

Securitization of Migration in Europe – The Case of Portugal

Robert Nalbandov¹

Abstract: The article analyzes the phenomenon of securitization of migration in Europe and its contribution to the intra-state security dilemmas as the causes of civil wars. The case-study of the article is Portugal, which presents a unique target of migration. The article reviews the patterns of population movements to and from Portugal as being pre-defined by its geographic location of being on the outskirts of the Western Europe and its Age of Exploration in Medieval Europe. In doing so, it also explains its unrepresented responses to the 2015 European migration crisis and why the current level of securitization migration is the lowest than elsewhere in the EU, thus, significantly contributing to lowering the threshold for the inception of domestic security dilemma.

Keywords: Securitization of migration; intrastate security dilemma; European migration; immigration to Portugal.

Introduction

Migration to Europe is not a recent phenomenon: it has always been part and parcel of European human development. Redistribution of human capital drastically increases, like waves, after significant disasters, both natural and man-made. Migration of the 20th century had three such “waves” during which considerable masses of people moved, or had been forced to move, from one place to another: two world wars and the end of the Cold War. Especially at the end of it, i.e., “the last decade of the twentieth century and the first of the twenty-first [became] the age of migration” (CASTLES; MILLER, 1993, p. 3). None of those population shifts presented a more severe challenge to the European Union’s institutional integrity than the 2015 migration crisis. The “new wave” migrants – large population groups moving to Europe from the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region, brought forth an uncontrolled influx of migrants and resulted in the receiving countries becoming more reluctant to accept immigrants as members of their societies due to the distant identities of the newcomers (VAN HAM, 2016).

The common European edifice is shaken by opposing forces calling the cultural diversity of the European Union, brought, among others, by the immigrants “a triumph of neo-liberal multiculturalism, a part of the triumph of global capitalism” (ARAEEN, 2000, p. 15) and, at the same time, by the “anti-hybridity backlash” (PIETERSE,

¹ Angelo State University (Estados Unidos da América).

2019, p. 119) fostered by the growing forces of nationalism and right-wing populism of some of its member-states reluctant, to say the least, to accept the incoming cohorts of the parents of their future citizens.

To promote their anti-globalization agendas, anti-immigrant forces across Europe use the post-Cold War cookbook of *securitization*, the term that denotes a speech act aimed at a specific identity group by negatively targeting others by presenting them as inherently unacceptable to the local social-economic fabric. Securitization efforts across the EU are not homogenous: the countries that experience a large influx of migrants tend to securitize more than those with an insignificant alien population. Levels of securitization can also be higher in some host cultures standing in stark contrast with the incoming groups: Christianity vs. Islam, modernist vs. traditionalist, industrialized vs. rural, ed vs. rural, etc. Studying the variables of successful securitization in outlier countries would contribute to the overall scholarship on migration since it will present somewhat a different picture from a commonly accepted view on the interplay between migration and anti-immigrant discourse.

The purpose of the present article is to present an overview of the phenomenon of securitization of migration in the European context and to showcase it on the unlikely example of Portugal. Mostly, the countries with high level of migrants from outside and inside of Europe (such as traditionally Germany, France and Greece but also more recently, the Eastern European nations) are at the spotlight of the immigration discourse. Current scholarship is abundant when it comes to the discussion of the causes and consequences of the large population movements to those nations. It would be, thus, beneficial to fill the ontological gap in relation to the countries with low migration levels from academic perspective and to inquire into the nature of this phenomenon. Low migration in Portugal is correlated with the low securitization phenomenon, which is an interesting aspect to study in this connection. The major question of the present article, “Why the level of securitization of migration are lower in Portugal than anywhere else in Europe?” will be explored at the following levels.

As such, present article has three major points to highlight. First, I will review the general notion of securitization as both a standalone social constructivist concept and closely related to the realist notion of the intrastate security dilemma. Second, I will analyze its applied form: the securitization of migration in the pan-European context. Finally, I will look into Portugal as an unusual case of a nearly complete absence of securitization efforts toward migrant communities and explain the key components of its somewhat lackadaisical immigrant sentiments. I will approach the immigration issue in Portugal from the perspective of its unique patterns of population movements pre-defined by its geographic location and the Age of Exploration in Medieval Europe and influenced by the limited, if at all present, securitization.

Concept of Securitization

To put it simply, *securitization* is a linguistic trick, for the lack of a better word, of taking a word out of its native non-threatening parent context and implanting it, via a skillfully formatted speech act, into a host context full of fear and insecurities. It is a part of the social constructivist school of thought, the so-called “Copenhagen School” of international relations (WAEVER, 1995; McSWEENEY, 1996; BUZAN *et al.*, 1998), and part and parcel of the overarching concept of Human Security (PARIS, 2001) introduced right at the dusk of the Cold War era. According to Freire (2016, p. 2). The theory of securitization “attempts to provide a multifaceted conceptualization of security. It argues that security operates within five “sectors” [military, political, economic, societal and environmental] that seem to reflect some of the irreducible aspects of” the universally acceptable connotations of security.

From the point of view of linguistics, securitization is the process whereby a politicized issue is constructed as an emergency and taken beyond the established rules of the game (BUZAN; WAEVER; DE WILDE, 1998, p. 23), to the realm of exception. As Rychnovska noted (2014, p. 14), securitization taps into “deeply embedded and formalized social relations” used as the basis for the subsequent securitization: racial, ethnic, religious, linguistic, regional or even economic identities. According to Glover (2011, p. 79), “[T]he process of securitization consists of three fundamental steps: 1) the securitizing move – i.e., the identification of an existential threat, 2) emergency action, and 3) effects on inter-unit relations by breaking free of rules”. The audience is “fundamental to the intersubjective character of securitization theory and an essential aspect of the creation of shared security meanings and the justification of security policies, as the success of a securitizing move (the speech act through which the securitizing actor presents something as a security threat), and in turn the entire securitization process, depends on audience acceptance” (CÔTÉ, 2016, p. 542).

Just having a designated audience, However, is only a part of successful securitization efforts: its aftereffects are that matter. As Floyd and Croft (2011, p. 155) stated, “a securitization exists only at the point when a designated audience accepts the speech act”. Securitization hits the bull’s eye of collective fears when it becomes both a performative speech act and is directed towards the dynamics of interactions between the securitizing agent and the target audience (BALZACQ, 2005).

Securitization of Migration

There is, perhaps, no better ground for securitization than a single nation-state space shared by different groups. Securitization works better and more efficiently when it is performed by a societal group enjoying the majority within a given state, based on their “social relations”, or identities, and launched against the minority groups. When applied to the field of migration, securitization mounts anti-immigrant sentiments preexisting in the host societies zooming in the widespread fears of the “other”, which is, by definition, detrimental to the identity of the “self”.

Much similar to Glover’s securitization steps, Huysmans (1995, p. 57) also holds three constituent parts: threat (security is about avoidance of threat, and if migration enters security discourse, it is equalized with the notion of threat); threatened object (state and society, which strive for maintenance of their identity and which feel threatened by the influx of migrants); and identity maintenance of the threatened object (state identity and cultural identity).

