (2019a) estimates that the figure is as high as 271.6 million in 2019." From the identified data, "47 million moved horizontal from a southern country to another southern country. In contrast, only 61 million were people migrating moved vertically from the south to the north (UN/DESA, 2019a)." The rest were remaining individuals migrating from the north to the south or from the north to the north. Nevertheless, "the number of migrants crossing the border illegally in the EU fell 13% in 2020, to around 124,000 (EU, 2021)." This was mainly due to the impact of COVID-19 restrictions. Data sets from the UN IOM and EU Frontex may differ because they follow different methods.

The Mediterranean Sea has become an important geographical area connecting the Orient and Occident, the North and the South. Fernand Braudel defines "the Mediterranean as an “espace movement” (space of movement), and several other authors have considered the Mediterranean nature of migration through the metaphors such as caravanserai (Ribas-Mateos, 2000, pp. 22-40).” However, the experience has shown that migration routes may change, as the motivation of the migrants may differ. The involvement of migration in the Mediterranean manifests a security dimension with historical effects and substantial impacts on regional and European security.

The research and studies on migration show that the trajectories of migrants are too hard to understand. In some cases, migrants enter the country or are only transit. In these two instances, they are referred to as transit migrants or asylum seekers. Monitoring and predicting migrations are very challenging processes. Basically, you need to understand the nature of conflicts, the actors involved, and accurate data availability. The availability of data enables, to a considerable extent, the control of movements. Migration statistics represent a static measure, while flows represent a dynamic measure of the migration process. For this reason, it is difficult to understand and control inflow and outflow. European governments, in 2015, found it difficult to control the movements of migrants.

Nowadays, migratory movements are caused mainly by conflicts or fragile states. These events create conditions simulating local populations to consider movement. Factors and conditions that affect the movement may be personal, political, or economic issues. Migrants will explore and use all available means and possibilities. Predominantly, “decisions are initially individually influenced by security factors, state policies, and internal ruling procedures, which affect decisions and movements to another country where opportunities and conditions may be better (Kuschminder et al., 2015 and Trindafyllidou, 2009).” "Two major factors are often cited as shaping people's decision to migrate: personal and political security, and the quest for a secure livelihood (UNODC, 2015, p. vi).” These factors will not be as influential without the role and indication of media and social networks. In both cases, media and social networks play a pivotal part in encouraging people to move.
Drivers of Migration

During the Arab spring and especially during the Syrian civil war, the western media have been saturated with images and comments related to the migration crises in Europe. The history and demographical developments uttered a number of drivers influencing and encouraging people to move. Several countries and institutions are carefully assessing and addressing the question of what are the drivers of irregular migration? Research studies displayed that drivers are mostly caused by the "economic, demographic, and environmental factors and social and political dynamics (A. Geddes et al., 2012, pp. 951-67)." For example, the UN/IOM (2019) concluded that "the drivers of migration are a complex phenomenon that depends on the interaction of multiple factors influencing migrants’ decision to migrate, from the country of origin to the destination country." Drivers may operate at different scales and levels of social culture, while technology facilitates it through information sharing. Always, drivers of migration are shaped and influenced by internal factors and the willingness to migrate. Nevertheless, these factors "determine the final decision of an individual to migrate (Castelli, 2018, p. 3)."

The economic drivers of migration

Economic insecurity should not be considered isolated from political instability. It can directly influence people to fulfill their life aspirations locally or migrate to other places. "The lack of economic opportunities in the country of origin and the hope of great opportunities in European countries are an important driver of irregular migration (Czaika and Hobolth, 2014, p. 17; Wissink et al., 2013, p. 1094; UNHCR, 2010, P. 15)." The finding argues that migrants will continue their journey to seek economic opportunities and greater quality of life. It is no a surprise that the lack of economic opportunities will force individuals to leave their country and go to Europe for greater opportunities. This issue is supported by ILO findings in 2015, showing that “the labour force or migrants looking for a job comprises over 70% of international migrants (ILO, 2015, p. 6).” For instance, migrants from the north and sub-Saharan Africa are looking for better economic opportunities in Europe ... especially in large economies like Spain, Italy, Germany, and the UK. Their countries of origin and nations could not offer proper job opportunities or industry to employ them. These are important factors motivating attempts to migrate to Europe. Poor economic conditions and not very well paid lead young and educated individuals to think for other possibilities. “Lack of job opportunities, wage differentials, and aspirations propel young people away from home in search of employment and income opportunities. The informal economy accounts for 33-90% of total employment (ILOSTAT, 2020, p. 3)."

