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Introduction

Gabriella Lazaridis and Khursheed Wadia

The securitisation of migration

During the 1990s and 2000s, the focus within studies of international migration was placed rather strongly on aspects of (cultural) difference, questions of ethnicity, identity and belonging and the way in which these intersected with age, gender and sexuality (for example, Anthias and Lazaridis 2013; Berggren, Brborić and Toksöz 2007; Borooah and Mangan 2009; Düvell 2006; Mingione 1995; Portes and Sensenbrenner 1993; Weiner 1995; Yuval-Davis 2007). Partly due to the obvious and urgent crises and contradictions engendered by neoliberal globalisation, inequalities have resurfaced as a key concern of sociological enquiry as well as within political, economic, migration and European studies over the past few years. Lately, the question of how the interplay between difference and inequalities is structured by political agency and discourses has risen on the agenda of academics and political commentators, and most notably in recent studies on the securitisation of migration (for example, Bigo 2008; Bourbeau 2011; De Genova 2007; Huysmans 2008; Lazaridis and Konsta 2011; Togral 2011). This is unsurprising, given the influence of the work of securitisation theorists (Booth 1991; Buzan, Wæver and De Wilde 1998; Wyn Jones 1995) on the analysis of numerous global issues ranging from climate change, to religious violence, to health.¹

Security concerns have topped western political agendas since the attacks of 9/11. Given that non-state agents carried out these attacks, governments in the West resurrected the Cold War argument that security should also be about combating non-military threats. Included among the non-military threats to state security is migration, the idea being that liberal migration regimes advance cross-border risks – for example,
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terrorism, drugs and human trafficking – while more restrictive regimes minimise such threats and improve state/national and societal security. As Lazaridis and Tsagkroni state in Chapter 9 of this volume, ‘securitisation then, takes place when political leaders utilise the rhetoric of threat pushing, in this way, an area of normal politics into the security realm’. Hence, while attempting to facilitate the mobility necessary to the global economy, western governments have sought to control, at the same time, that very mobility by integrating securitisation measures within migration regimes; asylum seekers, economic and other migrant categories then come to be seen as agents of social instability or as potential terrorists seeking to exploit immigration systems.

Scholars of the securitisation of migration have posed a number of questions. Among them: Is migration a security issue? If so, in what ways have the discourses and practices of securitisation rendered migration a security issue? And who produces the knowledge used to transform migration into a security issue? These questions are raised and discussed by Squire, Karamanidou and Maguire in Part I of this book.

Whose (in)/security?

The upshot of treating migration as a security threat is the increased insecurity amongst migrant and ethnic minority populations in the West, and particularly among those from Muslim majority countries or long-settled Muslim and ethnic minority communities.

The state is a territorial unit, enclosed within clearly defined borders and possessing its own legal system and bureaucratic apparatus claiming the monopoly on violence and guarding the existing power system, hierarchically organised from the most privileged at its top, through the gens simples or classes modestes, as Bourdieu called the ordinary people, to the précatariat at the bottom of the social ladder, who are characterised as insecure, frequently young workers forced into submission due to a lack of collective bargaining power. However, the lowest place in this hierarchy of power is reserved for the informal migrants, excluded from human rights enjoyed by all other groups integrated into majority society. Thus emerge dichotomies between ‘natives’ and ‘newcomers’, as well as new forms of identities and distinctions between ‘them’ and ‘us’, as expressed in political discourse, in the art and literature of marginality, and in patterns of adaptation and integration. Such dichotomies and distinctions, and the practices generated by them, lead to increased insecurity among migrants and ethnic minorities.
While it has been difficult to prove whether or not new surveillance technologies and strict policing, across and within borders, actually increase national and/or societal security, there is evidence to indicate that these factors construct a topology of ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’ (vulnerable to detention, deportation and other exclusionary mechanisms), and that the application of surveillance, policing and other measures harms the security of migrants and citizens and can lead to the economic and/or sexual exploitation of certain vulnerable groups.

