

Migration as a (Non)Traditional Security Issue of the Risk Society

Ioan TICU¹

¹ National Academy of Internal Affairs, Kiev, Ukraine, stratulat_natala@ua.fm

Abstract: Migration is an issue fervently debated in various scientific fields (history, sociology, political science, security studies, etc.). Postmodern literature on migration goes beyond hundreds of titles, monographs and articles. Discourses on public migration policies and sometimes policies themselves all too often tend to be based on seemingly trivial correlations, but which have no significant empirical basis. The reality is much less simple and requires a nuanced analysis to interpret it accurately. The emotions and attention aroused in the EU and US public debates on migration issues reveal an identity crisis and only widen the gap between potential evidence-based long-term policies and short-term migrant policies. The article aims to analyse, from a theoretical perspective, the content of the migration phenomenon in the contemporary globalized society, focusing on a series of legal elements, without ignoring the social and economic implications of the phenomenon.

Keywords: *migration, state security, perceptions of migration, economic security.*

How to cite: Ticu, I. (2021). Migration as a (Non)Traditional Security Issue of the Risk Society. *Postmodern Openings*, 12(2), 387-409. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/12.2/314>

1. Introduction

Since the beginning of human civilization, human migration has “influenced history” (Manning & Trimmer, 2013). The “migration process has attracted the attention of scientists, but most discussions are related to rural migration and its consequences” (Massey et al., 1993). Usually, the literature refers to the economic and social causes of migration (Winter-Ebmer, 1994). For example, according to the authors Zachariah et al. (2001), economic factors are predominant for urban and rural migration. Clyde (1959) considers that there are factors that self-motivate migration, among which he highlights employment, better opportunities for doing business and more comfortable living conditions. Instead, Massey et al. (1993) explore how social factors affect migration trends. In addition to factors of an economic or social nature, another reason for migration is the political factor. Schmeidl (1997) points out that “people move from place to place as refugees, asylum seekers or displaced persons due to internal disputes, foreign military intervention or other political or natural disasters”. Keane (2004) argues that humans move from one territory to another when forced by environmental reasons, when they face climate changes and other natural disasters in their home territory.

Since the late 1980s and early 1990s, there has been an intense academic debate about the meaning of the notion of "security" in relation to the phenomenon of migration, and how to study the security issues within society at the beginning of the globalization era. More specifically, the debate became oriented to three major axes (Fierke, 2007).

First, the prospects for broadening security studies have been included on the agenda of institutions empowered to discuss national security issues. Thus, researchers began to discuss what benefits could security studies bring to the problem of migration, namely the issues dangers and threats that should have been included in the analysis of national security related to the phenomenon of migration. The main question was whether to limit security studies strictly to the field of military threats and war, or their scope should be extended to include non-military, environmental, economic, identity, migration issues (Buzan et al., 1998; Krause, 2017; Walker, 1990).

second, the debate moved on to deepening the referential issues (i.e. what needs to be secured), which means that “security studies should use state-centered themes, focusing mainly on the security of states and their citizens” (Husymans, p. 3). Also the question rose whether referential issues should overcome centrist approaches and pay more attention to security

issues that cover a wide line of topics, like the security of individuals, of societies or the entire humanity.

Third, sixteen epistemological and ontological axes were drawn on how security should be perceived, as well as its nature (Buzan et al., 1998; Shapiro, 1992; Walker, 1990; Wendt, 1997). The division between the objectivist and subjectivist approaches determined academic polarization and brought to the forefront constructivist and deconstructivist tendencies. As Huysmans (2006, pp. 3-4) argues, the debate has divided researchers among those who support the idea that security policy has been a reaction to threats that are objective and / or subjective, and those who claim that insecurities are the result of politics as a process, that turns security issues into insecurity issues.

“This debate has often been presented as an epistemological debate between positivism and post-positivism, rationalism and reflectivism, or realism and epistemic relativism” (Koca, 2012). But the debate should not be constrained to encompass only epistemological dimensions, thus stemming a deconstruction of the concept of security. The same importance was placed on the disagreement over the ontological status of the concept of "insecurity" or the concept of "threat".

The contradictions on whether language and knowledge should be understood as having an ontological status that is linked to national security within social relations and the way threats were conceptualized have widened the gap between traditional security studies, respectively realistic and unrealistic and critical security studies, and the gap became obvious.

2. The concept of national security as a social construction - The Aberystwyth School

Fierke (2007) offers three broad points of view “on the relationship between politics and security: security as property, security as a social construction and security as a practice”.

Security seen as a priority of the national interests of states corresponds to the reasoning that characterizes traditional studies on security. These are mainly influenced by realism and neorealism, and were considered by scholars to be problem-solving theories, because the way those theories explained phenomena accepted “the world (or situation) as it is inherited, seeks to make it work, and in this sense, contributes to the existing reality” (Bingo, 2000, p. 6). Although the philosophical orientation of realism draws its origins from the studies made by Thucydides and Machiavelli, it became a sub-discipline during the international relations that followed the end of World War II and then came to be a dominant school

for security analysis during the years of the Cold War. According to the paradigm promoted by the traditional theories on security, security studies are "the study of the threat, use and control of military force" (Bingo, 2000, p. 7).

Regarding the mix between migration and security, it is difficult to find a fully elaborated analysis in traditional studies referring to these issues. This is mainly due to the fact that the traditional theories on security have largely focused on the "high politics" of war and similar threats to military dangers and has not focused on the issue of migration, which is considered to be a part of "social policy".