However, economic opportunities and demographic issues in the developed world are simulating conditions attracting people to move. These movements drive people towards the West. A study of the IOM Migration Global Report 2020 (UN DESA, 2019a; ILO, 2018, p. 20) suggested that "the number of international migrants, in 2019, is estimated to be almost 272 million globally, with nearly two-thirds being labour migrants." Migrants are mostly coming from North and sub-Saharan Africa and the Middle East. For example, “in the next 15 years, the working-age population in Sub-Saharan Africa is projected to increase by 55%, while Europe is expected to experience a fall in the working-age population of 9% (DESA WPP, 2015).”

However, "the estimated number and proportion of international migrants already surpasses some projections made for the year 2050, which were in the order of 2.6 % or 230 million (IOM, 2003)." It is an alarm call for the developed world to deal with migration movements from Africa and the Middle East. Skilled employees and other unskilled and untrained workers would like to move and explore the opportunity through legal and illegal means. Even they know the illegal means may be a risk of death and uncertainties explored by the migrant smugglers and unscrupulous labour recruits. For instance, “half” of potential illegal migrants from Senegal think there is a risk of death higher or equal to 25%, and the vast majority of illegal migrants, up to 75%, are willing to risk their lives to reach Europe (Mbaye, 2014, pp. 1-19)."
Apart from migration and drivers' characteristics, migration is considered an important source of labour force and population growth. The EU population is changing due to births and deaths and the difference between incoming migrants and outgoing emigrants leaving the EU27. For instance, Eurostat (EU, 2017, p. 4) found out "that from 2012 to 2016, net migration plus statistical adjustment contributed more than 80% to total population growth in the EU-28, compared with less than 20% from natural population change." However, migrants make a good contribution to high and low-skilled occupations.

**Political insecurity and conflict at home**

The Western world is focused on migration and refugee crises, especially in Europe and North America. Migration very often produces legal and illegal migrants. The illegal migrants are primarily identified as refugees or asylum seekers. The last two are seen as the most problematic by the host countries. Defining a migrant has very often caused public debates in Western societies. "For example, migrants are often conflated with ethnic or religious minorities and with asylum seekers (Saggar and Drean 2001, Crawley 2009, Beutin et al. 2006, Baker et al. 2008)." The world is facing a global crisis of displacement, which endangers the international order. "This is a crisis largely born out of war, and one that will be with us for decades to come (Guéhenno, 2016)." We need to understand reality and identify ways to respond effectively.

Deadly conflicts have caused the mass migration and exodus of refugees. The wars in Afghanistan, Syria, Libyan, and Somalia alone are responsible for more than half of the world's refugees. Political upheaval and conflicts in the Middle East and Africa are sources of the growing number of refugees and migrants. "The lack of respect for international human rights and humanitarian law has compounded the growing displacement of many as a consequence of their deteriorating living conditions (UNHCR, 2016)." The stream of refugees and migrants trying to enter Europe is increasing dramatically.

No one should know and predict what will happen in the future and what impacts migration will cause. Conflicts will undoubtedly continue and worsen the conditions of local population, especially in the Middle East and sub-Saharan Africa. Conflicts in Syria, Libya, Chad, South Sudan, Eritrea, Somalia, and other fragile states in Africa will become a major source and generate more international terrorism and uncertainties of national security. "The negative socio-economic impacts of war, and its legacies, or permanent unrest, may drive migration through negative impacts on labour markets, livelihoods, food and health security, social service delivery and through political instability and social tensions (including the psychological pressure on people living near conflict situations) and the growth of criminal networks (WFP, 2017)."

The conflicts happening today are driving migrants and refugees as symptomatic of the breakdown of the international order. The lack of a democratic system, the escalation of violence, and the intensification of rivalries between global powers have fueled conflicts and made wars even worse to solve. This phenomenon has weakened the international order and created divisions between Western countries in managing the migration crises. These reasons have shaken values and political solidarity among Western societies. Usually, countries debate and argue about crises and common issues. The acceptance of migrants and refugees affect communities and societies. Perhaps, the environment can affect lower or even increase the perception of reality in migrants coming from the Middle East and sub-Saharan Africa. The level of threat perception becomes even worse when radicalized and criminal elements are attached.

