

Theoretical Conceptualization of Migration-Security Nexus in International Relations Theory

Muhammad Najam ud din Farani

PhD Scholar and Visiting faculty member, Dept. of Political Science, University of Punjab, Lahore

Correspondence: najamfarani157@gmail.com

Dr. Qudsia Akram

Assistant Prof. of International Relations, Department of International Relations, Kinnaird College for Women, Lahore

ABSTRACT

In international relations discourse on security studies, migration was historically marginalized as an area of investigation. It was in the Post-Cold war scenario, that security framing of migration gained major significance. It became a permanent issue of high politics in the aftermath of 9/11. Migration-security nexus is a conceptual framework which helps in the exploration, identification, description and interpretation of security framing of migration in International relations discourse on security studies. Securitization theory, provided by Copenhagen school of international security studies, provide the suitable theoretical edifice to theoretical conceptualize the conceptual framework of migration-security nexus in International relations theory. This paper is an attempt to establish and explain the theoretical conceptualization of migration-security nexus with the help of securitization theory.

Keywords: *Migration, Security, Migration-Security Nexus, Securitization theory, Copenhagen School, International relations theory, Cold war, 9/11*

Introduction

In this modern day world of power politics, nation-states acting as primary actors of international relations define to a greater approximation the rules, treaties, regimes and institutes governing the movement of individuals or groups within or across their borders. Identity acts as a key determinant in this regard. Identity when it comes to nation-states regulating the movement of individuals and groups is shaped by many social frames such as society, culture, religion, politics, economy, environment etc. Among these different social frames of identity, national identity plays a pivotal role in determining the orientation of individual or group movements both within and across the borders of the nation-states in the realm of world politics and international relations. Such forms of movement in the realm of international politics are usually marked by an umbrella term i.e. migration.

According to International Organization for Migration (IOM), The United Nations (UN) Migration Agency, migration is defined as “The movement of a person or a group of persons, either across an international border, or within a State. It is a population movement, encompassing any kind of movement of people, whatever its length, composition and causes; it includes migration of refugees, displaced persons, economic migrants, and persons moving for other purposes, including family reunification” (IOM, 2019). This definition of migration by IOM, an affiliated body of UN poses certain legal, academic and policy challenges to

differentiate the spectrum of different movements which should and should not be considered under the categorization of migration. This definition do lay down the basis for a desire to operationalize a universal consensus among nation-states and other stake holders to moderate such kind of movements under a singular charter, set of rules or a unified regime. The real question here is this that is it even possible to universalize or find consensus among different nation-states having their own selfish political vested interests in this anarchical global order. The aforementioned oversimplification of the concept defined by the IOM and UN creates fuzziness around the idea of migration as everyone on this planet has to employ the state of movement in a certain respect to survive. For instance, take the case of mobility and circulation as forms of movement. Are mobility, circulation and migration same in character, nature, spectrum and scope? No, they are not. Mobility, circulation and migration are different in spatial and temporal sense. In simpler words, the length of distance and time is larger in migration as compared to the spatial and temporal spectrums of mobility. For example, tourists and traders cannot be declared as migrants as they are short term visitors in view of UN's criterion (1970) which requires that a person or group has to stay in a foreign place for more than a year to be declared or designated with the status of a migrant. Furthermore, all migrants are movers but not all movers are migrants. In the comparative cases of circulation and migration, circulation represents a cyclical pattern starting from the point of origin and passing through different nodes, eventually expected to come back to the point of origin without change in the existing life routine of an individual. For example, a person going to a job from his home and then returning back to home cannot be considered as a migrant as that person is only following a cyclical routine pattern of circulation movement, not migration. In substantiation of the aforementioned observations, academically speaking from a research point of view, the positioning of IOM and UN on the definition of migration can't be considered objective, universal and practical in orientation.

In order to construct theoretical conceptualization of migration-security nexus in International relations theory, it is important to build an understanding of security as a concept in International relations theory and what security discourses in International relations theory recognize the significance and role of migration in world politics

Security in International Relations

In international relations, security is one of the central themes in the discourse of world politics. No single state can afford to ignore or neglect security in the out projection of their vested interests in the form of official state policies. As much as it is central to understanding the dynamics of global relations between different nation-states, it still remains a contested theme in international relations theory depending on questions such as given below:

- What is security?
- How a risk or threat becomes a security issue?
- Who defines it?
- Who determines the conversion of a risk into a threat, leading it to become a security issue?

