

**WORKSHOP ON SECURITY, BORDERS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT:
INTERSECTIONS, CONVERGENCE AND CHALLENGES**

25 - 26 April 2019, University of Warwick

**Jointly organised by the Criminal Justice Centre (CJC) and the Centre for Law, Regulation
and Governance of the Global Economy (GLOBE), Warwick Law School**

Paper Abstracts

Session 1: Migration, Security and Justice: Concepts and Critique

- *Liquid Borders: The Concept of Resilience in EU Migration Policies* - [Daria Davitti, Faculty of Law, Lund University \(Sweden\)](#)

With our paper we wish to present the theoretical underpinnings of our current project which looks at the implications of using EU development and humanitarian aid to externalize migration. Taking as a starting point recent examples from EU migration policies of deterrence, the paper draws from different philosophical frameworks to examine the way in which the concept of 'resilience' is increasingly deployed to fabricate a situation of emergency and justify neoliberal forms of intervention in the migration context.

The lens of 'resilience' enables us to understand who is the neoliberal subject at the core of the EU policies of externalization, and to make visible the economic framing that these policies sustain, as also reflected more globally in the World Bank's continued involvement in identifying 'solutions' to the so-called refugee crisis.

- *Putting the 'Collective' Back into Collective Security: Overlapping Threats, the Blurring of Boundaries and the Human Security Agenda* - [Gary Wilson, School of Law, Liverpool John Moores University \(UK\)](#)

Under Article 39 of the United Nations Charter the UN Security Council is empowered to determine the existence of a threat to the peace, which it may then respond to with the implementation of enforcement measures. Traditional conceptions of collective security conceived of security threats typically in terms of external military challenges posed to the territorial integrity of sovereign states. However, the Council has increasingly conceptualized threats to the peace in broader terms. Under the human security centered approach which has come to influence its determinations, the significance of state borders and notions of sovereignty have diminished, and the Council has recognized the interconnections between different sources of insecurity. While several factors have informed the Council's holistic conceptualization of security threats, the international development agenda has been central to this process. Refugee flows, international terrorism, health epidemics, and climate change are just some of the causes of threats to the peace identified by the Council which both stem from and give rise to challenges for the international development agenda. This paper considers the Security Council's recent practice in conceptualizing threats to the peace and their relationships to one another, and evaluates the significance of the international

development agenda within this process. While it is contended that the parameters of collective security discourse have been shifted permanently, to progress the human security agenda further requires that consideration is given to how the tools of the collective security system are refashioned to address contemporary challenges and support international development priorities.

- *Challenging the Mantra of Irregular Migration in International Development Policies through Legal Mobilisation* - [Jeff Handmaker, International Institute of Social Studies, Erasmus University Rotterdam \(the Netherlands\)](#)

A headline of a major (left) newspaper reported Minister of Development Cooperation Sigrid Kaag's objective to "prevent migration and terror" by way of development aid, claiming "as Africans develop some perspective, they will be less inclined to step on a boat" (Trouw, 18 May 2018). This message has been repeatedly echoed in official statements and media reports, making clear that the mantra of combatting irregular migration remains a cornerstone of Dutch development policies, as is the case in most European countries. This translates to over half a billion Euros and thus represents around 13% of its annual development aid budget.

In this paper, I will critique the dominant, extra-territorial regime underpinning regional and national policies regarding international mobility. The research problem I address in this paper is that the policy mantra of irregular migration that is framed (by state and other actors) as inherently undesirable to both migrants and host states ought to be deterred by way of a variety of (mostly extra-territorial) measures. This results in narrow juridical categories of who is legally permitted to travel across international boundaries, and who is relegated to being a 'problem', which both unduly burdens the system of international refugee reception and leaves most migrants in a marginal / liminal situation, experiencing a host of human rights violations and costs hundreds of millions of Euros to maintain.

I will then analyse the functioning of specific extra-territorial deterrent measures of border control. These extra-territorial containment measures are usually based on bilateral agreements, and have the impact of securitizing development and humanitarian policies, resulting in multiple violations of international human rights law. Apart from concerns over these impacts, I will explain how these extra-territorial measures prevent us from understanding, let alone addressing the underlying reasons why people are moving transnationally. By extension, I will also explore how the mantra of irregular migration that drives international development policies both makes it very difficult to implement (two-way) integration policies and indirectly contributes to xenophobia and racism.