However, "radicalisation is a process, both ideological and material, of which social differentiation and exclusion, grounded in assumptions of shared ancestry, assign certain groups to a specific position in the production relations and social hierarchy (Creese and Peterson, 1996, pp. 117-45)." Consistently, radicalisation has diverse dimensions and indications in host societies with an impact on societal security. By preventing radicalisation, societies need to invest in a successful integration process and strengthen inclusion. No existing tool or system identifies the radicalisation apart from other forms of stress or influences on societies.
Public attitude towards migration

In recent years, "migration has become one of the most controversial and important topics in public policy (Javdani, 2020, p. 2)." Regularly, the narrative has been part of the host countries and political agenda. "It shows that, e.g., Italy and Greece have become countries of migration instead of nations of emigration (Gattinara, 2017, pp. 318-31)," and the concept has manipulated the public perception and attitude. Very often, "the social sciences presumed that attitudes are very stable social constructions that change only very slightly and very slowly (Messing-Sagvari, 2018, p. 3)." It does not change very often, but the economic depressions, terrorist attacks, and refugee crises are key factors and indicators to change and shift attitudes. For instance, "according to data from Eurobarometer – a longitude multi-topic pan-European survey of public opinions – the percentage of respondents who considered migration as one of the two most important issues facing their countries increased from 14% in 2005 to 22% in 2017, changing its importance ranking among more than a dozen issues from sixth to second (Messing-Sagvari, 2018, p. 3)."

Looking at the characteristics and perception of migration, Watson (2012, p. 284) suggested that "... an issue is securitized only if and when the audience accepts it as such, and securitization is not decided by the securitizer, but by the audience, and in most cases, these audiences are plural and diverse." Internal audiences and public attitudes towards migrants, e.g., Italy, Greece, and Spain, are strongly linked to their economic interests and sociological facts. In this case, states need to engage effectively with audiences and the public, which includes a better understanding of the concerns, emotions, and values of the real world. Scholars have often pointed out that the country's perspective, political domain, and historical context are determinantal factors that influence citizens' attitudes. For instance, the European Commission Survey "finds large cross-national differences on attitude towards migrants in Mediterranean countries (Greece 87% of respondents express resistance to migration), in Central European societies (87% of Hungarians shows resistance to migration). In contrast, Nordic countries disassociate themselves (only 15% of Swedish express resistance to migrants) (Beutin et al., 2006, p. 14)."

Migration continues to be a critical internal topic and public debate across the political spectrum, considering it "an important security shock threatening the collective identity of the host society (Baurbeau, 2015, p. 1964)." For the EU, "they are already securitized through labeling them a threat as "illegal" and "bogus" (Hintjens, 2019, p. 181)." "The rhetoric and discursive powers influence the social and economic integration of migrants, and media agents actively formulated security discourses premised on the notion that immigration threatens social-collective identity (Hintjens, 2019, p. 181)."

For instance, in the north, public attitude is considered largely ambivalent in nature and emotionally charged in reality. It shows the existing reflection between threat perception and human rights. There is no clear definition or understanding of who is a threat to our civil security and who needs support and assistance. In general, societies and especially right-wing movements consider and perceive migration as basically a crisis-driven issue. However, important politicians and societal actors need to have a comprehensive understanding of security. To better understand it, the "Copenhagen School has defined security as an act of speech. An issue becomes a matter of security when it is presented as such, not necessarily because, in reality, it exists as such (Ole et al., 1993)."

The migration-security nexus, in practice, influences more on the economic and social domains. Both concepts are significantly affecting the social consciousness and stereotypical thinking of the involved actors. These effects can manipulate the attitude of locals towards migrants. Economic and security factors are strong stereotypes and correlate with possible antagonist societal attitudes against migration. In Italy, for instance, the issue of migration becomes the primary stereotypical thinking across the country, and people favored tight migration policies that restrict migrants, especially those of different ethnicities and religions. If we refer to 9/11, "it has transformed Muslims from an ethnic/religious minority in society to a transnational risk category; potential sources of religiously inspired extremist violence (Humphrey, 2005, p. 12)."

It is worth mentioning that the toxic narrative of migration has raised the limits of cultural tolerance.
and religious issues. Nowadays, migrants are experiencing multipolar changes in cultural norms and religion. On the contrary, host countries oppose migration and multiculturalism, and both are considered a threat. For instance, "when looking at 'religion,' Maliepaard and Phalet (2012, pp. 131-148) have examined religiosity in terms of social identity and social practice." Both religion and social identity are very debatable and critical issues in the migration domain, future studies, and analysis of the security nexus. The media uses cultural and religious narratives to influence public opinions, mainly in Italy, Greece, France, and Germany. Articles and news coverage have increased dramatically during the last decade. For example, "migration crises, in 2005, in Italy, have been displayed in the media up to 380-times. The number of articles and time allocation increased ten times more in 2017, and statistics show that migration is covered and showed in media 4238 times (Caritas and Migrants, 2018, p. 8)."

During the last decade, the narrative has been evident in media, and more time and space have been devoted to illegal migration, crime and social security problems. It has been a driving factor in influencing and manipulating public opinion, becoming a "weapon" in the hands of extremists. During the Syrian civil war and insecurity in several fragile states like Iraq, Afghanistan, and Libya, the migration crises were considered a humanitarian issue. By the end of 2015, however, the narrative had changed, and migration crises become purely political and security issues. In a broader perspective, the public perceptions were shaped and influenced mainly through, e.g., illegal border crossings, labour force, refugees, asylum seekers, and terrorism within the EU. The duality of perception and threat are considered as determining factors influencing individual behavior and security.