Theoretical Conceptualization of Migration-Security Nexus in International Relations Theory

- Why certain issues are taken into considerations as security issues and others are not?
- What are the objectives of security?
- Is security subjective or objective in nature?
- What should be the scope of security studies in International relations?

Theoretical approaches to the study of security in International Relations

There are two major approaches to the study of security studies in International Relations theory. They are:

- Traditionalist school of security in International Relations
- Non-Traditionalist school of security in International Relations

Traditionalist school of security studies in International Relations

Traditionalist school of security studies in International Relations discourse takes the global political system as a system which is based upon anarchy. In such an anarchical system of world politics, states try to locate their selfish national interests. These vested national interests of nation states which are primarily shaped by the anarchical system at the international forefront (Milner, 1991).

For traditionalists, security is all about state survival (Bourbeau, 2006). This survival depends upon protection from objective military threats perpetuating from external borders (Šulović, 2010). In this regard, Nye and Lynn Jones (1988, p. 27) (Walt, 1991, p. 212) define security studies as “the studies of the threat, use and control of military force”. Traditionalists define freedom from such threats as security as it ensures the safety and security of the state essentially. In other words, according to traditionalist school of security studies, a nation-state can't make progress, development and move forward on other fronts if security of the nation-state, from both within and outside, has not been accounted and dealt with properly in an efficient manner with reference to different form of threats and risks.

In the contemporary scenario of world politics, the roster of epistemic community of traditional school of security studies in security studies has mostly been dominated, guided and directed by the scholars, academics, researchers, experts and practitioners belonging to USA, and they are to a larger extent of the view that the focus of security studies should not be broadened beyond ensuring the survival of state security from any objective military threat emanating outside its external borders (Diskaya, 2013). They endorse this view due to the fear that any agenda based on the motive of broadening and widening in the subject matter of international security studies would lead towards intellectual incoherence and lack of specificity in the field. For this particular reason, traditionalists criticize the broadening and widening approach or agenda of non-traditionalist school of security studies in International relations theory. They only consider survival of the state as an issue of international security studies. When it comes to the traditionalist school of security studies, other issues which do not enter the scope of survival of the state are considered as issues of domestic politics; they are not considered as part of the international security studies agenda.

Traditionalist school of security studies in International Relations theory is being represented by the following theoretical paradigms given below:

- Classical realism
- Neo-realism
- Neo-classical realism

Non-Traditionalist school of security studies in International Relations

Non-traditionalist school of security studies in International Relations theory in contrast or as compared to the traditionalist school of security studies in International Relations theory advocates for the deepening, broadening and widening the scope, focus, subject matter and the boundaries of security studies in International Relations theory (Buzan & Hansen, 2009). Non-traditional school of security studies in international relations highlights that security is basically a social construct (Huysmans, 2002). Implicitly they are of the view that concept of security in International Relations theory is not objective in character. Security as a concept, according to the advocates of the non-traditional security school of international relations, is inter-subjective in nature. Non-traditional security exponents of International Relations theory are of the view that state's survival should not be the only key and primary source of concern for the proponents of the international security studies. They are of the view that limiting the scope of international security studies in order to just understand that how to protect state against external military threat extremely narrows the very scope of security studies in International Relations theory and consequently its efficacy as well. They argue that when it comes to determining who and what can define security in the international arena; agents, structures and issues other than state should also be included in the international security studies discourse such as individuals, societal groups, non-state actors, institutes, social contexts, historical contextualization, identity, migrants, environment, demographic changes etc. (McDonald, 2008).