Accordingly, I will conclude that there is a strong argument to be made for fundamentally challenging the irregular migration mantra as a cornerstone of states' international development policies, and to decentralize policy-making and implementation on integration and migrant/refugee reception to the municipal level of governance. In contrast to national government agencies, municipalities tend to be far more grounded in both migrants' and "host" citizens' social and economic realities that would reduce the emphasis on state security and criminalization of migrants, embrace a human security approach and hence significantly reduce both the social and economic costs of combatting irregular migration.

Session 2: Reshaping International Development and Security

- *The Politics of Security Sector Reform: 'Ownership' Between the EU and Tunisia* - [Kiri Santer, University of Bern \(Switzerland\)](#)

This paper focuses on the EU SSR program in Tunisia which works with the Tunisian Ministry of Interior (Mol), and examines the politics and socio-legal implications of development interventions which seek to reform security sectors on the southern side of the EU's external border.

Since the Paris declaration of 2005 the notion of 'ownership' has been central to development interventions (including SSR). My interlocutors, experts and consultants in the EU Security Sector Reform programme, as well as the delegation's project managers, mobilise this key word continuously. 'Ownership' is conceptualised by donors as enabling sustainable impact. However, the Tunisian Mol has little interest in deep governance change and remains a 'difficult partner' due to its historic ties with the old regime and the push to become more autonomous in recent years (Kartas 2014). In such a context, 'technical assistance' and material support which is less sensitive in terms of sovereignty infringement, is in large demand and is used as a bargaining chip by the Mol in the face of perceived intrusive reforms.

Through the close study of circulating expert knowledge (Morris 2017), I interrogate how 'ownership' is negotiated between donors, reformers and recipients. I argue that 'ownership' is used to justify and legitimize interventions on the security sector which are politically contentious and helps the EU to navigate tricky questions of responsibility. With migration prevention and containment high on the EU's foreign policy agenda, I ask what the consequences are in terms of EU responsibility for "contactless control" (Moreno-Lax and Giuffr  2017) and human rights violations perpetuated by the Tunisian security forces.

- *Migration Management and Development Policy Issue-Linkage in European Union External Relations* - [Emily Venturi, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill \(USA\)](#)

This study evaluates the contributing factors and preliminary outcomes of the linkage of migration management to development policy in EU external governance through the Migration Partnership Framework and the EU Emergency Trust Fund for Africa after the 2015 Valletta Summit on Migration. With Senegal as a non-EU partner country case-study, the research draws evidence from expert interviews conducted in 2017 in Dakar, Brussels and Rome with the Senegalese Ministries of Foreign Affairs and of the Economy and Planning, the EU Commission DGs for Home Affairs, Development and International Cooperation, the EU Parliament, the European External Action Service, the African Union Delegation to the EU, the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, national embassies, NGOs, think-tanks, among others. The study argues that the EU's push to interlace migration and development instruments within a securitized cooperation framework has resulted in the displacement of development and migration management objectives. Within development cooperation, resources are determined as limited, displaced from development programs rather than increased, and not sufficiently embedded in a long-term shared political vision with Senegalese partners. While EU actors rejected allegations of strict conditionality within issue-linkage, the premises for the fulfillment of the migration-development nexus were undermined by the securitization

of development programming and the disputed role of the EU as a development actor in partner countries. In terms of migration management objectives, the prioritization of security has forestalled joint EU-Senegal progress on the two broader issues of legal migration and the safeguard of migrant human rights. At the same time, issue-linkage and externalization instruments have not sufficiently incentivized short term cooperation for identification and readmission efforts.

- *Sovereignty During Global Humanitarian Health Crises* - [Sharifah Sekalala, Law School, University of Warwick \(UK\)](#)

Global health threats are becoming securitised due to an increased perception that there is prevalence of highly communicable diseases, many of which originate in the developing world, such as Ebola in Africa, Zika in Latin America, swine flu and bird flu in Asia, and Nipa in India. In an interconnected world, there is more awareness of infectious diseases, and global travel makes them easier to spread. Buzan, Weaver and De Wilde (1998) describe securitization as a situation when the state moves beyond thinking of the mortality of individual citizens to worrying about an actor (in this case a global health crisis) presenting an existential threat to its survival and to the wider international community. The threat to state survival, due to the fear of new global health threats, is leading to heightened border controls in many affluent countries relying on the International Health Regulations of 2005.