Since the late 1980s, and in particular after the Cold War ended, the influence of traditional security studies begun to fade, as they were challenged by the "transformations in Western political agendas" (Huysmans, 2006, p. 15). Global events, with transnational consequences, have challenged the limits inherent to traditional security studies to explain international policy so that to make the analysis of these developments more obvious. Increasing ethnic, religious or identity conflicts within states - i.e. Yugoslavia, Rwanda, Somalia, the national liberation movements in Eastern Europe, economic crisis and ecological disasters - have highlighted the disadvantages of the traditional school of security studies, as they are limited to analyzing conflicts of a military nature and the nuclear caution characterizing the relations between the two superpowers of the polarized world during the Cold War (Rosenberg & Tickner, 1993, p. 32).

In addition, the process of European integration, brought on major changes regarding the traditional definitions of what a state is, what sovereignty and borders mean, and has also prompted security researchers to leave the strict concept of a state-centered and military security. Considering what we mentioned above, studies that were considered to be critical security studies or critical approaches to security emerged. Although the security studies that are critical towards the traditional approach are comprised of a multitude of approaches, differently oriented from a theoretical point of view, which prevents them from "forming an uniform and homogeneous cluster of ideas", "there are several attempts to group them in a meaningful way under the title: critical security" (Lijphart, 2003).

The Aberystwyth School, also called the Welsh School, was inspired by the neo-Marxist theoreticians of the Frankfurt School and promoted radical ideas about the traditional notion of security. The Aberystwyth School promoted the idea that security is a concept that derived from various other concepts and this is why any exact definition that might try to explain it could be contested. Therefore, following Fierke's (2007) analysis,

"security as a social construct" was the school's orientation on what security is. This approach contradicts the positivist and objectivist explanations on security. In particular, The Aberystwyth School theoreticians contradict the conceptualization of security, instead choosing to determine the meaning of the term "security" as an objective concept, scientifically tested "against the real world" (Fierke, 2007, p. 196). However, this way of analyzing security ignore material reality and does not mean that they awaited for the realization of security threats. Instead, the Aberystwyth School argues that in order to understand security "realities" one must be "guided by different theoretical or political points of view, as well as by different cultural maps, as well as contextual and historical structures" (Curran & Saguy, 2001).

In parallel with these arguments, Booth (2009) argues that "critical approaches to international relations and international strategic studies have sought to challenge conceptualizations about the realism of the world not by rejecting the idea of realism, but by claiming access to a more sophisticated level of realism". For them, security implies emancipation. Two important values in the contemporary society are security and community, which emerge as guiding principles that contribute to the growth of a human rights system depictive of a global culture and that is able to support what could be called "emancipatory politics".

"The concept of emancipation forms strategies and tactics of resistance, provides a theory of progress for society and provides a policy of hope for common humanity" (Booth, 2009). For them, emancipation means "critical" reflection, that would broaden and deepen the issues placed on the security agenda so that it includes non-statistical security issues, like poverty, environmental protection, identity change, patriarchy or racism.

Framing a problem in terms of security provides the way for different interpretations, that can lead to other political solutions than traditional ones. "Security" implies to take the risk of consolidating a security problem in a certain area (Huysmans, 2006). As Huysmans argues, the knowledge produced by interpreting different notions of security "is open to different interpretations and has a performative and constructive role, namely the use of security language, which can change the understanding of a problem" (Huysmans, 2006). In a similar perspective, as Tekofsky (2006) remarked, referring to developments at EU level, perceptions lead to the development of policies and laws.

Legal facts are generated by perceptions, and then new perceptions are based on these facts and create a frame of reference, a worldview that reflects and determines our attitude towards security. In turn, policies and rules "influence people's lives in a very real way. It is therefore important to

examine the arguments and measures produced in the European political discourse on security and migration. In line with these concerns, it is stated that security should not be seen as a good thing or a desirable goal” (Koca, 2012).

The Aberystwyth School can be defined as a critical moral and ethical movement on a broader debate on new security issues and as an advocate of politicization, rather than the development of viable security concepts.

3. The concept of security and communicative action – The Copenhagen School

The Copenhagen school also emerged from dissatisfaction with the traditional conceptualization of security. The most important aspect of the approach promoted by its thinkers, similar to the representatives of the Aberystwyth School, is the fact that they place a special emphasis on the way security is socially constructed versus the objective definition of security that characterizes the school of traditional security studies.

Consequently, the Copenhagen School defines security as the extension or intensification of politicization (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 23). Specifically, a problem is secured when political, social, or intellectual leaders have begun to talk about it and gained the attention of the general public and of the institutions of the state when speaking about existential threats that might affect key issues considered to be of national interest. It is about an intersubjective establishment of an existential threat in order to have practical political effects.

“In theory, any public issue can be located on a spectrum ranging from unpoliticized (meaning that the state does not deal with it and is in no way made a matter of public debate and political decision) to politicized (which means that the problem is part of a public policy that requires government decision and resource allocation or, less often, another form of government)” (Koca, 2012). A security issue means that the problem is seen as a threat to the very existence of the community and it requires emergency measures that justify the fact that the political body can take measures that break the normal limits of the political procedure. According to the Copenhagen school, security is the successful construction of a problem as an “existential threat” for a referential issue through the “act of speech” of social actors that are members of the institutional sector dealing with security, and its existentialist dimension is a justification for security policies of an extraordinary nature (Buzan et al., 1998).

In other words, by giving security speeches, the existing state of affairs can be changed. In other words, for Buzan et al. (1998, p. 10), the distinctive feature of national security “is a specific rhetorical structure (survival, priority of action and urgency). It can function as a tool for promoting security actions in sectors other than politico-military, such as protecting the environment or migration” (Koca, 2012). In this context, what constitutes the “exact definition and criteria of national security” is determined by an inter-subjective process by which “a shared understanding of what should be considered a collective response to a threat” is constructed through “acts of speech”, through discursive practices (Buzan, 1998, p. 26).