In the context of migration, in Europe, there was a lack of organization and resources, misunderstanding with transit countries, and lack of solidarity among the EU countries. The issue culminated in 2018 and became a crisis of values, increasing xenophobia and radicalism among political spectrums and key actors, particularly in Italy, Spain, and Germany. At this time, the media played a crucial role in influencing anti-migration sentiments and hostile reactions to migrants. Populist groups exploited the circumstances, labeling migrants as "invaders" or "others." "The term 'refugees' and the world 'migrant' might sound correct in English, but in Hungarian, a 'migrant' is an enemy who will kill us (Khan, 2019)." However, the role of media and perceptions of migration vary from country to country. Even the norms of dealing with migration issues can be fundamentally different. In most cases in Europe, the perception is related mainly to labour issues, national security problems, illegal trafficking, and terrorism. At the same time, media and politics have seen migrants "as a threat, as opponents of the home regimes, as a political risk to the host country, as a threat to cultural identity, as a social or economic burden and as hostages, risks for the sending country (Weiner, 1993, pp. 10-18)."

It is clear that all of this can lead to unstable public attitudes and antagonistic right-wing responses to migrants and refugees. For instance, "Italians consider all newcomers merely as migrants, not making a single distinction between legal, illegal, or asylum seekers (Doxon et al., 2018, p. 14)." There are many doubts among EU countries that migrants often look for better-leaving conditions than a safer shelter far away from conflict areas. Mostly, EU countries have rejected a significant number of asylum applicants. The stereotypical thinking of public opinion, the role of media and social networks, and the involvement of extremism, in some cases, were detrimental factors that decided the rejection of asylum applications. The triangle between public attitude, media and the political spectrum, and the duality of migration and threat perception have played an essential role in the decision-making process. "The duel correlation of migration and threat showed that 47% of Italians believe that criminality is connected to refugees, while 50% emphasized that there is a connection between illegal migrants and terrorism (Gattinara, 2017, pp 318-31)."

In Europe, the media and the political spectrum are closely associated and shape public attitudes. For instance, various European societies perceive Muslim refugees as a "threat" to national security. This attitude is strictly connected to migrants coming from the Middle East and North Africa. Due to terrorist attacks in Europe and the US, there is growing fear and uncertainty. The current public attitude "encourages" xenophobic narratives and links "threats" mainly with Muslims. For instance,
"a considerable number of citizens in Italy and Greece believe that migrants fragmented the public perception, caused a burden to health service, and bugged and made it harder for natives to get jobs (Doxon et al., 2018, p. 14)."

"The narrative and uncertainties initiated a vast political debate in Italy in 2013 and during elections in 2018, presenting the radicalisation and divisions among Italians (Caiani, 2019)." Italy, for instance, experienced the growing popularity of two populist parties: the left-wing party Movimento 5-Stelle (The Movement of Five Starts) and the right-wing party the Lega Nord (the North Leag). The Italian "trend" was followed in Germany (2017) and Hungary (2018). "The far-right Alternative for Germany (AfD) entered the federal parliament for the first time, with 12.6% of the vote, becoming Germany’s biggest opposition party (Caiani, 2019)." In comparison, "Mr. Orban secured the third term in office with a landslide victory in an election dominated by migration (BBC, 2019)."

Consistently, right-wing parties in Europe (Lega Nord (ITA), National Front (FR), the Freedom Party (AUT), Vox (SPA), Alternative for Germany (DEU)) and the media have increased pressure and manipulated public opinion blaming governments for inability to manage the migration crises, portraying them mainly as a bogey. For example, in Italy and Greece, societies have a high difference between perception and reality. "Apart from that, several surveys show that Italians believe that the presence of migrants is approximately 18%, while in Greece, it is a little low, up to 15% (Valbruzzi, 2018)."

Finally, we can confidently say that toxic narrative and political extremism have influenced public perception and compromised the role of the media. Stereotypical thinking has manipulated societies and increased the number of citizens who believe that migration is a threat-based crisis. The attitude and misperception of migrants are interconnected. Both domains have not been sufficiently studied. Moreover, it is difficult to identify which is more critical and what are the economic impacts.

**Is migration a benefit or a burden?**

The migration nexus in the developed world is attracting both public and academic attention. So, "it is better to understand how nations respond to the migration process affects the negative and positive consequences of immigration (Freilich, et al., 2006)." The process is associated with internal and national security. "The securitization nexus of migration is viewed as a "security" issue giving it a political priority (Leonard, 2007)." For instance, "the Brexiteers and anti-immigration supporters alike claim that migrants are a "burden" to the UK economy (Goodwin and Milazzo, 2017, p. 458)."