If traditionalist approach to security studies in international relations is synonymous with statism, then non-traditionalist approach to security studies becomes synonymous with centrality of humanity. For this reason, non-traditional school of security studies is also known by another name i.e. Human security (Yamanaka, 2012). From a historical perspective, human security or non-traditional security as a concept of international security studies gained prominence in post-Cold war scenario during the decade of 1990's. Human security as a term was first mentioned in the Human development report published in the year 1994 (UNDP, 1994). According to Human development report published in the year 1994 (UNDP, 1994), Human security can be classified into following 7 categories. They are given below (UNDP, 1994):

- Political security
- Economic security
- Community security
- Food security
- Personal security

Theoretical Conceptualization of Migration-Security Nexus in International Relations Theory

- Health security
- Environmental security

As much as there is unity among the ranks of traditionalist school of security studies over the survival of the state as the primary source of concern for the international security studies, there seems to be a wide range of disunity among the ranks of the non-traditionalists over developing unity on the primary focus of the international security studies. This disunity among the non-traditionalist school of security studies is represented by two major schools of thought. These two schools of security studies following the non-traditionalist approach to security studies are given below:

- Aberyswyth school of thought
- Copenhagen school of thought

The substantive argumentative assumptive foundations of these two aforementioned school of thoughts of non-traditional security are given below.

Aberyswyth school of thought

Aberyswyth school of thought also known as the Welsh school of thought advocates for a non-traditionalist approach for deepening, broadening and widening the discourse of the security studies in the international relations theory. It is also labeled by another title i.e. Critical Security Studies (CSS) (Diskaya, 2013). It was being influenced by Frankfurt school, Marxism and Gramscian critical theory (Diskaya, 2013). Ken Booth and Richard Wyn Jones are the main proponents of CSS. In the contemporary sense, Robert W. Cox is considered as the major contributor towards the development and progress of CSS (Booth, 2007).

The advocates of this school of thought disapprove of the traditionalist approach of security studies which solely and primarily revolves and focuses around the defense of the nation-state. The main purpose of this conceptual approach is to serve the objective of human emancipation plus human centrality as a focus of attention (Diskaya, 2013). The advocates of this conceptual approach are of the view that state in itself is a source of insecurity. They are of the view that restricting the focus of international security studies just to the survival of nation-states endangers the fairness and transparency in ensuring security of entities other than state in the arena of global politics. One notion that they produce to support their argument is based upon the comparison as of how many people have suffered by the hands of their own governments and states in comparison to the foreign hordes invading other nation-states (HSC, 2005). According to the CSS, in consideration of the inter-subjective nature and social construction of security, nation states in world politics, alone, can't be the sole guarantors of true security for all stake holders and entities. According to the exponents of CSS, "the best starting point for conceptualizing security lies in the real conditions of insecurity suffered by people and collective" (Booth, 2005, p. 22). In this lieu, Booth (1991, p. 319) is of the view that true security "can only be achieved by people and groups if they do not deprive others of it."

In short, according to the Aberyswyth/Welsh school of security studies otherwise known as CSS, it can be summarized in a nutshell that security is not all about

survival; rather it is also about living and progressing as well. When it comes to the divide between advocates and proponents of non-traditionalist approach of international security studies and the agenda of broadening, widening and deepening the scope and subject matter of security studies in the international relations theory, CSS experts tend to move a lot more towards deepening as compared to widening the scope of international security studies.

Copenhagen school of thought

Copenhagen school of thought provides another major approach to the study of non-traditional security threats in the realm of international relations study. The two major sources for the development of Copenhagen school of thought are:

- Social constructivism
- Neo-realism

Buzan is recognized as the main proponent of Copenhagen school of security studies in international relations theory (Stritzel, 2014). Other major contributors involved in the development of the theoretical edifice of Copenhagen school of thought in international relations theory are Weaver and de Wilde (Buzan, Weaver, & de Wilde, 1998).

Copenhagen School of security studies as a non-traditionalist approach of security studies in international relations discourse tends to focus on broadening the focus and scope of international security studies as compared to the deepening memorandum of Aberyswyth school of security studies. The advocates of Copenhagen school of security studies agree with neo-realists on the status of nation states as the primary guarantors of security in international relations discourse. But in contrast to neo-realists, the advocates of Copenhagen approach to security studies get a step ahead in broadening the scope of security studies in international relations discourse (Buzan, Weaver, & de Wilde, 1998). They do so by including referent objects of security other than state in the international relations discourse such as individuals, societal groups, non-state actors, institutes, social contexts, historical contextualization, identity, migrants, environment, demographic changes etc. (McDonald, 2008). They criticize the exclusionary nature of neo-realism but are not adamant as are the advocates' of CSS approach on demolishing the very theoretical edifice presented by neo-realists. The proponents of Copenhagen approach in a way provide a synthesizing mechanism of security framework for making a bridge between critical and traditional approaches of international security studies.