For Bigo, securitization is a technique used to “transform structural difficulties and transformations into elements permitting specific groups to be blamed... simply by categorizing them, anticipating profiles of risks from previous trends, and projecting them by generalization upon the potential behavior of each individual pertaining to the risk category” (BIGO, 2002, p. 76), securitization, thus, brings an individual migrant into the collective notion of “the migrant” which is further used as a receptacle of negative emotions.

Identity homogenization further contributes to splitting between the host groups and the incoming ones to the point when even the generations of former migrants born in the host countries are still considered as “them,” which is by definition “not us”. Post-migration generations might look, speak, and dress like the host communities and have all the latter’s cultural traits. Still, in their eyes, they will always be considered “not us” and, thus, detrimental to “us-ness”, whatever that constructed term can mean: language, religion, ethnicity, or race. Identity homogenization is not the real problem here: the problem is attaching negative connotations

to it via a linguistic act. Such a vision of migration puts migrants and the locals in different axes of domestic polarization. Truly, “[i]mmigration and ethnic diversity threaten... ideas of the nation, because they create a people without common ethnic origin” (CASTLES; MILLER, 1993, p. 14). Trust and fear are mutually exclusive notions never capable of coexistence, which means that as soon as fear enters the discourse on minorities, it eliminates any possibility of introducing trust.

Securitization of migration puts all blame of receiving societies under the cliché of migration, also assigning the solutions of the problems existing in the host societies long before the entry of the migrants into the domestic context: economic development, unemployment, demographic problems, and so on. Fear, unrest, failure of domestic policies attributes weaknesses of national policies to the issue of immigration. Securitization extends disharmony caused by migrants to the ontology of death – the factors mentioned above are united under the feeling of fear of death: “migrant becomes... carrier of death...[and]...foreigner is turned into a disease, a weed: something to be destroyed because it threatens life... Migrants cause violence, and violence kills... [M]igration is interpreted as an existential threat, which means that it threatens the survival of the self-identity of the natives” (HUYSMANS, 1995, p. 60). Doty (1998, p. 17) agrees, “...migration is increasingly perceived as a potential threat to the security and well-being of the industrialized states of the West”. As a result, being viewed as threat-bearers, migrants are marginalized by and from mainstream societies. In sum, migrants are presented as *mala in se*, which must be eliminated.

Security Dilemma as the End-State of Securitization

Since migrants represent alien societal groups pocketed inside the host societal groups and are considered threatening the latter, the discourse of securitization of migration brings into life the concept of the security dilemma. The modern notion of security dilemma was first introduced by Hertz as a “structural notion in which the self-help attempts of states to look after their security needs tend, regardless of intention, to lead to rising insecurity for others as each interprets its own measures as defensive and measures of others as potentially threatening” (HERTZ, 1950, p. 157). Jervis took this point further in presenting a security dilemma as having a realism-inspired and equally pessimistic outlook on the international system (JERVIS, 1978). More recently, in his seminal work of “offensive realism”, Mearsheimer concluded, “...the best way for a state to survive in anarchy is to take advantage of other states and gain power at their expense. The best defense is a good offense” (MEARSHEIMER, 2001). A perfect nutrient medium for the security dilemma is the systemic anarchy where, in Walter’s words, “...no central government exists to ensure order, no police or judicial system remains to enforce contracts, and groups have divided into independent armed camps” (WALTER, 1997, p. 338). Anarchy limits the communications between the countries; it increases uncertainty in each other’s intentions, and it reciprocates mutual annihilation fears. The world is essentially lawless and represents the “war of every man against every man”, to quote Hobbes’ *Leviathan* (2009). In this state of nature, dictated by the systemic anarchy, everyone (in this particular case, the countries) is out for themselves.

When translated into the realm of societal security, the dilemma becomes intra-state: in very simple words, “the more of them” means by this very fact, “the fewer of us”. With the process of securitization at full swing, eventually, according to Roe (1999, p. 194), countries find themselves in situations where “...the actions of one society in trying to increase its societal security (strengthen its own identity) cause a reaction in the second society, which, in the end, decreases the second society’s societal security (weaken its identity)”. According to

Posen (1993), intrastate security dilemma is directly linked with domestic anarchy, when a weak central government cannot control the territories inhabited by ethnic groups, which, as a result, become faced with “self-help” situations. Under such conditions, “when two groups find themselves without a third party that can credibly guarantee agreements between them... [and] ethnic majorities are unable to commit themselves not to exploit ethnic minorities” (FEARON, 1998, p. 108).

Routine lives of receiving nations are changed, and change is usually associated with fear of uncertainty: “... people whose conditions of life are already changing in an unpredictable way often see the newcomers as the cause of insecurity” (CASTLES; MILLER, 1993, p. 13). Such situations are typical in the countries with multi-identity groups, or, as Barkun calls them, “[s]egmentary societies – societies without central government, hence ‘stateless’ – [which] are analogous to, and potentially isomorphic with, the international system” (BARKUN, 1964, p. 122). Asymmetrical information existing between groups and uncertainty of each other’s intentions leads to increased mutual fear. The growth of protective measures undertaken by one group distorts the nature of offensive and defensive capabilities, which others view as bearing aggressive intentions.

While security dilemmas and securitization of migration are two different terms, there are still significant theoretical overlaps between them. One such commonality exists in the involuntary involvement of the migrants in the securitization processes. They may not even do anything hostile to the host communities or openly express their cultural heterogeneity: all they need to do is to remain themselves. And by being themselves, they are viewed by the host societies as dangerous and enhancing their potential for disruption of the existing order of things and the ways their countries had been run. An important aspect, which follows the discourse on the securitization of migration is that while being passive participants of the securitization game, migrants are nevertheless portrayed as its primary actors. In the same way, the societal groups would be keen to boost their defenses, which would be viewed as attempts to augment their offensive capabilities. In reality, however, neither of those actors have another choice but to accept what is imposed from outside of societies by state apparatus and various security communities, and inside the societies.

There are not many options left for migrants to counteract under such conditions. Even the protest actions they undertake are boomeranging back, being considered by mainstream polity as one more revelation of the “true nature” of the “barbarians”. For this move, skillful actors are needed to eloquently present the whole groups of “newcomers” as threatening the host people’s integrity. Dulić and Kostić called such situations “ideological cleansing” “meant targeting civilians because they belong to an ethnic or political group, which for ideological reasons is defined as an ‘objective’ enemy of the in-group and therefore must vanish from a given territory. In other words, the group’s members will become targets regardless of their own actions” (DULIĆ; KOSTIĆ, 2010, p. 1053).

The negative connotation of migration originates from the ideas that the world without migrants is harmonious – being composed of people of the same identity (ethnic, national, religious, or linguistic) – and migrants violate this harmony, or “perfect equilibrium”, by bringing in their own identities. Migrants are not considered as having the same characteristics of the title nation, i.e., they are not viewed as “people” in a sense that the title nation is. Also, migrants cannot be associated with the title nation, i.e., share with them “their cultural identity, their form of life” (HUYSMANS, 1995, p. 60). An important aspect to mention here is that the migrants acquire the characteristics of “billiard ball”: it does not matter which material different billiard balls are made of – they will all behave similarly on a billiard table (SNYDER, 1961). The differences, which, in many ways, can be the same as the differences within the title nation (sex, profession, wealth, culture), are neglected, and people are stigmatized as “migrants”.

