European Radical Right Parties as Actors in Securitization of Migration

Mehmet Gökay Özerim

Abstract—This study reveals that anti-immigrant policies in Europe result from a process of securitization, and that, within this process, radical right parties have been formulating discourses and approaches through a construction process by using some common security themes. These security themes can be classified as national security, economic security, cultural security and internal security. The frequency with which radical right parties use these themes may vary according to the specific historical, social and cultural characteristics of a particular country.

Keywords—European Union, International Migration, Radical Right Parties, Securitization.

I. INTRODUCTION

INTERNATIONAL migration has been transformed into a significant agenda item for the contemporary societies and states by its' increasing intensity and remarkable impact. Within this framework, international migration flows are one of the most vital experiences of Europe in context of social and economic transformation. This experience has been taking form by the effects of a variety of nested policies, ranging from the redefinition of the welfare state to the perceptions on multiculturalism. Moreover, integration experience of Europe has added to this picture a supranational governance aspect beyond its' national and international dimension.

On the other hand, positioning of international migration and migrants in the political and economic life spheres of the European countries is not an automatic and spontaneous process. Several actors have been effectively taking role in the framing process of migration which directly or indirectly influences a variety of policies and perceptions. Stemming from this fact, the question of how this framing process has been constructed is precious and worth to analyze while studying migration policies of the European countries both at national and also supranational level.

The general picture in Europe shows that there is a remarkable and growing trend of casting role to migrants with security perspective and constructing the perception of migration by combining this phenomenon with anxieties of security. Local, national and international actors that have been involved to this construction process do not only affect the policies towards migrants but also they manipulate images of migrants particularly in perceptions of the European societies. Moving from this perspective, it should be stated that the discriminatory approaches and policies towards

M.G.Ozerim, Ph.D., Yaşar University, is w,th the Department of International Relations, Universite Cad. No:35/37 Bornova, Izmir, Turkey (phone: +90 232 4115012; fax: +90 232 4115022; e-mail: gokay.ozerim@yasar.edu.tr).

migrants cannot be identified only with the certain actors or certain sentiments such as xenophobia since this kind of an explanation means to ignore the overall picture. As a result, this study stems from the fact that anti-immigration in Europe has been constructed by the impact of several national and international actors by using a variety of ideological tools.

Radical right parities might be exemplified as one of these influential actors. Till 2000s, a radical right party's rise with anti–immigration policies or any other voter mobilizer issue, even as a coalition partnership, was surprising. However, then it became a normal part of the political life in many European countries and radical right parties' with anti-immigration discourse gained seats in several countries[1]. These parties are not against only to irregular migration and they formulated an opponent stance to any kind of migration by framing it as a threat.

In construction process of radical right parties' anti-immigration discourse and their framing migration as a threat, the concept of security plays a prominent role. It is important to note that following the end of Cold-War, the concept of security has been re-defined as many concepts of international relations and correspondingly the meaning of security is extended by going further from its' traditional meaning. Migration was positioned as a threat by several actors in this redefined security concept and this process also might be exemplified as a period that migration has most frequently overlapped with the discourse of security [2].Since this securitization is a shortcut to obtain votes, anti-immigration stance became to a golden gate and to valuable election propaganda for many populist political parties, particularly for the radical right. Moreover, these parties obtained seats in the countries such as Sweden, UK and Netherlands which are well known with sound policies of multiculturalism and tolerance. Within this conjuncture, the numbers of parties which introduce race card hidden behind anti-immigration discourse in election campaigns become remarkably high in European political arena.

By moving from this background and using theoretical approach of securitization, this paper will analyze how European radical right parties have been framing migration as an issue of security and which security themes they have been using intensively within this discourse.

II. THE NEXUS BETWEEN SECURITIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION

When the historical process was analyzed as a background, it can be explicitly observed that all components of security

concept, such as actors, structures and roles have been involved into a transformation. Therefore, threats and security objects has been undergoing a simultaneous transformation within the same period, too [3].As a result of this transformation, the traditional understanding of security was questioned which was intensively state centric and focused on the militaristic capabilities and facts.This questioning brought a change in content and context of security studies and understanding. In this regard, the framework of the security and threats are not only includes to protect states to militaristic threats in critical security studies. It also covers ethnic or religious riots or identity problems [4]. Moreover, state is not the only security subject anymore since new security understanding covers individual and society, indeed [5].