In addition, and more recently, the human insecurity of migrants has increased, as they suffer disproportionately from the effects of the global economic crisis and associated social and political instability. Both scholars and migrant support practitioners have undertaken numerous studies on the production of insecurities among different categories of migrants in Europe (asylum seekers and irregular migrants, labour migrants and family/marriage migrants). These fall into two broad categories: studies which examine insecurities produced by exclusionary practices of immigration control (refusal of entry, detention, deportation, surveillance – De Genova and Peutz 2010; Squire 2009; Jansen, Celikates and De Bloois 2015; Walton-Roberts and Hennebry 2014) and those which consider insecurities which are generated as a result of poor integration regimes and/or social and economic crises in European countries (Anthias, Kontos and Morokvasic 2013; Carmel, Cerami and Papadoupoulos 2012; Lazaridis 2011; Lester 2010; Vonk 2012). Part II of this book makes a valuable addition to the existing literature, considering not only insecurities engendered by restrictive migration control practices, but also those created as a result of poor integration/inclusionary politics in European countries.

Immigration, (in)/security and the far right in Europe

The last decade has seen an increase in the popularity of far right parties across Europe. Popular support for the far right in the EU has been expressed in recent polls not only in individual member states but also in the European parliamentary elections of 2014, which saw the number of far right MEPs increase by 50 per cent (Isal 2014). While a complex set of reasons govern this trend, and while European far right parties do not represent a unified bloc in terms of ideology and political strategies, what they share in common is that they have gathered popular support, mostly over the issues of immigration and (in)security, particularly since the entrenchment of the economic crisis in 2008 and the subsequent launch of budget-slashing austerity programmes in Europe. Whether
or not the increased focus on security issues by European governments since 9/11 has given an advantage to the far right is unclear; few studies on far right parties have mapped or analysed individual party fortunes in relation to the increased securitisation of migration or of Islam.

However, far right discourses frame migration as a security issue through the use of some common themes, namely economic and cultural security and national and internal security.

The theme of economic security constitutes an important element of far right discourse whereby migrants are cast as ‘job thieves’ in a difficult labour market and as undeserving users of a shrinking welfare state. The theme of economic insecurity is used to amplify the fears and vulnerabilities of Europe’s medium-, low-, and unskilled workers who have been the principal losers in globalisation’s flexible job marketplace and who make up high unemployment statistics. Cultural insecurity is exploited by far right parties to appeal to those who have not benefitted from living in a global, cosmopolitan age but have been left behind: in the margins of societies where long-held values, traditions, thinking and knowledge are being constantly challenged, not only through the new technologies of globalisation, but also by migrants, who bring with them different cultures and religions. In this situation, the feeling that migration undermines the perceived uniqueness of western cultures, and that mainstream parties are doing nothing to protect national cultures, values and so on, leads to support for the far right.

The idea of national security, introduced by European governments and accepted widely after 9/11, is a regular element in far right discourses and policies, and parties of the far right are more comfortable than the mainstream parliamentary parties in calling for the cessation of migration, the incarceration and expulsion of asylum seekers, and the restriction of nationality and citizenship rights to ‘native’ Europeans in the interests of national security. Finally, the internal security theme, in which migrant and ethnic minority populations are linked with various criminal acts – ‘home grown’ terrorism, drug smuggling/pushing, or grooming young white women for sexual exploitation – is also a common feature of far right politics in Europe. While there exists a vast literature on the emergence of recent far right parties and movements in Europe (Hainsworth 2009; Klandemans and Mayer 2009; Mammone and Godin 2012; Mudde 2014), few works focus specifically on the intersectional field of far right politics, immigration and security. Security themes in far right discourse and practice, as a response to the securitisation of migration, are dealt with in Part III of this book.
Aims and structure of the book

This edited volume brings together contributions from authors (academics and practitioners) who are experts in migration, ethnic and community relations and/or security studies and whose research in these fields is both topical and based on their engagement with the most up-to-date debates and data gathered through fieldwork undertaken firsthand. The authors, working on countries across Europe, tackle the dilemmas outlined above to reach considered and original conclusions.

This book is organised in three distinct parts, which correspond to its principal aims. As a starting point, in Part I, ‘Securitisation of Migration’, it aims to advance knowledge and understanding of the evolution of migration policy since 9/11 and how it has been governed by security concerns. It does this through the examination of the structures and processes through which the securitisation of migration policy is said to have taken place. In doing so, it refers to different, often conflicting approaches: on the one hand, the securitisation of migration is treated as a given – a completed project – and on the other hand, this presumption is challenged, and the question posed is whether or not migration policy has undergone a process of securitisation, and if so, to what extent and by which means? Second, this book also seeks to explain and analyse the impacts of security measures, formulated and undertaken by European states, on migrant and established ethnic minority populations in the 9/11 era. Existing evidence shows that the impacts have been largely negative and have led to high levels of insecurity among these populations. Not only is it important to consider the impacts of securitisation, but also to give voice to those who experience these impacts most intensely, and to understand how, if at all, these social actors negotiate their differences with the state. In order to do this, specific cases provide a laboratory for observation and analysis. Here they include London’s Somali community, and particularly its young people, who have had to contend with UK immigration and community relations policies, Muslims who have come to be regarded as ‘suspect’ communities in the wake of 9/11, and migrant detainee populations deemed such a threat to social stability that their isolation from the rest of society, prior to expulsion from the EU, is seen by European states as a reasonable solution. This aim is reflected in the chapters which make up Part II – ‘Securitisation and Its Impacts on Migrant and Ethnic Minority Communities’ – of this book.

