Human (in)security and irregular migration: the Atlantic Basin

Introduction

Both voluntary and forced migration remain one of the most divisive issues among states today. Though it is not a new phenomenon, migration flows have been increasing over the last three decades. Since 9/11 and the subsequent 'Global War on Terrorism', migration has become an intense object for security analysis as it is undeniable how terrorism shapes public opinion on migration and affects political movements inside civil society and party systems. But does all migration matter for security? The answer is a clear no since most of the flows are regular and will not create neither a risk nor a threat for the state and its population. We live in a time of global human mobility and the twenty-first century is indeed the century of the migrant, but migration is a complex and highly stratified phenomenon. It impacts on the political boundaries left from the days of imperialism and colonialism, producing multicultural societies with shifting ethnic or religious compositions (Goldstone, 2012, p. 12). Global human mobility is a key feature of our world, albeit it includes many different dynamics, from the global tourist to the undocumented employee, and from human trafficking to refugees forced to leave their country of origin because of climate changes, poverty or wars (Castles & Miller, 2009). Hence, migration is contributing to many changes inside structures and institutions acting on global political, economic and social relationships (Castles, 2010, p. 1566). Notwithstanding, in this chapter, we focus on the migration-security nexus and so we are mostly referring to irregular migration flows that happen due to mass displacements (forced migration), cross-border asylum seekers and refugees, cross-border contract workers, migrants seeking better social and economic opportunities, and migrants with an irregular administrative status in the receiving countries.

Scholars need to be careful when associating migration and security because of the negative effects that may arise on migrants. But a lot of research has been developed in the last decades, especially in the security studies field, leading the migration-security nexus to be perceived mostly through a national security lens. The interest in how population dynamics and security studies are connected is increasing very fast, enhanced

by the expansion of political demography as field of study within international relations and political science. We have now a vast literature on this subject allowing us to explore how these two areas may be connected (Huysmans, 2000; 2006; Weiner & Russell, 2001; Bigo, 2002; Goldstone, 2002; 2012; Guild & van Selm, 2005; Adamson, 2006; Guild, 2009; Bourbeau, 2011; Sciubba, 2011; Rodrigues, 2015). The concept of securitization comes from the Copenhagen School and concerns focus on a specific subject beyond ordinary policies (Buzan, Waever, & De Wilde, 1998). When applying it to migration, it may be translated into securitarian frameworks to address migration-related issues (Ferreira, 2019, p. 37). Migration can matter for national security in situations when migrants or refugees are opposed to home countries' regime, when they are perceived as a security risk or a cultural threat in the home country, when immigrants cause social and economic pressure in host societies, or when the host society use immigrants as an instrument against the country of origin (Weiner, 1992, pp. 105–106). Ceyhan and Tsoukala (2002, p. 24) approach the securitization of migration in four different axis: (i) socioeconomic, due to unemployment, the rise of informal economy and underground economic activities, welfare state crisis, and urban environment deterioration; (ii) securitarian, considering the loss of a control narrative that associates sovereignty, borders, and both internal and external security; (iii) identitarian, where migrants are considered as being a threat to the host societies' national identity and demographic equilibrium; and (iv) political, as a result of anti-immigrant, racist, and xenophobic discourses. Therefore, since migration can impact in different areas as state sovereignty, the balance of power among states and the nature of conflicts in the international system, national security may also be affected (Adamson, 2006). Lastly, increasing human mobility has been associated with: urban clusters for migrants (Rodrigues, 2015, pp. 45–46), difficulties in the capacity of states to control who can enter their territories (Mabee, 2009, pp. 123-124), and asymmetries in the ethnic-religious population composition (Tragaki, 2007, p. 10). And if immigrants are not integrated into host communities, particularly if they come from a completely different cultural environment, the potential risk of religious and ethnic conflicts tends to be higher, demanding new governmental integration efforts of ethnic minorities into national communities (Savage, 2004). So, according to this body of work, there are possible risks for a hosting society.

Security is built on a set of discourses or narratives and historical practices based

on institutionally shared understandings, therefore becoming a political and social construct (Wæver, 1995). During this process, the elites in power, analysts and experts define the existing risks and threats in a certain moment and for different levels (national, regional, global). Then, they justify their validity alongside the community, subsequently activating, when possible, the means to neutralise them. Thus, the inclusion of a specific approach to security, in state practices or in international organisations, tends to be derived from an existing structure of power. And with increasing globalization, the state changed some of its functions and developed new ones, since the traditional function to guarantee the defence of its territory and political independence is now attached to the obligation of assuring economic independence, cultural identity and social stability. Transnational interdependences have been transforming the existing risks and threats, which are impossible to neutralise by only focusing on the state and with a national security strategy limited to national boundaries (Sørensen, 2005; Mabee, 2009). Therefore, new approaches may be considered, and human security has been one of the strongest alternative paradigms emerging in the international relations. Human security combines security, development and human rights, changing the referent for security from the state to the human. This people-oriented philosophy offers an alternative approach to tackle mass irregular migration, demanding a multilevel intervention and cooperation among states, international institutions and NGOs (Ferreira, 2019). However, due to the absence of a concrete framework, human security remains a somehow fuzzy concept that requires a greater understanding of what it is today in a very different global environment than the one existing by the end of twentieth century when the concept has burst to the surface with astonishing force within the international relations. Also, human security still needs further developments in terms of operational tools and concrete action plans to assure its implementation.