Currently, European countries are struggling to cope with a large number of arrivals. The number of migrants entering the EU is higher today than it was at the turn of the last century. Waves of migration have caused friction and debate among politicians and society, and this has became increasingly a very emotional issue. For instance, Ms. Theresa May gave, the UK. Home Secretary (CNBC, 2015) said that "when immigration is too high when the pace of change is too fast, it is impossible to build a cohesive society."

The number of people willing to move to the West for a better life is growing rapidly. The statistics provided by Eurostat (2020) show that "there were 676,250 asylum applications in 2019, an increase of 199,000 in the previous year." This number is only increasing. "The asylum seekers, refugees and migrants have been framed as an existential threat to the EU, starting around 2000 (Huysmans, 2000; Bigo, 2002; Bounfino, 2006; Leonardo, 2011; Murray and Longo, 2018)." A study conducted in Spain follows these ideas. It underlines that "the connection between illegal immigration and terrorism is constructive rather than an objective reality (Saux, 2007, p. 63)." It might be expected that migration can be a threat when migration is forced (in case of conflict or failed states), rather than vulnerable (in case of migration). The difference between forced migration and voluntary movements is distinguished by their impacts and reactions on host societies. They may cause short and long effects, especially on national security issues, psychological and social-cultural problems. However, Whyte Saux (2007, p. 63) analysed the migration issues more straightforward and "drew upon and analyzed the Moral-Panics Theory, arguing that the perceived danger of terrorism caused people to blame a certain group
of people, designating them as the enemy and creating a division between 'us' and 'them.'" The debate continued in the book of Barry Buzan, Ole Waever and others on *Identity, Migration and The Security Agenda in Europe* "underlined that the societal security had lost its understanding of groups and they are based only on 'we' identity (Waever, et. el., 1993, pp. 17-40)." What we are doing now is to utter our egotistic nonsense of 'we' and 'them,' and label migrants 'invaders,' 'terrorists,' 'criminals,' and constantly producing scenarios to attach and prejudice them. Unfortunately, "in Europe, the reverse has been true. Bombs in Madrid and London were immediately associate with migrants in the press even when this was shown not to be true in London (Tarlo, 2005, pp. 13-17)."

The security domain has changed and migration has become part of it. The abstract nature of security is mainly associated with migration, refugees, asylum seekers, crime, and terrorism. The concept of security is divided into two: external and societal security. External security dealt primarily with the physical integrity of the state. While, "societies, in most cases, look at migration as an internal security matter to societal security threatening and challenging the state's traditional national identity and core values (Heisler and Layton-Henry, 1993, p. 158)."

To that extent, "the impact of 9/11 transformed Muslims from an ethnic/religious minority in a multicultural society to a transnational risk category (Humphrey, 2005, pp. 132-148)." It started as a public debate among politicians and civil society on the differences between threat perception and security nexus. It is an issue and a question that requires a clear answer and understanding of the definition of ordinary migrants. To do this, all parties must be involved, distinguishing what a threat is and who caused it. It all has to do with understanding and addressing ‘so what’ and ‘why does it matter’ questions. It is about the perception and understanding of reality. The two interrelated domains require harmonization and awareness of the problem and environmental understanding. It all has to do with perception, action, and reactions. "The perception is based on perception rather than empirical facts (Tallmeister, 2013, p. 3)." Unfortunately, nowadays, the current security nexus is ambiguous, sometimes chaotic, and questionable.

**Societal Security**

The term security suggests that internal security issues are not securitized until they go through the process. It is a call for attention to the construction of societal security. In use, security is an abstract concept referred to as something not real until it operates. In other words, issues become security issues when they are perceived as such. The migration dilemma can be attributed to the creation of a hostile environment and uncertainties in societies. They can influence and determine the historical development of different regions and countries. At this stage, it is essential to overcome the duality between migrants and host societies and not become complicated in the political and social domain. In Western societies, migration has become one of the most perceived threats to domestic security along with illegal trafficking, organized crime, and terrorism. Migration is potentially dangerous, and US Senator Tom Tancredo (2004) labeled them “silent invasion.”

While, Barry Buzan portrays the concept of societal security more about survival in the case of existential threat. The threat must be accepted by society, which is ready to take action against it. Societies are made up of different groups and ethnicities. Each speaks for themselves or politicians, and community leaders can present them. Political elite and leaders play a critical role in turning, e.g., migration issues into a societal security problem by securitizing them and portraying themselves as having right to deal with it.

