

REDEFINING THE CONCEPT OF SECURITY FROM THE ASPECT OF MODERN IMIGRATIONS

Abstract

The paper analyses the contemporary security concept, with a special review of the security aspects of migrations. After the introduction, which primarily offers certain terminological concerns, and a review of the historical development of the term security, the paper points to the impact of globalization to national security, and the existence of interdependence of countries in modern age. For this reason, the paper especially emphasizes the importance of international organizations, as well as international documents, which present the basic guidelines for treatment of security risks modern society is facing. Although literature points to a series of security challenges and threats, it seems that in recent years the problem of mass migrations is a special problem, which was the reason for the other part of the paper to be dedicated to security aspects of migrations, in two basic directions: first, pointing to the principal problems appearing as the consequence of migrations, and second, presentation of the model for a response to the migration crisis. The last part of the paper is dedicated to conclusive contemplations.

Keywords: security, redefining of the security concept, national and collective security, migrations, security risks and migrations.

1. Introduction

The term *security* is an elastic and multi-dimensional term that can be understood in various ways, depending on its subject: perception of threats, protected values, means that could help protect these values (Baldwin, 1997; Buzan, 1983) and at what price (Wolfers, 1952). This multi-dimensional character of the security construct is not a novelty. Dimensions of security changed after the Cold War, but essential specifications of these dimensions convenient during the Cold War differ from those adequate for the XXI century (Baldwin, 1997, p. 23). In the context of modern social development and redistribution of

* PhD, Research Fellow, Institute of Criminological and Sociological Research, Belgrade, Serbia,
e-mail: lelalela_bgd@yahoo.com

** M.A., Research Associate, Institute of Criminological and Sociological Research, Belgrade, Serbia,
e-mail: nikola.vujicic.law@gmail.com

political, economic, and military power of dominant countries, terms like economic security, social and military security, environmental security, and also security of the individual and his/her identity, have found their way in the context of contemplating the term security.

Ethimologically, the term security in Serbian language (*bezbednost*) originates from the word *bez* (non-existence, absence) and *beda* (great poverty, despicable position, trouble, bad luck, evil) and presents a state of someone safe from danger, protected, unthreatened (Sretović, Talijan & Beriša, 2016, according to: Mijalković, 2009, pp. 44-45). Definition of the term security is most often linked with the state of being endangered (unsafe), as a social phenomenon and category which destructively affects the principal values which security safeguards and defends (Vulević, 2018, p. 56), or as a freedom to implement certain values, i.e., as “absence of threats to acquired values” (Wolfers, 1952, p. 485).

In the first part of the paper, the authors attempt to understand how the term security has modified, what it implied during the so called Cold War period, how the term security is perceived today, during the globalization period, and what national and collective security imply. Also, the paper offers a short review of the role the international law plays concerning maintaining and propagation of collective and international security. The second part of the paper analyses security aspect of contemporary migrations, and risks illegal migrations pose to security of countries, regions and people.

2. The expanded conception of security

Traditional view of security, defined basically in the military sense, was primarily focused on protection of countries from threats to national interests (Nasu, 2011). Such interpretation was also presented in the well-known paper of Hans Kelsen *Collective Security under International Law* (Kelsen, 1957, p. 1), in which the author limited the scope of the study to the *protection of people from others' force*, and it was absolutely linked with national security and protection of territory from foreign military threats and attacks, which was recognized as the final goal of sovereign states. However, the traditional term security, as defined by references within the framework of national survival, physical protection of state territory and military power, extended its scope in the second half of the XX century, especially since the end of the Cold War.

Barry Buzan spoke of security as an aspiration toward freedom from threats and capacity of countries and societies to protect independence of their identities and functional integrity from changes perceived as hostile changes (Buzan, 1991, p. 432). Because of the justifiable fear from war, the central, reference object of security was the state and its territorial integrity (Nasu, 2011). However, with the newly developed situation at the world scene, new threats become the focus, which do not exclusively concern the military sector. With the fall of the Berlin Wall, demise of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact, and the end of the Cold War, attention was not any more focused on military and political issues, and economic, social and ecological problems paved their ways toward the agenda of the international security system (Buzan, 1991, according to Vulević, 2018).

Namely, after World War II, Europe became the destination of many from the countries of the global East. Furthermore, the liberalization of migration policy in the context of European integration has enabled mass migration to the countries of the European Union, primarily to those with “strong economies”. At the same time, in recent years, conflicts have intensified in the territories of the countries of Central Eurasia (Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria), which has encouraged mass migration, again in the direction of Europe. Unprecedented wave of refugees seeking for a refuge in Europe during 2015, most of them being Muslims, intensified the already existing intolerance to immigration. Among some of the Europeans, immigrations are constructed as a threat to their personal employment, standard of living, the welfare state and the national economy, but also as a threat to their own (personal and collective) European and Christian identity (Mijalković, 2016, p. 44).

In the last several decades there have been increased attempts to reconsider security problems, as well as to conceptualize security at levels not within frameworks of nation-states (Baldwin, 1997). UN General Secretary talked about the necessity of a “conceptual breakthrough: which should include “armed territorial security”, but also “security of people at home, at work, and in communities”. It is possible that the world needs a theoretical view which would allow for better understanding of the contemporary world, a normative breakthrough which would broaden the idea of a moral community, an empirical breakthrough which would facilitate recognition of increased interdependence, and a political breakthrough which would strengthen the will to follow the extended security agenda (Baldwin, 1997; Rothschild, 1995).