So, since human security emerged in a multilateral context, are the states really committing to it? Is human security really challenging the dominant paradigm of national security existing since the Peace of Westphalia? What does it bring to the migration-security nexus? Is it more effective to assess irregular migration? These are the questions addressed in this chapter. We try to look on how the human security paradigm penetrated the traditional paradigm of national security in the geographical context of the Atlantic Basin. To do so, we considered the national security and defence strategies from countries

belonging to different regions, some regional powers, some with a strong historical Atlantic path. Further, we examined in which terms migration, especially irregular migration, was considered within the national security strategies of Argentina, Brazil, Canada, France, Mexico, Nigeria, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. We argue that human security, as national security, has a global, preventive and cooperative nature and it is complementary to national security. So far, the later tends to prevail when states deal with the migration-security nexus, especially during a crisis scenario, though we can observe some principles and values of human security in countries' security strategic documents. This merging is vital in a time of rising nationalism and increasing separation between us (nationals) and them (non-nationals). Irregular mass migration is a consequence of a globalized interdependent world, being also a paradox of globalization since it is reinforcing the Nation-state and fuelling national sovereignty debates. The more effective way to securitize irregular migration is through a comprehensive approach of the migration-security nexus combining both national security and human security. States keep focusing more on securitizing their territory and citizenry. Hence, human security is fundamental to protect migrants, asylum seekers and refugees facing vulnerability and insecurity. And the combination of both provides the securitization of different territories and of all individuals (nationals and non-nationals).

Human security, migration and migrants: a missing framework for analysis

During the nineties, after the peaceful ending of the Cold War, the growth in intra-state conflicts, Western societies' fear of immigration, the decaying environment and the acceleration of the HIV/AIDS epidemic, it was inevitable to include new strategic factors associated with human security in the security agenda. The acknowledgement of a new world led to new developments on security, from its traditional political-military conception centred in the state and its sovereignty, to a more inclusive and holistic view of peace and international stability based on the protection of individuals (Buzan & Hansen, 2009, p. 187). The state stopped being the only referent for security as human security is a people-centred concept. Nonetheless, human security did not replace national security, integrating new dimensions as the protection of human rights, economic

development and individual security. Though the term emerged in the eighties, it was not until 1994 that it had an institutional conceptualization in the UN 1994 Human Development Report. There was not a concrete framework, but the core ideas were established. It was characterized by a universal, broad and flexible approach and by the interdependencies among the seven components: economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, community security and political security (UNDP, 1994).

The broadening of the security concept was pushed by the Copenhagen School, a school of academic thought on critical security studies that emphasized the social dimensions of security and rejected the sovereign state as the primary referent for and agent of security (Buzan, Weaver, & De Wilde, 1998), also defending increasing difficulties to sustain an enduring and reliable national security strategy without a strong response to human insecurity (Vietti & Scribner, 2013, p. 27). That was a key point: assuming national security paradigm was being inefficient to deal with environmental disasters, famine, disease epidemics, refugee flows, and other dynamics that were putting people's security at stake (Owen, 2004, p. 374). So, human security has brought the assumption of contemporary risks that demand new processes of securitization, spurring preventive diplomacy, good governance and economic and social development to save a society from reaching a crisis point. Hence, cooperation and prevention are fundamental principles of human security. But so they are to national security.

Human insecurity is a major driver of migration and the promotion of human security seems to be one fundamental path to manage and control mass irregular migration (Ferreira, 2019, p. 195). It should be obvious to most political actors that people caught up facing a civil war, or violent conflict in general, or targeted with political/ethnic/religious persecution, or facing economic deprivation, or dealing with famine, or migrating in very poor health conditions are dealing with human insecurity. Human survival, human dignity and human development are many times at stake for those migrating or being irregular inside a receiving or transit country. Two research contributions that clearly dealt with global mobility and human security were Bach (2003) and Clark (2003) and they concluded that to assess the problem in the most vulnerable populations is necessary to work with countries of origin, transit, and destination. Due to its preventive nature, much of the focus on human security is to address the conditions of human insecurity before people are forced to migrate. Ferreira (2019) followed that and

conceptualized a model of Minimum Standards based on human security and dignity principles that could be applied by the EU. But who can enforce human security? As Vietti and Scribner concluded (2013), human security goes beyond the limits imposed by the problems of state sovereignty and border control, leading to a deeper connection between irregular migration and human security that demands multilevel governance, strong cooperation and accountability.

