THE IMPACT OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE ON THE SECURITIZATION OF MIGRATION (IN HUNGARY)

RITA ISABEL GONÇALVES PEREIRA[1]
Mestranda em Direito (Internacional e Europeu)

ABSTRACT

The 2001 attacks in New York pressured the world to look at migration as a potential threat to a country's security. These terrorist acts strengthened the approach of the European political elite speeches. These claimed that there were precedents that linked immigration to terrorism, thus constituting a threat to the European Space.

This paper analyzes the impact that political speech (rhetoric) and its construction had, and has, in the development of the securitization of migration in the European Union, specifically in Hungary, as well as the impact it has on public opinion. The research is restricted to Hungary, because it is one of the principal transit countries for irregular

---

[1] Rita has a degree in European Affairs (Faculty of Arts and Humanities-University of Lisbon) and is a first year Master's student in International and European Law at NOVA School of Law. rita.pereira3@campus.ul.pt

migration, due to its geographical location. Moreover, it has been a country that has stood out for its constant denials of European immigration policies, for the growth of extreme right parties at the national level, and the development of anti-immigration policies.

The Hungarian rhetoric, legislation, and society prove, through a methodology based on qualitative and quantitative analysis, that the concepts of securitization and political discourse influence each other.

This paper is based on the Theory of Securitization by Buzan, Ole Waever, and Jaap de Wilde, as a pillar for the justification of political speech and securitization. It also addresses the Theory of Integrated Threat which proves that speech/rhetoric can effectively generate xenophobic behaviors and manipulate a country's public opinion.

KEYWORDS
Securitization; Migration; Policy; Political Speech, Hungary.

1. Introduction

> *"Migration has always been a fact for Europe- and it will always be."*[2]
>
> - President Von der Leyen

Migration is currently an essential facet of political discourse (Odmalm, 2005) and its securitization has become more important than respecting and guaranteeing the rights of migrants (Estevens, 2018, 19-20). Furthermore, the project analyzes the political and social framework by looking over the impact politics has on the securitizing migration process.

Thus, the analysis bases on the following question: Is there an intrinsic link between securitization of migration and political speech?

The hypothesis tests if political discourse can influence public opinion and reinforce the need to develop emergency policies to combat migration, thus defining it as a threat. This hypothesis aims to study the demand for political discourse to refer to migration as a security matter. This research will be developed under a study case of the Hungarian society, the legislation on migration and asylum, political speeches, and public opinion studies concerning the period of growing intensification of the migratory flow in Europe (2015-2020). It intends to investigate whether the two concepts influenced each other and how this influence can have negative consequences, which will extend into the future, requiring the creation of a measure that controls it.

---

[2] Press Statement, Brussels, 23 september 2020 : https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/statement_20_1727, accessed on 10/11/2020.

NOVA SCHOOL OF LAW

CEDIS
CENTRO DE I&D SOBRE
DIREITO E SOCIEDADE

VARIA

Nº 2

CEDIS
WORKING
PAPERS   MARÇO
2021

Migration policies are, inextricably, linked to state interests. A state may have a more restrictive discourse of promotion, regulation, or integration, but they all influence the perception of migrants in that particular country (Padilla, 2010). Given this, and according to Gupta (2006), States can use their oratory power and techniques that in the public eyes justify particular solutions on immigration, thus originating a possible securitization process.

It is sought to conclude, if there is a clear influence of political speech in the migration construction as a national and european threat.

2. State of the Art

It is possible to find several academic articles related to the European Response to the migratory crisis and the consequent securitization of the matter, including papers by Matija Frčko and Davor "Solomun Securitization of Migration and Migration Policy in the European Union" (2018), the article by João Estevens (2018) and the monograph by Emellin de Oliveira. Even so, the question on the influence of political discourse in securitizing migration and build xenophobic mentalities was, until now, studied in depth.

Some papers and projects were worth studying to have a broader vision of this problem. Regarding the context of the migratory flows, the paper by Nina Miholji (2017), identifies the changes at a political and social level in Hungary. Birgit Glorius's book, focused on chapter 8 Bori Simonovits (pp. 155-176), was also instructive into the understanding of the perception of migration in Hungarian society, exploring demography and politics debating, based on the Intergroup Theory of Threat, political power in the construction of xenophobic attitudes. The article by Budapest (2015, pp.1-9), on the anti-

immigration political campaign launched by the Hungarian Government in 2015, is also relevant to analyze the issue in question.