Therefore, the study of national security is based on the analysis of political discourses. However, not every discursive act on security issues, namely the security of socio-economic activity, results in politically effective security. In this regard, the Copenhagen School pursues a the theory of Jurgen Habermas to explain postmodern politics (Hirschauer, 2019), which implies the decisive role that “democratic deliberation” has if the public space is thought to be transparent, and encouraging active citizenship and applying the rule of law are to be used as guiding principles to give shape to the contemporary society (Habermas, 1985).).

When it comes to migration as a security issue, the Copenhagen School is investigating it in connection to the social sector. “Social security refers to the security of the community and its identity, especially the ethno-national identity and acts in the context of antagonistic friend / enemy relations” (Koca, 2012). In this context, applying national security theories to the issue of migration means that migration can be described as an “existential threat” to the security or identity of the society, brought on by the “speeches” of certain social or political actors (i.e. politicians, the mass-media, voices of social influencers belonging to the general public), and in case a security movement becomes accepted by a “significant” number of society members who have received this message, then extraordinary measures, which were not previously considered to be “legitimate”, may be implemented.

4. Security as a practice – The Paris School

Many works have been influenced by the theory of national security promoted by the Copenhagen school when analyzing migration in relation to security, especially when speaking of the ascension to the European Union. Undoubtedly, Buzan et al. (1998) brought to the forefront a crucial intellectual paradigm that would help analyze the social construction of

particular issues, like threats to the security of the state, through discursive practices. However, their theory on national security has also stemmed a series of criticisms, especially from the Paris School of Security Studies.

The “Paris School of Security Studies” was especially inspired by the theories of Bourdieu and Foucault. Subsequently, their studies on security were appropriated and refined by scientists who applied a view specific to sociological studies on the security process. For Bigo (2000), it is not “discursive practices or act of speech, but rather security technology, security professional knowledge and bureaucratic practices that are the driving forces of the processes” that characterize national security policies.

The Paris school pursues a Foucauldian understanding of the discourse, which means that in any society there are many power relations that penetrate, “characterize and constitute the social body, and these power relations cannot themselves be established, consolidated or implemented without the production, accumulation and functioning of the political discourse” (Koca, 2012), which makes it possible to exercise power. We are participants in the “production of truth through power, and we can exercise power only through the production of truth” (Foucault, 1980, p. 93). Foucault argues that “we are also subject to truth, in the sense that the truth that makes laws also produces the true discourse that, at least in part, decides, transmits and extends to the effects of power” (Foucault, 1980, p. 94).

According to Bigo (2000), when the non-transparent world of bureaucracy puts its mark on politics, this creates a security threat because of the secret and decentralized processes it entails, more than any distress that would be caused by democratic public deliberation. Therefore, unlike the concept of security as understood by the Copenhagen School, the fact that technocratic practices bring along a “policy of unrest” is important for the Paris School - and even if such a policy is not framed in emergencies, it can still produce fear and, as a consequence, can be used as a claim to justify certain governmental practices (e.g., imposing certain ID cards, storing personal data in databases) (Bigo, 2000).

Referring to current practices governing migration in the EU, Bigo (2000) argues that “the interpretation of migration in terms of security issues results from the creation of a continuum of threats and general unrest, in which many different actors change their fears and beliefs about a risky and dangerous society”. Professionals responsible for risk and fear management in particular “transfer the legitimacy they gain from the fight against terrorism, criminals, spies and counterfeiters to other targets, especially transnational political activists, people crossing borders or people born in the country, but from foreign parents” (Bigo, 2000).

“Such a context justifies the introduction of certain bureaucratic and technological practices, i.e. discriminatory visa policies, surveillance practices based on extensive databases or the growing role of police and intelligence in the field of migration. Closely related to this, focusing on the relationships between specific professional groups, while structuring the effects of technologies” (Koca, 2012), allows the study of transnational security process in opposition to the approach of the Copenhagen school, which we find that is particularly applicable to national space.

Therefore, in this context, the Paris School “liberates sociologies of insecurity” (Huysmans, 2006, p. 9). In this context, productive analysis on national security made by the Paris School can certainly be sustained, as it is based on technocracy, which develops outside the public sphere. The Paris School does not stop here, while also challenging the view that the Copenhagen School promotes, which states that “security can be studied directly through the study of political discourse and political games” (Buzan, 1998). Instead, it places an emphasis on the role that technical and bureaucratic practices in security and thereby promotes the position of “security as a practice” against the authentic and strict constructivist approach that the Copenhagen school promoted.

5. The concept of state security in relation to the migration phenomenon

The concept of “security” was first used as such by the “Copenhagen School of Security Studies”. Departing from the realistic approaches to the traditional concept of security, that are largely preoccupied by the relations developing between different states, the Copenhagen theory of national security has proposed a completely different approach to the notion of security, while the focus was placed on social constructionism, mainly the idea that there is a social construction process defining the concept of “threats”. The defining feature of national security is a “linguistic action” or an “act of speaking” based on a special rhetoric of “urgency” and “priority” (Buzan, 1998). However, “speech security” is more than a means of representing a problem in a certain manner, and can also be considered a way to influence national domestic policies. In order to be transformed into a security issue, the issue must be described by words inducing the idea of an “existential threat”, while the one who makes the speech requires that uncommon measures are taken by those in charge (politicians) in order to deal with it (Buzan, 1998, p. 23). As Huysmans argues, “policies very much depend on the language in which they are politicized” (Huysmans, 2006, p. 6). Therefore, the role of the acts of language and speech is not only the

description, but also the mobilization of certain connotations, developing an "area of insecurity", that is addressed further by using particular policies.

Studying national security, however, not only involves more than a simple examination of discourses, but also a positioning of the ideas presented in those discourses to fit into a larger contextual framework. Extending the definition of what "to secure" means, as promoted by Wæver and Buzans in terms of "linguistic action" or "speech act", Balzacq emphasized that the social agent, meaning the public has a crucial importance in the social context that generated the act of political discourse. Thus, he defined security as a "pragmatic act", which "aspires to determine the strategic and technical uses of language in order to achieve a certain goal" (Guild et al., 2008).