Many of the images in our minds today about mass irregular migration evidence human insecurity both as a cause and an outcome of mass irregular migration. If irregular migration is fuelled by human insecurity in different areas, it is necessary to weigh up the security of migrants themselves that face numerous non-human conditions in many deterrence centres, refugee camps, or when they are subject to criminal networks involved in migrants smuggling and human trafficking (Ferreira, 2019, p. 5). A human security approach based on principles of social justice of various kinds will consider national security and human security as mutually supportive (Truong, 2011, p. 36). When migrants get to a country irregularly, some reports indicate cases of illegal work, labour exploitation, involvement in prostitution and human organ trafficking networks (Burgess, 2011, p. 15), which generate a space for the legal marginalisation of migrants based on nationalistic values that may ignite xenophobic practices inside hosting societies (Geddes, 2003, p. 22). Indeed, the development of underground economic activities has been reported in some studies, allowing both the lack of labour and socioeconomic security for the immigrants, plus labour abuse and tax evasion for those (individuals or companies) hiring them. So, human insecurity does not just come from the origin countries, neither from the journey of moving in an irregular path, but also from the conditions many immigrants face within hosting societies. Irregular migrants or semiskilled temporary workers often work under profound precarious and dangerous conditions and, at the same time, are excluded from the social welfare protection structures existing in the receiving countries as health, education and housing. So, even if they find a job that temporary fulfils national labour market needs, therefore adding value to national economy, their economic security is also temporary and not structural (Le Voy, Verbruggen, & Wet, 2004). For the benefit of immigrants and hosting communities, prevention of marginalisation, discrimination, urban segregation and social disruption are essential to ensure social stability. If the economic and social security of these individuals is granted, not only the area of socio-economic exclusion will be restricted, but also they are less

vulnerable to transnational organized crime. However, so far, the path followed by many states does not seem very inclusive, as some countries in global North lately rely on growing punitive governance, which illustrates the cycle of labour marginalisation, radicalisation and criminalisation. The politics of immigration control and the criminalization of irregular and illegal immigrants derive mostly from a social-legal system that allows their marginalization and their labour exploitation (Melossi, 2015, p. 60).

Migration policies go beyond economic and security issues as they enlighten the ethics of a given polity. From a human security approach, states are not only responsible to ensure the security of its borders and its citizens, but also of their residents. The resident population is made of nationals and non-nationals and both should be able to rely on the state to guarantee/safeguard their human rights and to help them when dealing with vulnerable conditions. But even beyond this domestic compromise, states should also act on human security internationally at different levels: within international institutions, bilaterally or supporting NGOs. If we analyse the migration-security nexus through human security, the conclusion is clear: migrants tend to be the weakest link. A new migrant-centred approach to the migration-security nexus through human security is therefore very much needed since migrants' security is not a referent on national security. Since there is spread research on the topic and there is no common shared framework among countries and institutions, what does human security add to the migration-security analysis? Even before migrants move, there is a commitment to ensure better standard of lives in developing countries by assuring human rights, development and humanitarian assistance. When they are moving, support and cooperation among countries of origin, transit and destination is provided to create safe legal routes, to fight migrants smuggling and human trafficking networks, and to assure basic human conditions in deterrence centres or refugee camps. And when migrants are in a receiving country, they can count on integration policies that encourage fair labour conditions and social welfare protection. Thus, we now proceed to show how migration is considered in the national security strategic documents of selected countries.

Institutional approach: migration and national security strategies

Though security has a deeply political nature, the way states approach it vary in time and space, and so we may assume it as a continuum involving various degrees of intensity (Bourbeau, 2011, p. 18). National security strategies are not the only resource to assess the human security of migration, albeit they are key instruments to understand the principles, the values and the institutional prerogatives structuring the securitization of migration developed by each state. Also, national security has been changing over the time, including some elements of individual security. These strategic documents are essential to understand states' strategic cultures and institutional view over global human mobility by analysing the security environment, prioritizing necessary actions, and defining domestic and international cooperation. All documents reflect each state decision-makers and experts' preferences in security and defence policy at a specific moment in time about different issues, being migration one of those. These documents (White Papers, Defence Agreements, Defence Concepts or another similar strategic document) were planned and implemented at different times but try to give a persistent security strategy projection as they are expected to last around five to ten years. So, here it is how the selected states approach migration in their security and defence strategies:

Argentina (2015)

The White Book for defence of Argentina ignores the migration-security nexus when approaching the existing risks for the country, as well the principles of human security, though a lot of ideas are explored under humanitarian aid and assistance and international cooperation (República Argentina - Ministerio de Defensa).

Brazil (2016)

Brazilian PND and END does not mention migration as an issue for security, neither the official version of 2012, nor the unofficial public draft under analysis of 2016. In these documents, both human security and irregular migration were absent, though some assumptions of human rights and global security cooperation in terms of peacekeeping were mentioned (Ministério da Defesa).

