İSTANBUL
ÜNİVERSİTESİ
YAYINEVİ

SİYASAL: Journal of Political Sciences

RESEARCH ARTICLE / ARAŞTIRMA MAKALESİ

Critical Security Perspectives on the U.S.-Mexico Border

Eleştirel Güvenlik Perspektifinden ABD-Meksika Sınırı

Çağla Lüleci-Sula [1]

Abstract

Critical approaches to security have enriched the literature significantly by provoking novel theoretical debates and introducing new areas of research since their entrance into the field. They have deepened and widened the traditional understanding of security by introducing referent objects other than the state and types of threats other than the military. These attempts have distracted security studies' extensive focus on state security and pointed to new research topics that were traditionally excluded from the scope of security studies. Curious about how different critical security approaches make sense of the migration-security nexus, this study examines how the Copenhagen School (discursive approach) and the Paris School (sociological approach) analyze the U.S.-Mexico border. It first examines how these two schools of thought define, understand, and approach security. Second, it directs its focus on the critical security literature on the U.S.-Mexico borderland. Third, the article discusses both approaches' accounts on the same border and how they handle dis/similar aspects of the migration-security nexus. The study concludes by defending the argument that bridging these two critical security approaches may increase their analytical power in making sense of the migration-security nexus.

Keywords: Border Security, Copenhagen School, Mexico, Paris School, United States

Öz

Alana girişlerinden bu yana, eleştirel güvenlik yaklaşımları yeni teorik tartışmalara yol açarak ve yeni araştırma alanları sunarak akademik yazını önemli ölçüde zenginleştirmiştir. Bu yaklaşımlar, devlet dışındaki referans nesneleri ve askeri tehditler dışındaki tehdit türlerini tanıtarak geleneksel güvenlik anlayışını derinleştirmiş ve genişletmişlerdir. Bu girişimler, güvenlik çalışmalarının devlet güvenliğine yoğun bir şekilde odaklı kalmasını engellemiş ve geleneksel olarak güvenlik çalışmalarının kapsamı dışında bırakılan yeni araştırma konularını alana kazandırmıştır. Farklı eleştirel güvenlik yaklaşımlarının göç-güvenlik bağlantısını nasıl anlamlandırdığını merak eden bu çalışma, Kopenhag Okulu (söylemsel yaklaşım) ve Paris Okulu'nun (sosyolojik yaklaşım) ABD-Meksika sınırını nasıl analiz ettiğini incelemektedir. Çalışma öncelikle bu iki düşünce ekolünün güvenliği nasıl tanımladığı, anladığı ve ele aldığını incelemektedir. Ardından, ABD-Meksika sınırını ele alan eleştirel güvenlik literatürüne odaklanmaktadır. Üçüncüsü, her iki yaklaşımın da aynı sınır üzerindeki açıklamalarını ve göç-güvenlik bağlantısının benzer ve farklı yönlerini nasıl ele aldıklarını tartışmaktadır. Çalışma, iki perspektif arasında köprü kuran bir yaklaşımın, göç-güvenlik bağlantısını anlamlandırma konusundaki analitik kapasitelerini artırmakta faydalı olacağı sonucuna varmaktadır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Sınır Güvenliği, Kopenhag Okulu, Meksika, Paris Okulu, Amerika Birleşik Devletleri

1 **Corresponding Author:** Çağla Lüleci-Sula (Asst. Prof. Dr.), TED University, Department of Political Science and International Relations, Ankara, Turkiye. E-mail: cagla.luleci@tedu.edu.tr ORCID: 0000-0002-0534-8271

Introduction

Following their introduction as a distinct field of study after the Second World War, various approaches in security studies have made significant contributions to the study of world politics. While traditional realist approaches dominated the field for decades, the end of the Cold War allowed critical approaches to make a ground for themselves in the literature of security studies. Since their entrance into the field, critical approaches to security have enriched the literature significantly by provoking novel theoretical debates and introducing new areas of research. Traditional approaches focus mostly on the survival and security of the state defined mainly in military terms, while critical approaches have introduced referent objects other than state and types of threats other than military to the literature. These attempts to widen and deepen how security is understood and studied do not only distract security studies' excessive focus on state security but also inevitably point to new research topics that could be studied under security.

Theoretical debates in security studies and International Relations aside, the end of the Cold War brought new challenges to world politics. As Walters (2010, p. 218) briefly puts it, "Globalization has changed the world." It led to the questioning of borders and boundaries of all kinds while bringing societies and economies closer than they were before, making the mobility of not only ideas and theories but also humans, goods, and money easier. The rapid increase in human mobility throughout the world has made migration more visible in the eyes of political and academic circles and enriched the literature on the link between migration and security. Since then, the topic has increasingly been studied through traditional and critical perspectives on security. Walters (2010) argues that according to conventional approaches, migration, and security have become to be linked differently after the 1990s, and this was nothing more than the state's response to rising globalization and the new challenges it brings. States now seek to recruit foreign labor more than ever, while also getting more and more anxious about 'new threats' that also become mobile across borders. On the contrary, critical approaches to security are interested in the social and political presentation of mobility and migration as a 'threat' to states, societies, and economies, an approach that brought much novelty to the linkage between migration and security.