When viewed from this aspect, the contribution of Copenhagen, Aberytwyth and Paris Schools cannot be ignored, particularly for the transformation of security understanding and in formulation of new approaches to security. Among these approaches, Copenhagen School is precious by taking constructivist perspective as a base to security studies and by its' innovative securitization approach which was developed by Buzan, Waever and Wilde in 1990s. Beyond just perceiving as an objective situation, securitization approach is different from the traditional approaches by framing and defining security as a discursive and political power and therefore it is important also for this study [6]. Accordingly, a variety of actors have been involved to the construction of the security definition, creating threats within this construction process and eventually using this process as a tool of power implementation. Within this perspective, Buzan, Waeverve Wilde defines securitization as an extreme version of politicization [7]. As could be derived from this definition, securitization might frame an issue as a threat and might be used as a tool to legitimate and mobilize extreme measures beyond regular political initiatives by claiming the urgency of these measurements in their discourse. Similarly, Balzacq defines the securitization as a process which claims that a development, issue or event raises a threat, so requires regulatory measurements in order to convince a group of audience [8].

According to the Copenhagen School, discourse has a central role to frame a subject as a security concern [9]. Actors and agencies are the other significant components of the securitization process since securitization is an actor based process. On the other hand, speech act, referent object and securitizing actors might be indicated the other main components of the securitization process. Referent object is the issues or the things that framed as under threat. Securitizing actors are the ones who creates or triggers the perception of that these referent objects are under a threat. Another concept which is highly related with this study and which is a part of securitization approach is the speech act and securitization frames a thing or issue as a security subject and it performs this through speech act. Speech act concept which was borrowed from the linguist Austin, simply means that any words has a performative power in it's essence [10]. On the other hand, as will be explained in the methodology section, it

is preferred to use the concept of "discourse" in context of this study since the methodology is designed by the tools of critical discourse analysis.

Within this framework of securitization approach, migration has been one of the remarkable and interesting examples of Buzan, Waeverve Wilde while referring to societal security. In fact, migration has been evaluated only as a part of humanitarian affairs till 1990s. In this respect, considering migration in terms of security is surprising and unexpected [11]. Copenhagen School indicated that securitization process move forward under certain discourse patterns and the concepts such as "invasion", "other" or "identity" are important aspects of this discourse [12]. On the other hand, radical right parties of today, which are the leading securitizing actors of migration in Europe, have been using further stronger discourse while constructing their anti-immigrant stance.

The anti-immigration discourse of the radical right parties have a direct target group which they strive to convince and which is conceptualized as "audience" in securitization approach. Any conditions or internal/external factors that influence perception of audience might be influential to convince them. From this point of view, it might be considered that terrorist attacks of September 11 and its' successors in Europe or the financial crises of Europe might be considered as elements that function to trigger securitization process and creates to conditions to convince audience easier. By these conceptual and daily perception changes, now the nexus between migration and security is more explicit, easier to observe and intensively agreed in contemporary not only in European societies but also in international community. For instance IOM published a report in 2003 titled "International Terrorism and Migration" and revised this report in light of recent developments in 2010 with the same title. It is an interesting case because as mentioned, it was unexpected to frame migration within the security concept before 1990s, but today migration might be evaluated even in context of terrorism in this new understanding.

III. Security Themes within the Anti-immigration Discourse of European Radical Right Parties:

A. National Security: New Chauvinism in Europe through Migrants

National security is one of the most frequently used and well-known security themes within the anti-immigration discourse of radical right parties. Today, the nexus between migration and security is far beyond just the border relations. Therefore, restrictions based on national security concerns are not only limited with border management regulations and controls. Radical right parties successfully integrate national security concerns to their election campaigns, party manifestos, slogans and posters by relating them with migration. Issuing asylum right, settlement, naturalization and citizenship, registration of foreigners, quotas or any other related issue might be presented to the public as a national

security concern by these parties.