Canada (2017)

The quite recent strategy for defence of Canada does not consider any references to human security neither to the migration-security nexus, though there is a vast assumption of international cooperation considering humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, as well as peacekeeping missions (Minister of National Defence).

France (2017)

The migration crisis in Europe is understood as one of the tough subjects nowadays that has created a lot of tensions inside the EU, while challenging the sovereignty over the national territory of France, demanding stronger border control from the French Armed Forces. Demographic factors, especially migration flows, are understood as factors that exacerbate crisis situations. So, migration and refugee flows are posing challenges not only to France but to fragile developing countries with low absorptive capacity. Thus, the action needs to happen in neighbouring countries as well in terms of migration without ignoring its humanitarian dimension. In the document, it also mentions increasing organized crime involving migrants smuggling and human trafficking (République Française).

Mexico (2014)

The regional context of North America presents several economic inequalities, existing intense regular and irregular flows. The Mexican strategy develops a full autonomous section to understand migration. Due to its huge flows under severe conditions, Mexican authorities must fight migrants smuggling and human trafficking networks, as well as provide humanitarian aid to those moving and support to those settling in to avoid labour and sexual exploitation, as well as the participation in organized transnational crime networks. Controlling the borders and increasing surveillance, especially in the Southern one, is necessary, but the focus should rely on the migrants facing the most vulnerable conditions in order to achieve an efficient human mobility system. As a transnational phenomenon, cooperation between origin, transit and hosting countries is essential and they should work together to create conditions that enhance legal migration. So, repatriation programmes of Mexican citizens could be enforced if required by external countries and accepted by national authorities (Presidencia de la República).

Nigeria (2014)

Irregular migration is perceived as a threat to national security in Nigerian strategy. Nigeria's inadequately policed land and maritime borders have resulted in numerous illegal border crossings and irregular migration associated with transnational crimes, also favouring the illegal movement of arms, terrorists and other criminals. The approach to migration is perceived as being mainly "*a matter of law enforcement*" (p. 21) that is necessary to tackle since criminal organizations and terrorist groups use migration channels to establish and reinforce their positions within the region. So, it should be handled within a framework of bilateral, multilateral and international cooperation, that can lead to the suppression of transnational organized crime and the prevention of acts of terrorism. Internally, the practices of the islamist terrorist group Boko Haram have had consequences on migration too, as mass displacements occurred, as well as the creation of refugee populations under non-human conditions, and the expansion of famine and poverty (Federal Republic of Nigeria).

Norway (2017)

The Norwegian foreign and security policy document states that the security environment is changing and one of the reasons is the strong indication that migratory pressure on Europe will increase as the political context in the MENA region is not yet stabilized. During the last years, new challenges relating to migration and integration emerged due to increasing terrorism and organized crime. Therefore, the control of Schengen's external borders and cooperation in the area of asylum are necessary, as countries need to improve their joint system for processing asylum applications and to deport migrants who have had their asylum applications rejected. Also, the Government is following the Nordic cooperation project on the integration of refugees and immigrants inside Norway to prevent social marginalisation and fertile ground for radicalisation. The issue of migrants and refugees demands a strong international response based on cooperation to deal with a humanitarian crisis and the need of further development programmes in weak and fragile states. "*Better coordination of development aid and humanitarian assistance for refugees and migrants could help to ensure a more sustainable approach to dealing with flows of refugees and migrants in the neighbouring areas*" (p. 38) (Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs).

Portugal (2013)

The Portuguese strategic concept claims its commitment to human security as it is a principle followed by the UN (United Nations), NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) and the EU (European Union) security strategies. As an active member of the global security system, cooperation in international missions and humanitarian aid programmes has been pursued by the Portuguese Armed Forces. The impact of failed states and civil wars on migrant and refugee flows is perceived as a global security risk. The consequences of climate change and transnational organized crime on human migration are also considered. Therefore, Portugal needs to commit to maritime security to fight transnational organized crimes, also concerning irregular migration and human trafficking. Population ageing is understood as a major national challenge and the suggested way to cope with it is to promote new immigration policies, reinforcing integration policies to avoid the rise of extremism, xenophobia and nationalism movements that can compromise social cohesion (Governo de Portugal).