Finally, the aim in Part III – ‘Populist Responses to Securitisation and Migration in a Crisis Europe’ – is to explore emerging populist reactions
across Europe to migration, migration policy and societal security in the post-9/11 years. In an era of security politics, populist extremist parties and groups have railed against immigration, arguing that it constitutes the single biggest threat to the security of Europe and that states need to protect their national cultures and communities by halting immigration, if not by returning large numbers to their country of origin. Such populist reactions have become increasingly clamorous as economic and financial crises have gripped European states, and governments have adopted austerity politics. In Part III, the cases of the British National Party, Greece’s Golden Dawn Party, Italy’s Casa Pound movement, and the parties of the Scandinavian far right (for example, Sweden Democrats) are examined.

In the first chapter of Part I, Vicki Squire poses the question of whether or not migration has been the subject of securitisation post-9/11. She goes further, asking how far and in what ways migration been has securitised over the past 10 years and more, and what consequences there are. Understanding the value of Christina Boswell’s (2007) argument that it would not do to simply presume the securitisation of migration post 9/11, nor to automatically assume that 9/11 had led to an intensification of such a process, and noting the different starting points of the analyses of the liberalisation of migration regimes and the analyses of securitising migration, Squire argues for a more nuanced account of securitisation than one which simply focuses on the association of terrorism and migration after 9/11. She claims that what Boswell suggests to be the ‘absence’ of securitisation would be better understood as an ‘absent presence’. Thus, Chapter 1 draws attention to the importance of understanding the coexistence of ‘liberalisation’ and ‘securitisation’ processes, particularly in terms which appreciate the important insights which a range of scholars have provided over recent years.

This is followed by Chapter 2, which deals with the mutually reinforcing nature of European Union and domestic securitisation policies. Lena Karamanidou maintains that a securitising approach has dominated migration policy since 9/11, both at the EU and individual state levels, and has been institutionalised through EU and domestic laws and policies and the establishment of agencies such as FRONTEX. In support of her argument, she explores the establishment of FRONTEX as an agency with a central role in managing security risks at the borders of the EU; the expansion and normalisation of detention and deportation regimes across member states and the impact of the Returns Directive; and finally, a range of internal controls such as identity checks, employment sanctions, arrests and limitations to the movements of migrants.
within the EU. Karamanidou shows that these developments do not always conform to a pure logic of securitisation, insofar as they are not always a fully conscious designation of threats by policymakers, and they do not always produce the desired outcomes in terms of controlling migration and the perceived risks posed by it.

In the last chapter of Part I of the book (Chapter 3), Mark Maguire contends that the attempt by EU governments to both facilitate the movement of human capital, which is necessary to the success of the global economy, and to control migration of people in the name of reducing security risks, has brought into the European policy-making arena a profusion of security experts. Maguire argues that it is therefore vitally important to understand the realm of expert knowledge, how experts shape various milieux of threats, and how states are advised to (re)act therein. He considers the alarming visions of the future constructed within the realm of security experts, paying particular attention to the security threats posed by climate change, for instance, and the ways in which ‘migrants’ have been turned into a part of the threatening masses imbricated by criminality and political dangers. Maguire shows how security expertise can be partial, contingent and mythic.

At the same time, the securitisation of migration policies has had serious implications in eroding the rights of migrants – in particular asylum seekers and irregular migrants – in Europe. This brings us to the second part of the book, which deals with the impacts of securitisation on migrant and ethnic minority communities.