Apart from suffering from identity problems (which can be characterized as problems *endogenous* to migrant communities – wherever they go, they will be carrying their identity notwithstanding the nature of receiving societies), people entering a state have other *exogenous* problems. They find themselves in vicious cycles of limited financial, administrative, social, and political capacities of local institutions that are counterproductive towards integrating large population flows from outside. Together with some migrant communities' resistance to assimilate and the presence of internal economic hardships, the receiving governments might lose their control over the immigrants. Migration starts attracting the attention of and being perceived as a common problem for nearly all layers of the receiving societies: policy-makers, law-enforcement officers, educators, legislators, private corporations, media, and public, who start talking of migration in political terms, who are abusing the word “migrant” for their benefits.

The key to bringing securitization of migration into the security dilemma discourse rests in group leaders' skills and abilities to engage in incendiary speech acts targeting the migrant groups and paving the way to the “ideological cleansing”. Such leaders skillfully manipulate the host societies' attitudes towards the preexisting hardships, such as low economic development, unemployment, etc. They present the migrants as both the causes and solutions of their troubles: get rid of the migrants, and the issues will disappear. These actors or agencies are becoming, in a way, “norm entrepreneurs...[who] call attention to issues or even “create” issues by using language that names, interprets, and dramatizes them” (FINNEMORE; SIKKINK, 1998, p. 897), and for whom negative stance towards migration is eventually becoming a widely accepted societal norm.

Such societal “norm entrepreneurs” are mastering specific linguistic connotations that lead to mobilization in favor of some and against other groups. History, usually precipitated with negative episodes of ethnic interactions, is revived; fables and myths of former glory are put in new contexts, and other groups are depicted as evil. Without close social and economic exchanges on the state level and with no guarantees from the governments, groups gradually become unaware of each other's intentions. This is how migration is brought into the realm of security dilemma by being securitized by the state, as a whole, by politicians, and by security communities. From the state's perspective, citizens are perceived as nationals as opposed to migrants, and the latter “are framed through...cultural discourses as foreigners or as citizens of different national origin who do not fit the “national standard” of norms and values” (BIGO, 2002, p. 67). Cultural mixing that can appear as a result of migration is the main boogiemán here. The “norm entrepreneurs' weaponize their groups' cultural purity based on constructed fears of multiculturalism targeting the very core of the host societies: their cultures” (MARTINIELLO, 1997, p. 14). As a result, migrants are presented as threatening the homogeneity of citizens' identity and, as a result, political integrity and sovereignty of a state.

Migration in the Pan-European Context

The modern discourse in Europe on migration is framed by refugees and asylum-seekers' inflows from less developed parts of the world. According to Heisler and Layton-Henry, migration acquires the pattern of population movements “from areas of high political, social or economic insecurity to...areas of lower insecurity” (1993, p. 148) which is a modern-day Europe. Europe is currently shaken by some of its member-states' negative feelings towards migrants due to their fears associated with perceived losses of their security. The 2015 migration crisis created somewhat a cognitive dissonance in Europe. “On the one hand, it strives to facilitate freedom of movement inside the Union as well as easing the rules and reducing the red-tape for entering the Union from neighbo-

ring countries, as it claims to want to obviate erecting new “walls” in Europe. Yet, on the other hand, it aims to provide security through filtering out unwanted goods and aliens, to be free from the security risks they might pose. To put it bluntly, the EU wants to liberalize but also strictly regulate its borders” (BENAM, 2011, p. 192). If at the dawn of the new millennium Europe was the champion of multiculturalism, it took the Europeans less than a full decade to admit – even at the leadership levels – that the “multikulti” concept, “where people would “live side-by-side” happily” (BBC, 2010) ever after, had failed.

Nationalists, right-wing and populist parties and their leaders mushroomed “during the past decades in Western European countries, [and] ha[ve] been progressively securitized [migration] by being politically and socially constructed as an effective or potential threat. The ongoing securitizing trend has been reflected in the tightening of Western European states’ migration laws and policies” (CASAGRANDE, 2012, p. 10). These parties had been building the anti-immigrant sentiments in their corresponding societies as early as the 1980s and 1990s century by politicizing the immigration system and asylum seekers as feeding into the uncontrolled flows of illegal immigration. Demirtaş-Coşkun explained the growing “unease” with the incoming migrants by two tectonic collapsed on the European continent: the end of the Soviet Union and the demise of Yugoslavia (2006, p. 10-11), which shook the pan-European societal fabric. Mass media has also been notorious for reinforcing these constructed links (i.e., securitizing them) (HUYSMANS, 2000, p. 763).

It seems that everywhere in modern-day Europe, the host societies’ anti-immigration feelings take over the domestic political discourses. In the south, in Greece, for instance, “...political and security elites used symbolic language, metaphors, exaggerations, inaccuracies and a criminalization of the ‘Other’ in order to actively promote the construction of migration as a threat, as opposed to multidimensional social phenomenon” (KARYOTIS; PATRIKIOS, 2010, p. 46). Across the continent, in the UK, “According to most post-Brexit analyses, ‘immigration’ was the single strongest issue driving Brits to vote Leave... By blurring the boundaries between EU and non-EU, economic and humanitarian, and legal and illegal migration, the Leave campaign challenged established notions of membership, nationality, and human rights in a democratic vote, and won” (GARRETT, 2019). And in the heart of Europe, in the traditionally neutral Switzerland, the right-wing Swiss People’s Party and the Christian-conservative Federal Democratic Union championed and won the public plebiscite to ban the construction of mosques (CHENG, 2015). Their crowning act of securitization is known as “The Swiss Minaret Ban” of 2009.

All over Europe, migrants are being considered as causing many of the existing problems with the population, both from domestic and international perspective: “[e]conomic stringency..., social changes..., institutional overload and other sources of difficulty occurred... after the advent of large-scale immigration; therefore, these problems, which can be seen as threats to social security, are readily attributed to the immigrant presence and thereby elevated into problems of societal security” (HEISLER; LAYTON-HENRY, 1993, p. 157). Being “...seen as a danger to living standards, life styles and social cohesion” (CASTLES; MILLER, 1993, p. 13), in many instances, migrants are accused of deteriorating the social and/or economic conditions within the host countries.

Several variables affect the causes of migration. Domestic hardships of economic, political, and social nature force people to change their dwellings to get a better future for themselves and their children. Migration can also be a logical result of the labor globalization processes where people’s massive movements are following the movement of goods and services (MUNCK, 2010). Regardless of the causes, migration has a number of consequences for receiving European nations. The mass influx of people from outside also alters the existing cultural setup in Europe by altering cultural homogeneity into multiculturalism, which is, in most cases, considered as a threat to existing *état de choses* of the receiving societies. Their national unity as nation-states is threatened by

the diversity that immigrants bring along. Even more so, the process of securitization of migration in Europe is targeting long-term cultural consequences: migrants are presented as endangering “the population dynamic of which they are part” (HUYSMANS, 2006, p. 100) by bringing in more children of their kind, thus, fostering the demographic transformation of the current homogenous ethnic identity of the host societies into the future mixtures.