Yet, rather than focusing on how or how much novelty critical approaches brought to the literature, this study focuses on the dis/similarities that exist between critical security schools, a topic that is relatively less considered. Curious about how different critical security approaches make sense of the migration-security nexus, the study compares two perspectives: the Copenhagen School (discursive approach) and the Paris School (sociological approach).[1] It does so by specifically focusing on the studies on US-Mexico border politics as a case. It asks, "How do Copenhagen School and Paris School make sense of the relationship between human mobility and security?" It first examines how Copenhagen School and Paris School define, understand, and approach security to better make sense of the differences and similarities in their approaches to mobility and border security. Second, the article analyzes studies that focus on the mobility-security nexus at

---

1 This study acknowledges the problems in rigidly labeling research, approaches, and thoughts as 'schools' because of the risks of overgeneralization and also strong knowledge claims. This classification is done since it is already widely accepted in the literature and for the sake of pointing to the similarities and differences between different approaches to security.

the U.S.-Mexico borderland. Third, it makes an analysis of both approaches' accounts on the U.S.-Mexico border and how they handle dis/similar aspects of the link between security and human mobility.[2] The study concludes that although both approaches fall into the field of critical security and share ontological and epistemological commitments, they have subtle perspectives on the mobility-security link and an approach that bridges the two may increase their analytical power in making sense of migration.

The Concept of Security: Copenhagen School and Paris School Perspectives

Security remains an essentially contested concept, in the sense that the question "What is security?" does not have a single agreed answer. The traditional understanding of security, which had been dominant during the Cold War, adopts the argument that "security is prior to language, is out there" and "the more security, the better" (Wæver, 1995, pp. 46-7). This view does not only refer to an objectivist understanding of security but also attributes a positive meaning to it. Walt's (1992, pp. 221-2) definition of security as "the studies of the threat use and control of military force and power" represents another feature of traditional security, which is its excessive focus on military issues. Traditional approaches that are established in the U.S. also take the state as the main referent object of security. As the literature on security developed by the 1970s onwards, definitions and understandings of security have become varied, and the meaning and agenda of security have been widened to include other sectors than the military and deepened to include other referent objects beyond the state. (Buzan & Hansen, 2009, pp. 187-188).

Then-new approaches to security, including constructivist security, feminist security, post-colonial security, human security, Aberystwyth School (Welsh School, Critical Security Studies), Copenhagen School, and Paris School (International Political Sociology of security) have drawn attention to the subjective and political nature of security that has not been considered as such by conventional approaches. These approaches do not only adopt a constructivist perspective in their definitions of security and threats, but also they encourage attempts to decentralize the state by focusing on the security and insecurity of multiple actors including human and non-human referents to the agenda. Furthermore, increasingly after the 1970s and 80s they emphasized the significance of and introduced studies on environmental, humanitarian, and societal aspects of security (Buzan & Hansen, 2009, p. 2).

Both the Copenhagen School and Paris School originate in Europe. Scholars of both approaches reject the positivist and objectivist approaches to security and they agree that security does not refer to an objective and material condition that exists independent of the meanings that are attached to it. According to these critical security approaches, security is not out there to find, achieve, or analyze. Rather, multiple actors socially and politically construct it via several channels and tools. In that sense, they share a post-positivist and interpretive research agenda, which makes it possible to bridge these two

---

2 I systematically reviewed the existing studies that 1) are published as peer-reviewed research articles, books, or book chapters, 2) analyze specifically security at the U.S.-Mexico borders, 3) explicitly state that they adopt either the Copenhagen or Paris School perspectives in their analyses, 4) or use the jargon and concepts of either of these approaches without explicitly mentioning the adoption of a theoretical position. Then I interpret how they analyze different aspects of the same border and what they leave behind by adopting the perspective that they choose to promote an integrated and more comprehensive approach to the study of mobility and border security.

approaches to produce more comprehensive analyses of border security. Other than that, Copenhagen School and Paris School have significant differences when it comes to the questions of what security is and what it does.

The Copenhagen School refers to the work of a group of scholars who were affiliated with the Centre for Peace and Conflict Research in Copenhagen in the 1970s-80s. In their answer to the question of what security is, the school argues that security is an intersubjective speech act that is socially constructed via language. According to this view, something is a security problem "when the elites declare it to be so" (Waever, 1995, pp. 47, 55). Such an approach to speech-acts is parallel to J. L. Austin's articulation and Derrida's approach to speech and act (Hansen, 2011). Accordingly, rather than practices, policies, or activities, "the utterance itself is the act" of security (Waever, 1995, p. 55), that is to say, language itself becomes security due to the understanding that something is done by simply uttering it. By talking about security, politicians, and practitioners justify extraordinary measures to deal with it, which the scholars of Copenhagen School define as an act of securitization (Waever, 2012, p. 53). This definition refers to a constructivist understanding of security, which approaches security as a making of human beings rather than an objective condition that shapes policies and analyses of security.

Scholars of Paris School started a conversation by criticizing the understanding that 'security is only speech', arguing that a group of often routinized practices (as discourses that contain speeches, practices, gestures, etc.) are able to construct emergency issues, rather than simply speech-acts (Bigo, 2002, p. 65). Accordingly, security is not only utterance but it is also constituted via everyday practices of often street-level security practitioners. These scholars analyze day-to-day practices as routine, patterned, and unintentional acts. Their definition of 'discourse' as more than speech and also 'politics' as constituted via everyday practices rely on the arguments of post-structuralism, rather than social constructivism. With a post-structuralist urge to question pre-defined boundaries around concepts and disciplines, these scholars encourage an interdisciplinary approach while defining and approaching security with reference, especially to the disciplines of sociology and philosophy.