An interesting explanation of the way in which traditionally understood security was redefined into a contemporary concept of security was offered by Emma Rothschild, who offered four principal forms of extension. In the first, security is extended from security of nations to security of groups and individuals. In the second, it is extended from security of nations to security of the international system, or beyond national physical environment (vertical extension, from the nation to the biosphere). The extension, in both cases, concerns types of entities whose security should be ensured. In the third form, security is extended horizontally, toward types of security for nations. The concept of security, thus, is extended from the military one to the political, economic, social and human security. In the fourth form, political responsibility for ensuring of security (or for strengthening of all these “security concepts”) is extended: it is extended in all directions from nation-states toward a broader, international level, including here international institutions, regional or local administrations, non-governmental organizations, public opinion, and abstract forces of nature and the market (Rothschild, 1995, p. 55).

Extension of the security concept was advocated by the Copenhagen School, which emphasized social dimensions of security and rejected the sovereign state as a primary subject and agent of security (Vietti & Scribner, 2013, p. 27).

Geometric presentation of the redefined concept of security, regardless of complexity, has a common scheme, which has become noticeable in all international political discussions since the late 1990s, and concerns returning the emphasis on security and sovereignty

of the individual, which had a certain influence also in East-European revolutions¹. The International Committee for Global Management too states the necessity of extending global security - from the traditional, focusing on security of the state, to security of people and the planet (CGG, 1995).

It is noticeable that the concept of the individual security is incorporated in all the stated constructs of security. We find confirmation for the said statement in literature, thus McSweeney states that “contrary to the orthodox viewpoint (...) security must make sense at the basic level of the individual human being, in order to make sense at the international level” (McSweeney, 1999). Individual (human) security is in the center of all real international security systems built on liberal-democratic ideals, while protection and promotion of basic freedoms must be a nucleus from which all other forms of security originate (Kajtez & Gostović, 2010). The phenomenon of human security added a new dimension to the extension of the security concept when the United Nations Program (UNDP) included it into the political discourse in its Human Development Report from 1994 (UNDP, 1994), and with that offered basis for development of the concept of “responsibility for protection”² as a political agenda, which was approved in the results of the World Summit in 2005. One of the new aspects of this concept is that human population, in contrast to sovereign states and the international community, is recognized as an object which is protected from threats of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity (Nasu, 2011).

The redefined concept of security, which does not define the referent object, does not make much sense, since a simple specification, such as ‘state’ or ‘individual’, is not sufficient any more. Taking into account the number of states, nations and individuals, and the interdependence of their security, the author claims that “defining of the referent security object “must run” hand-in-hand with the conditions for realization of its security”. For the purpose of making a precise concept of security, a broad spectrum of answers to the question “security for whom” - the acceptable answer is: individuals (some, the majority, or all individuals), states (some, the majority, or all states), international systems (some, the majority, or all international systems) (Buzan, 1983, p. 26). The next question that needs to be answered in the context of a redefined security construct is the question which values are to be protected? The concept of national security traditionally includes political independence and territorial integrity as values to be protected, but today it includes also social values, such as physical security, economic welfare autonomy, psychological welfare, etc. (Baldwin, 1997, p. 13).

It seems that for understanding of security we must bear in mind that its segments cannot be simply classified into individual, collective and general, global security, because

¹ Vaclav Havel wrote (following John Stuart Mill) „the sovereignty of the community, the region, the nation, the state, makes sense only if it is derived from the one genuine sovereignty - from the sovereignty of the human being“. See: (Havel, 1992).

² Human security is here defined as „survival and dignity of man through freedom from fear (violence) and freedom from depravity (poverty)“, i.e., as „security of people from all possible forms of oppression, primarily from threats to life, health, earning, personal security, and human dignity“. More details in: UNDP, 1994, pp. 25-33.

they are interdependent. Security is more and more understood and defined as the final product of joint effects of economic, social, demographic, political, cultural, ecological and military features of the state, region, or global community (Kajtez & Gostović, 2010, p. 102). In the modern world a multi-dimensional approach to security is the only valid, efficient and credible approach to solving security challenges and threats, in the aim of preservation of the international peace and stability, taking into account the complexity of threats and risks. Goals and activities within the framework of the political-military dimension, economic-ecological, and finally human dimension of security, are aimed at promotion of the position of the individual in the broadest field, in various aspects of social, political and economic life, from human rights and basic freedoms, democracy, free elections and the rule of law, to freedom of religious beliefs and fight against intolerance and discrimination (Jovanović, 2015, p. 12).

3. National security in the context of globalization

A comprehensive picture of modern development, often designated with the term *globalization*, includes increased economic interdependence, appearance of the world market in the field of capital, finance and merchandise, and increased interdependence which is the result of cheaper and faster transport, global reach of the media, and new communication and information technologies (Kalm, 2005). In the context of globalization, security of a state is not any more possible to be achieved through isolated efforts, since security risks are becoming common, and security is more and more dividable geografically and according to the content, so it is necessary to remove security challenges, risks and threats with joint efforts. Threats to security of the individual in a state, coming from external or internal risks and threats, in present times means that other nations also feel insecure, which some authors call “globalization of worries” (Kajtez & Gostović, 2010, p. 102).

National security today includes security of the society (regardless of ethnic, ethical, racial and ideological origin or commitment of its members) and security of the state, but also their participation in international and global security. It involves a certain condition of protection of their vital interests and values which is optimized by the function of military and civilian, state and non-state sector of the national security system, with relying on numerous international (non-governmental and inter-governmental) subjects in many aspects of international cooperation in the field of security. Entities at all levels of security - individuals, societies, states, and the international community - participate in the protection of national security. States still have all resources (human, material-technical and organizational) for the protection of all levels of security against most challenges, risks and threats (Mijalković, 2011, p. 160). Thus national security implies the state of unhindered implementation, development, enjoyment, and optimal protection of national and state values and interests which is achieved, maintained, and improved through the function of security of citizens, national security system and supranational security mechanisms, the absence of (individual, group, and collective) fear of being endangered, as well as collective sense of serenity, certainty and control over the future events and developments of importance for the life of society and the state (Mijalković, 2011, p. 161).