"Ethnic and national chauvinism" and "nativism" are the two distinctive elements of national security theme. Ethnic and national chauvinism is discriminatory and leads to exclusion by defining with certain lines "who are out of the group". Furthermore, it presents the "others" as a threat to the group by disseminating this myth and glorifying the group [14]. Within this perspective, European radical right parties underline to favor "real owners of the citizenship" by referring to the concept of "national preferences" in their anti-immigration discourse. According to this understanding, the outcomes of the welfare state belong only to the native citizens of the country; citizenship is the strict condition to have certain rights and the "others" cannot claim these rights.

This understanding also includes nativism which was originated from US and simply means to think that only native nationals of a country have exclusively rights and others are a direct threat to the unity of nation state[15]. One can say that nativism does not only reveal in national security theme and diffused to all security themes directly or indirectly. Citizenship is the most sensitive and highlighted concept of nativism and as it can be observed, citizenship has a central role in discourse of radical right by questioning and criticizing naturalization of migrants. This criticism reminds Checkel's remark that "sense of belonging has a central role in construction of identities in Europe after the Cold War and this debate is also in the essence of questioning migrants and their rights" [16]. As a result, the question of whether the migrants will be considered as the ones "waiting for citizenship" or just as foreigner" has been the focus of debate [17]. In fact, radical right parties are an actor of this debate by strongly defending to label migrants just as foreigners.

Another distinctive element of national security theme is the intensive relation of this discourse with the concepts derived from the war and borders [18]. The concepts of occupation, invasion, raid, attack, influx are highly frequent in the anti-immigration discourse. For instance, French National Front leader Le Pen is one of these actors who claim that France is "occupied" by the migrants coming from Africa and they abrade the national identity.

B. Economic Security: "Would You Like to Protect Migrants or Your Elderly and Youth?"

It is an important component of anti-immigration discourse to show migrants as a reason of existing or potential economic problems in a society by demonstrating a variety of reasons. This policy of the radical right might be called as economic chauvinism. This point of view propounds that outcomes of the welfare state must be awarded only to the citizens of the country. The crises of the welfare state in several Europe triggered these sentiments and create to depression conditions to convince audiences. As it can be easily observed, the essence of these policies, which are directly against to migrants, is the struggle for economic sharing[19].

On the other hand, it should be stated that economy is also one of the five sectors defined by Buzan, Waeverve Wilde, particularly in their studies in 1998 by referring to the concept of "economic nationalism". However, in their level analysis it is stated as a concept which is towards to protect national economy from the strong waves of globalization and although they have a vision for global market, financial system and trade system; they did not refer to the nexus between migration and welfare state or economy under this sector framework [20].

In a general perspective, the theme of economic security reveals in the discourse that defends migration creates a threat to employment market, welfare state, social security structure, illegal employment of the migrants, indirect taxation, social damping, not to contribute to social security system and to abuse it, creating burden in the health system, education expenses of the migrant children and youth and the critics to family unification. Moreover, radical right parties present a dilemma to the public whether they would like to host migrants or to guarantee health care of the elderlies and future of the young population.

For many radical right party leaders, anti-immigration policies are a cloak to distract voters from the real economic problems of the country [21]. In this framework, there are always other motivations behind the economic security concerns related with migration. According to Gibson, economic issues function as a tool for the political parties to implement a "hidden racism policy" [22].

C. Cultural Security: "Convincing People to the Idea that Real Europeans and European Values bill be Exhausted"

Cultural security might be defined as to protect original values (such as tradition, language, religion, customs etc..) and characteristics of a society against to the existing conditions and potential threats [23]. For the radical right parties, "native" citizens of a country are the only source and owner of the country's culture and accordingly, culture has a certain definition. This definition is at its' supreme level, does not require to enrich with different contributions and therefore it should be isolated from the "foreign" elements. This perception feeds the cultural security theme and frames migrants as a threat to the local culture of the host country. In this respect, anti-immigration discourse promotes that migrant population will destroy the homogeneous and unique structure of the culture.