Once migrants enter the host European countries, they find themselves in more or less unknown surroundings. The domestic environment of receiving countries plays a crucial role in the future of migrants. In an ideal case, the receiving state adopts a policy of inclusion of migrants into their societies, which will eventually lead to the assimilation of migrants. This involves providing decent living conditions for migrants, teaching the host language, employment, and accepting them in the societies through legal procedures (permanent residency is one example). On the other hand, the receiving countries may adopt exclusion policies and treat migrants as unwelcome visitors. The situation is aggravated by policy-makers having anti-migrant policies, which juxtapose migrants to local society and present the relations between them as a zero-sum game.

Portugal: A Case Study

Portugal represents an interesting case in terms of immigration processes, as well as its securitization. On the one hand, it is somewhat easy for relatively wealthy individuals to acquire legally live in Portugal: the country had become “one of the top earners among EU golden visa schemes” (BRILLAUD; MARTINI, 2018), offering affordable properties to investors and the rich retirees from all over the world in exchange for residence permits and eventual citizenships. This type of immigration is greeted with extended arms and will not be covered in the present paper. It is the type of migration, which is securitized and fearmongered, and reviewed in detail here.

Migration Patterns to Portugal

The state of immigration to Portugal is a direct outcome of the interplay between geography, cultural openness, and the treatment of the incoming groups in the country. According to EUROSTAT (2019), registered immigrants in Portugal comprise a much lower number – 4,7% (with over 70% of them being from non-EU countries) – than other EU member-states. There were several “waves” of immigration to Portugal: “Before 2008, the main reasons for emigrating to Portugal were work-induced. Between 2008 and 2015, labour inflows declined sharply and migration to Portugal became associated with students...and family reunification... Recent signs suggest a new cycle of migrant workers entering the country, often into subordinate professional activities for services and tourism (encouraged by an acceleration of the economy)” (CARITAS, 2019, p. 20). The context of immigration to Portugal is also notable for a complete historical reversal of the traditional migrant groups’ rankings.

The map of the origins of those immigrants also changed dramatically. Traditional sources of migration in Portugal included its former African colonies. In the 1980s, the *retornados* from the PALOP states (Países Africanos de Língua Oficial Portuguesa), such as Cabo Verde, Angola, São Tomé e Príncipe, and Mozambique, to mention a few, – used to represent the majority of the migrants (about 47,7%) (BAGANHA *et al.*, 2005). Recently, however, their numbers had dramatically decreased. By the end of 2017, Portugal became the second least preferred destination of African emigrants (WANJIKU KIHATO, 2018, p. 11).

The second category of immigrants is represented by the citizens of other EU member-states and Brazil, who comprise the bulk of the highly educated and well-paid job migrants. At the end of the Cold War, the collapse of the Soviet Union marked “the arrival of thousands of mostly undocumented immigrants from Eastern Europe,

particularly Ukraine, Russia, Moldova, and Romania. In a mere five years, Ukrainians have become the third-largest group of foreigners, immediately after Cape Verdeans and Brazilians” (MALHEIROS, 2002).

Presently, however, they occupy only the 3rd place (20,6%), superseded by the former citizens of Central and South America (21,6%) and those from other EU member states (43,8%) (INE, 2017), who now constitute the overwhelming majority of immigrants in the country. At the same time, Portugal is no longer among the major destinations for the African PALOP immigrants: less than 2% of them had settled in Portugal in 2017 (UNDESA, 2017).

Migration Crisis and Portugal

The migration crisis of 2015 hit the EU member-states disproportionately hard. While some had increased shares of nearly 5.2 million refugees and asylum-seekers (UNHCR, 2020) (Germany - 23.3%, France – 19,6%, Spain – 18,8% (EUROSTAT, 2020), others, like Portugal, had quite few numbers. The European Commission's “European Agenda on Migration” (2015) attempted to even out this disparity by suggesting that “[n]o Member State can effectively address migration alone. It is clear that we need a new, more European approach. This requires using all policies and tools at our disposal – combining internal and external policies to best effect”. Other guidelines aimed at promoting a “joined-up approach to migration [which] prevents the emergence of policy silos. But this also requires the end of geographical silos” (EUROPEAN COMMISSION, 2015, p. 18-19). However, much had to do with the migrant routes' geography, which cannot be leveled by this supranational institution.

It would typically take much longer and more costly for most of the “new wave” migrants from the MENA countries to reach Portugal being the last one on their westwards route. Some refugees, however, still make it there. Portugal had become one of the few European countries that accepted the migrants during the European refugee crisis by allowing non-profit rescue vessels into its ports (FINE, 2019, p. 7). Their numbers are minuscule if compared with the rest of Europe. For instance, in the first half of 2020, only 48 illegal immigrants entered Portugal via the port of Algarve (THE PORTUGAL NEWS, 2020), which come in comparison to tens of thousands of immigrants to countries like Spain or Germany. According to Pereira, the North African illegal immigrants are treating Portugal “as a gateway” to other parts of Europe, “...immigrants arrive in Portugal and, while waiting for the conclusion of the legal entry process, flee the country” (XINHUA NET, 2020). Some of them find low-income jobs and work “...under inhumane conditions and often for less than the state-guaranteed minimum wage of €580 (\$714) a month... The temping agencies for which they officially work even deduct food, accommodation and travel costs. In times where there is little work to be had, there's barely any money left over at the end of the month” (FAGET, 2018). The COVID-19 pandemic further exacerbated their condition.

As Waldersee states, “Seasonal and undocumented workers in Portugal fall through safety net” (WALDERSEE, 2020) since they largely fly under the radar of the governmental services designated to provide social and medical aid. Wallis' report (2020) agrees, “Tens of thousands” of undocumented workers, migrants among them, could be falling through the cracks in Portugal. Unable to access social help, because of their lack of a legal work contract, these people are falling deeper into poverty as the economic effects of the COVID-19 pandemic are felt”. To bridge the gap in social and medical services, Portugal's government decided to grant temporary citizenship to all those who remain illegally during the coronavirus pandemic.

As EURONEWS (2020) reports, “The Portuguese government is granting citizenship rights to all migrants and asylum seekers who have residency applications underway. The move is intended to ensure everybody who needs it has access to social security and health care while the country battles the spread and effects

of coronavirus". This is truly an unprecedented step towards improving the treatment of the illegal migrants, especially compared with the rest of the European Union members.

In the 1990s, another form of adverse treatment of illegal immigrants occurred: human trafficking. Joliffe (1990) called this quite peculiar phenomenon "piratism of human beings" when the migrants from Africa, particularly female slaves (ROSADO, 1990), have been kept in captivity and forced to work, as well as other slave labor skims. Eaton (1998, p. 56) talks about the dire conditions of those individuals. Many were forced "to work as builder's laborers for the fee of 1 per hour; less than half the statutory rate in the construction industry... [and] the only condition the "buyer" had to meet was the provision of a blanket and a place to sleep for each of his/her workers... This network of slave-wage laborers is often controlled by Portuguese University students... [who] see it as a way of making extra money for themselves". While these instances happened almost two decades ago, the population is still encouraged to stay alert to illegal immigration. The website "Safe Communities Portugal" (2016), among other vigilante actions, has launched an online monitoring system to report the cases of human trafficking and aiding illegal immigration.