"The link between migration and security has been extensively studied by Bigo and Huysmans, who developed their analysis focusing on the sociology of power and its importance in institutionalizing a specific discourse, (...)the security of migration as a result of the discursive power struggle between different agents, each producing a certain perception and understanding of the migration phenomenon" (Babayan, 2010). The success of these joint efforts is linked mostly to the legitimacy, the power and the authority of the agents at the specific stage. A discourse with dominant or hegemonic trends is obtained in connection with a "struggle over which interpretation and, therefore, what kind of knowledge should inform migration policy" (Huysmans, 2006, p. 53).

In the 1990s, after the peaceful end of the Cold War, the rise of intra-state conflicts, the fear towards migration of Western societies, the declining quality of the environment and of the people's health as an effect of the spread of HIV / AIDS as an epidemic, to the inclusion of new ideas on supplementary strategic factors when speaking of the security of humans seemed to be unavoidable. The recognition of a "new world" has made new security developments emerge, from the traditional state-centered politico-military and sovereignty point of view on security, "to a more inclusive and holistic view of peace and international stability based on the protection of individuals" (Buzan et al. , p. 187). The state has ceased to be the only a subject of reference for security. However, human security did not become synonymous with national security and did not replace it, only that new dimensions were integrated into the concept of security, like individual security, the development of the economy or human rights. This process was enshrined conceptually and institutionally in the 1994 UN "Human Development Report" and was made to become an "universal, broad and flexible approach and the interdependencies between seven components:

economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, , community security and political security” (UNDP, 1994).

When discussing security issues, it is natural to assume that there is a real threat to the survival of the state. This understanding was influenced in a decisive manner by structural constraints that influenced the conception on security, especially during the Cold War, when it was considered to be only a “zero-sum game”. The conception that the Cold War generated on security, Baldwin (1997) argues, was subdued to the concept of "military force", meaning that if the military force posed a problem, then it could be considered that security itself was the challenge, but in case there was no real danger that military force might be used, then the situation was considered a "domestic policy issue". When the Cold War ended, it became obvious that security was not perceived as being a strictly “military” issue anymore, even if the basic dimensions of what security meant remained the same, but their substantial specifics, that had emerged and became relevant while the Cold War was still developing, were different from those of the 1990s.; environmental security, identity security, social security and military security are still issues of security, even if dissimilar types of security, but in essence they are no longer fundamentally different concepts (Baldwin, 1997, p. 23). As a consequence, security could be separated from survival, but it is linked more directly too thee free pursuit of independence or to the protection of those internal interests that are considered to be basic for a state. "Genuine security requires not only the lack of a military threat or the protection against a military threat, but also the management of a multitude of risks related to the economic and social political well-being of states and their peoples" (Aftendorn, 1999, p. 2). The definition of security as “a low probability of impairment of acquired values” broadens the minimum realistic and problematic identification of a security issue with surviving, when specifying those ethical standards that are meant to be provided protection when the survival is insured (Baldwin, 1997, p. 13). If there is no menace to survival, then security means some primary ethical rules and implications that are important enough that states are going to decide to protect in an active manner by themselves "and security is considered to be, in a broader definition of the term, the protection against unwanted invasion from foreign states, and the defense of physical, psychological or economic interests, or of the language and culture” (Wallace, 2002, p. 241).

Because threats do not resume to "military" ones, then there will be no surprise if the future perils to security will be met with an attitude of cooperation between states and accommodation with the other’s needs and

values, as a process. For example, the “European Security Strategy” of 2003 stresses on the fact that the current threats menacing European security can also be confronted with solutions of a non-military nature, as the risks to European stability are not necessarily military. Thus, military instruments can be complemented by political and economic ones and engaged outside the European perimeter, especially to neighboring regions that pose a potential risk (Council of the European Union, 2003). “As with traditional security threats, new security issues, such as energy, environment and migration, require proactive policies aimed at redressing potential externalities” (Holsti, 2006).

“Moreover, the security dimension of the new issues on the political agenda is underlined by the fact that they are sometimes a by-product of traditional security challenges. Thus, a rogue state can threaten energy disruption or a civil conflict can cause refugee flows” (Ceccorulli, 2009) that affect both European stability and the warranty of energy supply and control of borders, which are security procedures. Dealing with security threats means considering the most appropriate strategies and the involvement of the best suited actors for maintaining stability. Both elements are even harder to be identified due to the supra-national nature of security risks (Howell & Richter-Montpetit, 2019).

As challenges transcend state borders, they become more inclusive, thus requiring broader models of cooperation. However, global governance does not make sense in certain situations: when threats are only perceived as such or target only specific elements (actors) and the way they are put into practice involves different types of actions worldwide, less grandiose plans for cooperation might be the solution that leads to better and more results in this regard. This is because “most migration threats” travel “easier over short distances than over long distances” (White, 2016). Therefore, neighboring state actors are constantly exposed to a greater potential for threat from migrants. This implies that there is a kind of “Security interdependence between states” which makes states very sensitive to the provisions of the policy adopted by neighboring states regarding the migratory potential.

It is noteworthy that Buzan et al. (1998) focus on a neorealist variable, such as “territoriality” in the “security complex” theory: it is true that the same way might lead to similar action from dissimilar actors, that are neighbors, but political arrangements made in order to deal with those threats spread their effects in certain areas. “If security interdependence means that no actor can hope to achieve security through a strategy, it is also true that the security nature of the problem at hand makes the cooperation

process problematic. Given the complexity of the challenge, full harmonization of procedures within a group would marginalize the effects of security interdependence” (Ceccorulli, 2009), while a way to address issues involving a broad participation of stakeholders would promise more sustainable management of this issue. However, security complicates the process of integrating migrants, as no stakeholder wants to find middle grounds if their interest that is considered paramount is in favor of the other. Partnership will be continued as long as it reinforces the security of the states as a whole, without significantly influencing internal agreements. Also, states are the main agents of security policies, “states are still the agencies through which the governance structures are established and financed and the efforts of these structures are largely realized” (Lake & Morgan, 1997, pp. 12). Thus, a customary technique to tackling the obstacle may present instability or gaps, trying to create disparate national interests.