This paper focuses on understanding whether the growing political discourse has influenced public opinion regarding migration flows. With that analysis it is pretended to argue what can be developed to contain this influence and change the landscape of xenophobic mentalities, which see migration as a threat to their security, making it a securitized issue.

The theoretical basis of the main question on this issue is based on two relevant theories to build the necessary argument to answer the starting question.

The Securitization Theory (1997) by the Copenhagen School is essential to understand the migration process as societal and political securitization. Starting from the analysis that the concept of securitization should be more extensive, Buzan, Waever, and Wilde define this concept defending the idea that security can be applied to other problems, rejecting the traditional concept definition. Based on Constructivism Theory, the authors elaborate the theory that the securitization of a specific issue is built through a security discourse and the public acceptance to recognize it as a threat. Securitization is "inter-subjective", which means that it **must** be accepted by the audience to which the speech is addressed, and should not be seen with a meaning that limits security problems to states and military competition (the traditional one). Political and social context driven by different ideas and values builds security issues.

The analytical framework of the theory consists of the following idea: "existential threat to a referent object by a securitizing actor who thereby generates endorsement of emergency measures beyond rules that would otherwise bind" (Buznan et al, 1998, p.4). It then depends on the priority of the issues *vis-à-vis* the society in question and the process of

VARIA

Nº 2

CEDIS
WORKING
PAPERS MARÇO
2021

legitimizing a threat by a political agent as an actor capable of deterring the target audience through speech acts. (Waever, 1997).

Finally, through the Intergroup Threat Theory (Stephan et al, 2000), it will be analyzed how political discourse can inchoate stereotypes and prejudices towards migrants. This theoretical framework has been widely used to study anti-immigrant feelings and behavior in European society, however, it was never studied from the perspective of how the act of political speech can influence the opinion of the groups concerned and emphasize the need for a look at migration as a political, economic or symbolic threat, once again securitizing it. In the Hungarian case, it is necessary to analyze the Theory of Securitization from a symbolic and realistic perspective, because these are the two types of threat that best define anti-immigration feelings in the country. Moreover, economic concerns and the vision of migrants as cultural intruders enhances migration as a threat to the country.

Does political discourse have a direct influence on the creation of this securitization?.

Finally, based on the analysis of political speeches between 2015-2020, by the Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Órban, I will try to understand how the rhetoric managed to shape Hungarian society, formerly multicultural, by having an anti-immigration mentality and to legitimate anti-immigration policies.

VARIA

Nº 2

CEDIS
WORKING
PAPERS   MARÇO
2021

3. Objectives of this paper

The objective of this paper is to study the possible connection between political discourse and the securitization of Migration. The research is restricted to Hungary since it is one of the main transit countries for irregular migration and it has a controversial position on the European Union migration policies. Hungary is known for the anti-immigration policies development, under Órban's Government. Thus, as a European Union, signatory country to the founding Treaties and the Charter of Fundamental Rights, it is captivating to do a deep search on the matter.

Since the main goal is to understand the depth of the connection between political discourse and migration securitization, the base analyzed instrument will be the speech acts of Prime Minister Viktor Órban.

The starting point to be analyzed is:

Is there an intrinsic link between the securitization of migration in Hungary and political discourse?

To answer, it is necessary to analyze the key political speeches, the legislation, and a study of the reception of migrants by the national people, that is, public opinion. There are important elements to develop the study realistically, namely the Hungarian political model between 2015-2020. The securitization of migration is an increasingly debatable topic in the European Union, since there are several countries with anti-immigration campaigns, violators of the rule of law, and who consider migrants a threat to the European space security.

Conducting an in-depth study of political discourse, as a cause of the securitization process, this paper intends to enhance the importance of creating anti-discrimination

policies, combating xenophobia, political speeches, and campaigns that are hate promotors.

Why is this important? In the past, political speech, speaker influence was technics used as a weapon. *e.g. Germany in the XX century/Holocaust.*

The Council of Europe itself defined hate speech as encompassing "all forms of expression that propagate, incite, promote or justify racial hatred, xenophobia, homophobia, anti-Semitism and other forms of hatred based on intolerance."

Therefore, the use of this kind of rhetoric represents a threat to the future of European democracy.