Influenced by a Bourdieusian approach, some scholars of the Paris School base their arguments on the concept of *field* with characteristics that are defined by the patterns resulting from the encounters between not only political elites but multiple agents (Bigo, 2013, p. 124In other words, social and political phenomena, such as migration and border security, can be read as fields that have their code of actions rather than speech acts that are claimed by elites (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992: 23-25). Other groups of scholars are particularly influenced by a Foucauldian reading of policing as a form of *governmentality* and they approach security practices as performative. Thus, the Paris School highlights the role of mundane practices and the web of relations, and the Copenhagen School mostly focuses on how utterance by itself makes security. Such difference is also apparent in their respective analyses of mobility and security. While the former focuses on routine bureaucratic practices of border security that end up with insecurities for multiple subjects, the latter analyzes how human mobility and migration have been constructed as a security threat through language in the first place.

The concept of securitization refers to an exceptional moment constructed by political elites, which is almost tangible to observe. According to Wæever (1996, p. 108), "security

discourse is characterized by dramatizing an issue as having absolute priority." Based on this understanding most researchers of the Copenhagen School analyze speeches of influential elites to reveal hints of securitizing moves. On the contrary, as Bilgin and Ince (2014) also argue, for the Paris School, neither there is 'a moment of security' claimed by state authority nor are 'moments of insecurity' as the critical scholarship argues. Security and insecurity form a continuum and they grow together in the everyday course of things like two faces of the same coin. Security for one can mean insecurity for another, hence, we cannot talk of the presence or absence of security once and for all. Security and insecurity are embedded in everyday (often referred to as micro) practices of multiple agents, which refers to a post-structuralist conceptualization of politics. In other words, security and insecurity are "normal social facts" (Bigo, 2001, p. 98). The School uses the term 'in/securing' (or (in)security to emphasize a reflexive understanding of security, that is, "the ways in which our practices produce insecurity as well as security for ourselves and for others" (Bilgin & Ince, 2014, p. 2). Thus, in their analyses of security, scholars of Paris School conduct ethnographic research, and interviews, along with other methods to observe and interpret the daily routines of multiple agents that constitute in/security.

While Paris School scholars analyze practices of multiple actors that make insecurities possible, a significant concern for the Copenhagen School is also "to rescue security studies from being a narrow state-centric military-based concept, without making it an overarching-exaggerated concept which includes any threats to individuals, groups, nations, and humanity" (Huysmans,1998, p. 482)However, their conceptualization of security (and securitization) is criticized to remain state-centric because of the central role it devotes to elites that represent (mostly state) authority. For the Paris School, empirical security studies of the 'social' cannot be limited to the analysis of one actor. The Paris School refers to "the plurality of spaces and actors," rather than focusing only on elites and how they securitize originally political things and events (Kessler, 2009, p. 88). Put differently, another point of divergence is that the Paris School encourages decentralizing the state with its strong focus on the need for a sociological analysis of security, while the Copenhagen School relies mostly on how elites make security through speech.

These differences stem from the central questions that the two schools ask. The Copenhagen School aims to search for an answer to the questions of "who can securitize what, and under what conditions?" (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 32). These questions point the scholars to analyze speeches of elites and the contexts in which these speeches become possible. According to Bigo (2008, p. 116), two central questions that the Paris School asks are "What security means, and what it does." Thus, these scholars are not particularly encouraged to define strictly the agents of security, which along with their focus on the sociality of security, results in a wider range of agents when it comes to who makes security. In terms of what security does, both schools demonstrate skepticism towards 'security' in terms of its consequences. The Copenhagen School argues that "security has often anti-democratic and anti-creative implications" (Waever, 2012, p. 53). The more things remain in the area of politics rather than security, the better it is. The Paris School's reference to security as in/security is already self-explanatory. The scholars of it suggest that security practices create insecurities at least for certain groups of society. Thus, they agree on the argument that claims and practices of security need to be approached critically and cautiously.

Studies that contribute to the migration and border security literature base their arguments on these different questions and understandings of security. Migration and border security research from the Copenhagen School perspective analyzes the processes in which migration and mobility are socially constructed as security threats by influential actors to justify extraordinary measures, that are, practices and policies of security. Scholars that adopt the Paris School perspective are interested in security practices not as a result of security discourse, but as the sources of insecurity themselves. Insecurity at the borderlands is not an exceptional moment, on the contrary, is made possible day by day by the routine practices of security professionals. The next section analyzes how the abovementioned differences and similarities between the two approaches are reflected in the study of border security with a specific focus on the U.S.-Mexico borderlands.

The U.S.-Mexico Border: Copenhagen School and Paris School Perspectives

The U.S. external borders have been a topic of interest for the researchers of migration and security nexus. The U.S. government's current security approach towards the Southern borders of the state can be traced to the 1980s. However, Operation Blockade (Operation Hold the Line) of 1993 was a significant initiative that aimed to close the border in Texas to undocumented workers because of defined translational 'threats' of undocumented migration and drug trafficking among others (Ackleson, 2003a). NAFTA further served neoliberal economic structures and interests and aimed to restrict human mobility to the U.S. while encouraging a more liberal approach toward the flow of capital and goods.

The 9/11 attacks have added another layer on top of the securitization of mobility in the United States after which security discourse and practices to limit mobility have increased dramatically. The securitizing discourse of the war on terror let American leaders justify and imply extraordinary measures inside and outside of state borders regardless of the lack of evidence showing that the suspects entered the country through Mexican borders (Ackleson, 2003a). The U.S. governments have increasingly merged issues of mobility and terrorism, putting mobility on the agenda of security, which resulted in an increase in border security measures such as increased federal presence, as well as border patrols and customs at the borders. Since then, both securitizing speeches of political elites and security practices aiming to constrain mobility from the Southern borders have intensified. The U.S.-Mexico borders have increasingly become a field of security made up of a mixture of practices of physical bordering and bordering via surveillance technologies.