This paper asks how the use of humanitarian aid by affluent countries is helping to impact on the sovereignty of developing countries who bear the brunt of these humanitarian health crises. Using the case study of the Ebola crisis in West Africa in 2015, the paper examines the policy implications of international aid for humanitarian health work. During this crisis, many affluent countries like the UK closed their borders to flights from affected areas while also providing humanitarian health assistance to the area. The UK matched public donations to Sierra Leone through official UK aid, set up 'a forward command and control logistical hub', provided health professionals to hospitals and funded rapid response calls for researchers from anthropology to experimental vaccine experts who sought to use experimental treatments that had not previously been conducted on human populations. This paper examines how this humanitarian aid redefined the border as a site of control and contestation in the struggle for sovereignty.

Firstly, it will examine how humanitarian aid helped in the determination of whether or not a global health threat existed and how this impacted on whether or not sovereign states could keep their borders open. Secondly, the case will help to illustrate how expats and nationals of developing countries were treated differently when they contracted Ebola, with foreign nationals being repatriated and given specialised treatment which was not offered to domestic citizens. Likewise, humanitarian aid enabled samples and data cross over from the developing world to developed countries in order to further bio-medical research. In this way, developed states conducted biomedical research that may help to protect themselves against future global health threats but strictly policed their borders to avert risk to their own populations. This analysis will address the following questions, which are critical to our understanding of global health law and governance:

1. How are developed countries constructing and redefining what a 'humanitarian health threat of international concern' under the WHO's International Health Regulations of 2005 through their actions within humanitarian health crises?
2. How can poor countries like Sierra Leone, which lack resources and infrastructure, exert sovereignty during humanitarian health crises?
3. How are private actors based within developed countries such as pharmaceutical companies, insurance companies, research councils are all exerting their influence within humanitarian crises and how will affect our understanding to access to experimental testing as a treatment option in the future?

Session 3: Securitization and Extra-Territorialization: Economic, Social and Political Dimensions

- *The Securitization of Official Development Assistance in Australia* - [Likim Ng, College of Law, Australian National University \(Australia\)](#)

This paper will analyse how Australian foreign aid has been used as a security mechanism to control migration. Drawing on securitisation theory, the paper will examine how official development assistance (ODA) has been used to support Australia's restrictive laws and policies of deterrence towards refugees and asylum seekers.

In Australia, the area of migration has been increasingly described in terms of security. We see refugees and asylum seekers being constructed as security threats that need to be excised before they reach Australian territory. To that end, externalised borders have been created through processing centres and funding of border management systems in beneficiary countries such as Nauru, PNG and Indonesia. Concerning is that these borders exclude refugees and asylum seekers from legal rights. Refugees are detained in offshore processing facilities where they are subjected to indefinite detention that can lead to psychological harm. They are also denied access to the legal protections of Australian courts. ODA was originally intended to promote the economic development and welfare of developing countries. However, the Australian government has been also using ODA to control migration. For example, in a 2013 in a Memorandum of Understanding providing for the resettlement refugees in the PNG, Australia agreed to provide an addition 26 million dollars in aid to fund offshore processing in Manus Island.

From a critical perspective, I will analyse the language of security used in policy and practice to show how ODA is being linked with security and border control. I argue that this link has consequences once these refugees are constructed as security threats. Instead of being used to assist the development of donor countries, ODA has been used to reinforce governmental policies of harsh detention conditions and the circumvention of fair trial rights.

- *Securitized States, Barricaded Borders, and Hollow Humanitarianism: The Case of Rohingya Refugees in India* - [Mudasir Amin, Department of Social Work, Jamia Millia Islamic University \(India\)](#)

The Rohingya Muslims, facing political exclusion and persecution in Burma, have also been dehumanized, put under massive surveillance, threatened with deportation, pushed back

using violence, even by the countries they flee to. This paper analyses the Indian State's policy response to the Rohingya crisis, juxtaposing its political and humanitarian aspects, examining the measures taken by the government to project the Rohingyas as a 'threat to India's national security'. Despite having detained and deported some of them, India has invested and collaborated in the Rakhine development program and sent meagre assistance to Rohingya refugees in Bangladesh- all to secure strategic interests as a regional power under its 'look East policy' where Myanmar holds immense significance.