In addition to traditional national values, modern ones include the survival of the state and nation, the quality of life of the citizens and nations, and social welfare, the constitutional and legal order of the state, public order, economic prosperity, the stability of energy supply and information resources, political stability and national unity, national pride and dignity, i.e. honour and reputation, national identity, healthy environment, and other values. National interests are benefits of importance to society and the state and they are related to the attainment, enjoyment and development of national values. One of the most important principles of the post-Westphalian model of national security is also lawfulness. This includes standardization of vital state and national values but also mechanisms and organisations responsible for security (their establishment, jurisdiction, duties, powers, responsibilities, and control). This includes national legislation (constitution, laws and by-laws), but also international law (conventions, resolutions, charters, covenants, recommendations, rulings and decisions of international courts). Generally, national legislation should be based on international law. In this sense, it is possible to speak about international legal basis of national security (Mijalković & Blagojević, 2014, p. 52).

4. International (collective) security and the role of the international law in its preservation

The idea of international security, which is different from national (state) security, appeared with the development of the system of collective security. The League of Nations recognized attacks of aggression and war actions which began because of disrespect of the procedures for avoiding wars, according to its Pact, as threats to security of all members of the League (Covenant of the League of Nations 1919, art. 10 and 16). On the other hand, founding of the UN Security Council, which is primarily responsible for preservation of the international peace and security (Charter of the United Nations 1945, article 24) and its functioning in practise, gradually made numerous countries accept the idea that security of the international community, not only security of one state, can easily be undermined.

The international security law, based on the system of collective security of the United Nations, is based on two elements. The first element is contained in the norm of non-use of armed forces according to article 2(4) of the Charter of the United Nations, while the second element is based on the institution of the United Nations Security Council, which is primarily responsible for preservation of the international peace and security from article 24 of the Charter of the United Nations (Koskeniemi, 1996, p. 456).

Collective, global security is the product of the law, based on delegating powers of sovereign states to the collective entity (Orakhenshivili, 2011, p. 2), offering a normative basis and means for regulating behaviour of sovereign states and conflicts among them. Collective security offers institutionalized procedures which legalize collective response, designed, at least originally, to deal with traditional, military-oriented threats to preservation of the international peace and security. However, challenges to collective security focused on sovereignty appeared, especially after the Cold War, because of the diversity of perceived security threats, increase of transnational security worries, larger role of nongovernmental

actors, and certain efficiency of the existing international arrangements in response to dynamic security challenges (Cuéllar, 2004, p. 233).

However, as technological development improved international trade flows, movement of capital, finances and information, but also research and exploitation beyond state boundaries, thus, on the other hand, security worries spread geographically and spatially to various zones, which extend also to the maritime zone of security, cyber space (Roscini, 2014), Arctic and Antarctica. New security fronts, thus, are not immune to the impact of the extended security concept, and impose new challenges to the existing legal regimes which regulate security activities. On the other hand, in contrast to the traditional territorial context, in which the only security subject are sovereign states, in present times, with extension of limits security covers, it is possible to find an extraordinary number of challenges which give rise to security issues.

The progress in recognizing of numerous issues which potentially present security threats has opened new fields of the security domain, so now more and more frequently there are talks about economic security, environmental security, security in the field of energy and resources, biosecurity and health security (Nasu, 2011, p. 18). Today, “non-military security threats” and the “comprehensive security concept” are rooted in the vocabulary of diplomats and politicians throughout the political spectrum (Koskenniemi, 1996, p. 460).

Extension of the field of security threats has been recognized also by international organizations, thus the Security Council (1992) emphasizes social, economic, ecological and humanitarian sources³ as threats to the international peace and security, while the report of the UN General Secretary for the year 2004 states six clusters of global security threats contemporary worlds is facing, which are challenges that require prevention (see: United Nations-General Assembly, 2004, p. 25). They include economic and social threats, including poverty, contagious diseases and degradation of the environment, interstate conflicts, civil conflicts, including wars, genocide and other crimes, but also terrorism, nuclear, radiological, and biological weapons, and transnational organized crime.

Collective security, which often academically differs from the balance of political power, is considered as summons for an “automatic response” in case of existence of a potential aggressor (Mearsheimer, 1994, p. 5). However, the system of implementation of rules which ensure collective security, according to the United Nations Charter, is not automatic, but, referring to the Charter, decisions are made on whether and in which way the Council shall response, and the Council itself has a broad discretionary right. The point is that, according to the Charter, member states have renounced some of their freedoms of activities, by giving the Council power to decide on their behalf on collective actions and (legally) related decisions the Council passes (Koskenniemi, 1996).

Security Council, in accordance with the extended security concept, also extended its tasks in the aim of preservation of the international peace and security. Traditionally, collective security, and with it also powers of the Council, were viewed as a military

³ In literature there is no unique position on whether this, many times quoted sentence, should be understood literally, or as a real indication of the readiness of the Security Council to use its collective security powers in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter, to deal with economic, social, humanitarian, or ecological development, which are serious enough to justify such treatment. More details in: Koskenniemi, 1996, pp. 456-488.

affair, dealing primarily with prevention of interstate violence and over the border use of force. However, most violences in modern times do not imply formal armies marching across borders, but derive from violence within a state's borders, i.e. civil wars, which are threats to the international peace and security, and situations when the Security Council intervenes. Whatever conceptual difficulties exist because of traditional implementation of collective security in resolving of national conflicts and limitation of violence in a state, they did not prevent the Security Council to use its mandate for interventions in the last several decades (Koskenniemi, 1996, p. 461).