Copenhagen school of security studies has made three major theoretical contributions regarding the development of international security studies. They are given below:

- Sectoral approach
- Regional security complex theory (RSCT)
- Securitization theory

Sectoral approach for security studies

Theoretical Conceptualization of Migration-Security Nexus in International Relations Theory

Sectoral approach towards the study of international security studies discourse is considered as a major contribution of Copenhagen school of thought and its advocates. This particular approach deals with the delineation of security into five sectors. They are given below (Buzan, Weaver, & de Wilde, 1998):

- Environmental sector
- Societal sector
- Political sector
- Economic sector
- Military sector

Regional security complex theory (RSCT)

RSCT broadens the level of analysis framework in international relations theory by connecting the local to the international level of analysis through the induction of a new level of analysis i.e. regional level of analysis (Buzan & Weaver, 2003). In this regard, RSCT provides four level of analysis for the study of world politics and making sense out of international relations. They are given below (Hussain & Farani, 2014):

- State
- Regional
- Inter-regional
- International

RSCT also broadens the level of analysis framework for understanding international relation by building security complexes for different nation states at different levels of world politics. In this regard, the typology of security complexes for nation states at different levels of world politics is given below (Hussain & Farani, 2014):

- Domestic security complex
- Regional security complex
- Inter-regional security complex
- Global security complex

Securitization theory

In international relations discourse of world politics, the foundations of securitization theory were laid down by Buzan, Weaver and de wilde. Concept of securitization which acts as the heart of securitization theory was first introduced by Ole Weaver (Mcdonald, 2008). 'Security: A new framework for analysis' is considered as the biblical textbook to understand the theoretical preface presented by the advocates of the securitization theory. Securitization theory is constructivist in approach as it is taken as a type of social praxis.

According to Weaver, security can be described as a security act (Buzan, Weaver, & de Wilde, 1998). Buzan (1991, p. 18) defines security as “pursuit of freedom from threats”. Buzan, Weaver and de Wilde (1998) consider security to be about survival. They consider state as the main guarantor of security but they oppose the exclusionary nature of military threat defining the security focus of international security studies.

“Securitization can be defined as the positioning through speech acts (usually by a political leader) of a particular issue as a threat to survival, which in turn (with the consent of the relevant constituency) enables emergency measures and the suspension of ‘normal politics’ in dealing with that issue” (McDonald, 2008, p. 7). The central argument of the securitization theory which can be deduced from this definition is that there is no objective threat or risk assessment rather all security threats are inter-subjective in nature or character. An issue only becomes a security issue only by the speech act of an agent representing the state authority (Buzan, Weaver, & de Wilde, 1998). Securitizing actors take into account the facilitating conditions in order to take the appropriate measures with reference to managing and controlling the emergence of existential or emerging neo-existential threats (Buzan, Weaver, & de Wilde, 1998). Facilitating conditions, according to securitization theory, provide the securitizing agents to analyze different forms of actions as well as choices available in order to deal with the existential crisis, different positional discourse narratives on the given existential crisis to form an appropriate speech act, and to gauge the intensity of the existential threat by having knowledge of security threats and risks existing throughout history. According to the securitizing theory, the speech act by the securitizing agent, which in most cases is the political elite, must be accepted by the relevant audience (Buzan, Weaver, & de Wilde, 1998). In case of acceptance by the relevant audience, the arena of normal politics is transformed into the arena of panic politics. This is particularly done through specific extraordinary securitizing moves or measures to neutralize the existential security threat. The theoretical assumptions provided by securitization theory through which a risk becomes a threat and then neutralized through securitization process can be structurally summarized in the following hierarchical steps given below (Buzan, Weaver, & de Wilde, 1998):