The critical security literature on the migration-security nexus contains many studies that focus on the U.S.-Mexico borders, especially analyzing the issue from the Copenhagen and Paris School perspectives. Their respective analyses of border security and migration provide insides into how these two schools of thought define and examine the migration-security nexus. While the studies that adopt a Copenhagen School perspective analyze how influential elites securitize mobility and migration through their speeches, researchers of the Paris School emphasize how bureaucratic daily practices create insecurities at the borderlands or wherever borders are located through the technological and physical practices of security professionals.

Adopting a securitization framework to the issue of borders and mobility, Doty (2007) conceptualizes 'civilian border patrol groups' that operate on the U.S-Mexico border

and their relationships with statecraft, identity, and security to understand how certain practices may lead to exceptionalism when it comes to 'securing' borders. The author links Schmitt's theory of the political and his approach to the friend-enemy dichotomy with the securitization theory. The article analyzes the conditions under which existential threat discourse occurs. The clearest indicators of securitization in the U.S.-Mexico case are the rhetoric and images on the websites of civilian border control groups and anti-immigrant organizations (Doty, 2007, p. 128). Doty relies on a securitization framework while also approaching discourse in a rather broader manner, not reducing it to only speeches of certain individuals and groups, but integrating visuals and images as part of the securitizing discourse. On the same topic, Ackleson (2005, p. 166) proposes that the official discourse of the U.S. is the most important factor that builds the link between migration and the idea of security, risk, and danger. The study adopts the Copenhagen School's conceptualization of security as constructed discursively by influential elites' speeches and argues that this discourse creates 'the other' (Ackleson, 2005, p. 168). The author adopts a constructivist perspective and analyzes speeches, scripts, and official documents on U.S. border security policies. The article exemplifies the tone of securitization in elite discourse such as a Congressman's speech about 'Hold the Line Operation', which says "Securing our Nation's borders against illegal immigration is the first priority of our immigration policy" (Ackleson, 2005, p. 175).

Although Doty is more interested in a variety of securitizing actors such as border patrols compared to Ackleson's relative focus on political elites, both articles integrated a broader understanding of how actors discursively set the agenda of border security. Their main focus is on different types of actors but they apply a similar method to analyze securitization. Doty points to extremist speeches of patrol groups' founders towards Mexican immigrants, such as "they are illegal aliens" (2007, p. 114) and "defense of nation begins at the defense of the borders" (2007, p. 123). Based on the idea that "how something becomes securitized can be partly traced through discourse" Ackleson (2005, p. 169) also analyzes discourses of influential actors, institutions, and official texts in the United States. Relying on these speeches, the study concludes that securitization of migration which became possible by the U.S. agents' discourse has increased after 9/11, which ended up with extra control (i.e. federal presence) along the Southern borders (Ackleson, 2005, pp. 175-6).

Applying Buzan's perspective of securitization, Hutchison (2020) analyzes the discourses of U.S. presidents Obama and Trump to reveal signs of securitization of the Mexican border and immigrants. The author points to the speeches and security mechanisms that create 'invisible enemies' out of Mexican immigrants and argues that security speech is not limited to Trump's election campaign and his administration, but it is an institutionalized perspective that has been going on for decades, including the Obama period. He cites securitizing speeches of influential elites such as then U.S. Secretary of Homeland Security Johnson who said "Our message is clear to those who try to illegally cross out borders: You will be sent back home" (Hutchison, 2020, p. 93). The article also analyzes continuity in policies and legal frameworks of border security, emphasizing how the law implementation and deportation regime have been getting stricter for years.

The sociological approach to border security, referred to as the Paris School of security, defines in/security in terms of everyday bordering practices. Approaching security from

a different critical perspective, most sociological researchers imply fieldwork as their main method of border security analysis. Some studies do not only analyze the everyday practices of social actors but also how materials and things can give us hints about the securityness of the issue of mobility and migration at the U.S. borderlands. For instance, Sundberg's research (2008) draws attention to geopolitical frontiers that are constructed via everyday practices. The research relies on information gathered through textual analysis and ethnography while focusing on the material evidence (identity documents, personal mementos, backpacks, water bottles, etc.) of the undocumented crossing of borders. Sundberg (2008, p. 872) emphasizes that "the emergent narratives and practices around the objects are not directed by elite actors, but arise from everyday encounters between the objects left behind." Due to the geographical change in the U.S.-Mexico border in 1994, it became physically more difficult to cross the border and the article's interest in 'materials left behind' is related to this fact (2008, p. 874). The article analyzes the framing of left materials by government officials and media as "trash" without explanation regarding the geographical and political context behind the existence of such 'trash'. The trash talk is similar to how Mexican immigrants are framed by multiple securitizing actors and media as those who "trash" America (Sunberg 2008, p. 874). Thus, like Ackleson, Sundberg (2008, p. 886) also questions the construction of 'the other' or the relations of inclusion and exclusion that are created by border security initiatives. While the former research relies mainly on speeches that make this construction possible, the latter looks at the material and physical indicators of in/securitization. By conducting fieldwork at the borderlands, researchers of the sociological approach emphasize how security is embedded in everyday routines and micro-practices of bordering, rather than being an exceptional moment that is claimed by political elites.