In this respect, radical right parties demonstrate anti-immigration not only supporting restrictive regulations against migration but also blocking any initiative and policy towards multiculturalism or integration of migrants [24]. They do not solely defend culture of the host country and generally they also refer to the European culture by claiming the necessity of protecting it from the "raid of foreigners" and globalization waves [25]. On the other hand, liberal values are promoted as an integral part of the culture which should be also protected from the migrants; such as the rights of gays and lesbians, equality of women and other freedoms. These theses of the radical right parties unsurprisingly presented with the religious differences and within this understanding religious "othering" is an important element of cultural security theme. As a result, İslamophobia is a significant complementary of anti-

immigration and nativism in Europe. From this point of view, Goodwin's remark is important which underlines that anti-İslamism is an important mobilizing element for the voters of radical right and this emphasizes that promises of radical right such as further border managements and restrictions have not been enough to convince voters of radical right in Europe to attract vote [26]. Based on these policies and identity politics, radical right parties have been creating the definition of who the "others" and "non-citizens" [27].

D. Internal Security: Reinforcing "semipermeable" Borders

The theme of internal security which is very different from the identity based "societal security" approach of Copenhagen School, proposes that migrants pose danger to the daily life of the citizens in a country by their potential of criminality. As a result of using this theme, migrants are demonstrated as a subject of criminality while securitizing migration. After September 11 attacks, migration policies became as a part of internal security policies not only in US but also in Europe [28]. Depending on intensively to this policy change, migrants have not been affiliated with only ordinary crimes but also with terror. Radical right parties use internal security theme to stop receiving migrants and also to legitimize their demands to restrict visa and asylum conditions, more strict identity controls. By this discourse, the difference between foreigner, migrant and terrorist has been getting blurred since they urge audience to perceive migration as a direct threat to internal security.

Bigo states that Following the end of Cold War, units such as military and secret services are more concentrated on the affairs inside the borders while internal security units such as police and customs check are more active trans-border affairs to find internal enemies. In this perspective, Bigo propounds that securitization is a result of states' efforts to create new borders (with social and identity elements) beyond existing psychical borders [29]. This argument of Bigo is precious to emphasize new borders in new security understanding which are more abstract, more ideological, generally hidden, semipermeable and discriminative even for the people living within the same physical borders.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the broad literature analysing nexus between security and migration, it can be said that a multi-actor based securitization process on migration exists in Europe at national and supra-national level.This securitization process provides a basis in favour of anti-immigration sentiments and the radical right parties have been acting as prominent norm entrepreneurs and agents within this process. Radical right parties in Europe have been formulazing their anti-immigration discourses and roles by using some common security themes in a constructive process, these themes might be classified and defined as national security, economic security, cultural security and internal security.

As a result of losing functionality and mobilizing impact of their long lasting arguments such as anti-semitism following the end of Cold War, anti-immigration policies is a new

populist subject (and a Raison d'etre-reason for existance) for the European radical right parties. Moreoever, anti-immigration is a result of a search for a new «othering» subject by the radical right parties. In this scope, security discourse has been actively used by the migration policies of the European radical right parties. The frequency and intensity of the European radical right parties in using these themes may vary according to the specific historical, social and cultural characteristics of a particular country that they have been existing.The thesis of the radical right parties which defends that migrants and migration might demage national sovereignty is no longer adequate to pursue the audience. New security understanding requires to focus on individual security needs such as employment, economy, social life. Anti-immigration discourse and policies have been functioning as a cloak to hide and ignore all other social problems in Europe and to distract voters from those « real» issues. In addition, migration flows and migrants have been abused as a «discharge chanel» instead of «supra-nationalism and globalization». In other words, migration and migrants are used as a «scape goat». Another interesting remark is that the weight of anti-islamism and religional themes have been increasing in the anti-immigration discourses of the European radical right parties.

In fact, migration can be accepted just as a «case study» for the challange within the re -definition process of European welfare state model in the context of globalization. New production relations in Europe creates new «othering» process, indeed. On the other hand, neither migration policies nor migration flows are stable. They have been all involving in a continuous transformation process. The capacities and speed of national governments and EU institutions in responding these transformation will be a determinant for the survival or weakening of the anti-immigration actors and policies in Europe.