In Chapter 4, Khursheed Wadia focuses on the securitising and practice of detention (and linked to it, that of deportation) which is so extensively deployed by EU states today. The practice of detaining large numbers of migrants is used widely across Europe as a means of ‘migratory management’, and consequently, numerous reports by human rights experts and academic studies have sought to explain why such measures are used, their significance, and whether or not their increased deployment since 2001 is indicative of an ‘insecuritisation’ of migration. Until recently, not many have sought to explain and consider the nature of such restrictive practices and the insecurities they generate among different migrant populations. Yet, to do so is important in a context where there is wide public acceptance that migration must be managed within a security framework and where, as a result, questions about daily security practices and their impact on ordinary people, are rarely raised. This chapter therefore aims to do two things. First, it examines the conditions under which migrants are detained, and in a significant proportion of cases, deported from Europe, and second, it
Gabriella Lazaridis and Khursheed Wadia considers the types of insecurities produced by detention and deportation. It focuses on migrant women as a particularly vulnerable population among detainees (and eventual deportees) and on gendered forms of insecurity, drawing evidence mainly from Britain and France. It goes beyond the state-centric migration-security nexus to consider the experiences of migrants (ordinary, more often than not marginalised people) in order to open up the study of migration and (in)security to ‘voices from below’ (Hoogensen and Stuvoy 2006: 217).

Laura Zahra McDonald deals with Muslim communities and securitisation in Chapter 5. She reminds the reader that in the wake of 9/11, 7/7 and subsequent al-Qaeda-influenced attacks, the notion that ‘communities defeat terrorism’, borrowed from Britain’s experiences in Ireland, has been reestablished as a security mantra. McDonald argues that, intended at one level to engender a sense of inclusion and partnership between state-led operations and ‘communities’ (in this case Muslim communities), the result has often been the effective profiling of an entire population, not only in relation to religion, but also geographical locations, ethnicities, socialities and political affiliations. The direct impact of counter-terrorism policies and practices such as those contained in the ‘Prevent and Pursue’ counter-terrorism strategies (a theme also touched upon by Don Flynn and Awale Olad in Chapter 6) has been well documented: for example, spikes in police stop and search of young Muslim men, travel disruptions and heavy-handed policing at international borders under Schedule 7 of the Terrorism Act 2000, pre-charge detentions, covert data collection and spying, control orders, and terrorism prevention and investigation measures (TPIMs). This chapter focuses on the indirect and vicarious forms of victimisation on the individual and communal levels, through which forms of physical, verbal, discursive and epistemic violence are committed on migrants and ethnic minority groups. The assertion by the state and within public discourse that Islam and Muslims exist in a binary of ‘moderate’ and ‘extreme’, within which a battle of loyalty and civilisation rages, has created internal tension and fuelled outsider perceptions of a communal cognitive dissonance. The impact on human experience, the author argues, is profound, and examples abound of self-censorship in matters of dress, politics, religious expression, processes of communal regulation, and complex negotiation for established and recent Muslim communities in Britain. In particular, the state pathologising of Islamic concepts, including the notion of ummah and definitions of jihad, define this struggle to ‘live Islam’ in such challenging contexts.

In Chapter 6, Flynn and Olad deal with securitisation and its impact on the Somali community in London, a community that is by and large
Muslim, which has grown rapidly over the last three decades. Drawing on conversations with prominent Somali community activists, Flynn and Olad review the policy landscape in which Somalis have been received in the UK and consider the factors contributing to the uncertainties and insecurities faced by this community as well as its well being. This chapter looks at the ways in which the immigration and policy framework has set out the options which young ethnic Somalis consider are available to them, and the implications these are likely to have for their future.

Flynn and Olad conclude with a consideration of the question as to whether the post-9/11 policy agenda conferred a security dimension to immigration management, or whether immigration and security are, and remain, distinct modes of approach which, at best, overlap only at the edges; that is, the authors ask whether life for young Somalis could be significantly different if 9/11 had not occurred, or whether the broad determinants of their fate in UK society had already been set by existing immigration and integration policies. They argue that, this fact notwithstanding, it appears to be a misjudgement to view securitisation as a phenomenon which is uniquely oppressive and dangerous to the community. In many ways, community activists regard it as symbolic of the many things which are wrong about the position of Somalis in British society, but the wider frame in which the spectrum of discontent exists has deeper roots in the older and more extensive forms of marginalisation which have marked the experiences of this ethnic group.

After considering the implications of securitisation discourses and practice for human security, which exposes the gap between the protection that migrants and migrant communities in principle enjoy under international laws and the human rights deficit and disproportionate levels of insecurity they experience in the name of securitisation, Part III of this book moves on to deal with populist far right responses to securitisation and migration in a Europe beset with crisis. Immigration ideologies which incorporate strong sentiments of xenophobia are among the most characteristic themes of the far right, with a distinguishing popular appeal within the electorate. Taking advantage of the framing of migration as a threat, not only to state security but also to our ontological security, the far right has managed to launch openly racist and hostile campaigns and attacks which violate the civil liberties, recognised in international treaties on human rights, of vulnerable populations living in Europe.