Talavera et al. (2010) conducted ethnographic research on the deportation regime in the U.S.-Mexico borderlands, arguing that undocumented people who live close to this border come across law enforcement in open and public spaces. Like Sundberg, the article focuses on the presence of deportability in the everyday lives of immigrants rather than emphasizing the immediate moments of arrest and removal as indicators of in/security. The article delineates the key themes in people's narratives about deportability as "fear, invisibility, hiding, stigma, loss, grief, depression, anxiety" (Talavera et al., 2010, p. 168). It analyzes the social and political practices of in/security, which create the conditions for the Mexican population to feel the way they do about deportability. Security practices of sheriffs, border patrols, and officers, as well as law enforcement and the way the fields are designed to trigger the sense of fear and insecurity, the sense of being a target, and the idea of spatial separation between 'public as dangerous' and 'private as safe' (Talevera et al., 2010, p. 171). The article gives an account of everyday security practices that make the Mexican population living near the border feel insecure, and it disparately relies on individuals' perspectives unlike the Copenhagen School approach, which highlights political elites as the main actors of border security.

The Paris School's emphasis on routine practices of security has drawn researchers' attention to how technology use at the U.S.-Mexico borderlands or elsewhere within the state insecurities multiple individuals and groups mostly by creating illegal subjects. The events of 9/11 were a significant turning point in the U.S. governments' approach

to security, which triggered a transformation of state borders from being patrol-driven to surveillance-driven. Ackleson (2003) analyzes the U.S. border security regime after 9/11 and the development of "smart borders" that became possible via technology and surveillance systems. The author analyzes how increasing usage of technology creates insecurities for the subjects of the border security regime. Latham (2014) also examines the relationship between mobility and information processing/production through technology use. The article argues that recent interest in border security has two focuses, which are the governance of mobility, and border security through information gathering. Influenced by critical theory and biopolitics literature, the author considers his article to be an example of the latter (Latham, 2014, p. 18). According to the article, since the 1940s, with the help of cybernetics, information is generated on the position of people, and what the article names a 'world brain' is established (Latham, 2014, p. 18). Thus, the article does not overlook the continuing significance of the physical space and security practices, but its focus is on analyzing technological spaces (electronic borderlands built by information technologies by the state and nongovernmental institutions) that construct the U.S.-Mexico borderlands.

Amoore (2006, p. 337) also analyzes how surveillance practices make significant tools of bordering. The paper puts forward that the U.S.-Mexico border poses an appropriate empirical case because it is considered to have high-risk groups. This makes surveillance practices at the U.S.-Mexico borderlands more intense than anywhere else. The author analyzes the US-VISIT program of border controls (United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology), under which the management of border security stopped being a matter of geopolitical/physical disciplining and became an issue of biopolitics in which everyday life of people can be monitored and controlled. Amoore analyzes risk profiling, representations of biometrics and bodies, and authorization techniques that make the privatization of border security possible. Defining biometric borders, she relies on Bigo's "Mobius Ribbon"[3] concept, referring to the practices of inclusion-exclusion of migrants as well as the creation of illegal subjects through technology use.

Although Ackleson, Amoore, and Latham focus on a similar topic, they ask different questions informed by their theoretical perspectives. Ackleson (2003, p. 57) asks "How have the threats and solutions at the U.S. borders been defined, both empirically and discursively?" His study focuses on the social constitution of border security against defined threats, policy goals, and limitations, and argues that signs of such construction can be traced in discourse, defined as "scripts of politics" (Ackleson, 2003, p. 58). However, aiming to make sense of the practices of anonymity on the U.S. borders by the state and non-state institutions, Latham (2014) and Amoore (2006) adopt a Paris School perspective, which directs the research to analyze digital technologies of border security. These practices of border in/security also include militarization (electronic and physical domination of the borders by the authority) and 'border anxiety' (official and public fear that the border is an insecure line of the Mexican drug cartel, piracy, smuggling,

---

3   Bigo's (2001) Möbius Ribbon analogy refers to the blurring of the boundaries between inside and outside and the interpenetration of internal and external securities. He utilizes this analogy to make sense of 'transborder threats' as defined by traditional security approaches, which might refer to terrorism, smuggling, and irregular migration (See Mutlu and Lüleci, 2016). The analogy also implies that agents and relations of inside and outside (internal and external) are more often than not unfixed and ambiguous.

violence) (Latham, 2014, p. 22). Online representations highly contribute to everyday violence and the force of the border. In Latham's (2014, p. 28) words "Mobile technology in the borderlands opens onto a range of micro-practices conducted around and across the border in the everyday."

Like Ackleson's research, Astor (2009) examines the impact of the 9/11 attacks on the securitization of migration in the United States. He argues that recent discourse about that border after 9/11 ("secure our borders") has important similarities with the rhetoric in the 1950s that prepared the conditions for Operation Wetback. He asks "How and why unauthorized immigration across the Mexican border became an issue elevated out of the realm of ordinary politics and into the realm of security during the 1950s?" and the answer provided in the article is "through discourse" (Astor, 2009, pp. 6, 11). The author provides examples from securitizing speeches of the representatives from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, American politicians, as well as media sources like newspapers. According to Astor (2009, p. 10), the securitization framework helps make sense of Agamben's conceptualization of "exceptional politics." Their reliance on the definition of security as 'exceptional moments' is why the researchers of the Copenhagen School focus on sharp changes in elite speeches, as well as the possible triggers of such change such as the 9/11 events or the election of anti-immigrant leaders like Donald Trump.