Therefore, it is more likely that states will cooperate in order to achieve a common security in case of a common threat. Trade cooperation processes have demonstrated that in case of a common and integrated initiative, there is no need for a third party intervention, which could be the first visible result of such a strategy, as third parties, when involved, may raise formal or informal issues that might actually maintain the challenge than actually solve it. However, the fight against the black market and trans-border criminality or other illegal acts sometimes go through the fine net of legal barriers, which makes it no surprise at all that other security threats manage to move between state borders. This means that collaboration between states directed with priority to fencing eludable security issues is ultimately ineffective. This is the effect of collaboration with the other members of a cluster of actors targeting "restrictive" policies, which can switch the way a problem is solved, but not the probability of pressure brought on by challenging it. Cooperation and negotiation processes “with third actors, third regions and international organizations ensure that issues such as migration, energy or the environment are addressed in a consistent and robust manner” (Ceccorulli, 2009).

“Multilateralism becomes a way of managing problems both as a principle and as a practice” (Webber, 2004). If regional groups develop the ability for a better control and management of the threats to their security inside their own territory, then they could move outward, to the neighboring countries and strive for multilateral cooperation, which will further diminish the risk that new security threats will appear and the spread of the adverse effects of the already existing threats could decrease.

This is also the reason for the numerous endeavors at intra-regional collaboration in the contemporary international context regarding joint security discussions. Likewise, global governance can forge ahead, compensating the deficiency of higher-level authority and global and regional solutions (Ruggie, 1983). “When inter-regionalism is not an option, because a group is not so unified as to manage security threats collectively, then solutions can be considered at other levels, like state to state relations” (Ceccorulli, 2009).

However, the partnership must be designed fairly, ensuring that responsibilities are dealt with as shared obligations, through multidirectional flows of actions and multi-layered participation: that is, the way multilateralism expresses itself is as important as the practice of multilateralism itself (Newman, 2007; Thakur & Van Langenhove, 2006). As a new concept of security, “threats require a broad partnership and all relevant actors involved in the security issue should take part in the arrangements to be made” (Ceccorulli, 2009), so as to respond to the multifaceted nature of the subject that is addressed. Therefore, the multilateral process of cooperation with third parties is a component of general international relations and should be constantly aligned with other aspects of foreign policy.

The concept of security was taken to a new level of meaning by the Copenhagen School, whose scholars authored various security studies that placed a large importance on the social dimension of what security means and considered that the traditional referent for security, which was the sovereign state, created a non-sustainable national security approach, in terms of duration and strategy, because it did not take into account the most important issue, namely human security (Vietti & Scribner, 2013, p. 27). This view meant that states had to confront new types of risks and new kind of threats, that required new strategies, like the development of the economic and social sectors, good governance, a diplomacy oriented towards preventing security threats, because only such strategies could prevent the accumulation of tensions within society, that could lead to crisis. As the concept of human security gained more and more weight, the idea of human security became more important, because human insecurity puts pressure on the state and the political system and can lead to acts that threaten national security (Vietti & Scribner, 2013).

Migration can lead to national security issues in situations where migrants or refugees oppose the regime of their countries of origin, when they are perceived as a security risk or a cultural threat in the country of origin, “when migrants cause social and economic pressure in host societies

or when the host society uses migrants as a tool against the country of origin” (Weiner, 1992, pp. 105–106).

Thus, securing migration can be done if four axes are considered: “1. socio-economic, due to unemployment, the growth of the informal economy, the crisis of the welfare state and the deterioration of the urban environment; 2. security, in view of the loss of a narrative of control combining sovereignty, borders and internal and external security; 3. identity, if migrants are seen as a threat to the national identity and demographic balance of the host societies; 4. political, as a result of anti-migrant, racist and xenophobic discourses” (Ceyhan & Tsoukala 2002, p. 24).

Various aspects can affect national security, like threats on national sovereignty, international balance of power between state actors, types of conflicts that occur globally. This has an impact on migration, which was associated with the migratory movement from the villages to the urban communities, the frontiers regime to control who enters a country, on grounds of ethnicity, religious affiliation etc. If ethnicity and religion are so different from the one of the majority of population in the receiving state, then the integration of migrants is very hard to achieve, conflicts arise and the policies favoring the integration of minorities into the national community are put under a lot of pressure.

The personal safety of the migrants is also an issue that must be resolved, most of all when they are illegal migrants, victims of human trafficking networks, who are at risk of losing their lives, especially on routes from North Africa to southern Europe and, more recently, those related to the Syrian civil war. Public policies and criminal law can do so much, because numerous cases of illegal labor, workforce exploitation and criminal behavior (prostitution, human trafficking) still arise, which can lead to marginalization even under the rule of law, as such deviant behaviors are considered to be the consequence of poor national values (Geddes, 2003, p. 22).

The personal security of migrant can be ensured if phenomena like marginalization and discrimination are prevented, if the segregation between the urban and rural communities is diminished and social disruptions are discouraged. By doing this, socio-economical impairments could also be reduced. The progress made until now in the international community and by the states themselves does not seem to provide the definite solution for such issues, while most economically developed countries impose severe legal measures on migrants, as their standard of living is particularly targeted, therefore they feel the need to protect their own citizens by marginalizing nationals from poor countries and the radicalization of criminal sanctions

regarding the migratory workforce. Therefore, in order to understand the theoretical perspectives and causes of migration, Lee's push and pull theory is considered the most complex and relevant theory in the field, as it describes the causes, model, and process of migration itself.