In Chapter 7, Emanuele Toscano investigates CasaPound, a far right movement in Italy. CasaPound is a cultural and political movement
which, since its foundation in Rome in 2003, has spread throughout Italy. Referring directly to fascism, they define themselves as ‘fascists of the third millennium’. However, as Toscano explains, Casapound appear to be far removed from the traditional extreme right, dealing with issues such as immigration and civil rights differently from other neo-fascist groups and organisations in Italy and Europe. Nevertheless, CasaPound militants oppose Italian ‘multiracial’ society from a number of standpoints. As Toscano argues, from a political point of view, the intensification of the migratory phenomenon represents for them the failure of national states to protect their own citizens; from a cultural point of view, ‘multiracial’ society is considered to be the result of a process of destruction and homogenisation of cultural differences under the push of globalisation; and from a social point of view, the migratory phenomenon is seen as a threat because it leads to a decrease of rights and protection for everybody. Similar to other far right parties and movements (see Chapter 8 by Gabriella Lazaridis and Anna-Maria Konsta and Chapter 9 by Gabriella Lazaridis and Vasiliki Tsagkroni, respectively), the presence of irregular migrant workers in the labour market is seen as a form of unfair competition, exploited by unscrupulous businesses. Moreover, immigrants are considered to be the new ‘slaves’ of global society, useful to the entrepreneurial system, the trade system, and the interests of organised crime. Migration (from the developing South) is perceived as a forced act, undertaken by individuals, a consequence of the impoverishment of their countries, which in turn is often connected to the expropriation of economic resources by northern hemisphere multinational companies. Hence, it is argued by CasaPound that the control of migratory phenomena is only possible through cooperation with non-European countries, in order to promote their own development, and through the intensification of restrictions on immigration into Italy. Toscano points out that these positions are not followed through by claims of presumed racial superiority over migrant subjects, and that this is where CasaPound’s thinking represents a rupture with classic postwar neo-fascism.

As Chapter 8, by Lazaridis and Konsta, shows, the position of Golden Dawn in Greece and the British National Party (BNP) in the UK is very different to that of CasaPound. In this chapter, Lazaridis and Konsta examine what they refer to as ‘majority identitarian populist’ parties in the UK and Greece: two countries with contrasting historical and politico-economic trajectories, both affected by the current economic crisis, but to different degrees, and dealing with this in different ways. Focusing on the core narratives of two ‘identitarian populist’ parties, the
BNP in the UK and Golden Dawn in Greece, this chapter shows how populist actions, in the name of security, promote exclusionary practices through the construction of Otherness. Such practices are commonly heralded as answers to the ‘soft’ security issues which have arisen after 9/11 and the more recent hardships encountered by citizens in their daily lives (to do with changes in the economy, work and social organisation), which range from profound hostility to immigration and multiculturalism in the UK, to covert and overt violence against the Other, in Greece. The otherness of migrants is seen as a threat to the state and also to the social and economic security of ‘majority’ society in both countries under study. Finally, Lazaridis and Konsta assess the attractiveness of these ‘identitarian populist’ groups to young people and examine the paths of engagement for young people in these parties.

Finally, in Chapter 9, Lazaridis and Tsagkroni shine the spotlight on the far right in Scandinavian countries. The authors look at the rise and popularity of far right parties in Scandinavia and ways in which they use the securitisation of migration and the alleged threat migrants pose to ‘our’ state, economic and ontological security and identity, as a conduit through which to justify and legitimise their anti-immigration, racist and xenophobic rhetoric and praxis. As this chapter shows, despite their differences and background, what the Scandinavian parties present is a rhetoric with strong populist elements, in which immigrants are cast as dangerous, and in which states need to be alerted to the threat their countries face. Contributing to the rise in xenophobia and Islamophobia, the securitisation of migration represents more than a theory in the case of the parties under examination. The fear of Islam, in recent years, is a key element of the policy of these far right parties, which seem to have taken an uncompromising position against immigrants. Muslim migrants, seen as agents who are out to subvert ‘western’ values of free speech and freedom of the individual, are set as particular targets.