This study reveals that anti-immigrant policies in Europe result from a process of securitization, and that, within this process, radical right parties have been formulating discourses and approaches through a construction process by intensively using these security themes that mentioned above. However the frequency with which radical right parties use these themes may vary according to the specific historical, social and cultural characteristics of a particular country.

REFERENCES

[1] C.U.Schierup et al., *Migration, Citizenship, And the European Welfare State: A European Dilemma*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2006, s.3

[2] J. Huysmans,*The Politics of Insecurity: Fear, Migration and Asylum in the EU*. Londra: Routledge. 2006, p.45

[3] Ş.Ovalı,Ütopya ile Pratik Arasında: Uluslararası İlişkilerde İnsan Güvenliği Kavramsallaştırması, *Uluslararası İlişkiler*, 2006, Cilt 10, No:3, p: 3-52, p.4

[4] A.Kaya, *Islam, Migration and Integration: The Age of Securitization*. Londra, Palgrave Macmillan, 2009, p.8

[5] D.Bigo, Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease. *Alternatives 27*, 2002 Special Issue,p.328

[6] B.Buzan et al.,*The Evolution of International Security Studies*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press,2009, p.213

[7] İbid., p.23

[8] Ibid, p.9

[9] T.Balzacq, Constructivism and Securitization Studies. *Handbook of Security Studies,* Londra, Routledge, 2002, p.9

[10] R.Taureck, Securitisation theory – The Story so far: Theoretical inheritance and what it means to be a post-structural realist. *4ᵗʰ annual CEEISA convention, University of Tartu, 25 -27 June 2006*, p.6

[11] J.Huysmans, *The Politics of Insecurity: Fear, Migration and Asylum in the EU*, Londra, Routledge, 2006, p.16

[12] B.Buzan et al.i *Security: A New Framework for Analysis,* London, Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1997, p.121

[13] R.Wodak et al, *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, Londra, Sage Publications, 2001, p.34

[14] R. S. (1994). Triple Chauvinism" in the New Eastern Europe. *Social Currents in Eastern Europe: The Sources and Consequences of the Great Transformation*, Duke University Press, p.125

[15] C. Mudde, The Relationship Between Immigration and Nativism in Europe and North America,*Migration Policy Institute,* Washington, 2010, p.3

[16] Ibid., p.93

[17] Ibid, p.93

[18] M.Berezin,*Neoliberal Zamanlarda Liberal Olmayan Politikalar: Yeni Avrupa'da Kültür, Güvenlik ve Popülizm*. İstanbul, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2009, p.77

[19] N.Mandacı, "Avrupa'daki Radikal Sağ Partiler ve Balkanlı Kuzenleri: Çanlar Türkiye İçin Çalıyor". *Uluslararası İlişkiler Dergisi*, Cilt: 33, No: 9, 2012 41-71, p.45

[20] B.Buzan et al., S*ecurity: A New Framework for Analysis*. London,Lynne Rienner Publishers,1997, p.100

[21] M. Hale Williams,*The Impact of Radical Right Wing Parties in West European Democracies.* Macmillan,Palgrave., 2006, p.59

[22] Ibid., p.59

[23] J.Tardif, Intercultural Dialogues and Cultural Security, *Globalpolicy,*9(1), 2002

[24] M. H.Williams, *The Impact of Radical Right Wing Parties in West European Democracies.* Macmillan,Palgrave, 2006, p.70

[25] H. G.Betz, Exclusionary Populism in Austria, Italy and Switzerland. *International Journal,*56(3), 2001,p. 393-420, .p.394

[26] M. Goodwin,The New Radical Right: Violent and Non-Violent Movements in Europe. *Report of Institute of Social Dialogue*, 2012, p.11

[27] A.Kaya,*Islam, Migration and Integration: The Age of Securitization*. Londra:Palgrave Macmillan,2009, p. 9

[28] C.Mudde, The Relationship Between Immigration and Nativism in Europe and North America. *Migration Policy Institute.* Washington, DC., 2010, p.11

[29] D.Bigo,*Terror, Insecurity and Liberty: Illegal Practices of Liberal Regimes after 9/11*. Londra,Routledge, 2008, p.320