6. The push and pull sociological theory - a possible explanation of the causes of migration and the impact of these causes on state security

The push and pull sociological theory, through its representatives (Muniz-Solari et al., 2010), highlights Lee's push and pull theory to describe the asymmetrical pattern of migration and migrants. According to Lee's theory (as cited by Muniz-Solari et al., 2010), in the context of migration, push and pull factors are significant. Muniz-Solari et al. (2010) explain what "push" and "pull" mean as follows: "push factors are negative factors from the place of origin, while pulling factors are the positive ones from the place of destination". In addition, Lee suggests that "the decision to migrate and the migration process is influenced by factors associated with the area of origin, destination, intervention factors, personal factors and fluctuations in the economy" (Lee, as cited by Muniz-Solari et al. , 2010).

Weiner observes that contemporary migrants participate in economic, social and political activities within the states where they migrated, but they also remain active in their country of origin (Muniz-Solari et al., 2010). Different types of migrants influence the national security of host countries in a different way. Sometimes, migration has a good effect, as it might be the cause for the initiation of trade between communities or the development of commerce relations (Weiner, 1992, pp. 103–105). The changes in occurred when the capitalist market was transformed into a global market system (Huysmans, 2006, pp. 757-759), thus linking illegal migrants and security in a way that calls into question present migration and refugee systems (Ibrahim, 2005).

Tom Tancredo suggests that "migration levels raise different questions" and that this could lead to a clash of cultures between the groups that have not yet assimilated the loyalties presupposed by their host countries, such as political loyalty or dual citizenship, which subsequently affect the national security of these states. Tancredo (2004), therefore, suggests that states that do not have policies for assimilating migrants, treat migrants as illegal (Tancredo, 2004).

Similarly, Weiner identifies five broad categories of migrants in his attempt to classify migration as a threat to national security: first, when national states are under a regime that rejects its own citizens; second, when

the host country sees migrants, who in fact are likely to be more like refugees than like ordinary migrants, as the bearers of political issues that might affect its own security ; third, “when migrants are seen as a cultural threat” (Weiner, 1992, pp. 105–106); fourth, when migrants and refugees are perceived “as a social and economic problem for the host society”; fifth, “when the host society uses migrants as a tool of threat against the country of origin” (Weiner, 1992, pp. 105–106). Some researchers linked migration to insecurity a long time ago and concluded that “migrants and refugees pose a real threat to host states” (Franz & Steiner, 1999).

The most important aspect in this regard is noted by Maggie Ibrahim: "In discovering how migration has become a security issue, it is instructive to highlight how cultural differences, as a systematic classification, are associated with the threat" (Ibrahim, 2005). In other words, Ibrahim considers that migrants, because they bring along new cultures and cling to their traditions and identities, could become a threat when they disrupt the normal life of the host state. As such, “negative faith” and “discriminatory action will lead to an ethnic conflict, which ultimately influences the unity of the state” (Ibrahim, 2005). This problem also influences the culture of the state, but it can bring along terrorism, insurgencies and other criminal activities. In addition, Ibrahim notes that migration is a threat to human security in terms of “drug trafficking” (Ibrahim, 2005, p. 169). Basically, Ibrahim says that the population moving across the border to escape war, famine or prosecution will be “a threat to the host country” (Ibrahim, 2005).

Moreover, she emphasizes that: "securing the discourse on migration was based on the fear that migrants may be supporters of insurgencies" and the potential engine of social riots and terrorist activities (Ibrahim, 2005, p. 173). Also on the same note, Alexandra Spencer believes that there is a link between migration and terrorism, by conducting research “based on interviews with 48 migrant terrorists who carried out successful terrorist attacks in the United States between 1993 and 2001” (Spencer, 2008). Spencer's research found the reason why terrorists could infiltrate into the American society, namely because of the loyalty the U.S. have to their migration policies and security measures (Ibrahim, 2005, p. 173). Spencer concludes her analysis with the conclusion that weak migration policies and counter-terrorism strategies are a driving force linking terrorism and migrants (Ibrahim, 2005). However, the diaspora consists mainly of refugees and is more likely to be “hostile to the regime from the country of origin” (Ibrahim, 2005, pp. 179-180; Smith & Stares, 2007, p. 90). Some migrants that migrated because of economic reasons may also become antagonists,

“especially if they live in democratic countries, while the government of their homeland is undemocratic” (Smith & Stares, 2007, p. 90).

Katja Franko Aas and Mary Bosworth (2013) provide an established analytical perspective between crime and migration in terms of “legal action, social beliefs and cultural disparities, especially in the spectrum of migration control, policies and practices” (Aas & Bosworth, 2013). The theory of the two authors examines migration models and various instruments and procedures that can be secured in the overall migration process (Aas & Bosworth, 2013). To substantiate this, Aas and Bosworth (2013) say that measures that might seem crisis-oriented should be implemented as long-term policies, and exemplify by referring to the open border policies and criminal justice as tools for migration control, as migrants have a greater impact than previously thought on a country's national security .

Much of the migration from poorer countries is caused by a lack of human security, which is expressed in “poverty, inequality, violence, lack of human rights and weak states. Such political, social and economic underdevelopment is linked to the history of colonialism and the current condition of global inequality” (Castles et al., 2013).

Smuggling, human trafficking, forced labor and lack of human rights are the real and de facto fate of millions of migrants (Klaus & Pachocka, 2019). The frequent insecurity of people in poor countries is often overlooked during political discussions about state security, however the two phenomena are almost impossible to divide. “Frequently, such insecurity of migrants is linked to perceived threats, which are an aspect of the dimension of mass psyche, which can be divided into three basic categories: cultural, socio-economic and political” (Castles et al., 2013).