With the aforementioned theories, the paper tries to prove that there is a connection between the influence of political discourse and the process of securitizing migration and that this relationship can harm society. The Hungarian case is intriguing to study due to the variation it has had throughout history. Hungary has always been an immigration destination since its geographical location has always been favorable, nevertheless in the XI century, when the migratory phenomenon was already observable, Hungarian society was multicultural, a union of citizens from third countries. However, when in 2010 the crisis instigated the growth of extreme right and therefore conservative parties, their influence on the migratory issue became inevitable. Thus, when in 2015 Europe was plagued by the beginning of the so-called "migration crisis", the Hungarian Government responded with an anti-immigration campaign.

VARIA

Nº 2

CEDIS
WORKING
PAPERS MARÇO
2021

4. The theoritical Framework

The analysis of the aforeknown question will be made through two theories. The present paper will resort to the Theory of Securitization by the Copenhagen School and the Integrated threat theory (Stephan and Stephan, 2000) as the sunshade for its theoretical framework.

4.1. Securitization Theory

"Security is articulated only from a specific place, in an institutional voice, by elites."

Waever (1995: 57)

The Securitization Theory emerges as a fundamental theoretical basis for assessing the context of the role of the political actor as a securitizing agent. In international relations, the securitization process refers to the moment in which state actors transform a given subject into a matter of security. This way of approaching security issues was instituted by theorists from the Copenhagen School, founded in 1985, who analyzed the subject from a broader perspective and beyond the traditionalist paradigms that had been associated with securitization until then.

Theory defends the idea that the securitizing agent can be a political actor who can establish an object as a threat to security, in a given social context. In other words, this actor should make the public recognize such an "object" as a threat.

The construction of this threat is developed through a social interpretation of it and the transparency of a political agenda that turns this issue into a securitized problem, which means that there is a politicization of the issue that is then legitimized by the State as a threat to the national space.

In theory, as expressed by Buznan, Waever, and Wilde (1998, p.23), a public issue can be non-politicized, politicized, or securitized, but to become an effective threat to security, it must be legitimized by public agendas and it is here that the speech act becomes important. A subject becomes politicized when it is part of the public policy agenda, but it only becomes a security issue when it is presented by a securitizing actor to an audience that, by influence, sees the issue as an existential threat that needs an answer emergency that goes beyond the limits of political decision-making.

For an issue to obtain a securitized "status", the securitizing/political actor must have the ability to influence his audience through appropriate language. For this reason, Buzan, Waever, and Wilde (1998, p.25), considered that the speech act was a fundamental element for the securitization process's success. How the actor can dissuade and convince a receiver that they are facing a threat is what dictates the legitimacy of securitizing the problem.

The theoretical construction of the meaning of "securitization" was, therefore, changed after the study by Buzan, Waever, and Wilde. The authors expanded the application of securitization by separating it from the traditional idea, which defended a one side concept of securitization as the defense of the territory at the military level, any subject could become securitized depending on the influence of the actor who would transmit this idea to the public.

4.2. Integrated threat theory

Integrated threat theory (Stephan and Stephan, 2000) is a framework that tends to be widely used in academic analyzes of anti-immigration sentiments. This theory suggests that there are four types of threats that are seen by the group that feels threatened: realistic; symbolic; negative stereotype and the threat as intergroup anxiety. It is important to understand each of these concepts to identify which ones apply to anti-immigration feelings in Hungarian society.

Realistic threats focus on the economic, material, and political sphere, meaning that the group sees the "invader" group as a threat to their well-being, employment, as a threat to national politics. Threats based on the negative stereotype are built upon a previously conceived idea that an external group will effectively be a threat. It can also be seen as a threat that causes intergroup anxiety, which means that the "internal" group does not feel comfortable, but threatened if it has to interact with an external group. Finally, Stephan et al identify a fourth type of threat: symbolic. These base on the perception that an external group has values and beliefs that differ from the internal group and, therefore these different views can call into question the values of a nation.

When analyzing anti-immigration behavior in Hungary, what we question is if they are built by political discourse.

4.3. Definition of the Concepts

Before delving into the hypothesis to be examined in this paper, it is necessary to clarify the main concepts.

The definition of these concepts, hypotheses, dimensions, and indicators is essential to guide our responses and hypothesis verification. With the indicators outlined, it becomes

easier to understand what is needed to verify the ideas and to be able to give an answer or elaborate a proposal that addresses the problem of the paper. (Quivy and Campenhoudt, 1995, pp.262).

Political Discourse

To prove the hypothesis: "Securitization of migration in Hungary is a cause of the influence of political discourse"; whose dependent variable is "securitization of migration in Hungary" and as an independent variable "political discourse", there are some dimensions worth exploring.