Analysis

Portugal is a rare case of a relatively low securitization of migration (if not, its absence) compared to the rest of Europe. To answer the question on the level of treatment of the immigrants, the current state of affairs with the incoming population needs to be cross-referenced with the unique background of immigration and emigration in the country. Mostly, four factors account for the present state of affairs: the fabric of traditional migrants who had arrived in Portugal before the refugee crisis; the unique geographic location of the country; its own emigration past and low impact of "ethnic entrepreneurs" on the ways the local population has been viewing the newcomers throughout the decades of its history.

Brazil and the European Union represented the core of the traditional migrants to Portugal before the end of the Cold War and prior to the "new wave" migrants to Europe. Later on, when the people from the former colonies started arriving in the country, they further contributed to the local population's cultural homogeneity, which is quite surprising. Thus, the problem was not to separate the migrants from the locals, who could be differentiated, essentially, by their various accents of the Portuguese language. Thus, "[o]ne of the principal hurdles to overcome in studying immigrants in Portugal is knowing who, exactly, should be considered an immigrant. This problem stems from Portugal's recent colonial past, and is still far from gaining the consensus of those who are interested in the matter" (MARCHI; SILVA, 2019, p. 34). Similarly, as Eaton claims (1998, p. 52), "the immigrants are usually colored, often native or second language Portuguese speakers, and invariably individuals from former colonial outposts". On top of that, those migrants included "a higher per capita rate of employers, self-employed, scientific professionals, technicians, directors and senior management executives than do the native Portuguese, themselves. This group of individuals is located right at the top of the Portuguese socioprofessional structure" (BAGANHA *et al.*, 2005, p. 437), creating, thus, a new sort of the Portuguese elite, comprised mainly of migrants themselves.

Another variable that influences the process of securitization is geography. The countries close to the major points of origin of the migrants fleeing from economic hardships and political insecurities are generally known as receiving their highest numbers, especially if the host populations are significantly better off than the migrants. Being on the outskirts of the European Union and farthest away from the major points of origins of the recent conflicts in the Middle East, in a way, sheltered Portugal from the incoming groups of desperate refugees fleeing

the havoc and destruction in Syria, Afghanistan, and Libya in 2015. Many of them would have exhausted their economic and physical means, for that matter, until they had reached the shores of the Iberian Peninsula. The overwhelming majority of the “new wave” immigrants settled in the Eastern and Central European countries. In contrast, others were detained and re-routed back to their homelands by the least receptive EU members, such as Hungary (DRAJIĆ, 2020). The “geographic silo” that concerned the European Union turned into a significant factor that kept Portugal largely out of immigrant routes.

Currently, these groups still represent a non-visible minority in Portugal and will remain so, at least, for a while. In the nearest future, according to Pew Center (2017), the projected Muslim population share in Portugal in the height of the refugee crisis was 0.4%, and even with the “high migration” scenario will be one on the lowest ends of the spectrum in 2050: only 2.5% versus more than 30% in Sweden, about 20% in Austria and Germany. While in some European countries, such as “Germany and Italy, net migration was fully responsible for population growth because natural increase was negative... [i]n... Portugal, natural increase and net migration were both negative, each thereby contributing to population decline” (CHAMIE, 2016, p. 39).

In 2013, for example, Portugal had the lowest number of asylum applications (SANTINHO, 2013). Perhaps, contributing factors for this outcome of a significantly lower number of the “new wave” migrants in Portugal were the internal institutional settings regarding migration. This was because “Portugal was (and is) a country with a restrictive and passive reception policy and a limited reception structure, unable to respond to the needs of the global refugee movements” (CARITAS, 2019, p. 36).

The country was simply not logistically ready or traditionally used to receiving large groups of migrants. On top of that, Portugal cannot boast stable socio-economic development, especially after the 2008 economic crisis in Europe. Currently, it is #7 in Europe by the level of unemployment: 8.1% with the fourth largest unemployment level among the youth under 25: 26.3% (EUROSTAT, 2020). There is simply not much employment prospects the migrants could look forward to in Portugal.

The third factor lowering the level of securitization of migration in Portugal, which directly stems from its geographic location, is its history. The exploration boom of the medieval centuries largely predisposed Portugal to become a traditional emigree country. Portuguese settlers created colonies in South America, Africa, and even as far as India. Later on, in the 20th century, especially after WW II, they would look for jobs and better economic conditions elsewhere. The wanderlust for explorations made the Portuguese culture and its people more open and, thus, more “receptive” to the cultural differences of the societal groups they had interacted with and not the treat them as something inherently alien, so to say. When the time came for the reversal of this process, the preexisting cultural openness and acceptance of the cultural differences between them and the host communities they interacted with largely predisposed a higher immigration reception level in Portugal. When the “new wave” migrants started arriving in Portugal, they were met with a receptive ground, the road to which had been paved by the generations of incoming migrants that were widely culturally accepted.

A significant historical and cultural factor contributing to the lower tide of the 2015 crisis in Portugal is its Christian past and presence. Portugal currently remains a predominantly Catholic country: the 2011 national census assessment of the religious composition found only 3.9% of non-Catholic religious group members making Catholicism “essentially “traditional”, inter alia characterized by a high degree of trust in the ecclesiastical institution, the latter being seen as a guarantor of ‘moral order’ and a secure provider of ‘guidance principles” (MACHADO, 2015).

Portugal has also repeatedly hit the top religious countries as far as their religious identity goes (95% baptized and 83% being currently Christian); being most “religious” and “spiritual” of all the EU member states (72% and 64%, respectively); believing to have “a soul and a physical body” and “feel a connection to something that cannot be seen or measured scientifically” (80% and 59%, respectively); having the highest views on religion as defining the choice between the right and wrong and “giving meaning and purpose to life” (62% and 64%) and the lowest numbers of people with the negative news on religion in Europe (24%). Portuguese are also the proudest of their national identity – more than being European (69%), which is to them tantamount to being Christian: the difference between being proud of their nationality and being proud for being Christian is the lowest in the EU: only 5% are more nationalistic than Christian (PEW RESEARCH CENTER, 2018).

Interestingly enough, the Portuguese’ national and Christian pride did not make them more antagonistic to the incoming culturally diverse populations, most specifically, the Muslims. Only 31% of them believe that “Islam is fundamentally incompatible with their country’s culture and values”, which is the lowest than anywhere in the EU. A stark contrast to these statistics is the situation in the EU members with the highest numbers of non-Christian immigrants (mostly Muslim). For instance, Sweden, Austria, Germany, and France are prouder of their nationality than being Christian; they also hold much higher cultural and religious incompatibility views of Islam than the Portuguese. They also are known to “drop out” of Christian ways and practice secularism while not identifying themselves as religious or spiritual.