The first perceived danger is the perception of the population about migrants, which causes the current cultural status and can mostly contribute to the insecurity of migrants. Often, the religious identity and language practices of migrants are strongly perceived as threats by the population. The second threat perceived by the population is the socio-economic threat, which includes the ethnic diasporas, such as the Chinese diaspora in Southeast Asia, the Syrian-Lebanese communities in West Africa, Chechens and other Caucasian populations in the post-Soviet Russian Federation. The third perceived threat refers to the fact that migrants are perceived as a potential disloyalty source or subversive movement for the host state, such as Palestinians who lived in Kuwait before the first Gulf War. The threats of international migration perceived by the public as an attack on national identity and the maintenance of cultural cohesion are key issues aspects of

the confrontations brought on by international migration in the current state of affairs of the 21st century.

7. Conclusions

Migration is not simple to analyze because it has so many dimensions that raise security issues and affect the communities living in the state of origin, but also in the countries of destination. There is a large number of states struggling with different threats caused by migration, some of them affecting national security.

Security is “built on a set of discourses or narratives, and historical practices based on institutionally shared understandings, thus becoming a political and social construct” (Wæver, 1995). During this process, power elites, analysts and experts define the risks and threats that exist at a given time and on different levels (national, regional, global). Then, they justify the validity of such opinions within the community, subsequently activating, where possible, means to neutralize them. Thus, the power structure of the state influences the public policies adopted on migration and the amount of influence that the international organizations could have on those policies. Globalization has challenged the responsibility of states even further, as some security threats have changed and others have been added. Independence and safe borders, protected from military threat, are no longer the sole focus of security, as economic issues, cultural dimensions and social stability have entered the equation. The transformation of risks and threats in a globalized society makes them impossible to be dealt with only in a state-centered approach and through a national security strategy limited to national borders.

The analysis carried out in this article showed that all schools of thought provide fundamental information on security studies in general and the link between migration and security in particular. However, they all suffer from certain disadvantages that raise normative, analytical and methodological issues. First, the state-centered and militaristic conceptualization of security in traditional security studies does not offer a critical involvement in securing migration. More specifically, far from providing a precise methodology to be followed in order to understand whether migration has been addressed as a security issue, this approach treats migration as an objective threat and reproduces security discourses and practices. Consequently, it is argued that without always being explicitly discussed as a security issue or without being accepted as such in certain political contexts, migration is an issue that can be turned into a security issue.

References

- Aas, K. F., & Bosworth, M. (2013). *The borders of punishment: Migration, citizenship, and social exclusion*. Oxford University Press.
- Aftendorn, H., Keohane, R. O., & Wallander, C. A. (Eds.). (1999). *Imperfect unions*. Oxford University Press.
- Babayan, D. (2010). *Balancing security and development in migration policy – EU mobility partnerships*.
<https://www.coleurope.eu/sites/default/files/thesis/babayan.pdf>
- Baldwin, D. A. (1997). The concept of security. *Review of International Studies*, 23(5), 5-26. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0260210597000053>
- Bingo, D. (2000). Border regimes and security in an enlarged European community. *Police co-operation with CEECs: Between trust and obligation*. EUI Working Papers, 65, 1-31.
[https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/en/publications/border-regimes-and-security-in-an-enlarged-european-community-police-cooperation-with-ceecs-between-trust-and-obligation\(8d876fdd-3a49-40b8-baad-e2590b663b17\)/export.html](https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/en/publications/border-regimes-and-security-in-an-enlarged-european-community-police-cooperation-with-ceecs-between-trust-and-obligation(8d876fdd-3a49-40b8-baad-e2590b663b17)/export.html)
- Booth, K. (2009). International relations: The story so far. *International Relations*, 33(2), 358-390. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047117819851261>
- Buzan, B., Wæver, O., & De Wilde, J. (1998). *Security: New framework for analysis*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Castles, S., De Haas, H., & Miller, M. J. (2013). *The age of migration: International population movements in the modern world* (5th ed.). The Guilford Press.
- Ceccorulli, M. (2009). *Migration as a security threat: Internal and external dynamics in the European Union*.
<https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/pais/research/researchcentres/csg/garnet/workingpapers/6509.pdf>
- Ceyhan, A., & Tsoukala, A. (2002). The securitization of migration in western societies: Ambivalent discourses and policies. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 27(1, S1), 21-39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03043754020270s103>
- Clyde, M. J. (1959). The causes of labor migration. *Bulletin of the Inter African Labor Institute*, 6(1), 12-47.
- Council of the European Union. (2003). *European Security Strategy - A secure Europe in a better world*.
<https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/documents-publications/publications/european-security-strategy-secure-europe-better-world/>
- Curran, S. R., & Saguy, A. C. (2001). Migration and cultural change: A role for gender and social networks? *Journal of International Woman's Studies*,