South Africa (2014)

The South African Defence Review considers human security, identifying the need for a shift from solely national security to the provision of security for its people by addressing critical political, socio-economic and environmental problems as many African countries suffer with human insecurity. Human security is approached as "*a component of a wider national security*" (p. 3-1). In terms of regular migration, one of the main worries is the internal flows from rural to urban spaces that are challenging the existing urban infrastructures. As for irregular migration, it is addressed in relation to the expansion of the informal labour market, illicit economic activities, disease control, migrants smuggling and human trafficking. To manage irregular migration flows, border control and safeguard must be achieved, in many cases with the cooperation of neighbouring countries. Social instability, the growth of terrorist cells, the financing of terrorism activities and other criminal activities, as well as the development of no-go areas are other problems emerging from irregular migration in South Africa. South Africa remains a destination country for many neighbouring migrants. So, intolerance and violence against non-nationals is another strong issue in social relations, entrenched in "*negative perceptions and stereotypes about foreigners, business rivalry, criminality, population density and pressure on scarce resources, particularly where perceptions of relative*

deprivation are sharpened by high unemployment and strong migratory pressure" (p. 2-17) (South African Government).

Spain (2017)

Irregular migration flows demand a comprehensive approach that advocates safeguarding the human dimension and strong international cooperation. Through a large understanding about the causes of migration, "*improving channels of legal migration, protecting migrants, combating exploitation and people smuggling, and cooperating in terms of return and readmission*" (p. 24) might be possible. The North Africa region and the Sahel present unstable political contexts that enable mass migration flows, many of them being irregular. Spain's direct interest in order to address irregular immigration demands cooperation with those countries and with the EU to advance towards greater regional stability. In recent years, "*criminal networks have taken advantage of the migrant and refugee crisis, and their extreme vulnerability, to open human trafficking routes to Europe*" (p. 60). These irregular migration networks use maritime routes that create a vulnerability in the Spanish maritime space, demanding stronger border control.

Irregular migration flows come from conflicts and regional instability, poverty and environmental degradation. Without lasting solutions, forced displacements may affect the political stability and social cohesion of the receiving countries. But the migration crisis management cannot ignore the protection of human rights of those who are in the most vulnerable situations. Also, the integration of immigrants in Spain is important to promote the country's prosperity and diversity, respecting different values, lifestyles and freedom. So, the goal is to prevent, control and organize irregular migration flows at borders, and ensure appropriate integration of immigrants, asylum seekers and refugees. For that to happen further cooperation is needed, among states, the EU, with transit and origin countries, and by encouraging the private sector to participate. Complying with all national and European legal provisions, developing safe routes for legal migration, combating human trafficking networks, and monitoring Spanish external borders are also part of the Spanish lines of action (Gobierno de España).

United Kingdom (2015)

Migration is understood as a major global and national security challenge, whether directly or because of political-social instability in conflicts such as the ones in Syria and

Iraq, which led to increasing mass migration and human trafficking. Instability, extremism and conflict in the Middle East and Africa have displaced millions of people in recent years. Transnational organized crime and climate change can also be a driver of migration that needs to be securitized. There is a strong humanitarian challenge in Europe, pressing the EU and demanding coordinated work with multilateral agencies and countries that are hosting large numbers of refugees. There is the goal to help improving livelihoods and give displaced people the best possible prospects, but as close to home as possible. It is also vital to further strengthen the ability to control migration, to offer asylum, and to ensure that the border, immigration and citizenship systems can manage migration overseas, at the UK border and within the UK.

The UK is not part of Schengen's open borders agreement and has an independent way of dealing with the migration crisis in Europe, but remains working with NATO and the EU, as well as bilaterally (though no countries are mentioned within the document for bilateral cooperation). All in all, there is a comprehensive approach to migration that ensures investment in countries of origin to help reducing forced displacement and migration over the long term, to provide humanitarian aid to those who are forcibly displaced, as well as education and livelihood opportunities. Tackling the capacity of origin and transit countries to manage their borders more effectively and organised immigration crime are priorities. And to do so, humanitarian aid, disaster response, and especially development assistance is needed. Therefore, the UK is committed to those principles in fragile states with vulnerable populations since "*it makes a significant contribution to long-term national security and prosperity. Tackling poverty and instability overseas means tackling the root causes of many of the global challenges that we face including disease, migration and terrorism*" (p. 48) (HM Government).

United States of America (2017)

The document tries to put the idea of 'America First' in terms of security and the first pages clearly state that the fundamental responsibility is to protect the American people, the homeland, and the American way of life, adding the need to strengthen border control and reform the immigration system. A full section is dedicated to that issue since it is perceived as central to national security, economic prosperity, and the rule of law. Though the document has an autonomous section to analyse migration, the border issue is considered when approaching terrorism, drug trafficking, and criminal cartels. Therefore,

affirming the need to enforce national sovereignty and the right to determine who should enter in the USA and under what circumstances is a key priority.

Another issue is irregular migration and the way it "*burdens the economy, hurts American workers, presents public safety risks, and enriches smugglers and other criminals*" (p. 9). So, it is fundamental that the state can decide about who to legally admit for residency and citizenship based on the migrants' merits and abilities and not allowing an extended-family chain of migration. Though regular migration may be stimulated according to the national interest, there is a need to enhance border control (construction of a border wall), the screening and vetting of travellers, close dangerous loopholes, and revise outdated migration laws and policies.