Lastly, it was the relative weakness of nation-wide political parties and leaders based on nationalistic grounds capable of steering up the feelings of chauvinism and ethnic superiority of their ethnic kin against the newcomers that had dramatically lowered any chances for more or less successful securitization. Unlike Hungary, Austria, and Switzerland, which had constantly been hitting the nationalism ceilings across the EU member-states (BBC, 2019) with their “Jobbik” (VERSLUIS, 2016), “Freedom Party” (PUNTSCHER RIEKMANN, 2011), and “Swiss People’s Party” (GREEN *et al.*, 2016), correspondingly, Portugal had a relatively low level of populist feelings, especially directed against the migrants.

In this sense, the Portuguese nationalism was, partly, not even endemic to Portugal: it was heavily influenced from abroad. As Marchi and Silva noted, “In the midst of this changing social fabric emerged a new generation of right-wing extremists. They were, often, the children of returnee and/or proletarian parents who had settled in the periphery of the main cities, increasingly occupied by immigrants, as well as the children of middle-class city folks who saw themselves surrounded by shanty towns inhabited by immigrants... [T]hese young people were easily influenced by foreign political trends, in particular, by the extremism of the skinhead subculture conveyed by the Portuguese media and by accounts of relatives and friends who had emigrated to France and Great Britain” (2019, p. 34).

For ethnic entrepreneurs to be successful, several factors should be present. First, there must be a class of people presented as “degenerative scapegoats” (GIRARD, 1987), which can be further securitized. Next, there must be some sort of “a shared ideology, a blueprint for living and a vision of the world that defines obstacles to the good life or the holy life in the form of certain people who must be removed, eliminated, wiped out” (SCHEPER-HUGES, 2007, p. 168). Finally, there must be a sizable group of people, if not vocally, then, at least, silently, supporting the securitization efforts. In Portugal, none of these factors were salient for the overall securitization of migration. For one, “the country has bad memories of a right-wing dictatorship that only fell in the 1974 Carnation Revolution” (BEVINS, 2019), which it tried to avoid repeating. Also, since many of the youth expressing nationalist feelings were the descendants of the immigrants themselves who, on top of

everything else, were difficult to be distinguished from the autochthonous Portuguese population, securitizing against themselves turned out to be a toilsome work.

In a way, the Carnation Revolution was the very antecedent variable, which had predisposed the anti-nationalist sentiments in the Portuguese society for the generations to come. Since nationalism is very closely associated with authoritarian regimes being one of their most potent tools of social mobilization, it is fundamental for it to be present in the recipe for securitization of migration. In Portugal's authoritarian regime, however, such sort of ethnic nationalism was absent or suppressed by the economic elites.

Nationalism under the *Estado Novo* and its champion, António de Oliveira Salazar's rule, overthrown by the Carnation Revolution was not the nationalism in its pure, ethnic sense. The general modus operandi of Estado Novo was a rampant denial of populism, which is the basic petri dish for nationalism and chauvinism created the model of autocratic governance where the elites and even the δῆμος (the demos) not the ὄχλος (the Greek for "a crowd") were ruling the country. This fact alone put *Estado Novo* aside from the traditional national-populist movements in Europe (the Nazi Germany is a clear example of such a regime) which used the people as the grounds for their electoral powers. Gallagher once said, "European national conservative movements have a strong attachment to elections whereas Salazar refused to invest power in the masses. Trends may change but it hard to see someone with his approach to politics finding a place in any of the major populist parties that have formed on the right... Salazar was opposed to parties of any kind, arguing that they were false harbingers of progress. He prefers instead to invest his hopes in elites that would offer an impersonal rule dedicated to the national cause" (GALLAGHER, 2020, p. 8).

The dislike for populism was evident in many spheres, including the economic one where nationalism is present at its full swing. As Chilcote noted, for instance, "the Salazar regime limited foreign investments... not in defense of an authentic nationalism" but with the intension to keep its power grip on the domestic political economic processes (CHILCOTE, 2012, p. 59). As a result, national and populism being the major driving forces behind anti-immigrant aspirations and ethnic scapegoating, failed to reach due fruition and strive fully under the conditions of power deprivation.

Finally, the lower levels of securitization predisposed the absence of the intrastate security dilemma in Portugal. The host Portuguese society does not feel threatened by the incoming migrants due to their lower numbers. They also do not feel that their identity is being under attack by the conflicting identities of the newcomers. Being in dire economic conditions themselves and looking forward to leaving Portugal for better job prospects, the unemployed youth, which is the main incendiary engine of securitization and the key driving force of security dilemmas all over the globe, does not have too many "degenerative scapegoats" around itself to channel their negativity to. On their part, the current migrants are also insignificant enough to think of mobilizing against the host communities via boosting their defensive capabilities only to be mistakenly take by as offensive in the security dilemma game. The current situation is simply not enough for a successful securitization which also predisposed the absence of the "norm entrepreneurs" in the country.

Conclusion

Europe has traditionally been the destination target for various migrants, mostly from outside. With the collapse of the Soviet Union and opening up of the EU, the migration patterns have shifted towards Eastern Europe as the migration source. The recent upheaval in the Middle East leading to the Migration Crisis of 2015, re-

-aligned the origins migration back to outside of Europe. Yet, securitization of migration as a tool of separating the incoming groups from the endemic societies is still present in the domestic political discourse of the European countries with the large migration strata. Portugal, from this perspective, represents an outlier worth exploring: it is one of the least anti-immigrant yet one of the most patriotic and religious EU members. The question “Why the levels of securitization of migration are lower in Portugal than anywhere else in Europe?” covered by the present article has several answers to it.

Portugal's unique geography being the westmost in Europe tangled with the centuries of exploration and emigration predisposing its current demographics and coupled with comparatively lower numbers of recent immigrants with diverse and conflicting identities than elsewhere in Europe made securitization of migration virtually impossible. On top of that, significantly low degrees of ethnic mobilization and ineptitude of the “norm entrepreneurs” to successfully steer anti-immigrant tensions lowered the threshold of constructed securitization. Securitization of migration did not happen in Portugal because there was no need to construct the vision of threat coming from the immigrants. There were simply no moral grounds to justify it. Securitization of migration can be, indeed, justified, as Floyd asserts (2011, p. 428), if the following conditions are met: “an objective threat... that endangers the survival of an actor”; and “the object of security must be legitimate”; and “the security response must be appropriate to the threat in question”, which basically equates securitization to the postulates of the *Just War* theory (GILBERT, 1987). From that very standpoint, there were no viable bases to create the image of the “other” and then demonize it by attributing negative connotations.

While history holds no counterfactuals, but political future may, indeed, have them. The questions like “what if Portugal was on the eastmost borders of the EU?” or “what if its socio-historical background was less receptive of immigration?” are moot. That said, the future may, of course, be different from the current state of affairs in Portugal regarding migration and its securitization. Having been previously shielded from the threat of securitization, Portugal may be exposed to both reinforced waves of migration and quickly appearing right-wing populist leaders capable of stroking previously dormant cords of nationalism and xenophobia. This test has yet to come to Portugal. Still, it can be met with either dignified responses based on the centuries of exposure of its people to multiple world cultures or closure within leading to increased securitization practices and turning Portugal's natural “geographic silo” into a political one.