According to Fairclough (2012), political discourse is a form of argument based on a practical activity, aiming at the maintenance of societies. A political actor is effectively aware of the power of his words and he can formulate them to achieve the goals he wants. One of the characteristics pointed out by the author is that political speeches are elaborated as a response to a crisis or conflict and to persuade the target audience to obtain something e.g political status.

Political Discourse encompasses an important dimension: public opinion. The concept of public opinion is immensely linked to the transformation and shaping of opinions of a specific group that, together, believes in common values and common threats that legitimize the information they receive from the speaker.

To understand the dimension of public opinion relating it to political discourse there are some indicators to explore. To understand this concept, there is a need to evaluate (1) xenophobic and anti-immigration references in Viktor Órban's speeches, (2) the importance of political propaganda in the construction of mentalities, and (3) the presence of references to migration as an international threat.

Securitization of Migration

It is necessary to balance national security with the security of the people (…). Migration policies are generally outdated and look at migration in a static way and not in terms of human mobility

William Lacy Swing (2017)[3]

Politics and fear played an important role in the categorization of migration as a national security threat. After the 9/11 attacks, migration appeared in the discussion of the campaign against terrorism (Togral 2011, p.219), and it legitimizes the need to treat migration flows as a security issue.

In line with the arguments of the Theory of Securitization, migration was constructed as a security threat by political elites through speeches, thus legitimatizing the idea that "the issue is presented as an existential threat, requiring emergency measures and justifying actions outside the normal bounds of political procedure" (Buzan, Waever & de Wilde 1998, pp.23-24).

This Theory, developed by theorists from the Copenhagen School, translates into the elements needed to evaluate political discourse from the perspective of migration securitization. Thus, it becomes important to clarify what Securitization is in fact in the light of this theory: it is the process of securitizing an object as an international threat by a

securitizing agent who argues the need for a certain problem to be treated as a threat (Waever et al, 1997). Hence, the "speech act" is a catalysis of the construction of migration as a threat, thus calling for the need to securitize it. The securitizing agent tends to be a

---

[3] Director General of the International Organization for Migration.

political actor with the power to influence public opinion so that a certain object is recognized while hindering its security. The issue may be subject to politicization and later to securitization, which was what happened in the case of the Hungarian Government's response to the migration crisis.

For an analysis of the perspective of the public opinion parameter, it is important to base the Intergroup Theory Threat framework (Stephan et al, 2006), which applies to the analysis of any group that feels threatened, in this case, Hungarian society. This threat may be false, however, the group may feel that it is true and that it is a problem in their personal space. This can be justified by the persuasive nature of politics and how it influences people who live in countries with a large migrant population.

5. Analysis of Hungarian Society and Debate

According to Topulli (2016), the statement that "migration is a securitized matter" is usual and acceptable in academic literature. Huysmans (2000, p.752) argues that the rise of racist and xenophobic parties caused migration to start being presented as a threat to public order, increasing the legitimacy of securitization of migration, a trend observed in Hungary.

Thus, the political discourse presents itself as a legitimizer of securitization by associating migrants and refugees with crime and as a threat to national identity and sovereignty. (Topulli, 2016, p.87) Especially after the terrorist attacks in the USA and later in Europe, political discourse took the form of a strong mechanism against migration, and one of the

countries where this trend stood out the most was Hungary. This prominence can be explained by the fact that when the migratory flow to the European continent broke out,

Hungary was one of the countries that due to its location, on the Serbian and consequently Turkish border, received more migrants.

Considering this, since the beginning of the migration crisis in 2015, the Hungarian government, chaired by Viktor Órban, has shown a tendency to politicize migration.

Since 2010, the ruling party, the Hungarian Civic Alliance, has shown its right-wing essence, however, it took an extreme side when in 2015 the migration crisis was seen by the Government as a threat and it launched a populist campaign, based on power oratory, whose goal was to obtain the support of the population in the launch of anti-immigration policies and rejection of common asylum policies issued by the European Union.

5.1. Influence of Political Discourse and Action on Public Opinion

Initially, a national Immigration and Terrorism Survey (May 2015) was launched and the result, according to the European Parliament, showed that the country was launching a campaign that linked migration to threats to national security by fostering and creating xenophobic mentalities through of a manipulative campaign.