We believe that this assembling of several different expert approaches to the theme of securitisation of migration and its impacts on European societies lends this edited volume its particular value and strength. This is further enhanced by the fact that the securitisation of migration and the insecurities which processes of securitisation have generated are analysed here at the regional (EU), national and sub-national levels.

The study of migration and security poses a dilemma: whether to adopt national-societal or human-centric perspectives and whether the divergent and competing approaches to security (national, societal, and human) can or should ever be reconciled. The questions arising from this dilemma are important, not just for academics, but also for
current and future policymakers, influencers and the general public so that all of society can make informed choices about migration and its place in contemporary Europe – on the basis that ‘human security’ is taken into account rather than a narrowly conceived ‘state/national security’; and by human security, we mean the security of all people residing in a member state, not just those who hold EU citizenship. The clamour for greater securitisation has not created a safer European society. Rather, it has created a society which permanently lives in fear of real or imaginary threats, on the one hand, and on the other hand, has cohorts of the population scapegoated, marginalised and excluded in a ‘fortress Europe’, where the recognition of rights is seen as a pull factor, thus encouraging more migrants to come to Europe, who will be seen to further endanger EU citizens’ identity, economic opportunities, health and safety. This perceived threat informs the discourses of the rising-in-popularity far right, which opposes immigration and rights of migrants to hold rights – this, despite the presence of international human rights law, or the EU’s Charter of Fundamental Rights, or the rights and freedoms enshrined in the European Convention of Human Rights – and renders the opportunity to improve the current situation rather limited.

Directions in future research

A review of the chapters contained in this edited volume suggests a number of future research directions which may be followed. Where the securitisation of migration and human (in)security is concerned, three gaps in academic and policy research may be highlighted, although, of course, there are bound to be many other areas which are also worthy of attention. The first thing which emerges is that both securitisation and human (in)security, as concepts related to migration, are subject to little interdisciplinary conversation. Currently, securitisation tends to be debated extensively within the area of politics and international studies, while human (in)security has been picked up by other social science disciplines, in particular sociology. While Maguire informs us that the production of expertise in security techno-science has been subject to research in anthropology, he is one of the few within the discipline to work on the input of such expert knowledge into the securitisation on migration. He also argues that more useful work could be undertaken within anthropology and psychology on what the erection of walls and borders across Europe and elsewhere signifies, on psychical levels, given that they fail to deliver the intended outcome of resisting
undesired populations in material and practical terms. On the whole, only a few anthropologists (De Genova and Peutz among them) have undertaken studies on the intersecting themes of migration and mobilities and (in)security and exclusion. Where other disciplines are concerned, Mountz, Coddington, Catania and Lloyd (2012) argue that there is an urgent need for critical research, in geography, on migration and the processes and practices of mobility and containment, bordering and exclusion, which are undertaken in the name of increased security. They contend that such processes and practices are fundamentally geographic in nature, both empirically and conceptually, given that spatial tactics form an intrinsic part of them.

Second, it can be argued that far more academic and policy research needs to be undertaken, linking the concepts of securitisation and human (in)security in migration, in order to suggest ways in which European states may, if at all, ensure freedom from fear for both national and migrant (and minority) communities. Empirical research on the impacts of the securitisation of migration at local levels may also prove useful in answering questions about what policy initiatives and governance measures are best adopted in addressing the challenges of human (in)security among migrant and ethnic minority populations in Europe. In undertaking such research, it is important that certain assumptions about where (geographically) risk, and hence securitisation and human (in)security matters, are not perpetuated; currently there is a tendency among academics, policy makers and influencers to assume that risk and increased national security is an important issue for western countries, while human (in)security is a matter for countries in the developing South. Such thinking produces a ‘politics of pity’ vis-à-vis the South (Aradau 2004), while obscuring the fact that human (in)security issues arise and should matter in the North.

Third, more critical research needs to be carried out where collective resistance and education is concerned. The resistance discourses and action of civil society organisations and communities against the framing of migration as a security issue, and the perception of people from the most vulnerable cohorts of society as dangerous Others, is currently under-studied. Analyses of ‘best practice’ action which promotes a humanitarian and inclusive anti-discrimination approach would be welcome. In addition, the role of education (both formal and in the wider cultural sense) in sensitising young people against the dangers of far right, anti-immigrant discourses and policies which de-normalise certain cohorts of the population also requires further examination.
Notes

1. For an overview of the development of different schools of thought in securitisation studies and issues to which securitisation theory is applied, see Balzacq (2011) and Williams (2011).
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