- Issue represented as an existential security risk
- Securitizing agent evaluates the existential security risk
- If found unworthy of attention, security issue is led to desecuritization process
- If found worthy of attention, securitization process is initiated
- Existential risk deemed as an existential threat
- Facilitating conditions
- Acceptance/recognition of the securitizing move/action by the relevant audience
- Securitizing measures taken up by the securitizing agent

Theoretical Conceptualization of Migration-Security Nexus in International Relations Theory

- Legitimate extraordinary measures brought in to deal with the existential security threat
- Transformation of normal state of politics into panic state of politics
- Neutralization of existential security threat

Securitization theory has two main faces i.e. securitization and de-securitization (Buzan, Weaver, & de Wilde, 1998). Although securitization theory does explain the transformation of risks into threats through securitization process, its primary focus is on the desecuritization process (McDonald, 2008).

Desecuritization is the process through which securitization process is reversed i.e. any issue or object is taken out of the security framing (Buzan, Weaver, & de Wilde, 1998). The main objective of the desecuritization theme is to help those who unjustly become the victims of securitization process e.g. minorities, political opponents, refugees, migrants, right activists etc.

Critics of securitization theory are on both sides of the security discourse i.e. traditionalists and non-traditionalists. Traditionalists precisely criticize the broadening agenda of securitization theory (Diskaya, 2013). Non-traditionalists criticize the securitization theory on many accounts. The first criticism comes on the account of the state authority governing the securitization process as the securitizing agent. Non-traditionalists specifically from CSS advocates are of the view that state in itself is also a source of insecurity (Diskaya, 2013). So how come state as securitizing agent becomes the sole and only securitizing actor in the whole securitization process. Moreover, the securitizing actors in most cases belong to political elites. The exclusion of those who are securitized is another source of scathing criticism from CSS as it marginalizes actors and agents other than state and promotes the narrative of the dominant minority classes, thus leading to selective politicization, giving preferential treatment to some over the other, making a mockery out of the principles of rule of law, fraternity and equity. Additionally, the securitizing agents are only taken as representatives of certain classes and securitization theory does not cater into account the institutional representations of the civil-military relations. Furthermore, the silence on how securitizing agents would fairly behave when it comes to dictatorships is another aspect which needs to be addressed in the securitization theory.

Secondly, the issue of facilitating conditions is one which seems to emphasize more on the generic nature of threats and the conditions in which they exist and can be neutralized. The structural assumption of facilitating conditions in securitization theory fails to accommodate the issue of historical and social contextualization (McDonald, 2008). This leads the whole process of securitization towards the negative representation of security as it focuses on what is the organic composition of the threat. Instead of the social construction of the threat by locating the voices of those who are going to get securitized by certain agents who deem it necessary to transform a risk into threat. Such framing of the perceived threat will not yield the desired support at the grassroots for the neutralization of the existential threat.

Thirdly, the issue of acceptance or recognition by the audience also raises questions. Who and what actually qualifies an audience in the securitization

process? What kind of audience is sufficient, significant and relevant for the process of securitization to yield its desired results (McDonald, 2008)? Securitization theory deals with these questions in abstractions, not in the practical real sense of the existential world. Does the securitization theory take into account the secrecy and the closed nature of the affairs when it comes to the selfish nature of world politics? Does it address the question of relevant, significant and sufficient audience for the acceptance of a security policy in democratic versus the totalitarian states? Any refinement in securitization theory has to address these questions.

This research study is going to apply securitization theory with slight modifications in view of the aforementioned criticism. In view of the securitizing agents, this research study is not only going to take into account the positions and narratives of the government from political perspective but also from the perspectives of the institutional positions taken in view of civil-military relations in Pakistan. Additionally, positions and narratives of voices other than state machinery will be taken into account for evaluating the fairness and transparency of the securitization process e.g. academics, security experts, journalists, lawyers and human rights activists. In view of facilitating conditions, this study will not only focus on the nature of the threat, security apparatus available to deal with it but also the historical contextualization in which this threat should be analyzed.