"(…) The public consultation on migration and the related country-wide billboard campaign initiated by the Hungarian Government, and stresses that the content and language used in the particular consultation launched in Hungary, on immigration and terrorism, are highly misleading, biased and unbalanced, establishing a biased and direct link between migratory phenomena and security threats (…) "

In 2016, the Hungarian government launched a second questionnaire, this time regarding its opposition to the refugee quotas delegated by the European Union, but once again the

results were influenced by a campaign that preceded the investigation and which called for the rejection of the Quota Plan by the people. All over Hungary, posters were posted with controversial and populist messages such as: "Did you know? The Paris terrorist attacks were carried out by immigrants ". These posters, once again, linked migration to the national threat, terrorism and appealed to nationals to look at this flow as a problem for their security.

This questionnaire launched as a main question: "Do you want the European Union to prescribe the mandatory settlement of non-Hungarian citizens in Hungary without the consent of the National Assembly?", and the goal was to make a referendum that could annul the European Union's decision to relocate migrants to hungary.

The results of the questionnaire pointed to a negative opinion on the part of the population regarding the European quota plan. However, there was not enough voter participation to assume that, as only 39% of the population answered the question. Still, Órban declare it a victory stating that:

"The European Union's proposal is to let the migrants in and distribute them in mandatory fashion among the Member States and for Brussels to decide about this distribution. Hungarians today considered this proposal and they rejected it. Hungarians decided that only we Hungarians can decide with whom we want to live. The question was 'Brussels or Budapest' and we decided this issue is exclusively the competence of Budapest."

One year later, the Hungarian Government used the National Investigations route to emphasize the need to protect the country from a threat: migration. In this survey, the target was the European Union and the Government asked citizens how they should deal with European immigration policies, defining them as "mistaken proposals on the part of Brussels". Although the questionnaire was intended to have public feedback on how the

Government should approach European policies, several experts said it was in reality a "political mobilization concealed as public opinion research." (European Commission, 2017)

In the same month that the Survey was published, the European Commission developed a series of responses that covered some information that was wrongly transmitted in it.

Unfortunately, populist campaigns have managed to influence public opinion and the Government of Órban has managed to legitimize its claims to restrict immigration policies in the country.

Based on a 2017 Gallup study, it is simple to study the evolution of mentalities regarding the topic of migration and asylum. The study enhances that Hungary is one of the least receptive countries to the theme of immigration and consequently is part of the list of European countries with the worst performance with regard to the reception of migrants. According a Gallup Poll, carried out in 2016, Hungary had a percentage of 0-9 (the higher the percentage, the more it showed the acceptance of the national people), of 1.69%, which meant that the Hungarian people considered migration a problem.

Nothing becomes a security issue by itself, it only is adress as one if someone labels it. (Waever, 1995) Therefore, political and institutional actor's and its speeches build the meaning of security in global politics.

Thus, Viktor Órban speeches were a relevant instrument to build migration as a security issue and a treath to national and european space.

5.2. Órban's Speech act as a Securization method

In november 2015, Órban made an interview for Jornal Politico regarding the terrorist attacks that occurred in Paris and said that "all the terrorists are migrants", thus connecting migration with terrorism, having a narrow-minded thought. This statement also securitized migration, since the Prime-Minister used a security language, transforming migrants into threats to Europe's security and cultural roots. By using the terrorism concept in his speech, Órban drew attention to the need for the growth of securitization of European borders as a means of containing migratory flows. (Órban, 2015a).

Later, in 2016, Viktor Órban was interviewed on the "180 minutes" program on Kossuth Radio and claimed that migration was a threat to Europe by saying "that Europe is being threatened by massive immigration on an unprecedented scale." With this statement, the Prime Minister not only denounced his xenophobic, anti-multicultural thinking, he also built an image of the migrant as a constant threat and with characteristics that can damage national values. (Órban, 2016b)

Those are two examples of the many times Órban's publically declared his anti-immigration tendency. However, the world assumed this would not influence Hungarian society's opinion over migration, but it did. Órban's words regarding migration flows and migrants' impact on society transformed this country, causing the growth of racist and xenophobic mentalities. With a speech act based on "the fear of the other", the Prime Minister modified the history of a past multicultural and accepting country. In the past, during the Habsburg Empire, Hungary had Germans, Slavs, Italians, Romanians, and Jews that were considered a part of the Hungarian society, thus coexisting in the territory. There was a change when in 2015 during the Mediterranean Refugee Crisis, the European Union created a plan to relocate refugees on the Member-States, and instead of relocating them, the Hungarian Government spent millions on a xenophobic and anti-immigrant campaign to influence public opinion over the matter.