In an attempt to provide a theoretically grounded explanation, the paper uses a discursive analysis of speech acts by the governing elite, the parliamentary debates/questions on the issue, circulars and ordinances passed that call for deportation and other strict measures. The paper centralizes the operational and policy level implications of this discourse affecting the everyday lives of Rohingyas living in India and the constant dehumanization they are subjected to as their bio-metric details are collected. It also highlights how amid rising religious majoritarianism under the current dispensation, the government has used their Muslim identity, keeping up with widespread Islamophobia, to project them as terrorists. The paper examines how the absence of a concrete refugee policy/law allows the Indian state to take extreme measures against forcibly displaced people by terming them 'illegal migrants'. It brings forth the interplay between, and the balancing of, a democratic-humanitarian image on the one hand and a strict stance on the other, repeatedly invoking the imminent dangers to the security of the nation-state, resulting in greater control not just over the refugee 'other' but over its own citizens by extension.

- *Humanitarian Aid as Border Security: An Analysis of State Contributions for the Support of Refugee Camps Outside Their Territory* - [Jinan Bastaki, United Arab Emirates University \(UAE\)](#)

According to the UNHCR, over 55% of the world's refugees are being hosted in the MENA region and Africa, which reflects the top three refugee-producing countries: Syria, Afghanistan, and South Sudan. However, these numbers mask the active efforts by many wealthier states to keep refugees from reaching their shores, leaving the burden to fall on less wealthy or less politically powerful states. From the EU-Turkey deal, to the building of well-equipped refugee camps by richer countries in less wealthy states, certain states are being paid to host refugees on their territory, which appears to help in avoiding responsibility from some more developed countries to host refugees. At the same time, those states profess their responsibility towards refugees through these same financial contributions. The most glaring example can be seen in Australia's asylum policy, which sends asylum seekers to the Pacific island nation of Nauru and the Manus Island in Papua New Guinea, but it is by no means the only one. The UNHCR provides immediate relief through the establishment of refugee camps, but this sometimes acts as a replacement for durable solutions. This paper explores states' dual policy of keeping refugees out while simultaneously paying significant amounts to support refugees abroad, in countries that do not have the capacity to host refugees, and the shortcomings of the global refugee system that enables this arrangement to flourish.

Session 4: Criminal Justice, Border Controls and International Development

- *US Crime and Migration Policies: A Mechanism for Reinforcing Global Inequality* - Yolanda Vazquez, College of Law, University of Cincinnati (USA)

This paper places U.S. migration and crime policies within the framework of imperialism and colonialism. Specifically, it will discuss the manner in which the mass expulsion of noncitizens from the U.S. to predominately poor nations of color reinforces racial hierarchies created during the U.S.'s quest for land and global power.

U.S. immigration law has always intersected with global concerns about the status, extension and maintenance of the United States' power in the world, while the U.S. criminal justice system worked to control its members residing within its interior. Migration and crime policies have merged together to do both. Over the last 10 years alone, millions of individuals have been imprisoned and/or expelled from the U.S. Unsurprisingly, those most impacted are poor people of color, both within and outside of the U.S., who originated from countries with long histories of U.S. intervention in its economic and political affairs, resulting in economic instability, civil war, violence, and political unrest. These countries and its citizens are some of the poorest nations in the Western Hemisphere while the U.S. remains the wealthiest in the region and a global superpower. Crime and migration policies are, therefore, a contemporary mechanism by which the U.S. maintains a global racialized hierarchy.

Placing U.S. migration and crime policies within the historical framework of imperialism and colonialism, particularly with Mexico and Central America, helps to understand these policies as more than simply domestic laws to aid in national security and public safety, but as an extensive system of global control.