Theoretical conceptualization of Migration-Security Nexus

Migration-security nexus delineates migration as an existential security risk (Collver, 2006). Nation-states use this policy instrument to restrict the movement and passage of unwanted foreign individuals or groups within and across their borders (Karyotis, 2007). Migration-security nexus as a policy concept emerged in Europe at the end of Cold war (Angenendt, 2008). In the aftermath of 9/11, according to western security experts, the new existential threat or the next coming anarchy is going to emerge as a result of mass overflows associated with migration (Bourbeau, 2006). Migration-security nexus as a concept gained currency in the aftermath of 9/11 when certain foreign nationals attacked Pentagon and twin towers of the World Trade Center (WTC) (Faist, 2004).

Migration-security nexus and 9/11

In the aftermath of Sep 11, 2001 attacks on the twin towers of the World Trade Centre (WTC), migration has been essentialized and profiled as a neo-existential security threat (Humphery, 2013). Graeme Hugo has expressed his views on the impact of 9/11 on the securitization of migration in the following words: “the security considerations that arose in the aftermath of 9/11 ... have led to much greater dialogue between countries with respect to movement across borders” (Taylor, 2007).

Threats or risks associated with migration

Weiner (1993) who is first credited with the foresight to apprehend the emerging potential of migration associated threats to the nation-states in the field of political science categorizes risks or insecurities emanating from migration related issues into the following sets given below. They are (Weiner, 1993, pp. 10-18):

- Threat or risk to the home regime

Theoretical Conceptualization of Migration-Security Nexus in International Relations Theory

- Threat or risk to the host country
- Threat or risk to cultural identity
- Threat or risk to economy
- Threat or risk to society
- Threat or risk to the sending countries if they are held hostages in the host countries

The aforementioned threat or risk assessment of migration as a neo-existential security issue when it comes to sending and receiving contexts of nation-states, also makes it an issue of foreign policy as well as international relations (Koslowski, 1998). Karyotis (2007) is in agreement with Weiner (1993) in this particular context as he is of the view that the modalities governing migration have an ample impact on the bilateral relationship of both the sending and the receiving nation states (Haas, 2010). Umukoro (2016) while applying the principles of thermodynamics explain how entropy in the form of cross-border migration can result in the form of chain migration as well as transfer of conflict from one area to another. Fearon (1998), Lake & Rothschild (1998) and Premdas (1991) are all in agreement over the negative effects of accepting migrants as a result of a conflict by the hosting state which may result in the form of ethnic conflicts, creating instability in the hosting nation, causing violence within the hosting nation-state (Umukoro, 2016). Tom Tancredo, a republican member of House of Representatives (HOR) described the entry of migrants in USA as ‘silent invasion’ (Collver, 2006, p. 261). Other risks or threats that can be associated in relation to migration acting as a nation security threat to a nation-state are given below:

- Drug trafficking
- Human trafficking
- Terrorism
- Smuggling
- Kidnapping
- Organized crime

In the hindsight of the aforementioned threats, a relatively new thesis has emerged regarding the securitization of migration as a threat i. e. criminal-migrant nexus (Karyotis, 2007). As each action has an equal and opposite reaction so does the crime-migrant nexus thesis as far right nationalist parties in the contemporary politics are voicing their opposition against the acceptance and integration of migrants in their social fabric which according to their stereotypical notions of methodological nationalism may alter the matrix of their cultural homogeneity as well as the cohesive monolithic collective identity (Karyotis, 2007). Examples in this regard can be highlighted by the electoral politics of Nigel Farage as the leader of the Brexit party, Donald Trump as the President of USA, Le Pen’s far right politics in France etc. The fears of far right wing political parties can best be highlighted by Margaret Thatcher, former British Prime Minister, who said that “we joined Europe to have free movement of goods ... not ... to have free

movement of terrorists, criminals, drugs, plant and animal diseases and illegal immigrants” (Karyotis, 2007, p. 9).

Management of migration related threats

This view or perception of framing migration as a security threat has led the nation-states towards the development of instruments and procedures to restrict and cut the overflow of migrants within and across their borders. These instruments, structures and procedures may include:

- Profiling risk objects regarding migration
- Surveillance and policing of migrants
- Biometrics
- Databanks
- Border protection and management
- Spatial exclusion
- Detainment centers
- Immigration/emigration protocols
- Refugee camps
- Transnational networks
- International agencies/organizations
- Law

Almost all Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) member states have enlisted migration as a security concern in their threat list (Bourbeau, 2006). Metelev (2016) argues that how nation-states have begun to frame migrants as a security threats in their respective frameworks of national security. Cinoglu and Altun (2008) have observed that how threats associated with migration have led the nation-states towards the operationalization of migration-security nexus by strengthening and intensifying the border control regimes and protocols. Stivachtis (2008) observes that how such negative security framing against the presence of migrants in foreign lands have made it difficult for them to sustain their presence in foreign land, creating an identity paradox of us versus them.