- 2(3), 54–77,
<http://vc.bridgew.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1619&context=jiws>
- Fierke, K. M. (2007). *Critical approaches to international security*. Cambridge University Press.
- Focault, M. (1980). *Power / knowledge*. Vintage.
- Franz, W., & Steiner, V. (1999). *Wages in the East German transition process – Facts and explanations*. Centre for European Economic Research Paper.
- Geddes, A. (2000). *Immigration and European integration: Towards fortress europe?* Manchester University Press.
- Guild, E., Carrera, S., & Balzacq, T. (2008). The changing dynamics of security in an enlarged European Union. In D. Bigo, R. B. J. Walker & S. Carrera (Eds.), *Europe's 21st century challenge*. Routledge.
- Habermas, J. (1985). *The theory of communicative action (1st vol.)*, Reason and the rationalization of society. Beacon Press.
- Hirschauer, S. (2019). For real people in real places: The Copenhagen school and the other “little security nothings”. *European Security*, 28(4), 413-430. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09662839.2019.1656199>
- Holsti, K. J. (2006). Something old, something new: Theoretical perspectives on contemporary international peace and security. In E. Newman, R. Thakur & J. Tirman (Eds.), *Multilateralism under challenge? Power, international order and structural change*. United Nations University Press.
- Howell, A., & Richter-Montpetit, M. (2019). Is securitization theory racist? Civilizationism, methodological whiteness, and antiblack thought in the Copenhagen School. *Security Dialogue*, 51(1), 3-22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010619862921>
- Huysmans, K. (2006). *The politics of insecurity: Fear, migration and asylum in the EU*. Routledge.
- Ibrahim, M. (2005). The securitization of migration: A racial discourse. *International Migration*, 43(5), 163-187. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2435.2005.00345.x>
- Keane, D. (2004). Environment causes and consequences of migration: A search for the meaning of environmental refugees. *Georgetown International Environmental Law Review*, 16, 209– 210. <https://environmentalmigration.iom.int/environmental-causes-and-consequences-migration-search-meaning-environmental-refugees>
- Klaus, W., & Pachocka, M. (2019). Examining the Global North migration policies: A “push out – push back” approach to forced migration. *International Migration*, 57(5), 280-293. <https://doi.org/10.1111/imig.12575>
- Koca, T. (2012). *The securitization of migration in Europe in the post-september 11 era. A comparative analysis of Germany and Spain*. University of Hamburg.

- Krause, K. (2017). Critical theory and security studies: The research programme of `critical security studies. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 33(3), 298-333.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0010836798033003004>
- Lake, D. A., & Morgan, P. M. (Eds.). (1997). *Regional orders. Building security in a new world*. The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Lijphart, A. (2003). Measurement validity and institutional engineering – Reflections on Rein Taagepera's meta-study. *Political Studies*, 51(1), 20-25.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9248.00410>
- Manning, P., & Trimmer, T. (2013). *Migration in world history* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Massey, D. S., Arango, J., Hugo, G., Kouaouci, A., Pellegrino, A., & Taylor, J. E. (1993). Theories of international migration: A review and appraisal. *Population and Development Review*, 19(3), 431.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/2938462>
- Muniz-Solari, O., Li, W., & Schleicher, Y. (2010). Conceptual framework: Why do people move to work in another place or country? In M. Solem, P. Klein, O. Muñiz-Solari & W. Ray (Eds.), *Global economy: A module for the AAG Center for Global Geography Education*. AAG Centre for Global Geography Education.
- Newman, E. (2007). *A crisis of global institutions? Multilateralism and international security*. Routledge.
- Rosenberg, E. S., & Tickner, J. A. (1993). Gender in international relations : Feminist perspectives on achieving global security. *The Journal of American History*, 80(3), 1043. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2080425>
- Ruggie, J. G. (Ed.). (1983). *Multilateralism matters. The theory and praxis of an institutional form*. Columbia University Press.
- Schmeidl, S. (1997). Exploring the causes of force migration: A pooled time-series analysis, 1970–1990. *Social Science Quarterly*, 78(2), 284–308.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/42864338>
- Shapiro, M. (1991). Sovereignty and exchange in the orders of modernity. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 16(1), 447-448.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/030437549101600404>
- Smith, H., & Stares, P. (Eds.). (2007). *Diasporas in conflict: Peace makers or peace-wreckers?* United Nations University Press.
- Spencer, A. (2008). Linking immigrants and terrorists: The use of immigration as an anti-terror policy. *Online Journal of Peace and Conflict Resolution*, 8(1), 5,
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237829585_Linking_Immigrants_and_Terrorists_The_Use_of_Immigration_as_an_Anti-Terror_Policy

- Tancredo, T. G. (2004). Immigration, citizenship, and national security: The silent invasion. *Mediterranean Quarterly*, 15(4), 4–15. <https://doi.org/10.1215/10474552-15-4-4>
- Tekofsky, A. (2006). The community method of border management. <https://www.ru.nl/publish/pages/527694/tekofsky.pdf>
- Thakur, R., & Van Langenhove, L. (2006). Enhancing global governance through regional integration. *Global Governance: A Review of Multilateralism and International Organizations*, 12(3), 233-240. <https://doi.org/10.1163/19426720-01203002>
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (1994). Human development report 1994. Oxford University Press.
- Vietti, F., & Scribner, T. (2013). Human insecurity: Understanding international migration from a human security perspective. *Journal on Migration and Human Security*, 1(1), 17-31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/233150241300100102>
- Walker, R. (1990). Security, sovereignty and the challenge of world politics. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 15(1), 3-27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030437549001500102>
- Wallace, W. (2002). Where does Europe end? Dilemmas of inclusion and exclusion. In J. Zielonka (Ed.), *Europe unbound. Enlarging and reshaping the boundaries of the European Union*. Routledge (pp. 78-94).
- Webber, M., Croft, S., Howorth, J., Terriff, T., & Krahnemann, E. (2004). The governance of European security. *Review of International Studies*, 30(1), 3-26. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0260210504005807>
- Weiner, M. (1992). Security, stability, and international migration. *International Security*, 17(3), 91. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2539131>
- Wendt, H. (1997). Zuwanderung und asyl in Deutschland - vor dem Hintergrund demographischer Entwicklungen [Immigration and asylum in Germany - Against the background of demographic developments]. *Zeitschrift für Bevölkerungswissenschaft*, 22(2/3), 319-346.
- White, M. J. (2016). Migration and the Environment. In M. J. White (Ed.), *Handbook of migration and population distribution* (pp.465-484). Springer.
- Winter-Ebmer, R. (1994). Motivation for migration and economic success. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 15(2), 269–284. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-4870\(94\)90004-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-4870(94)90004-3)
- Zachariah, K. T., Mathew, E. S., Irudaya Rajan, S. (2001). Social, economic, and demographic consequences of migration on Kerala. *International Migration*, 39(2), 43–71. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2435.00149>