Since 2015, when migration flows to Europe increased, the Hungarian Prime-Minister started to demonstrate his xenophobic and nationalist feelings. As stated by the Theory of Securitization, the position of a prime minister, as part of the political elite, can help legitimize his speech acts and, therefore contributing to the persuasion of Hungarian citizens. The prime-minister defends that refugee flows are a threat to cultural integrity, and sets space for xenophobic treatments and assimilationist approaches.

In 2016, the Prime-Minister commented on the Quota Plan and Common European Asylum System stating that Hungary "does not need a single migrant for the economy to work", adding that "there is no need for a common European migration policy: whoever needs migrants can take them but don't force them on us, we don't need them, ", thus demonstrating the Hungarian denial of accepting migrants in its territory and its discriminatory and xenophobic feelings. Most of the time he uses a discriminatory strategy and a security language that tends to legitimize his speech, and corrupt society. Not only he tries to use a tactic of implementing the "fear of migrants", but also to build an image of migration as a matter that urgently needs to be securitized by patrolling borders as if migrants are a source of aggression and violence.(Órban, 2016c)

With his speech act, Órban builds a mentality where migrants are a "threat to the interests and privileges of the dominant group", meaning they are a threat to national security and national identity. (Flowerdew et al., 2002)

Many speeches, allegedly defending European identity and conduct, ends with a demonstration of the tension between national sovereignty and the role of community policies. This tendency was observable in the 2019 State of Union Speech, where he affirmed that "we are preparing to stop the formation of a pro-immigration majority. We want a European Parliament which respects the decisions of countries and peoples about

their future, and accepts that we Central Europeans want to pursue our path.", thus evidencing the importance of national sovereignty above European values and Human Rights.(Órban, 2019d)

In 2020, during an interview with a Hungarian radio, the Prime Minister made a statement blaming foreigners for the spread of the coronavirus in the country.

He said it was not a "coincidence that the virus first showed up among Iranians.", adding that Europe is "fighting a two-front war, one front is called migration, and the other one belongs to the coronavirus, there is a logical connection between the two, as both spread with movement." With these statements, Órban accused migrants of being the principal cause of Covid-19 in Hungary and even linked the concept of war, migration, and pandemic and once called attention to the need for Europe to fight against migration and treat it as a threat. Having someone with this power to make such statements on national and international radio and television is extremely dangerous for the democratic values of the international order. (Órban, 2020e)

As prime minister, power holder, who gives him legitimacy in his speeches, it is to be expected that they will influence the population's way of thinking.

Still, although we can analyze that there is, indeed, an influence, Hungary currently lives in endless corruption. Some polls and votes fail to be completely reliable, calling into question the citizens' representation in the country's politics.

The current trend is the transformation of society, passing on an image of public opinion that we can never be sure whether it is true or if it has been manipulated by political interests, thus silencing citizens and distancing them from national and European politics.

6. Erasing Stereotypes: Migration as a development agent

Mobility is an inherent characteristic of human beings and it was (and is) a common practice for decades. Hungary is an example of how politics can change the scope of a concept and can turn it into a negative matter. There is a general concern regarding migration since many countries fear the effect of entry of people on the national economy and identity.

Migration is a current topic, and a controversial one, on the European agenda. Nevertheless, the link between migration and development is an often overlooked aspect and it shouldn't because migration can contribute to the economic and social development of the countries of origin and the host countries. The European strategy for migration has become increasingly complex, since countries, such as Hungary, represent a huge hindrance in the development of a Common Plan. Not only are a lot of diverse realities, problems, that require specific responses, but there's also the fact that some countries do not accept migration as a positive phenomenon that does not facilitate European Union's work on the matter.

 In the last decade, migration increased the European workforce by 70%, thus contributing to the development of Europe's economy. There is a common idea that migrants steal jobs, however, they fill vacancies in underutilized sectors that are not occupied by nationals. So, the argument that immigrants are a threat to the EU's economy is not eligible to legitimize the development of the securitization of migration (Huysmans, 2000). Nevertheless, society sees migration as a negative phenomenon, not only from an economical point of view but also from a cultural one. Regarding the economy, societies tend to accept that migrants withdraw employment opportunities for nationals and that they do not contribute to a host country's development. Immigrants make great contributions

from the remittances, their action in the labor market also contribute to the development of both host and origin countries. Moreover, immigration suppresses labor shortages,

enhances the growth of new ideas and entrepreneurship, and can help to oppose the aging process of societies. Concerning the cultural side, "migration generates the encounter between different people", thus contributing to an exchange of ideas, and developing a multicultural environment in the host country.