5. Security aspect of (im)migration

Contemporary migrations are not perceived any more only as internal or international movement of people for existential reasons (economic migrants, refugees from conflict zones, political asylum seekers and ecologic migrants) (Mijalković & Petrović, 2016, p. 1), or as a separate, temporary phenomena, as were conceptualized until recently, but as a permanent issue of the contemporary, social, political and economic life (Berne Initiative, 2003), linked with numerous globalization aspects. Migration pattern is clearly linked with the increasing *globalization*, while factors which contribute to migrations are smaller transport costs, information-technological revolution, global reach of the media, and the consciousness about discrepancies of the living standard between rich and poor countries (World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization, 2004).

Twenty first century has been designated also as the century of migrations, since global mobility is a highly stratified phenomenon, because of the large number of refugees forced to leave their home countries because of wars, poverty, and climate changes (Castles & Miller, 2009). In the European Union there are two noticeable demographic movements, relevant for analysis of the relation of security and demography - the increasing migration flows (European Commission, 2014) and the continual aging of the population. The development of information and communication technologies has enabled the population in all parts of the world to access information on living conditions in rich countries, their social and immigration policies, and the possibility of going to these countries (Tatalović, 2018), which made migrants move toward stable and rich countries, which, because of the economic development and bad demographic trends, need new population (Tatalović & Malnar, 2016, p. 219).

Literature often states that migrations, especially transnational ones, are linked with key issues such as security, but also social, economic and political stability (Solomon & Bartsch, 2003). If we take into account that contemporary migrations are becoming global, organized, and mass migrations, it is clear that risks and consequences for human, national and international security have multiplied (Mijalković & Petrović, 2016).

Different positioning and perception of migratory movements in contexts of national securities and defense strategies of the European Union member states, because of various security strategic cultures and approaches to the migratory-security link, block development and implementation of a joint and efficient strategy for solving of the migration crisis (Estevens, 2018). Removal of international borders within the European Union has

stimulated spreading of the narrative which suggests security deficit and has formed new challenges to the public order, which derive from the removal of international borders, and bring about an increasing politicization of and securitization of the issues of migration and asylum (Guild, 2009; Bourbeau, 2011; Vietti & Scribner, 2013).

This denationalization of state sovereignty requires cooperation, and, although it seems that close cooperation in security and defense is necessary in the European Union (and the European ground), there is no joint position on how to proceed and how to exit the framework of managing humanitarian crisis after the so-called migrant crisis, so different strategic cultures end with implementation of various security and defense policies within the Union (Biehl, Giegerich & Jonas, 2013), but also out of it.

Faced with the need for integration of the increasing number of migrants, some countries approach the migration problem primarily from the security aspect, which has brought about securitization of migrations⁴ in some countries, such as the United States of America, Australia, or Hungary. Humanitarian approach⁵, social-economic approach and securitization are models with which countries reacted to the migration crisis, where some countries accepted migrants, others allowed their transit, and some didn't allow them to pass through their territories (Tatalović, 2018; Tatalović & Malnar, 2016, p. 287).

In order to find out why migrations can be perceived as a security threat at various levels, it is necessary to state that security is based on a collection of discourse or narratives and historical practices based on institutionally divided understandings, which thus become a political and social construct (Wæver, 1995). During this process, dominant political elites in power and analysts define the existing risks and threats at a certain moment and for different levels (national, regional, global), activating, when possible, means for their neutralization. Thus, inclusion of a specific approach to security into state practice or international organizations usually derives from the existing power structure. The process of globalization has added new functions of responsibility of the state and has changed some of the previous ones, since the traditional function of guaranteeing defense of the territory and political independence is now linked with the obligation to ensure economic independence, cultural identity and social stability. Globalization has transformed the existing risks and threats, which are now impossible to neutralize by only focusing on the state, and/or by the strategy of national security which is limited to state borders (Mabee, 2009; Ripsman & Paul, 2010).

⁴ Simić points out (referring to Philippe Bourbeau) that as for the process of securitization of migrations it is important to differ politicization of migrations from securitization of migrations. Because, in contrast to securitization of migrations, which implies a „process of integration of migrations in the institutional and discourse sense, into the security framework, which emphasizes police and defense affairs, while politicization of migrations relates to the process of extracting migrations from the limited network and/or bureaucracy, and bringing them into the public arena“. According to him, it is one thing to deal with technical issues concerning the status of refugees, their accommodation, and other accompanying things, from a completely different one of „proclaiming that migrants are a security threat“. More details in: Simić, 2017, pp. 4-10.

⁵ The criterion of a humanitarian approach is defined based on the highest standard of treatment of the migrant population, in accordance with the relevant documents of the United Nations (UN) which regulate treatment of refugees as the most vulnerable migrant group, including the ban on racial, religious, or discrimination linked with the country of origin, provision of medical and other protection, protection of the family union, necessary aid and accommodation, etc. More details in: Tatalović & Malnar, 2016, pp. 285–308

When studying the impact migrations may have on security, five cases are most often identified “in which refugees or migrants may be considered threats to the countries from which migrants are coming, countries receiving them, or relations between the countries of origin and countries of destination”. The first case is when refugees and migrants are considered threats (or at least a source of problems) - between the countries of origin and the countries of destination, which is a situation that arises when refugees and migrants are opposed to the regimes of their countries of origin. The second is when migrants or refugees are perceived as a political threat or a security risk for the destination countries. The third is when immigrants are perceived as a cultural threat, and the fourth one is when they are perceived as a social and economic problem for the society of the host country. Finally, the fifth case is when the society of the destination country uses immigrants as an instrument of threat to their countries of origin (Weiner, 1992, pp. 105–106).

Securitization of migrations has a tendency to include four forms: socio-economic, because of unemployment, increase of informal economy, crisis of a social state, and degradation of urban environment; securitarian, which takes into account loss of control narration which connects sovereignty and borders, and internal and external security; identity one, where migrants are perceived as a threat to national identity and demographic balance of the host society; and a political form, which is the result of anti-immigration, racist and xenophobic discourse (Ceyhan & Tsoukala, 2002, p. 24). Since migrations can affect various aspects of sovereignty of a state, they thus affect national security (Adamson, 2006), and also contribute to a disbalance of power among states. In accordance with the previously stated, the position seems correct that migrations contribute to changes in structures and institutions in global political, economic and social relations (Castles, 2010, p. 1566).