On another section, when exploring the priority actions, the document states that the USA is committed to reduce human suffering. Even if expecting stronger shared responsibilities with other states and institutions, the USA will continue its humanitarian assistance, trying to ignite international responses to natural disasters and to provide food security and health programs that save lives. The support to displaced people will be close to their homes until they can safely and voluntarily return home (The White House).

We believe this analysis shows how human security managed to (or failed to) penetrate the dominant national security paradigm. In the next section, we explore how migration can be framed within national security and human security and highlight which countries are considering and which are ignoring human insecurity.

National security and/or human security: a comparative approach

Through a comprehensive approach to the literature review previously done, Table 1 considers fourteen dimensions, half of them linked to national security and the other half to human security. In terms of national security, we considered irregular migration as: (A) threatening social cohesion due to shifting ethnic and religious population composition; (B) requiring a focus on deterrence centres and repatriation programmes; (C) demanding stronger border control; (D) facilitating terrorism; (E) increasing transnational organized crime; (F) increasing small criminality and internal insecurity; and (G) pressuring the social welfare protection instruments. As for human security, we focused on (A') assuring human rights, dignity and humanitarian assistance to migrants

moving or trying to enter a country; (B') committing to development support and cooperation with countries of origin and transit; (C') combating migrants smuggling and human trafficking; (D') developing new safe legal routes; (E') fostering integration policies that protect immigrants from social marginalization and urban segregation; (F') assuring fair labour conditions and protection to migrants; and (G') persuading socioeconomic integration through social welfare protection. We use (+) to identify when countries consider one these fourteen dimensions in their strategic documents.

Table 1. Migration-security nexus: a framework for analysis

Country	National security							Human security						
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	A'	B'	C'	D'	E'	F'	G'
Argentina														
Brazil														
Canada														
France				+	+				+					
Mexico			+		+				+	+				
Nigeria				+	+				+					
Norway				+	+			+	+			+		
Portugal			+		+				+	+		+		
South Africa	+		+	+	+	+				+		+		
Spain	+		+		+			+	+	+	+	+		
U.K.				+	+			+	+	+				
U.S.A.		+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+				

One of the first ideas derived from Table 1 is that although most states are not following a concrete framework to promote human security, they consider certain elements of it when approaching the migration-security nexus. And so, we can perceive a light penetration of human security within national security strategies. This is relevant since human security may re-orient the values and principles guiding national security strategic cultures and hence be enforced by states in their security practices, avoiding being just a dream of the international community. The presence of human security in these documents is fundamental to commit states to it and to make them accountable for it in the national political arena and in the international system.

Only three countries totally ignore the migration-security nexus according to their documents, namely Argentina, Brazil and Canada. When considering human security, what prevails is ensuring development, support and cooperation with countries of origin

and transit to stabilize them or the regions under deep political turmoil. We can also observe that countries are more focused on the dynamics with origin and transit countries than to deal with the human insecurity of migrants, asylum seekers and refugees when they are inside their countries, especially if they are a destination country. Nevertheless, Norway, Portugal, South Africa and Spain stress out the importance and the necessity of strong integration policies. Notwithstanding, it is harder to find references about enabling the access to housing, employment and other social programs, as well as opening and regulating safe routes for migrants. Only Spain puts the development of legal safe routes as a priority of action.

Hence, we conclude that the focus on the migration-human security nexus tends to work on a previous stage, before irregular migrants arrive in the country. So, countries rely on international cooperation and global migration governance, especially through the promotion of stronger aid and human rights' programmes in countries of origin to promote human security. All in all, these documents end up reassuring the restrictive character of migration control policies, as many countries are committing to intense border control, stronger asylum and citizenship vetting; while others, like the U.S.A., are now focusing on deterrence centres and repatriation programmes to manage irregular migration. Another important conclusion is that although there is no direct evidence connecting recent mass migration flows and terrorism, many countries keep associating irregular migration with a growing terrorist threat, except for Mexico, Portugal and Spain. One common ground seems to exist around the fight against migrants smuggling and human trafficking since there is an intense criminal transnational activity going on today and, at the same time, it imposes great vulnerability on the migrants themselves. The humanitarian consequences of avoiding human security are not fully detailed in these documents. So, we must trust that more and better international cooperation will be the key to manage irregular migration flows and to overcome the obstacles existing to access asylum. Considering dangerous border crossings and the risk of exploitation as inherent to irregular migration, if the first can be dealt with international cooperation and better border control, the last seems to remain under-securitized.