Criticism of migration-security nexus

Although migration-security nexus and the fears of nation-states regarding that do have their basis in real politics, yet the thesis of crime-migrant nexus or migrant-terror nexus do cast a negative shadow on the innocent status of the majority of migrant populations. This security profiling renders away their basic fundamental rights such as natural justice, freedom of movement, freedom of association, human rights etc. they are not granted citizenship rights normally which implies that they may have legal rights but they can't exercise their political rights. The risks associated with methodological nationalism, cultural homogeneity, collective

Theoretical Conceptualization of Migration-Security Nexus in International Relations Theory

identity, territorial or sovereign or border infringements do not revolve only around the excesses of migrant populations. Lack of control or ineffective governing procedures, instruments and structures may also be responsible in this regard.

Conclusion

Theoretical conceptualization of migration-security nexus via securitization theory is quite probable considering the item of migration placed as a non-traditional security threat by international security experts. In securitization theory, state authorities are the primary actors who act as the securitizing agents. The case scenarios of migration-security nexus across the globe also show the involvement of state authorities as the agents securitizing migrants as security threats. In accomplishment of the objectives of migration-security nexus, certain strict measures are adopted to restrict and tackle the rights of migrants. The idea of facilitating conditions given in the securitization theory can also help us to understand that how migration-security nexus emerges in certain social and historical contexts and remains absent in others. This can help us to locate the root causes to identify the reasons leading to the development of migration-security nexus. Through comparative studies, we can learn from others who have abstained from employing migration-security nexus while they still face the same existential threats in the same globalized world. Perhaps, in this way not only a better understanding of the inter-subjective nature of the security world we live in can be understood but also in this way, the world we live in can be made into a much better secure and peaceful world. In securitization theory, threat is either checked or neutralized through extraordinary measures. Border controls, surveillance, data codification are some of the choices that do come under the category of extraordinary measures as has been explained by the securitization theory. In crux, theoretical assumptions of securitization theory help us to understand the functioning of migration-security nexus. Additionally, securitization theory also provides us with the theoretical edifice to counter migration-security nexus via desecuritization process which would help us to discover means and ways to reverse the securitization of migrants as security threats.

References

- [1] Angenendt, S. (2008). International Migration-Just a Matter of State Security? In J. Sommer, & A. Warnecke (Ed.), *Brief 36 The Security-Migration Nexus: Challenges and Opportunities of African Migration to EU Countries* (pp. 19-21). Bonn: Bonn International Center For Conversion (BICC).
- [2] Booth, K. (1991). Security and emancipation. *Review of international studies*, 17(4), 313-326.
- [3] Booth, K. (2005). *Critical security studies and world politics*. London: Lynne Rienner.
- [4] Booth, K. (2007). *Theory of world security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [5] Bourbeau, P. (2006, March). *Migration and security: Securitization theory and its refinement*. Retrieved from Academia.edu: https://www.academia.edu/4434883/Bourbeau_Philippe_2006_Migration_and_Security_Securitization_theory_and_its_refinement_ISA_San_Diego
- [6] Buzan, B. (1991). *People, states and fear: An agenda for security analysis in the post-cold war*. Brighton: Wheatsheaf.
- [7] Buzan, B., & Hansen, L. (2009). *The evolution of international security studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [8] Buzan, B., & Weaver, O. (2003). *Regions and powers: The structure of international security*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- [9] Buzan, B., Weaver, O., & de Wilde, J. (1998). *Security: A new framework for analysis*. London: Lynne Reinner.
- [10] Cinoglu, H., & Altun, N. (2008). Terrorism, International Migration and Border Control. *European Scientific Journal*, 9(20), 100-114.
- [11] Collver, M. (2006). Migrants, Migration and Security Paradigm: Constraints and Oportunities. *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol.11, No.2, 255-270.
- [12] Diskaya, A. (2013, February 01). *Towards a critical securitization theory: The Copenhagen and Aberystwyth schools of security studies*. Retrieved from E-IR: <http://www.e-ir.info/2013/02/01/towards-a-critical-securitization-theory-the-copenhagen-and-aberystwyth-schools-of-security-studies/>
- [13] Faist, T. (2004). *The Migration-Security Nexus. International Migration and Security Before and After 9/11*. Malmö: School of International Migration and Ethnic Relations, Malmö University.