Migration is identified as being one of the main factors weakening national tradition and societal homogeneity. It is reified as an internal and external danger for the survival of the national community or western civilization. This discourse excludes migrants from the normal fabric of society, not just as aliens but as aliens who are dangerous to the reproduction of the social fabric. The discourse frames the key question about the future of the political community as one of a choice for or against migration. But it is not a free choice because a choice for migration is represented as a choice against (the survival of) the political community. The discourse reproduces the political myth that a homogenous national community or western civilization existed in the past and can be re-established today through the exclusion of those migrants who are identified as cultural aliens (Huysmans, 2000, p. 758).

The process the securitization of migration has included multiple actors such as national governments, grass roots, European transnational police networks, the media, etc. The securitization of migration is a structural effect of a multiplicity of practices. If one wishes to interpret how this structural effect has been produced by the political, professional and social actors involved, one has to focus on the relation between the positions of these actors and the practices they perform. Instead of focusing on how this effect was produced by which actors, we should to concentrate on the logic of securitization that characterizes this field and on how the European integration process is implicated in its reproduction.

As Huysmans wrote, the securitization of migration in the EU and its Member States has developed on the basis of three relating themes: internal security, cultural security and the crisis of the welfare state (Huysmans, 2000, p. 758).

Illegal migrations have security repercussions. They unavoidably bring about increased danger for domestic population with regard to crime, terrorism and contagious diseases. For a host country, because of the excess inflow of cheap labour and unexpectedly large social welfare costs, they may present a source of destabilization of its economic security, and also increase the risk from internal and international conflicts (Simeunović, 2017, p. 37).

The risks migrations carry are reflected not only at the level of threatening national, regional and international security, but also at the level of threatening fundamental human rights of migrants. Mass migrations may, on one hand, affect demographic structures at local and regional levels, if migrants are systematically placed in certain geographic areas, which significantly changes demographic structures of populations, and may give rise to conflicts based on geographic, ethnic and religious, and racial identity (Mijalković & Petrović, 2016, p. 10). However, if migrants are not integrated into host communities, especially if they come from completely different cultural environments, potential risks from religious and ethnic conflicts increase, which requires adequate efforts in the aim of integration of national minorities into national communities (Savage, 2004).

Aspiration of a significant number of migrants to emigrate in spite of restrictive migration policies of economically developed countries, has inspired the idea of smuggling of migrants (Mijalković, Petrović, 2016, p. 3), which exposes this population to organized and transnational crime. Secondary victimization of the migrant population is especially obvious during illegal entering of host countries - because of human trafficking networks (Czaika & de Haas, 2013), which often results in a loss of human life, especially on routes from North Africa to countries of South Europe, and in recent times they are linked with the civil war in Syria (Ferreira, 2016, pp. 1–2). There are a lot of data pointing to cases of illegal labour, exploitation of labour, involvement in prostitution and networks of organ trade (Burgess, 2011, p. 15), which creates space for legal marginalization of (im)migrants based on the use of nationalistic values in the aim of justification of social separation of migrants (Geddes, 1995, p. 198).

Illegal immigrations present, in conditions of globalized security, a very serious and complex challenge. On one hand, countries have a sovereign right to control their own borders and to define conditions for entry and exit from their territories, in accordance with the interests of national security, economic welfare, public moral, and political stability. On the other hand, the principles of protection of human rights and principal norms and principles of humanitarian law impose the obligation to take into account the causes of mobility and immigration waves, and acceptable treatment of vulnerable people seeking protection in more stable areas closeby or farther away (Jovanović, 2015, p. 18).

Cooperation of countries in redefining policies and legal frameworks, in order to enable a broader framework of regular models of migrations, is the key factor in finding solutions for challenges which countries of origin, transit countries and final destination

countries face. This shall not stop irregular migrations, but shall reduce moving of people who do not have identity documents, especially via smuggling networks. If migrations are recognized as an unavoidable mark of the times we are living in, not necessarily as a negative phenomenon, then policies of migration management should be adjusted to real trends and problems of migrants, because restrictively defined policies which impose strict rules are in a large degree in discrepancy with protection of basic human rights. Countries have a sovereign right to decide which foreigners may enter and reside at their territories, however, criteria must be defined in accordance with international legal standards. All migrants, regardless of their status, are entitled to protection as human beings, and, depending on the status they are subject to, additional systems of protection within the framework of international conventions (Marković, 2017, p. 14). Restrictive policies for treatment of migrants shall not stop illegal migration flows, nor shall they ensure security in Europe (Völkel, 2017, p. 93).

Mobility of people is a reality in the world we are living in, and societies and communities should be led in the direction of abandoning stereotypes, while decision-makers have a special responsibility to fight xenophobia and racism. The International Organization for Migration has been advocating now the position that migrations are not a problem or a crisis situation which should be solved by short-term, ad-hoc measures, but a reality and a process to be managed, that migrations are unavoidable (if we bear in mind the causes for people's migration in today's world), necessary (because of adequate distribution of labour and development of economy), and desirable (because of the contribution migrants make both in destination countries and their home countries) (Marković, 2017, p. 15). Cooperation with regard to migrations is not a general standardized process, but has a bilateral, multilateral or intergovernmental character, and should be established among all European countries. The issue of migrations with regard to partial integration creates difficulties to European countries and institutions, emphasizing democratic deficit of the Union's institutions and establishing the need for intergovernmental cooperation for building of joint migration policies (Geddes, 1995). The lack of focus in this multi-layered approach also contributes to explaining the spectrum of unintentional consequences of migration control in the Mediterranean region (Collier, 2016, p. 621).