Migrants pay taxes and social contributions, fill the gaps in the labor market, many times they contribute to the creation of job opportunities by investing in the host country, which means their contributions improve economies and that is visible in Europe.

There is an urgent need to demystify the supposed "dark-side" of migration. There is a need to have a multicultural approach and not an approach based on the Conception of "fortress Europe" by restricting external borders. To do this, the European Union institutions must do something about anti-immigration countries, such as Hungary, since they are not only violating European values, but also human rights, since migration includes the respect for civil and political rights such as arbitrary detention, torture, or a lack of due process, as well as economic, social and cultural rights such as the rights to health, housing or education. So, discriminatory laws and xenophobia attitudes should be addressed more often to slow down these influences.

It is necessary to promote intercultural relationships, to guarantee conditions for the integration of migrants in European societies, assuring social and political rights, guaranteeing access to health-care and to education. It is essential to disseminate good integration practices and to fight any type of borders that may arise.

Migration is a synonym of social, economic, and cultural development and it a process that can benefit and not destroy, as Órban's speech acts insinuate. Furthermore, migration can be considered a human right as it is enshrined in Article 13 of the United Nations

Declaration of Human Rights that "every human being has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state".

"It is essential to disseminate ideas that contradict the underlined unrealistic perspectives, to demystify any discussion or public opinion that points to fears and uncertainties of migratory flows."

7. Methodology

To obtain answers to the problematization presented in the project, exploratory research was used to understand, more clearly, some fundamental concepts. In addition to the exploratory method, descriptive research will also be developed. For this, primary and secondary sources were used that will help in the in-depth study of the initial question. The primary study focuses on some dissertations and articles, specified in the state of the art and some secondary sources and theories.

It was essential to start from a quali-quanti research, with qualitative and quantitative instruments, to develop a study and a reliable answer to the hypothesis in question.

Firstly, it is essential to frame the issue, referred to in the Introduction. Then, there is a brief presentation of the Theories that will conceive the problem of this work.

Finally, and according to the Quivy and Campenhoudt Manual, a hypothesis was presented, as well as concepts and dimensions which, as a whole, form the Model of Analysis, guiding the observation phase.

A conclusion on the topic follows.

6. Conclusion

Today's narrative about migration has become unacceptably toxic and negative.

Laura Thompson, IOM Deputy DG, at the World Economic Forum (2017)

Migrants are builders of resilience, agents of local development and city-makers.

William Lacy Swing, IOM Director General

This work aimed to analyze how a speech act can contribute to the securitization process of migration in Europe.

The type of rhetoric used by the Hungarian prime-minister is dangerous for European values, peace and it is not compatible with the globalization process. These speeches are a threat to everything that was achieved post World War II. Instead of ignoring the political influence in this matter, European Union should do something to prevent Hungary leaders from expanding xenophobic mentalities and enhance connections between migration, terrorism, and underdevelopment. By not addressing this, the EU creates space for the growth of threats that undermine democracy and respect for human rights.

Between 2015 and 2016, Hungary was one of the main receiving countries for new asylum applications in the EU with a percentage of 174,4 (thousands) in 2015 and 28,2 (thousands) in 2016. Nevertheless, more than 75% of asylum applications were rejected, thus showing the disparity of opinions between the Member States and the lack of balance regarding the number of asylum applications per country. This disparity leads to several inconsistencies in the development of European migration policies, as Member-States have different opinions on the matter. These inconsistencies led to the growth of a security approach to detriment of development, by that securitizing migration and having difficulties in defining the main priority: human rights or border security.

The dichotomy between migration (international protection) and border security is a controversial topic amongst migration agendas since European Union does not seem to decide which one should be the most important. It looks like migrants are seen as

VARIA

Nº 2

CEDIS
WORKING
PAPERS   MARÇO
2021

"unwanted" and are deemed to be a threat to Europe. The most common approaches are the assimilationist and the "fear of the other", thus resulting in the broadening of policies aimed to limit migration flows. The fact that the European Union takes an approach that tends to prioritize the security of the European space, makes politicians like Viktor Órban feel that they have enough power to influence the public.