References

- ARAEEN, Rashid, 2000 – A New Beginning: Beyond Postcolonial Cultural Theory and Identity Politics. *Third Text*. 50, pp. 3-20.
- BAGANHA, Maria; GÓIS, Pedro; PEREIRA, Pedro T., 2005 – International Migration from and to Portugal: What Do We Know and Where we are going?, in K. Zimmermann (Ed.) – *European Migration: What Do We Know?*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 415-458.
- BALZACQ, Thierry, 2005 – The Three Faces of Securitization: Political Agency, Audience and Context. *European Journal of International Relations*. 11, p. 171-201.
- BARKUN, Michael, 1964 – Conflict Resolution Through Implicit Mediation. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 8, p. 121-130.
- BBC, 2010 – Merkel says German multicultural society has failed. Available in: <<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-11559451>>.

- BBC, 2019 – Europe and right-wing nationalism: A country-by-country guide. Available in: <<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-36130006>>.
- BENAM, Çigen, 2011 – Emergence of a “Big Brother” in Europe: Border Control and Securitization of Migration. *Insight Turkey*. 13, p. 191-207.
- BEVINS, Vincent, 2019 – Where Progressives Are Winning. *The Atlantic*, October 7. Available in: <<https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2019/10/portugal-election-progressives-left-winning/599518/>>.
- BIGO, Didier, 2002 – Security and Immigration: Towards a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease. *Alternatives*. 27, p. 63-92.
- BRILLAUD, Laure; MARTINI, Maíra, 2018 – *European Gateway*. Transparency International.
- BUZAN, Barry; WEAVER, Ole; DE WILDE, Jaap, 1998 – *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Boulder – Lynne Rienner.
- CARITAS PORTUGUESA, 2019 – *Common Home. Migration and Development in Portugal*.
- CASTLES, S.; MILLER, M. J., 1993 – *The age of migration: international population movements in the modern world*. London: Macmillan.
- CASAGRANDE, Cassia, 2012 – *The impact of public discourse on the securitization of the asylum law (LAsi) and policies in Switzerland*. Barcelona: Institut Barcelona d'Estudis Internacionals (IBEI).
- CHAMIE, Joseph, 2016 – International migration. *Great Decisions*, p. 35-50.
- CHENG, Jennifer, 2015 – Islamophobia, Muslimophobia or racism? Parliamentary discourses on Islam and Muslims in debates on the minaret ban in Switzerland. *Discourse & Society*. 26, p. 562-586.
- CHILCOTE, Ronald H., 2012 – *The Portuguese Revolution State and Class in the Transition to Democracy*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- COTE, Adam, 2016 – Agents without agency. *Security Dialogue*. 47, p. 541-558.
- DEMONY, Catarina, 2019 – Europe's loneliest far-right party losing election battle in Portugal. *Reuters*. Available in: <<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-portugal-election-farright/europes-loneliest-far-right-party-losing-election-battle-in-portugal-idUSKBN1WFOL1>>.
- DEMIRTAŞ-COŞKUN, Birgül, 2006 – Migration and Europe: Toward a More Securitized Policy? *Insight Turkey*. 8, p. 7-15.
- DOTY, Roxanne, 1998 – Immigration and the Politics of Security. *Security Studies*. 8, p. 71-93.
- DRAJIĆ, Marco, 2020 – *Serbia and Hungary Hammering Democracy*. Belgrade: Centre for Security Policy.
- DULIĆ, Tomislav; KOSTIĆ, Roland, 2010 – Yugoslavs in Arms: Guerrilla Tradition, Total Defence and the Ethnic Security Dilemma Europe. *Asia Studies*. 7, p. 1051-1072.
- EATON, Martin, 1998 – Foreign Residents and Illegal Immigrants in Portugal. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 22, p. 49-66.
- EURONEWS, 2020 – Coronavirus: Portugal grants temporary citizenship rights to migrants. Available in: <<https://www.euronews.com/2020/03/29/coronavirus-portugal-grants-temporary-citizenship-rights-to-migrants>>.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION, 2015 – “The European Union in a Changing Global Environment” (June 2015). Available in: <https://eucivcap.files.wordpress.com/2017/03/20150625-european_union_changing_global_environment-more_connected_contested_complex_world.pdf>.

- EUROPEAN COMMISSION, 2015 – European Agenda on Migration. Available in: <https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-migration/background-information/docs/communication_on_the_european_agenda_on_migration_en.pdf>.
- EUROSTAT website on asylum-seekers: Available in: <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Asylum_statistics#Main_countries_of_destination:_Germany,2C_France_and_Spain>.
- EUROSTAT EUROINDICATORS, 2020 – Euro area unemployment at 7.9%. Available in: <<https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/2995521/10568643/3-01092020-BP-EN.pdf/39668e66-2fd4-4ec0-9fd4-4d7c99306c98>>.
- EUROSTAT Data, 2019 – Available in: <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Migration_and_migrant_population_statistics>.
- FAGET, Jochen, 2018 – Illegal immigrants provide cheap labor in Portugal's agricultural sector. *Deutsche Welle*. Available in: <<https://www.dw.com/en/illegal-immigrants-provide-cheap-labor-in-portugals-agricultural-sector/a-43039465>>.
- FEARON, James D., 1998 – Commitment Problems and the Spread of Ethnic Conflict, in David Lake; Donald Rothchild (eds.) – *The International Spread of Ethnic Conflict*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, pp. 107-126.
- FINNEMORE, Martha; SIKKINK, Kathryn, 1998 – International Norm Dynamics and Political Change. *International Organization*. 52, p. 887-917.
- FINE, Shoshana, 2019 – *All At Sea: Europe's Crisis of Solidarity on Migration*. London: European Council on Foreign Relations.
- FLOYD, Rita, 2011 – Can securitization theory be used in normative analysis? Towards a just securitization theory. *Security Dialogue*. 42, p. 427-439.
- FREIRE, Lucas, 2016 – Security Studies. *Philosophia Reformata*. 81, p. 1-13.
- GALLAGHER, Tom, 2020 – *Salazar: The Dictator Who Refused to Die*. C. Hurst & Co.
- GARRETT, Amanda, 2019 – The Refugee Crisis, Brexit, and the Reframing of Immigration in Britain. EuropeNow. Council for European Studies. Available in: <<https://www.europenowjournal.org/2019/09/09/the-refugee-crisis-brexit-and-the-reframing-of-immigration-in-britain/>>.
- GILBERT, Paul, 1987 – Just war: theory and application. *Journal of Applied Philosophy*. 4, p. 217-222.
- GIRARD, Rene, 1987 – “Generative scapegoating”, in R. Hamerton-Kelly (Ed.) – *Violent origins: Ritual killing and cultural foundation*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, p. 73-105.
- GLOVER, Robert, 2011 – The Theorist and the practitioner: linking the securitization of migration to activist counter-narratives. *Geopolitics, History and International Relations*. 3, p. 77-102.
- GREEN, Eva; SARRASIN, Oriane; BAUR, Robert; FASEL, Nicole, 2016 – From Stigmatized Immigrants to Radical Right Voting: A Multilevel Study on the Role of Threat and Contact. *Political Psychology*. 37, p. 465-480.
- HEISLER, Martic, O.; LAYTON-HENRY, Zig, 1993 – Migration and the links between social and societal security, in Ole Waever, et al. (Eds.) – *Identity, Migration and the New Security Agenda in Europe*. New York: St. Martin's Press, p. 148-166.
- HERZ, John, 1950 – Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma. *World Politics*. 2, p. 157-180.
- HOBBS, Thomas, 2009 – *Leviathan*. New York: Digireads.
- HUYSMANS, Jef, 1995 – Migrants as a Security Problem: Dangers of ‘Securitizing’ Societal Issues. In *Migration and European integration: the dynamics of inclusion and exclusion*. London: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, Pinter Publishers.