Migration policy, at whatever level it is developed, has to address the reality that European countries have become countries of immigration. Immigrants, asylum-seekers and refugees are present and are challenging the myth of national cultural homogeneity. They are a multicultural presence in everyday practices, and are indicative of the fact that cultural identity is not constant but variable (Martiniello, 1997). The political rendering of cultural identity involves a mixture of issues, including multiculturalism, European identity, nationalism, and xenophobia and racism. But the key element is that the cultural mixing resulting from migration is politicized on the ground that multicultural developments challenge the desire for coinciding cultural and political frontiers (Martiniello, 1997, p. 14). Letting migration figure as a dangerous challenge to the vaguer notion of social and political integration of society has strong securitizing effects (Heisler & Layton-Henry, 1993). Discourses representing migration as a cultural challenge to social and political integration have become an important source for mobilizing security rhetoric and institutions (Huysmans, 2000, p. 762).

6. Conclusion

Security concept, viewed in its broadest sense, is certainly a field which is constantly evolving. The path of its evolving moved from the political-military concept, focused on the state and its sovereignty, to a new one - more comprehensive and holistic view of peace and international stability, based on protection of the individual. In this sense, the state does not present any more the only reference object of the security concept. Nevertheless, security of man has not replaced national security, but has integrated new security dimensions, such as protection of human rights, economic development and security of the individual. Extension of the security concept had its institutional conceptualization in the UN Report on Human Development from 1994, which defined a universal, broad and flexible approach and interdependence of security components - economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, security of the community and political security. For these reasons, vitality of this matter contributed, under the auspices of the UN and other international organizations, to a series of documents being adopted, of importance for this field which, it seems, is still continually evolving.

As for globalization, security of a state cannot any more be achieved by isolated efforts, because security risks are becoming common, and, as it is rightfully emphasized - security can less and less be divided geographically and by content, so it is necessary to remove security challenges, risks and threats with joint efforts. National security today includes security of the society (regardless of ethnic, ethical, racial and ideological origin, or commitment of its members) and security of the state, but also their participation in international and global security. It involves a certain condition of protection of their vital interests and values which is optimized by the function of military and civilian, state and non-state sector of the national security system, with relying on numerous international (non-governmental and inter-governmental) subjects in many aspects of international cooperation in the field of security.

The increasing globalization is visibly linked with the concept of migrations. Factors that contribute to migrations are reduced transport costs, information-technological revolution, global reach of the media, and awareness of discrepancies in the living standard between rich and poor countries. It seems that the latter factor - the gap between rich and poor countries - plays a big role in migrations. Historically viewed, we may say that is not a novelty, since migrations of people, if we exclude forced migrations because of wars, often happened because people were seeking better living conditions. At the present, modern age, we may state that migrations, especially transnational, are linked with key issues, such as security, but also social, economic and political stability. Still, if we take into account that contemporary migrations are becoming global, organized and mass, it is clear that risks and consequences for human, national and international security have multiplied. Different positioning and perceptions of migratory movements in contexts of national security and defense strategies of the European Union member countries, because of different security strategic cultures and approaches to the migration-security connection, block development and implementation of a joint and efficient strategy for solving of the migration crisis.

At this point, it is necessary to emphasize once again the following: The process the securitization of migration has included multiple actors such as national governments, grass roots, EU transnational police networks, the media, etc. The securitization of migration is a structural effect of a multiplicity of practices. This crisis has developed on the basis of three relating themes: internal security, cultural security and the crisis of the welfare state. This is one of the starting points in solving of this problem.

As for the state response to the migration crisis, two basic models are noticeable, based on which states responded: humanitarian approach on one hand, and social-economic approach on the other hand, where some states received migrants, others allowed them, while some did not allow them to pass through their territories. We believe that determination for the first, humanitarian approach to migrations is necessary, which would primarily be reflected in integration, and a unique migration policy, with absolute protection of human rights. In this sense, such ideas should be strengthened primarily at the international plan, with adoption of adequate conventions under the auspices of the United Nations, which would be a good sign-post and basis for unique proceeding. This way, although migration crisis would not be solved in all its aspects, certainly a unique way would be set which would contribute, along with a series of other mechanisms, to realization of the principle of humanity on which modern societies are founded.