The threat is perceived and presented differently by different groups, societies, and nations. Each group or society recognizes itself based on its collective identity, language, culture, and religion. "Societal security, then, is about the preservation of traditional patterns of language, culture, association, and religious and national identity, within acceptable conditions for evolution. In other words, societal security is about "large, self-sustaining identity groups (Buzan et al., 1998, pl. 119)." All individuals identify themselves as part of the community, members of society, and religious groups. When internal
and external developments of events threaten these values, they consider themselves under threat. These may not be identified as a security threat but will be perceived as a threat to their community and individual identity. “In recent years, integration is identified as a confrontation process and a cultural change of values and behavior patterns between migrants and host societies (Natale et al., 1997, p. 252).”

Within migration, the framework poses a threat to the identity of societies. Scholars such as Buzan and Waever address this issue in detail. They refer and underline the importance of the ‘others’ in maintaining and reinforcing their identity. Societies have already established their own stereotypes over migrants and have prepared themselves how to address this issue. Ironically, the issue of migration is securitized. It has become part of the political debate, as a result, it is considered problematic, and migrants are generally seen as “others.” Therefore, “the act of securitizing immigration is more threatening than immigration itself, as it often results in racism and xenophobia, ultimately leading to social integration (Tallmeister, 2013, p.2).”

**Economic Security**

Migration not only affects the national interests of the state but also affects the national economy. Since the economic crises of 2008, the migration nexus has been a contentious issue. Nowadays, migration is not a cliché but a very simple fact. In this debate, there are supporters and opponents of migration. On the one hand, supporters of migration believe that the labour market benefits from both high and low-skilled occupancies. In Europe, for instance, they can help address labor market imbalance, contribute to taxes and social security, and promote economic growth. This phenomenon is known as “brain gain.” Several studies and researches have shown the data focus on cost versus benefits. “A poll conducted in the US found out that 51 percent of responders believe immigrants take jobs away from native-born workers. However, 86 percent of interviewers believe that immigrants are hard workers, and 61 percent think immigrants create jobs and set up new businesses. (Mary, C. W et al., 2015, p.9)” In support of the benefits, World Bank President Jim Yong Kim (CNBC, 2015) said that “countries with aging population can create a path for refugees and migrants to participate in the economy, everyone benefits.” He went on mentioning that “the evidence showed that migrants work hard and contribute more in taxes than they consume in social services.”

On the other hand, opponents of migration saw it as a burden or a “3D effect (dirty, dangerous, and difficult) (King & Lulle, 2016)” on the host country’s economy. For instance, in 2008, the labour market in Italy suffered significant consequences and profound deterioration of working conditions. In same cases, migration has been seen as a “solution” replacing native workers, especially in-home care and unskilled jobs. Therefore, “migrants are considered to take away jobs from native-born workers” (Tallmeister, 2013, p. 2). This has, firstly, a psychological effect and secondly has reduced the chances of the low-income residents to find a job. At first, it may seem like the country is getting cheap and flexible labour. However, in the long run, the country may lose competitiveness, create social problems, higher unemployment, and provoke societal reactions. Very often, “public opinion supported the idea that immigrants depress wages and take away jobs, contributing to economic problems (Somerville and Sumption, 2009, pp.3).” The phenomenon was reflected in statistics displayed by OECD/EU (2018), “migrants between the ages of 15 and 64 were approximately 40% of workers in the low-skilled sector, and only 10% were native-born.”

At first glance, it seems that migration negatively impacts the labor market and social welfare. However, we must carefully identify migrants who are a burden and a source of crime and others who positively affect the national economy’s development. “The economic impact of migration differs in every country and depends on the economic conditions of the time, and it can be seen that immigration often has a positive impact on the employment levels of the host state (Islam, 2007, p. 53).” Nowadays, globalization is an established concept of the modern world, bringing more benefits to our daily lives … such as access to economic growth and high living standards. The notion of free trade can lead to massive movements. Politics consider it as a burden on the economy and societal security.
Scholars do not primarily support this finding. Tallmenister (2013, p.3) emphasized that “contrary to the public perception and opinion that migrants threaten job security, depress wages and lead to an increase in unemployment levels, immigration, in reality, can increase job opportunities and enhance the economy of the receiving state.”

**Internal Security**

The analysis of the social security and the economic impact of migration directly affects the internal security that emerged as part of the national security. For instance, “the Schengen Agreement and Convention of Dublin connected migration to terrorism, international crime, and border control (Huysmans, 2000, p. 756).” “Terrorism has emerged as the most widely recognizable and visible threat to a national security, especially after the 9/11 attacks (Srikanth, 2014, p. 61).” For instance, Jamal Al Nassar (2005) “presents the relation between terrorism and migration in metaphorical terms as the migration of dreams and migration of nightmares.”