Analysis and Discussion

The previous section reviewed the studies that adopt either The Copenhagen School (discursive) or the Paris School (sociological) approaches in their analyses of the U.S.-Mexico border security policies and practices. Both being critical perspectives on security, these two approaches have their nuances, which this article aims to reveal by examining the studies that focus on the same border, but from different perspectives. On the one hand, the pieces by Doty (2007), Ackelson (2003; 2005), Astor (2009), and Hutchison (2020) adopt a perspective that is more in line with the Copenhagen School's understanding of security, embodied in the framework of securitization. The Copenhagen School focuses on "how migration is connected to representations of national/societal dangers" and "how the development of security discourses in the area of migration is often presented as an inevitable policy response to the challenges for public order and domestic stability" (Huysmans, 2000, p. 757). Some of these studies also refer to Schmitt and Agamben's "exceptional discourse" linked with securitization theory (See Huysmans, 2008). On the other, Latham (2014), Amoore (2006), Talavera et al. (2010), and Sundberg (2008) analyze the U.S.-Mexico borderlands with a specific focus on how everyday practices of border security happen to result in social and political insecurities for multiple actors. Theoretically, most of these studies base their analyses on security as a form of *governmentality*, which refers to how certain practices create normal or proper subjects, resulting in relations of inclusion-exclusion. Some studies utilize the Bourdieusian concept of field in their analyses of how multiple actors create a network of insecurity through their mundane bureaucratic practices.

Differences in these two approaches' definitions and understanding of security are reflected in their approach toward the migration-security nexus in multiple ways. Both

approaches have their advantages and limitations in the analysis of border security. First, the Copenhagen School's excessive focus on moments of exception and following extraordinary measures may result in overlooking how not only elites but also multiple actors construct insecurities on a daily basis through bureaucratic and routine practices. In this sense, the discursive approach is successful in demonstrating the impact of elites on setting up a security agenda, as Ackleson does, while falling short in making sense of the agency of other actors as well as the impact of securitization on immigrants. In contrast, due to its interest in not only what security means but also what it does, the sociological approach integrates how practices of security end up with insecurities for its subjects, reflected in Talavera et al.'s research on the emotions and anxieties of individual immigrants. Different from the Copenhagen School, the Paris School is also interested in how multiple actants including security professionals, bureaucracy, and technologies and fences create insecurities for immigrants daily.

Second, for the scholars of Paris School, physical and material indicators and agents of the process of in/security, including buildings, fences, physical appearances among the borderlands, technologies, security vehicles, things, and even trash that immigrants leave behind as Sundberg's article, are significant in understanding the securityness of an issue. The Copenhagen School is less interested in the material indicators of securitization while focusing on social agents of security, mostly the political elites. This focus on exceptional discourse by the elites may make it difficult for the Copenhagen School analyses to detect and comprehend the presence of insecurities when there is a lack of securitizing speeches by elites (See Luleci-Sula & Sula, 2021).

Third, the Paris School's extensive focus on unintentional daily practices may risk overlooking the broader political contexts in which insecurity becomes possible. As such, studies that adopt the sociological approach overlook exceptional events that create immense insecurities for multiple referent objects, such as hate speech, conflicts, and even war. Conflicts, invasions, and wars, which the Copenhagen School refers to as extraordinary measures that may follow securitizing speeches, remain a major concern for world politics, as well as the discipline of IR, which no security approaches can rule out in their analyses of politics and security.

The differences in these two schools of thought's focus on analyses and actors are also related to their conceptualization of 'the international.' As quoted from Huysmans above, the Copenhagen School's attempt to enlarge the definition of security is limited by the idea that security should not lose its meaning by overemphasizing the importance of any threats to individuals, groups, nations, and humanity. Thus, the international remains primarily to be a matter of states, policymakers, and their political agenda. Conversely, aiming to bring a sociological approach to the study of world politics, the Paris School challenges the disciplinary boundaries, arguing that conventional IR's tendency to assume international as "a realm of reality with clear boundaries" contributes to the inside-outside distinction of the modern state (Bigo and Walker, 2007, p. 728). This difference is also reflected in their respective approaches toward the migration-security nexus. Technology use, discourses and practices of security professionals, civil bureaucracy, individuals' ideas, borderland as a field and its placement/position, materials, etc. remain within the scope of 'international security' for the sociological approach. However, enriching the

scope of interest also has its disadvantages, such as a possible failure to link the issue with 'the international,' as might be a criticism to Talavera et al. Furthermore, defining insecurity as related to disciplinary power and its everyday reproduction may result in overlooking the political (sovereign power) and how politicians contribute to the making of insecurities, sometimes intentionally. For instance, neither Amoore nor Latham emphasized the intentionality aspect of biopolitical governance of security, while the political aspect of securitization is clearer in Doty and Astor's studies.

Another significant difference between the two approaches lies in their preferred methods. Côté-Boucher et al. (2014) summarize the Paris School's approach to the migration-security nexus to analyze everyday in/security practices at borders, and to underscore the importance of fieldwork research to provide detailed and contextualized analyses of border security. One goal of the Bourdieusian understanding of the discipline is to provide an empirical visualization of what is defined as 'the international' (Pouliot, 2012; Bigo 2011). Since fieldwork has the potential to reveal social 'realities' of migration, the researcher needs to leave her/his armchair and experience the field to be able to give an account of in/securities. On the other hand, studies that adopt the Copenhagen School approach do not always define and clarify their preferred methods. Most of these studies do seem to analyze speeches of influential actors rather randomly, without a systematic analysis of speeches or scripts through discourse or content analysis. In some Copenhagen School articles, this ends up with a defective justification (or lack of any explanation) of how they proceed step by step to their conclusions.