References

- Adamson, F. B. 2006. Crossing borders: International migration and national security. *International Security*, 31(1), pp. 165–199. doi: 10.1162/isec.2006.31.1.165.
- Baldwin, D. A. 1997. The Concept of Security. *Review of International Studies*, 23, pp. 5-26.
- Biehl, H., Giegerich, B. & Jonas, A. 2013. Introduction. In: Biehl, H. Giegerich, B & Jonas, A. (eds.) *Strategic Cultures in Europe: Security and Defence Policies Across the Continent*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, pp. 7-11.
- Bourbeau, P. 2011. *The Securitization of Migration: A study of movement and order*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Burgess, J. P. 2011. Introduction: Security, migration and integration. In: Burgess, J. P. & Gutwirth, S. (eds.), *A threat against Europe? Security, migration and integration*. Brussels: Institute for European Studies, pp. 13–15.
- Buzan, B. 1983. *People, States and Fear: The National Security Problems in International Relations*. Brighton: Wheatsheaf.
- Buzan, B. 1991. New patterns of global security in the twenty-first century. *Royal Institute of International Affairs* 1944, 67(3), pp. 1-432.
- Buzan, B. & Hansen, L. 2009. *The Evolution of International Security Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Castles, S. 2010. Understanding global migration: A social transformation perspective. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36, pp. 1565-1586. doi: 10.1080/1369183X.2010.489381.
- Castles, S. & Miller, M. J. 2009. *The age of migration: International population movements in the modern world*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Ceyhan, A. & Tsoukala, A. 2002. The securitization of migration in western societies: Ambivalent discourses and policies. *Alternatives*, 27, pp. 21–39. doi: 10.1177/03043754020270S103.
- Collyer, M. 2016. Geopolitics as a migration governance strategy: European Union bilateral relations with southern Mediterranean countries. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 42(4), pp. 606–624.
- Cuéllar, M. F. 2004. Reflections on Sovereignty and Collective Security. *Stanford Journal of International Law*, 40, pp. 230–239.
- Czaika, M. & de Haas, H. 2013. The effectiveness of immigration policies. *Population and Development Review*, 39 (3), pp. 487–508. doi: 10.1111/j.1728-4457.2013.00613.x.
- Estevens, J. 2018. Migration crisis in the EU: developing a framework for analysis of national security and defence strategies. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 6(1). doi: 10.1186/s40878-018-0093-3.
- Ferreira, S. 2016. Migratory crisis in the Mediterranean: Managing irregular flows. *Stability. International Journal of Security & Development*, 5(1), pp. 1–6. doi: 10.5334/sta.433.
- Geddes, A. 1995. Immigrant and ethnic minorities and the EU's 'democratic deficit'. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 33(2), pp. 197–217.
- Guild, E. 2009. *Security and migration in the 21st century*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Havel, V. 1992. *Summer Meditations*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Heisler, M. & Layton-Henry, Z. 1993. Migration and the Links Between Social and Societal Security. In: Wæver, O., Buzan, B., Kelstrup, M. & Lemaitre, P (eds), *Identity, migration and the new security agenda in Europe*. New York: St. Martin's Press, pp. 148–166
- Huysmans, J. 2000. The European Union and the Securitization of Migration. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 38(5), pp. 751–777.
- Jovanović, I. 2015. OEBS i savremeni izazov upravljanja i bezbednosti migracija. In: *OEBS i savremeni bezbednosni izazovi (zbirka eseja)*. Beograd: Organizacija za evropsku bezbednost i saradnju, Misija u Srbiji, pp. 11–23.
- Kajtez, I. & Gostović, D. 2010. Filozofske osnove bezbedonosnih izazova zapadnog Balkana. *Svarog - Časopis za društvene i prirodne nauke*, 1, pp. 97–106.
- Kelsen, H. 1957. *Collective Security under International Law*. Washington DC: United States Government Printing Office.
- Koskenniemi, M. 1996. The Place of Law in Collective Security Koskenniemi. *Michigan Journal of International Law*, 17(2), pp. 456–488.
- Mabee, B. 2009. *The globalization of security: State power, security provision and legitimacy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Marković, L. 2017. Migracije - izazov, problemi ili karakteristika našeg doba?. *Evropske sveske*, 4, pp. 11–15.
- Martiniello, M. 1997. *Sortir des Ghettos Culturels*. Paris: Presses de Sciences Po.
- McSweeney, B. 1999. *Security, Identity and Interests, A Sociology of International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mearsheimer, J. J. 1994. The False Promise of International Institutions. *International Security*, 19(3), pp. 5–49.
- Mijalković, S. 2009. *Nacionalna bezbednost*. Beograd: Kriminalističko-policijska akademija.

- Mijalković, S. 2011. *Nacionalna bezbednost*. 2nd edition. Beograd: Kriminalističko-policijska akademija.
- Mijalković, S. & Blagojević, D. 2014. The Basis of National Security in International Law. *NBP Žurnal za kriminalistiku i pravo*, 1, pp. 50-68.
- Mijalković, S. 2016. Izazovi identiteta u kontekstu terorističkih napada „Pariz 2015“. *Bezbednost*, 58(1), pp. 24–66.
- Mijalković, S. & Petrović, I. 2016. Bezbednosni rizici savremenih migracija. *NBP Žurnal za kriminalistiku i pravo*, 2, pp. 1-18.
- Orakshenshivili, A. 2011. *Collective Security*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ripsman, N. M. & Paul, T. V. 2010. *Globalization and the National Security State*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Roscini, M. 2010. World Wide Warfare - Jus ad bellum and the Use of Cyber Force. *Max Planck Yearbook of United Nations Law Online*, 14(1), pp. 85-130.
- Rothschild, E. 1995. What is Security?. *Daedalus*, 124(3), pp. 53-98.
- Savage, T. M. 2004. Europe and Islam: Crescent waxing, cultures clashing. *Washington Quarterly*, 27(3), pp. 25–50. doi: 10.1162/016366004323090241.
- Simeunović, D. 2017. Migraciona kriza kao bezbednosni izazov za zemlje Zapadnog Balkana – stanje u 2017. i perspektiva. In: Despotović, Lj. & Gajić, A. (eds.) *Kultura Polisa, posebno izdanje, Kultura bezbednosti: migrantske krize, stanje, perspektive, rizici*, pp. 31-56.
- Simić, D. 2017. Bezbednosni izazovi migracija. Migracije kao izazov za Evropsku uniju i Srbiju. *Evropske sveske*, 4, pp. 4-10.
- Sretović, D., Talijan, M. & Beriša, H. 2016. Savremeni koncept bezbednosti. *Vojno delo*, 1, pp. 73-101.
- Tatalović, S. & Malnar, D. 2016. Migracijska i izbeglička kriza u Evropi: države balkanskog migracijskog pravca između sekuritizacije i humanitarizma. *Međunarodni problemi*, LXVIII(4), pp. 285–308.
- The Commission on Global Governance - CGG. 1995. *Our Global Neighbourhood*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- UNDP. 1994. *Human Development Report*. New York: UNDP.
- Vietti, F. & Scribner, T. 2013. Human insecurity: Understanding international migration from a human security perspective. *Journal on Migration and Human Security*, 1(1), pp. 17–31.
- Völkel, J. C. 2017. When Interior Ministers play diplomats. Fatal ambiguities in Europe's securitised migration policy. In: Jünemann, A., Fromm, N. & Scherer, N. (eds.), *Fortress Europe? Challenges and Failures of Migration and Asylum Policies*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, pp. 83–103.
- Vulević, S. 2018. Migrantska kriza kao izazov socijalnoj bezbednosti u Evropskoj uniji. *Vojno delo*, 3, pp. 55-74.
- Wiener, M. 1992. Security, Stability and International Migration. *International Security*, 17(3), pp. 91-126.
- Wæver, O. 1995. Securitization and Desecuritization. In: Lipschutz, R. D. (ed.), *On security*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 46–86.
- Wolfers, A. 1952. 'National Security' as an Ambiguous Symbol. *Political Science Quarterly*, 67(4), pp. 481-502.