Conclusion

We live in a time of rising nationalism in the world while we assist to a crisis of multilateralism. And if we agree that stronger global cooperation is the key to manage irregular migration on a global level, the truth is that the actual context is presenting more difficulties to impose human security both internationally and domestically since states have different priorities and views over the migration-security nexus and are committing more to the traditional national security paradigm. The causes of migration are now well established and are mostly the same. So, the ongoing research on push-pull factors has now a solid body of work that allows us to conclude that the main drivers of migration rely on societal inequalities that have been expanding with asymmetric developments of capitalism. Also, irregular mass migration tends to come from crisis scenarios, like civil wars, political persecutions and environmental degradation. Cross-border human mobility implies the merging of different cultural environments since migration flows are global and not only regional or limited to people sharing the same broad cultural values. So, multicultural societies are the way to go. Of course, this challenge established ideas of national identity, but one may say that this is a tough concept to measure in the information age and within transnational societies. One thing is for sure, national identity is more that the citizenry and a passport. Or maybe, nowadays, that is all it is and nothing more.

If we accept globalization and the free circulation of goods, services and capital, we cannot allow double standards on regulating the circulation of people. On the one hand, a shared system for migrants that are already part of the global productive apparatus and on the other hand a very divisive system full of cultural boundaries, contradictions and discriminations towards non-productive individuals. The choice that we must make collectively cannot be confined to economic benefits and we cannot route for an ugly globalization that leaves powerless individuals out of it. Globalization is also for asylum seekers and refugees. Either we embrace it fully or we are using our privileges to choose the "good part" and leave the "bad part" out for others to deal with. The ethics must always prevail in national and international policy making and if that happens, if societies stick to globalization, they will demand an alternative path to migration governance. To achieve better integration and to promote a globalization of humanitarianism, human security may just be the key to manage global migration and the migration-security nexus.

Nevertheless, without a clear and strong commitment of states to human security (making them accountable for it) recent history proves that will be an enormous and arduous task.

References

ADAMSON, Fiona B. – "Crossing borders: International migration and national security". In *International Security*. Vol. 31, Nb. 1, 2006, pp. 165-199.

ADELMAN, Howard – "From refugees to forced migration: The UNHCR and human security". In *The International Migration Review*. Vol. 35, Nb. 1, 2001, pp. 7-32.

BACH, Robert – "Global Mobility, Inequality and Security". In *Journal of Human Development*. Vol. 4, Nb. 2, 2003, pp. 227-245.

BIGO, Didier – "Security and immigration: Toward a critique of the Governmentality of unease". In *Alternatives*, Vol. 27, 2002, pp. 63-92.

BOURBEAU, Philippe – "*The Securitization of Migration: A study of movement and order*". Abingdon: Routledge, 2011.

BURGESS, J. Peter – "Introduction: Security, migration and integration". In *A threat against Europe? Security, migration and integration*. Brussels: Institute for European Studies, 2011, pp. 13-15.

BUZAN, Barry & HANSEN, Lene – "*The evolution of international security studies*". Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

BUZAN, Barry, WAEVER, Ole, & DE WILDE, Jaap – "*Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1998.

CASTLES, Stephen – "Understanding global migration: A social transformation perspective". In *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. Vol. 36, Nb. 10, 2010, pp. 1565-1586.

CASTLES, Stephen & MILLER, Mark J. – "*The age of migration: International population movements in the modern world*" (4th ed.). New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

CEYHAN, Anastassia & TSOUKALA, Ayse – "The securitization of migration in western societies: Ambivalent discourses and policies". In *Alternatives*. Vol. 27, 2002, pp. 21-39.

CLARK, Michele Anne – "Trafficking in Persons: an issue of human security". In *Journal of Human Development*. Vol. 4, Nb. 2, 2003, pp. 247-263.

Federal Republic of Nigeria – "National Security Strategy 2014 [Consulted at: December 5, 2018]. Available at: http://ctc.gov.ng/nigerian-national-security-strategy-2014/.

FERREIRA, Susana – "Humans Security and Migration in Europe's Southern Borders". Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019.

GEDDES, Andrew – "*The politics of migration and immigration in Europe*". London: SAGE Publications, 2003.

GOLDSTONE, Jack A. – "Population and security: How demographic change can lead to violent conflict". In *Journal of International Affairs*. Vol. 56, Nb. 1, 2002, pp. 3-22.

GOLDSTONE, Jack A. – "A Theory of Political Demography. Human and Institutional Reproduction". In *Political demography: How population changes are reshaping international security and National Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012, pp 10-28.

Gobierno de España – "National Security Strategy 2017" [Consulted at: December 5, 2018]. Available at: http://www.dsn.gob.es/sites/dsn/files/2017_Spanish_National_Security_Strategy_0.pdf.

Governo de Portugal – "Conceito Estratégico de Defesa Nacional [Strategic Concept of National Defense]". [Consulted at: December 5, 2018]. Available at: http://www.portugal.gov.pt/pt/ministerios/mdn/quero-saber-mais/sobre-ominister io/20120223-conceito-estrategico/20130416-conceito-estrategico.aspx.

GUILD, Elspeth – *Security and Migration in the 21st Century*. Cambridge and Malden: Polity Press, 2009.