As Buznan, Barry, Waever and Wilde explain, a speech act can present migration as a security threat posing a danger to people's well-being and identity. Órban uses his political opportunism to build a common mentality in Hungary, which leads to poor cooperation on a European level. Therefore, political discourse can have an impact on the securitization of migration in Europe and on a national level

This impact may not only be visible as an influence for public opinion but also as an influence for the delay in developing a Common Migration Plan, in accelerating aid to migrants, in creating integration processes, and more legal avenues. These anti-immigration speeches and positions, influence the European decision-making process, making it what it has been so far: a process that is full of setbacks and that does not progress, due to the lack of support from all the Member States of the Union. This is why it is necessary to do something about these discourses and approaching them as a threat to democracy, fundamental rights, and above all, as destructors of all the bases on which the Union was built.

VARIA

Nº 2

CEDIS
WORKING
PAPERS
MARÇO
2021

26

8. Bibliography

BUZAN, Barry; Ole Waever; Jaap Wilde. *Security: a new framework for analysis*, Londres, Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1998

BUZAN, B. and Waever, O. *Regions and Power: The Structure of International Security*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003

BODIN, Jean. *Os seis livros da república*. Tradução de José Carlos Orsi Morel. São Paulo: Ícone. 195 páginas, 2011[1576]

GLORIUS, Birgit, chapter 8. *The Public Perception of the Migration Crisis from the Hungarian Point of View: Evidence from the Field*

ESTEVENS, J. *Migration crisis in the EU: developing a framework for analysis of national security and defence strategies. Comparative Migration Studies.*1-21, 2018

FRCKO, M. et al Solomun,D. *Securitization of Migration and Migration Policy in the European Union. Criminal Justice and Security in Central and Eastern Europe From Common Sense to Evidence-based Policy- making Conference Proceedings.* 349-360, 2018

FAIRCLOUGH, I; FAIRCLOUGH, N. *Political Discourse Analysis: a method for advanced students.* Nova York: Routledge, 2012

GUPTA, Kapil. *The State of Securization Theory: A Review of The Politics Of Insecurity. The Whitehead Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations.* 181-183, 2006

GALLUP. (2017). New index shows least-, most-accepting countries for migrants. http://news.gallup. com/poll/216377/new-index-shows-least-accepting-countries-migrants.aspx. Accessed 30 Mar 2018.

HUYSMANS, J. *'Security! What is it? From Concept to Thick Signifier', European Journal of International Relations* 4(2): 226-255, 1998

HUYSMANS, J. The EU and the Securitization of Migration. Journal of Common Market Studies, Vol. 38, No. 5: 751–77, 2000

MIHOLJI, N. *The Securitization Of Migration Issue: Hungarian. Journal of Community Positive Practice.* XVII(3). 56-66, 2017

NOVA Refugee Legal Clinic. (2021). *Migrations as development agents for the countries of destination.* http://novarefugeelegalclinic.cedis.fd.unl.pt/?blog_post=migrations-as-development-agents-for-the-countries-of-destination (accessed on 5/02/2021)

OLIVEIRA, Emellin. *Imigração x Segurança: A securitização da Imigração Pós-11 de Setembro e o Aumento do Controlo Migratórios nos EUA*. ISCTE (p. 1-60), 2014

PEIXOTO, João. *The relevance of migration to the development of the countries of destination: a new perspective on the migration-development nexus*. In: SOUSA, Constança Urbano de (ed.). The relevance of migration for the 2030 Agenda for

Sustainable Development. The Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration**.** Lisbon: Autónoma University of Lisbon, pp. 49-70, 2019

WAEVER, O. *'Securitization and Desecurization'* in R. Lipschutz (ed) *On Security*, New York: Columbia University Press, 46-86, 1995

Political Discourses:

Órban, 2015a in: https://www.politico.eu/article/viktor-orban-interview-terrorists-migrants-eu-russia-putin-borders-schengen/ (accessed on 5/12/2020)

Órban, 2016b in: http://abouthungary.hu/speeches-and-remarks/prime-minister-viktor-orban-on-kossuth-radios-180-minutes-programme-20171010/ (accessed on 5/12/2020)

Órban, 2016c in: https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/jul/26/hungarian-prime-minister-viktor-orban-praises-donald-trump (accessed on 5/12/2020)

Órban, 2019d in: https://visegradpost.com/en/2019/02/11/prime-minister-viktor-orbans-state-of-the-nation-address-full-speech/ (accessed on 5/12/2020)

Órban, 2020e in: https://www.france24.com/en/20200313-hungary-s-pm-orban-blames-foreign-students-migration-for-coronavirus-spread (accessed on 5/12/2020)