- HUYSMANS, Jef, 2000 – The European Union and the Securitization of Migration. *Journal of Common Market Studies*. 38, p. 751–777.
- HUYSMANS, Jef, 2006 – *The Politics of Insecurity: Fear, Migration and Asylum in the EU*. London: Routledge.
- JERVIS, Robert, 1978 – Cooperation under the Security Dilemma. *World Politics*. 30, p. 167-241.
- JOLIFFE, J. 1990 – Angolans work as Portugal's "slaves". *The Guardian* (undated).
- KARYOTIS, Georgios; PATRIKIOS, Stratos, 2010 – Religion, securitization and anti-immigration attitudes: The case of Greece. *Journal of Peace Research*. 47, p. 43-57.
- MACHADO, Jorge, 2015 – Religions and Secularism in Portugal: mainly a lingering monotheism, Observatoire des Religions et de la Laïcité. Free University of Brussels. Available in: <http://www.o-re-la.org/index.php/analyses/item/1305-religions-and-secularism-in-portugal-mainly-a-lingering-monotheism?fbclid=IwAR2tVP_Y1pUTzYKYrLcu07HtSGnCM1bht94HQycectIp8zk57dzTsD7VXdc>.
- MALHEIROS, Jorge, 2002 – Portugal Seeks Balance of Emigration, Immigration. Immigration Policy Institute. Available in: <<https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/portugal-seeks-balance-emigration-immigration>>
- MARCHI, Riccardo; SILVA, Raquel da, 2019 – Political Violence from the Extreme Right in Contemporary Portugal. *Perspectives on Terrorism*. 13, p. 27-42.
- MARTINIELLO, Marco, 1997 – *Sortir des Ghettos Culturels*. Paris: Presses de Sciences Politiques.
- MCSWEENEY, Bill, 1996 – Identity and Security: Buzan and the Copenhagen School. *Review of International Studies*. 22, p. 81-93.
- MEASHHEIMER, John J. 2001 – *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: W.W. Norton and Co.
- MUNCK, Rolando, 2010 – Globalization, Migration and Work: Issues and Perspectives. *Labour, Capital and Society/Travail, capital et société*. 43, p. 155-177.
- PARIS, Roland, 2001 – Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air? *International Security*. 26, p. 87-102.
- PIETERSE, Jan Nederveen, 2019 – *Globalization and Culture: Global Mélange*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers; Fourth Edition.
- POSEN, Barry, 1993 – The Security Dilemma and Ethnic Conflict, in Michael E. Brown (Ed.) – *Ethnic Conflict and International Security*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, p. 103-124.
- PUNTSCHER RIEKMANN, Sonia, 2011 – Austria's Dismal EU Membership: From Enthusiasm to Ambivalence, in Günter Bischof, Fritz Plasser, Anton Pelinka and Alexander Smith (Eds.) – *Global Austria Book: Austria's Place in Europe and the World*. New Orleans: University of New Orleans Press, p. 238-256.
- RELATORIO DE IMIGRACAO, FRONTEIRAS E ASILO (RIFA), 2018 – Report for 2017. Lisbon: Serviço de Estrangeiros e Fronteiras (SEF), Available in: <<https://sefstat.sef.pt/Docs/Rifa2017.pdf>>.
- ROSADO, J., 1990 – Girls enslaved by lure of jobs. *The European*. 13.
- RYCHNOVSKÁ, Dagmar, 2014 – Securitization and the Power of Threat Framing. *Perspectives*. 22, p. 9-31.
- SAFE COMMUNITIES PORTUGAL, 2016 – Reporting "Trafficking in person. Available in: <<https://www.safecomunitiesportugal.com/report-a-crime-online/trafficking-in-persons/>> and Aiding illegal immigration. Available in: <<https://www.safecomunitiesportugal.com/report-a-crime-online/aiding-illegal-immigration/>>.
- SANTINHO, Maria, 2013 – Afinal, que asilo é este que não nos protege? [After all, what is this Asylum that does not protect us?]. *Etnográfica*. 17, pp. 5-29.

- SCHEPER-HUGES, Nancy, 2007 – The Gray Zone: Small Wars, Peacetime Crimes, and Invisible Genocides, in Athena McLean; Annette Leibing (Eds.) – *Shadow Side of Field Work: Exploring the Blurred Borders Between Ethnography and Life*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, p. 159-184.
- STATISTICS PORTUGAL, 2017 – *INE Foreign population with legal residence status*.
- SNYDER, David, 1961 – The Level-of-Analysis Problem in International Relations. *World Politics*. 14, p. 77-92.
- THE PORTUGAL NEWS, 2020 – Illegal migrants crossing to the Algarve increasing. Available in: <<https://www.theportugalnews.com/news/illegal-migrants-crossing-to-the-algarve-increasing/54516>>.
- UNDESA, 2017 – *World Population Prospects: 2017 Revision*. Available in: <https://esa.un.org/unpd/wpp/Publications/Files/WPP2017_KeyFindings.pdf>.
- UNHCR website on refugees. Available in: <<https://www.unrefugees.org/emergencies/refugee-crisis-in-europe/>>.
- VAN HAM, Peter, 2016 – *The EU's joined-up approach to security*, The Hague: Clingendael Institute.
- VERSLUIS, Arthur, 2016 – A Conversation About Radicalism in Contemporary Greece. *Journal for the Study of Radicalism*. 10, p. 145-162.
- WALDERSEE, Victoria, 2020 – Seasonal and undocumented workers in Portugal fall through safety net. Reuters. Available in: <<https://uk.reuters.com/article/uk-health-coronavirus-portugal-unemploy-idUKKBN22H106.nm>>.
- WALLIS, Emma, 2020 – Falling through the cracks: Undocumented workers in *Portugal, InfoMigrants*. Available in: <<https://www.infomigrants.net/en/post/24566/falling-through-the-cracks-undocumented-workers-in-portugal>>.
- WALTER, Barbara, 1997 – The Critical Barriers to Civil War Settlement. *International Organization*. 51, p. 335-364.
- WANJIKU KIHATO, Caroline, 2018 – *The 'Containment Compact': the EU Migration 'Crisis' and African Complicity in Migration Management*. Johannesburg: South African Institute of International Affairs.
- XINHUA NET, 2020 – Southern Portugal becomes destination of newly-formed illegal immigration route: official. Available in: <http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/2020-07/23/c_139233038.htm>.