Legal sources

- Charter of the United Nations, June 26, 1945, 1 UNTS XVI.
- Covenant of the League of Nations, 28 June 1919, 225 CTS 188 (came into force on January 10, 1920).
- Security Council. 1992. United Nations Security Council, Provisional verbatim record of the three thousand and forty-sixth meeting. UN Doc S/PV.3046, 31 January 1992.
- United Nations-General Assembly. 2004. United Nations-General Assembly, A/59/565 2 December 2004, Fifty-ninth session, Agenda item 55, Follow-up to the outcome of the Millennium Summit, Part two - A more secure world: our shared responsibility, Report of the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change.

Website references

- World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization. 2004. *A Fair Globalization: Creating Opportunities for All*. Geneva: ILO. Available at: <https://www.ilo.org/public/english/wcsdg/docs/report.pdf>.
- Kalm, S. 2005. *Global Migration Management and Biopolitics*. Mapping Biopolitics, ECPR, Granada April 14-19, 2005. Available at: <https://ecpr.eu/Filestore/PaperProposal/5afa52ef-f1bd-45cb-9471-50e733df978e.pdf>.
- Nasu, H. 2011. *The expanded Conception of Security and International law: Challenges to the Uited Nations Collective Security system*. VU University Amstedam. <http://amsterdamlawforum.org/article/viewFile/225/417>.
- Solomon, M. K., & Bartsch, K. 2003. *The Berne Initiative: Toward the Development of an International Policy Framework on Migration*. Migration Policy Institute. <http://www.migrationinformation.org/Feature/display.cfm?id=114>.
- Tatalović, S. 2018. Migracije kao globalni problem. *Prosvjeta-novine za kulturu*. <http://casopis.skd-prosvjeta.hr/migracije-kao-globalni-problem/>.
- Berne Initiative. 2003. *The Goal of the Berne Initiative*. http://www.iom.int//DOCUMENTS/OFFICIALTXT/EN/Goal_E.pdf.

Dr Ljeposava M. Ilijić

Naučni saradnik, Institut za kriminološka i sociološka istraživanja, Beograd, Srbija
e-mail: *lelalela_bgd@yahoo.com*

Nikola S. Vujičić, M.A.

Istraživač saradnik, Institut za kriminološka i sociološka istraživanja, Beograd, Srbija
e-mail: *nikola.vujicic.law@gmail.com*

**(RE)DEFINISANJE KONCEPTA BEZBEDNOSTI IZ ASPEKTA SAVREMENIH
IMIGRACIJA**

Sažetak

Autori u radu analiziraju savremeni koncept bezbednosti, uz poseban osvrt na bezbednosne aspekte migracija. Nakon uvodnih napomena, u kome su pre svega date određene terminološke odrednice, kao i osvrt na istorijski razvoj shvatanja pojma bezbednosti, ukazano je na uticaj globalizacije na nacionalnu bezbednost, te postojanje nužne međuzavisnosti država u savremenom dobu. Iz navedenog razloga, u radu je posebno istaknut značaj međunarodnih organizacija, kao i međunarodnih dokumenata koji predstavljaju osnovne smernice za postupanje sa bezbednosnim rizicima sa kojima se savremeno društvo susreće. Mada se u literaturi ukazuje na niz bezbednosnih izazova i pretnji, čini se da se poslednjih godina kao poseban problem javio problem masovnih migracija, što je bio razlog da druga velika celina u ovom radu bude posvećena upravo bezbednosnim aspektima migracija i to u dva osnovna pravca: prvo, ukazivanje na osnovne probleme koji nastaju kao posledica postojanja migracija i drugo, predstavljanje modela reagovanja na migracionu krizu. Zaključnim razmatranjima, posvećen je poslednji deo rada, pri čemu su se autori pre svega okrenuli pitanjima državne reakcije na migrantsku krizu. Kada je reč o poslednjoj krizi, primetna su dva osnovna modela na osnovu kojih su države reagovala i to: humanitarni pristup sa jedne strane i socijalno-ekonomski pristup i sekuritizacija, sa druge strane, pri čemu su neke države primale migrante, druge omogućavale njihov tranzit, a neke zabranile prolaz. Smatramo da je neophodno opredeljenje za prvi, humanitarni pristup migracijama, koji bi se pre svega ogledao u integraciji, te jedinstvenoj migracionoj politici, uz obavezno poštovanje ljudskih prava. U tom smislu, ovakve ideje bi trebalo osnažiti pre svega na međunarodnom planu, uz donošenje adekvatnih Konvencija pod okriljem Ujedinjenih nacija, koje bi bile dobar putokaz i osnov za jedinstveno postupanje. Na taj način, iako migrantska kriza ne bi bila rešena u svim svojim aspektima, zaisgurano bi bio trasiran jedinstven put koji bi doprineo da se, uz niz drugih mehanizama, ostvari princip humanosti na kojima počivaju moderna društva.

Ključne reči: bezbednost, redefinisane koncepta bezbednosti, nacionalna i kolektivna bezbednost, migracije, bezbednosni rizici i migracije.

Article history:

Received: 28 January 2020

Revised: 13 December 2020

Accepted: 20 January 2021