As Huysmans (2002) and C.A.S.E. Collective (2006) indicate, one normative dilemma or trap of studying security is the possibility of participating and constantly reproducing discursive securitization. Probably not to fall into this dilemma, most Paris School pieces do not openly name the issue as being related to in/security while the focus on 'securityness' is rather straightforward in the Copenhagen School studies. Many of the studies mention migration's links with daily hardship, violence, and anxiety. However, these studies –consciously or not- avoid direct links by mentioning 'migration as in/security.' The securitization perspective on migration is also critical of issues being out into the security realm, though they use the term security as well as risk, danger, and threat without the normative consideration of reproduction of (in)security.

As Katzenstein and Sil (2010) argue and this study observes while analyzing the Copenhagen School and Paris School approaches to the migration-security nexus "research traditions give themselves permission to bypass aspects of a complex reality" that does not fit in their theoretical or meta-theoretical commitments. This makes it -at least from a pragmatic point of view- desirable to integrate multiple approaches to come up with comprehensive answers to our research questions. Such integration can be defined as an attempt to utilize distinct theoretical constructions by pooling them together while being aware of the strengths and weaknesses of the existing approaches and utilizing both to make sense of a particular social phenomenon. The Copenhagen School and the Paris School share the same meta-theoretical commitments while having the above-mentioned differences in certain theoretical assumptions.

In terms of their ontological commitments, both schools of thought challenge the objectivist understanding of security, defining it as a socially constructed and contingent

phenomenon. While the Copenhagen School focuses on how threats and security issues are constructed through language, the Paris Schools researchers search for hints of security in mundane and bureaucratic practices of security professionals. According to this view, security is not something 'out there' to be dealt with or explored but is constituted by multiple subjects. Both schools of thought defend a post-positivist approach to social sciences. Their epistemological commitment highlights the interpretive and constructivist nature of knowledge. Different from the Copenhagen School, the Paris School researchers place a strong emphasis on the reflexive nature of knowledge.

These two approaches are coherent meta-theoretically. They have differing theoretical arguments regarding how security is constituted but do not disagree in their ontological and epistemological commitments. As a result, these can be combined using an eclectic strategy. Such an approach would examine how security is initially formed through linguistic construction as well as how securityness of an issue is continuously reproduced through routine practices of security professionals. As a result, complex social and political issues, such as migration, which have multiple dimensions including political discourse and socio-political practices, can be captured and analyzed more thoroughly through the analysis of both exceptional speeches that may trigger processes of securitization and with the broadly defined concept of discourse that includes not only speeches but also the legal and political frameworks and regular behaviors that enable border insecurity.

Conclusion

Walters (2010) distinguishes critical approaches to the migration-security nexus into two: discursive and material-semiotic (sociological) approaches. This differentiation makes it significant to understand the differences and similarities between security definitions and understandings of the Copenhagen School and Paris School. After analyzing the studies that focus on the migration-security nexus by focusing on the U.S.-Mexico border, this study concludes that although both fall into the category of critical approaches to security and that they share common meta-theoretical commitments, there have differences in their empirical conductions, summarized in Table 1 below, which reveal certain strengths and weaknesses of both.

First, the Copenhagen School's focus on speech acts makes it vulnerable to grasping the insecurities resulting from routine practices in the field. Second, its emphasis on political elites as securitizing actors may end up overlooking how multiple actors contribute to the insecurities that immigrants face. Third, Paris School's extensive focus on unintentional everyday practices may pose a deficiency in analyzing exceptional cases and security measures such as violence, invasions, conflicts, and even war. Fourth, dissimilarity in their conceptualization of 'the international' causes them to focus on a limited aspect of the phenomena they are analyzing while leaving untouched other significant aspects of it (either materialities or further political agenda). Fifth, studies of the Copenhagen School are not as open and clear as the Paris School when it comes to how they analyze migration and border security. A lack of clarification regarding their methods might make it difficult to grasp how they come up with their claimed conclusions. Last, most articles from the Paris School perspective refrain from using the term 'security' due to the normative dilemma it brings, while the Copenhagen School is more open about defining the moments and processes of security.

Laudan (1977, pp. 104-10) argues that *research traditions* are not much different when it comes to the empirical realities they interpret. Considering that they share a common research tradition, understood from their meta-theoretical commitments, it is safe to call for an integrated approach in the critical analysis of the migration-security nexus. The studies that define security discourse more comprehensively, including speeches, scripts, documents, materialities, and bureaucratic and security practices, present a more comprehensive analysis of a complex social and political phenomenon such as border security. This is why this study presents a call for more integration between these two schools of critical security studies.

Table 1
Approaches of the Copenhagen School and the Paris School on the Migration-Security Nexus[4]

	In/security	Focus of analysis	Referent object	Actors	Preferred method	Main influencers in social/political theory	Possible roots in IR theory
Copenhagen School	Speech-act	Exceptional discourses, securitization of migration, self-other dichotomies, threat construction	Widened, but the main focus is still state	Elites/influential actors	Discourse/content analysis (not a strong emphasis on method)	J. L. Austin, Derrida	Constructivism
Paris School	Everyday practice	Governmentality, dispositif, technology, and surveillance, politics of inclusion and exclusion, political and social consequences of migration practices	More emphasis on individuals/society	Multiple	Ethnography (fieldwork) and textual analysis	Foucault, Bourdieu, Latour	Post-structuralism

4 Please note that this table is only an interpretation made by the author about the differences between the two approaches. It does not aim to draw clearly defined boundaries between these two schools of critical security but is only a tentative list to make it easier to grasp the possible nuances between them.

References

Ackleson, J. (2003). Securing Through Technology? Smart Borders after September 11[th.] *Knowledge, Technology, & Policy,* 16(1), 56-74.

Ackleson, J. (2003a). Directions in border security research. *The Social Science Journal,* 40, 773-581.