Theoretical Conceptualization of Migration-Security Nexus in International Relations Theory

- [14] Fearon, J. (1998). Commitment problems and the spread of ethnic conflict. In D. Lake, & D. Rothchild, *The international spread of ethnic conflict: Fear, diffusion and escalation* (pp. 107-127). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- [15] Haas, H. d. (2010). The internal dynamics of the migration processes: A theoretical inquiry. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(10), 1518-1617.
- [16] HSC. (2005). *Human security report 2005: War and peace in the 21st century*. Oxford: OUP.
- [17] Humphery, M. (2013). Migration, Security and Insecurity. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 34(2), 178-195.
- [18] Hussain, N., & Farani, M. N.-u.-d. (2014). Afghanistan as a factor in India-Pakistan relations. *Regional Studies*, XXXII(02), 51-71.
- [19] Huysmans, J. (2002). Defining social constructivism in security studies: The normative dilemma of writing security. *Alternatives*, 27(1), 41-62.
- [20] IOM. (2019). *Key migration terms*. Retrieved June 25, 2019, from IOM UN Migration: <https://www.iom.int/key-migration-terms>
- [21] Karyotis, G. (2007). European Migration Policy in the aftermath of September 11. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 20(1), 1-17.
- [22] Koslowski, R. (1998). International migration and European security in the context of EU enlargement. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 12(1), 30-48.
- [23] Lake, D., & Rothchild, D. (1998). *The international spread of ethnic conflict: Fear, diffusion and escalation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- [24] McDonald, M. (2008). Securitization and the construction of security. *European Journal of International Relations*, 14(4), 563-587.
- [25] Metelev, S. (2016). Migration as a Threat to National Security. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, 9(14), 1-6.
- [26] Milner, H. (1991). The assumption of anarchy in international relations theory: A critique. *Review of International Studies*, 17(1), 67-85.
- [27] Nye, J., & Lynn Jones, S. (1988). International security studies: A report of a conference on the state of the field. *International Security*, 12(04), 5-27.

- [28] Premdas, R. (1991). The internationalization of ethnic conflict: Some theoretical explorations. In K. d. Silva, & R.J.May, *Internationalization of ethnic conflict* (pp. 10-25). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- [29] Stivachtis, Y. A. (2008). International Migration and the Politics of Identity and Security. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 1-24.
- [30] Stritzel, H. (2014). *Security in translation: Securitization theory and the localization of threat*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [31] Šulović, V. (2010, October 05). Meaning of security and theory of securitization. Belgrade: Belgrade center for security policy.
- [32] Taylor, S. (2007). Migration and human security in the Asia Pacific region. *Global Change, Peace and Security*, 19(3), 171-174.
- [33] Umukoro, N. (2016). Thermodynamics: Application of its principles to the effects of cross-border migration and Boko Haram crisis on security challenges in Africa. *Jouranl of Applied Security Research*, 11(1), 44-60.
- [34] UNDP. (1994). *Human development report 1994*. New York: UNDP.
- [35] United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (1970). *Methods of Measuring Internal Migration, Series A.-Population Studies, No.47*. New York: United Nations.
- [36] Walt, S. M. (1991). The Renaissance of security studies. *International Studies Quaterly*, 35(02), 211-239.
- [37] Weiner, M. (1993). *International migration and security*. Colorado: Westview press.
- [38] Yamanaka, A. (2012, 04 12). *A new vision for non-traditional security with human security*. Retrieved from Fédération pour la paix universelle France: <http://france.upf.org/conferences-europeennes/109-europe-2012/unesco-avril-2012/session-i-ouverture/554-a-new-vision-for-non-traditional-security-with-human-security>