After 9/11, the US developed a counterterrorism strategy and created the new Homeland Department, increasing the effectiveness of border control. Measures taken by the government to prevent and reduce the illegal or legal entry of dangerous and suspicious elements did not mitigate terrorist attacks or criminal activities. However, we should not ignore “that terrorism is undoubtedly a real threat to the internal security of states throughout the world, but its connection to immigration must be questioned (Tallmeister, 2013, p. 4).”

If we go back in time and look at what happened in the 2013 Boston Marathon, the attack was caused by people who hold US citizenship, not by those entering the country illegally. It sparked a wide-ranging debate in American society. Even “President Obama expressed his concerns of how is possible a young man who grew up and studied here, as part of our communities and our country, resort, to such violence? (Ray, 2013).” At first glance, it seems implausible how a young man who studies harms the society that has welcomed him. This event caused many debates and questions for the American administration to strengthen legal and illegal procedures entering the US. The Trump administration went even further, reducing the US migration lottery and building the wall on Mexico’s border. Even the US is experiencing hundreds of millions of migrants crossing state borders illegally every year. Despite migratory movements in Europe or the US, various scholars disagree that migrants and migration are essential sources of crime or terrorism. In support, Mueller argued, “that the threat of terrorism by either national or immigrant terrorists had been highly exaggerated (Mueller, 2006, pp. 2-8).”

In some cases, threats and violence were mainly related to migrants. Immediately, the media reacted by raising the veil of doubt, spreading racist messages, and introducing xenophobic behavior. The media reaction mainly shapes perception, influences personal emotions, and the atmosphere that argues the difference between ‘us’ and identifies migrants as ‘them’. For instance, some terrorist acts were not prepared by migrants. Unfortunately, “because of bombings in Madrid (2004) and London (2005), immigrants and asylum seekers are labeled as the enemy Saux (2007, p. 63).” In these cases, the message immediately spread worldwide, and societies begin to create stereotypical perceptions of ‘them’ as a threat. Migration and terrorism became political discourse and media campaigns ranging across life aspects. It pursued on all media outlets, emphasising the connection between migration and terrorism. On the other hand, governments advise robust responses and anti-radicalization doctrines against the “home-growing” terrorism.

To conclude, scholars of strategic studies noted that reality itself is a challenge to be addressed and understood. However, they fail to distinguish and identify differences between “migrants” and “foreigners”. For instance, “individuals” enter the US on a temporary visa led to the attack of 9/11 (Spencer, 2008, pp. 1-24). Apart from that, migrants are randomly portrayed as the primary source of crime in several EU countries. Even in many cases, this is not proven.
Conclusion

This review has assessed the indication of international migration on national security and potential future challenges. The topic is subject to heated debates among scholars of security studies and different actors in the developed world. It is not easy to identify and assess an illegal economic migrant, terrorist, or even a criminal. Therefore, this review is focused on migration and its effect on national security. Simultaneously, the migration nexus and refugee movements to the north are usually considered and identified as “crises”. The conclusions are structured around the following three questions:

1. Why people move, and what are the drivers of migration?

The UN definition of migration identifies when an individual is called migrant and shows how it takes place. The definition can extend and facilitate analysis and understanding of why people move. Most of the analysis points out an apparent increase in the numbers of migrants using irregular means. Refugees come mainly from the Middle East and North Africa. Currently, illegal migration is often unpredictable and mostly explored by smugglers and unscrupulous labour recruiters. Even so, possible scenarios may arise, and different drivers in their home and receiving countries may increase migration.

The migration routes evolve based on several internal and external factors, including available means and information. Security, economic, and political conditions are among the main drivers influencing movement alongside whether regular routes are available or not. Evidence and analysis show that movement, in most cases, is affected by deadly conflicts and economic underdevelopment. Measures taken to restrict entry do not seem to effectively reduce refugees but rather force them to explore illegal and dangerous routes. In such situations, media and social networks play a role in sharing information and “shaping” the audience. The immediate impact of internal conflicts influences individual decisions, and employment opportunities slowly control the flow.

2. What is the public attitude towards migration?

The phenomenon of migration is becoming an important and debatable topic among social and political actors, arguing about implications and effects. Migrants have a clear impact on both sending and receiving countries and influence political decisions and preferences. The public mainly follows and supports policies. Understanding public attitudes are very crucial. In general, attitudes differ from one country to another. Understanding the attitude of migrants can help manage and understand the situation. However, sometimes better situation awareness may not be enough. We need to understand the growth of international networks and the role of social media.