GUILD, Elspeth & VAN SELM, Joanne (Eds.) – "*International migration and security. Opportunities and challenges*". Abingdon: Routledge, 2005.

HM Government – "National Security Strategy and Strategic Defence and Security Review 2015. A Secure and Prosperous United Kingdom" [Consulted at: December 5, 2018]. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-security-strategy-and-strategic-defence-and-security-review-2015.

HUYSMANS, Jef – "The European Union and the Securitization of Migration". In *Journal of Common Market Studies*. Vol. 38, Nb. 5, 2000, pp. 751-777.

HUYSMANS, Jef – "*The Politics of Insecurity: Fear, migration and asylum in the EU*". Abingdon: Routledge, 2006.

LEVOY, Michele, VERBRUGGEN, Nele, & WETS, Johan (Eds.) – "*Undocumented Migrant Workers in Europe*". Brussels: PICUM, 2004.

MABEE, Bryan – "*The globalization of security: State power, security provision and legitimacy*." New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

MELOSSI, Dario – "*Crime, punishment and migration*". London: SAGE Publications, 2015.

Minister of National Defence – "Strong, Secure, Engaged. Canada's Defence Policy" [Consulted at: December 5, 2018]. Available at: http://dgpaapp.forces.gc.ca/en/canada-defence-policy/docs/canada-defence-policy-report.pdf.

Ministério da Defesa – "Política Nacional de Defesa e Estratégia Nacional de Defesa" (Versão Preliminar) [Consulted at: December 5, 2018]. Available at: https://www.defesa.gov.br/noticias/29093-minutas-do-livro-branco-da-pnd-e-da-end-estao-disponiveis-para-leitura.

Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs – "Setting the course for Norwegian foreign and security policy" [Consulted at: December 5, 2018]. Available at: https://www.regjeringen.no/en/aktuelt/future_course/id2550127/.

OWEN, Taylor – "Human Security - Conflict, Critique and Consensus: Colloquium Remarks and a Proposal for a Threshold-Based Definition". In *Security Dialogue*. Vol. 35, Nb. 3, 2004, pp. 373-387.

Presidencia de la República – "Programa para la Seguridad Nacional 2014 – 2018. Una política multidimensional para México en el siglo XXI" [Consulted at: December 5, 2018]. Available at: http://cdn.presidencia.gob.mx/programa-para-la-seguridad-nacional.pdf.

República Argentina, Ministerio de Defensa – "Libro Blanco de la Defensa 2015" [Consulted at: December 5, 2018]. Available at: http://ceed.unasursg.org/Espanol/09-Downloads/Info-Pais/Arg/LB/Libro_blanco_2015.pdf.

République Française – "Revue stratégique de defense et de sécurité nationale 2017" [Consulted at: January 3, 2019]. Available at: https://www.defense.gouv.fr/espanol/dgris/politique-de-defense/revue-strategique/revue-strategique.

RODRIGUES, Teresa Ferreira – "Population dynamics: Demography matters". In *Globalization and international security. An overview*. New York: Nova Science Publishers, 2015, pp. 33-49.

SAVAGE, Timothy M. – "Europe and Islam: Crescent waxing, cultures clashing. In *The Washington Quarterly*. Vol. 27, Nb. 3, 2004, pp. 25-50.

SORENSEN, Georg – "State transformation and new security dilemmas". In *Globalization, security, and the nation-state. Paradigms in transition*. New York: State University of New York Press, 2005, pp. 81-98.

South African Government – "South African Defence Review 2014" [Consulted at: December 5, 2018]. Available at: https://www.gov.za/sites/default/files/dfencereview_2014.pdf.

The White House – "National Security Strategy of the United States of America 2017" [Consulted at: December 5, 2018]. Available at: https://www.whitehouse.gov/articles/new-national-security-strategy-new-era/.

TRAGAKI, Alexandra – "Demography and migration as human security factors: The case of South Eastern Europe". In *Migration Letters*. Vol. 4, Nb. 2, 2007, pp. 103-118.

TRUONG, Thanh-Dam – "The Governmentality of Transnational Migration and Security: The Making of a New Subaltern". In *Transnational Migration and Human Security. The Migration-Development-Security Nexus*. Berlin: Springer, 2011, pp. 23-37.

UNDP – "*Human Development Report 1994*". New York: UNDP, 1994.

VIETTI, Francesca & SCRIBNER, Todd – "Human insecurity: Understanding international migration from a human security perspective". In *Journal on Migration and Human Security*. Vol. 1, Nb. 1, 2013, pp. 17-31.

WAEVER, Ole – "Securitization and Desecuritization". In *On security*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995, pp. 46-86.

WEINER, Myron – "Security, stability, and international migration". In *International Security*. Vol. 17, Nb. 3, 1992, pp. 91-126.

WEINER, Myron & RUSSELL, Sharon Stanton (Eds.) – "*Demography and National Security*". New York: Berghahn Books, 2001.