Ackleson, J. (2005). Constructing security on the U.S.–Mexico border. *Political Geography,* 24, 165-184.

Amoore, L. (2006). Biometric borders: Governing mobilities in the war on terror. *Political Geography,* 25, 336-351.

Astor, A. (2009). Unauthorized immigration, securitization, and the making of Operation Wetback. *Latino Studies,* 7(1), 5-29.

Bigo, D. (2001). The Möbius Ribbon of Internal and External Securit(ies). In M. Albert, ed., *Identities Borders Orders: Rethinking International Relations Theory* (pp. 91-116). Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

Bigo, D. (2002). Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political,* 27(1), 63-92.

Bigo, D. (2013). International Political Sociology. In P. D. Williams, ed., *Security Studies: an introduction* (116-129). NY: Routledge Taylor&Francis.

Bigo, D. (2011). Pierre Bourdieu and International Relations: Power of Practices, Practices of Power. *International Political Sociology,* 5(3), 225-258.

Bigo, D. & Walker R.B.J. (2007). Political Sociology and the Problem of the International. *Millennium- Journal of International Studies,* 3, 725-739.

Bilgin, P. & Ince B. (2014). Security and Citizenship in the Global South: In/securing citizens in early republican Turkey (1923-1946). *International Relations*, 29(4), 1-21.

Buzan, B. & Hansen, L. (2009). *Evolution of International Security Studies*. Cambridge University Press: New York.

Buzan, B., Wæver, O., & de Wilde, J. (1998). *Security: a new framework for analysis*. Boulder: Rienner.

C.A.S.E. Collective. (2006). Critical Approaches to Security in Europe: A Networked Manifesto. *Security Dialogue,* 37, 443-487.

Côté-Boucher, K., Infantino, F. & Salter, M. B. (2014). Border security as practice: An agenda for research. *Security Dialogue,* 45(3), 195–208.

Doty, R. L. (2007). States of Exception on the Mexico-U.S. Border: Security, Decisions, and Civilian Border Patrols. *International Political Sociology,* 1(2), 113-137.

Eckl, J. (2008). Responsible Scholarship After Leaving the Veranda: Normative Issues Faced by Field Researchers—and Armchair Scientists. *International Political Sociology,* 2(3), 185-203.

Hutchison, H. (2020). Continuity and Change: Comparing the Securitization of Migration under the Obama and Trump Administrations. *Perceptions,* XXV(1), 81-98.

Huysmans, J. (1998). Revisiting Copenhagen: Or, On the Creative Development of a Security Studies Agenda in Europe. *European Journal of International Relations,* 4(4), 479-505.

Huysmans, J. (2000). The European Union and the Securitization of Migration. *JCMS: J Common Market Studies,* 38(5), 751-777.

Huysmans, J. (2002). Defining Social Constructivism in Security Studies: The Normative Dilemma of Writing Security. *Alternatives,* 27, 41-62.

Huysmans, J. (2008). The Jargon of Exception—On Schmitt, Agamben and the Absence of Political Society. *International Political Sociology,* 2, 165-183.

Katzenstein, P. J. & Sil, R. (2010). Analytic Eclecticism in the study of World Politics: Reconfiguring Problems and Mechanisms across Research Traditions. *Perspectives on Politics,* 8(2), 411-431.

Kessler, O. (2009). Toward a sociology of the international? International relations between anarchy and World society. *International Political Sociology,* 3(1), 87-108.

Latham, R. (2014). The Governance of Visibility: Bodies, Information, and the Politics of Anonymity across the US-Mexico Borderlands. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political,* 39(1), 17-36.

Luleci-Sula, C. & Sula, I. E. (2021). Migration Management in Turkey: Discourse and Practice. *Uluslararası İlişkiler Dergisi,* 18(72), 1-22.

Mutlu, C. E. & Lüleci, Ç. (2016). The International Political Sociology of Security Studies. In Guillaume, X. & Bilgin, P. (Eds.) *Routledge Handbook of International Political Sociology* (pp. 81-91). Routledge.

Pouliot, V. (2012). Methodology: Putting practice theory into practice. In Adler-Nissen, R. *Bourdieu in international relations: Rethinking key concepts in IR* (pp. 45-58). London: Routledge.

Sundberg, J. (2008). 'Trash-talk' and the production of quotidian geopolitical boundaries in the USA–Mexico

borderlands. *Social & Cultural Geography,* 9(8), 871-890.

Talavera, V., Nunez-Mchiri, G. G., & Heyman J. (2010). Deportation in the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands: Anticipation, Experience, and Memory. In De Genova, N. & Peutz, N. (Eds.) *The Deportation Regime: Sovereignty, Space, and the Freedom of Movement* (pp. 166-194). Durham & London: Duke University Press.

Wæver, O. (1995). Securitization and Desecuritization. In R. Lipschutz, (Ed.), *On Security* (pp. 46-86). New York: Colombia University Press.

Walt, S. M. (1991). The Renaissance of Security Studies. *International Studies Quarterly,* 35(2), 211-239.

Walters, W. (2010). Migration and Security. In Burgess, J. P. (Ed.), *The Handbook of New Security Studies* (pp. 217-228). London: Routledge.

Wæver, O. (2012). Aberystwyth, Paris, Copenhagen: The Europeanness of new "schools" of security theory in an American field. In A. B. Tickner & Blaney (Eds.), Thinking International Relations Differently. Routledge.

Wolfers, A. (1952). 'National Security' as an Ambiguous Symbol. *Political Science Quarterly*, 67(4), 481-502.