In general, the analysis focuses on public attitudes towards migrants. It provides a complex view of the public. However, this approach has not been without problems. The stakeholders have securitized the issue, and the audiences are part of the securitisation environments. Most of the audiences are plural and diverse. Under these conditions, it is not easy to assess the audience correctly and investigate its migration attitude. There is a strong feeling and hostile perception that labels migrants ‘invaders’ and migration is considered a threat-driven issue in Europe. The migration narrative initiated a political debate and favored extremist politicians like Mr. Salvini in Italy and Ms. Le Pen in France to dominate the political scene.

3. Is the migration for the developed world a benefit or a burden?

The relationship between migration and development is complicated and, in many cases, related. It is problematic for all the reasons outlined above. We do not want to be naive and undermine the value or even the burden of migrants. They involve all economic, cultural, and religious aspects that need to be considered. Here, the main question is not whether or not to accept migrants but how to manage and make them part of society. Developed countries need to explore ways to maximise value and minimise negative impacts. It requires constructive and effective management of migration policies.
and practices.
The security domain has changed, so has altered migration. The abstract nature of security is mostly associated with migration and threat-based issues. Societies and migrants need to build up flexible relations. All stakeholders need to recognize the problem and develop effective policies to approach recognized values and mitigate identified challenges. With that in mind, governments need to understand the diversity and the potential benefit of migrants. We need to maximize the value of migrants through carefully planned policies and practices than the benefit of migrants overcoming the burden in the host country. Despite the fact and public attitude towards migration, scholars and several polls have identified very little correlation between migration and crime.
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Over the last few years, especially since Trump's rise to power, many political scientists have been sounding the alarm bells. Amongst them is a prominent scholar Adam Przeworski. He warns that citizens have lost their trust not only in democracy but in nominally democratic institutions that constitute the basis for a healthy democracy. For the author, the unique challenge to democracy is the one that gradually destroys democracy, the one that almost has no signs of danger on the surface. Critical of arriving at firm conclusions and predicting the future, he notes, “I hope to encourage skepticism amongst those who will read this book.” (Przeworski 2019:xii). The primary purpose of this book is to demonstrate the issues in today's democracies by offering cases from past and present.

The author offers his account of democratic failure across various case studies. Those studies include Germany in the 1930s, Italy in the 1950s, and Orban's Hungary. Presenting both historical and contemporary examples from different countries makes this an empirically rich study. Drawing on the past models, he argues that economy and inequality are essential factors that determine the durability of democracy. He also draws our attention to the part that citizens play in determining the political outcomes. “Conditions,” writes Przeworski, “do not determine the outcomes; actions of people under the conditions do” (2019:79).

Critical of adding adjectives to democracy, Przeworski argues that adjectives make it more challenging to qualify as a democracy. Such demanding definitions of democracy for him creates an unnecessary longer list of crises to examine. For that reason, he chooses to adopt a relatively simple explanation of democracy. “Democracy,” writes Przeworski, “is a political arrangement in which people select governments through elections and have a reasonable possibility of removing incumbent governments they do not like (2019:5). Given his definition of democracy, he places particular emphasis on the electoral process. For instance, “Under democracy,” he puts, “the only effective device for disciplining politicians are elections (Przeworski 2019:6).

Departing from the past, Przeworski identifies three signs that cause a crisis. He posits that, amongst several others, three signs that might indicate a crisis warrant closer examination. Those are “(1) the rapid erosion of traditional party systems; (2) the rise of xenophobic, racist, and nationalistic parties and attitudes; and (3) the decline in support for “democracy” in public opinion surveys” (Przeworski 2019:83). Even though he offers his take on each sign, he does not arrive at a satisfying conclusion. Rather, he poses more questions.

Having explained the past, the author turns to the present world. He argues that the belief that future generations will have worse conditions than their parents contributes to the crisis of democracy. Przeworski then concludes his book with the following remarks. “I am moderately pessimistic about the future. I do not think that the very survival of democracy is at stake in most countries, but I do not see what would get us out of the current discontent.”(2019:206).

This is undoubtedly a timely book by a prominent political scientist. Comparing the past with the present in the book allows us to see the differences between two troubling times. Moreover, perhaps, more importantly, he brings back some of the old literature that seems to have been forgotten by some of today's scholars.
The one thing that might trouble the reader is the unwillingness of Przeworski in offering definite answers to the question that he asks. Though he clearly says that he does not intend to provide solid solutions, seeing perhaps, a few answers would have been great for readers and, of course, for students of democratic decline. In addition to this, adopting a “minimalist” view of democracy might receive criticism from scholars of democracy.

To finish on a positive note, the book seems to have taken its place amongst prominent books on the issues that democracy faces as it is an excellent analysis of different cases from the past and present. More importantly, the author, perhaps deliberately, by posing questions at the end of almost every section, creates opportunities for future researchers. For anyone who wishes to delve into the trajectory of democracy in today's world, this is a must read by a prominent political scientist.