- *EurAfrican Border Security-Building as Pre-Crime Control* - Eva Magdalena Stambøl, Criminology, Aalborg University (Denmark)

Criminological research has noted how thinking and doing crime control in the US and Europe have shifted in their logics the past decades: from reactive criminal justice towards anticipative, pre-emptive, intelligence-led and territorial modes of preventing future risk and security threats. What has not been studied much by criminologists, however, is the tendency of the EU and its member states to increasingly use foreign policy and external action as tools of pre-active crime control by outsourcing to third countries the control of allegedly Europe-bound cross-border illicit flows. The article draws on four months of fieldwork in one region which is seen by the EU as particularly threatening in terms transnational crime, terrorism and irregular migration *en route* to Europe, namely the Sahel region in West Africa – more specifically in Niger, Mali and Senegal. It notices that the types of crime control models exported by the EU are mirroring the shift internally in Europe from reactive to pre-active, pre-emptive and territorial crime control as there is now a major new emphasis on intelligence-led policing, information and intelligence sharing and databases, surveillance technology and border security. This seems to constitute a shift away from the EU's liberal state-building and Security Sector Reform (SSR) agenda focusing on long-term building of democratic and accountable criminal justice institutions and internal security forces which emphasize human security. Moreover, studying these exports in their implementation phase

reveals that European crime control logics often collide with the reality and different logics and political rationalities of the local actors on the ground.

Session 5: Controlling ‘Dangerous’ Mobilities: Intersections of Domestic and Foreign Policy

- *The UK Prison Deal: Implications for State Sovereignty and Citizen Security* - [Dacia Leslie and Natalie Dietrich Jones, University of the West Indies \(Jamaica\)](#)

Using the work of Bosworth (2017) as an entry point, this paper will examine the post-colonial relationship and its influence on foreign policy and development cooperation. In particular, it will discuss donor recipients’ flexibility in negotiating development finance for infrastructural projects which converge domestic security, criminal justice and migration control. The paper will use the case study of a proposal for a grant from the Government of the United Kingdom (UK) to the Government of Jamaica, to construct a new correctional facility for Jamaicans removed from the UK, to explore these issues. Known locally as the ‘prison deal’, the proposed arrangement was rejected by a new political administration. The paper will therefore examine the implications for state sovereignty and crime control following on from the Jamaican state’s rejection of the offer. It largely draws on key policy documents and reports, secondary statistical and qualitative data obtained from the keynote speeches of two former Ministers of National Security, as well as discourse analysis of comments made by political elites in the media. The authors argue that it is possible to balance a foreign policy dynamic where power is skewed in favour of a donor country, with domestic security and human rights concerns, without jeopardising national interests.

- *Development Aid and The Externalization of Border Controls* - [Ana Aliverti and Celine Tan, Warwick Law School, University of Warwick \(UK\)](#)

Global mobility remains one of the most pressing challenges of our times. Countries in the global North are turning to major ‘sending’ countries to secure their cooperation in controlling their borders and in repatriation processes. By explicitly linking migration to global security threats and weak governance, these migration control initiatives are justified by development goals and sometimes financed by official development assistance (ODA). While domestic security concerns have been progressively interwoven into the discourse, policy and practice of international development, the implications of this policy shift are not well documented and understood. By intersecting criminology with international development scholarship, this paper seeks to advance our understanding of the novel intersections between criminal justice, security and development to govern mass migration. Focusing on UK policies and the analysis of specific programmes, the paper argues that this shift is disrupting distinctions between international and domestic policies and development and criminal justice, altering the aims of international aid and expanding the boundaries of penal power.

- *Sub Saharan Africa as Extraterritorial Securitization Field for Fortress Europe* - [Justice Richard Kwabena Owusu Kyei, Department of Sociology and Social Work, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology \(Ghana\)](#)

Majority of the new immigrants within Schengen states are mainly females and males from the global South forced to flee economic, political and climate change adversities. Since the establishment of the Schengen Treaty, immigrants are considered day in and out as the most dangerous criminals and enemies that most European states have to protect themselves against. Security agencies in Schengen states have been empowered to fight the threat of migration from Sub Saharan Africa that seeks to destabilize the order among member states. Globalisation has however, posed enormous challenges to the building of Fortress Europe as migrants persistently develop new entry and coping strategies. There are tactical strategies by European Union governments to extend the territories of Fortress Europe in Sub Saharan Africa in exchange for humanitarian and economic aids. The study investigates the extent to which border control of Fortress Europe is extended beyond Schengen States. The paper also examines how African governments respond to securitization packages that are embedded with humanitarian and economic aids. Data for this study are drawn from key informant interviews, content analysis of government official documents on migration, humanitarian packages, printed and online newspaper portals. The research reveals that there is a system breakdown in the measures put in place to protect Schengen States from the entry of irregular migrants. The migratory phenomena seem to have overpowered the securitization strategies of Fortress Europe.