



NEAR EAST UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
MASTERS PROGRAM

**TRUMP'S DISCOURSE IN ECONOMIC
SECURITISATION REGARDING TO IMMIGRATION**

MEMORY EDLIGHT KANGANGA

MASTER'S THESIS

NICOSIA
2018

NEAR EAST UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
MASTERS PROGRAM

**TRUMP'S DISCOURSE IN ECONOMIC
SECURITISATION REGARDING TO IMMIGRATION**

MEMORY EDLIGHT KANGANGA
20168403

MASTER'S THESIS

THESIS SUPERVISOR
ASSOC. PROF. DR SAIT AKSIT

NICOSIA
2018

ACCEPTANCE/APPROVAL

**We as the jury members certify the “Trump’s Discourse in Economic
Securitisation Regarding To Immigration” prepared by Memory
Edlight Kanganga defended on**

22 June 2018

Has been found satisfactory for the award of degree of

JURY MEMBERS

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sait Akşit (Supervisor)
Near East University/Department of International Relations

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Umut Koldaş (Head of Jury)
Near East University/Department of International Relations

Dr. Bilge Azgın
Near East University/Department of Political Science

Prof. Dr. Mustafa Sağsan
Graduate School of Social Sciences
Director

DECLARATION

I, hereby declare that this dissertation entitled ‘.....’ has been prepared myself under the guidance and supervision of “.....” in partial fulfilment of The Near East University, Graduate School of Social Sciences regulations and does not to the best of my knowledge breach any Law of Copyrights and has been tested for plagiarism and a copy of the result can be found in the Thesis.

- The full extent of my Thesis can be accessible from anywhere.
- My Thesis can only be accessible from the Near East University.
- My Thesis cannot be accessible for (2) two years. If I do not apply for extension at the end of this period, the full extent of my Thesis will be accessible from anywhere.

Date

Signature

Name, Surname

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank Almighty God for allowing me to reach this far through his mercy and guidance. I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sait Akşit for his guidance, inspiration and most of all patience during the writing process of this thesis. My gratitude also goes to the jury members, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Umut Koldaş and Dr. Bilge Azgın for their input in shaping the topic of this thesis as well as highlighting some grey areas that needed to be expressed clearly. Finally, I am very grateful to my family and friends for their constant support and prayers that helped me to sail through this journey.

ABSTRACT

TRUMP'S DISCOURSE IN ECONOMIC SECURITISATION REGARDING TO IMMIGRATION

Immigration is a sensitive issue and is often associated with terrorism, abuse of social welfare and security threat. By examining Trump's discourse on immigrants, this thesis will highlight how Trump's rhetoric before and after the presidential elections presents economic securitisation on the issue of immigration. It will point out how Trump took advantage of the changes in US politics to build a rhetoric on immigration that securitized the issue from largely an economic perspective during the presidential campaign. Trump's discourse changed the sentiment in the country and was reflected in the implementation process. This thesis argues that the discourse of Trump on economic securitisation with regards to immigrants is a right-wing populist politics and has caused consequences in America. The thesis follows the Copenhagen school of security that propose the tool of a discourse analysis in order to clearly examine the discourse of Trump. It made use of the Copenhagen securitisation theory as the backbone of the study so as to clearly understand Trump's discourse in economic securitisation with regards to immigration.

Keywords (5-8 words): Securitization Theory, Securitization of Immigration, Economic Securitization, US Politics, Trump's Discourse, Trump

ÖZ

EKONOMİK GÜVENLİKLEŞTİRME BAĞLAMINDA GÖÇ KONUSUNUN TRUMP'IN SÖYLEMİNDEKİ YERİ

Göç sıklıkla terörizm, sosyal refah ve güvenlik tehditi olarak tanımlanan hassas bir konudur. Bu çalışma, ABD Başkanı Trump'ın seçim süreci öncesi ve sonrasında göç konusunu nasıl güvenlikleştirdiğini ortaya koyabilmek amacıyla bu kapsamdaki söylemini irdelenmiştir. Bu çerçevede çalışma, Kopenhag Okulu bünyesinde ortaya konan güvenlikleştirme kavramından faydalanmıştır. Tez, Trump'ın ABD siyasetindeki değişimden faydalanarak seçim kampanyası ile başlayan süreçte göç konusunu ekonomik bağlamda güvenlikleştiren bir söylem kullandığını ortaya koymaya çalışmıştır. Trump'ın kullandığı söylemin ülke içerisinde göçe yönelik algıyı da değiştirmiş olduğu söylemde ortaya konan politika tercihlerinin Trump'ın Başkanlığı sonrası uygulamaya geçirilmeye çalışılması ile vurgulanabilir. Tez, Trump'ın göç konusunu ekonomik olarak güvenlikleştirme amacıyla kullandığı söylemin Amerikan siyasetinde popülist sağ yaklaşımın yükselmesine neden olduğunu savunmakta ve olumsuz sonuçlarına vurgu yapmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Güvenlikleştirme Teorisi, Göçün Güvenlikleştirilmesi, Ekonomik Güvenlikleştirme, ABD Siyaseti, Trump'ın Söylemi, Trump

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACCEPTANCE/APPROVAL	iii
DECLARATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ	v
ABBREVIATIONS	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
i. Theoretical Framework	5
ii. Statement of the Problem	5
iii. Objectives of the Study	6
iv. Significance of the Study	6
v. Justification	7
vi. Methodology	8
vii. Scope of the Study	8
vii. Structure of the Thesis	9
CHAPTER I	11
SECURITISATION AS THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	11
1.1 Traditional Security Approaches	11
1.1.1 Realism and Neorealism	12
1.1.2 Liberalism	14
1.1.3 Neo-Marxism	17
1.2 Post-Cold War Approaches	18
1.2.1 Critical Theory	18
1.3 Securitization Theory	24
1.4 Economic Securitization and Immigration	27
CHAPER II	34
TRUMP’S DISCOURSE ON IMMIGRATION	34
2.1 Trump’s Rhetoric on Immigration During His Election Campaign	40
2.2 State Implementation in Relation to Trump’s Rhetoric	44
2.2.1 Opposition to Trump’s rhetoric position on societal level	48
2.2.2 Advantages and Disadvantages of Trump’s Rhetoric	50
2.2.3 Consequences of Trump’s Populist Politics for US Citizens	52
CONCLUSION	57

REFERENCES.....	62
PLAGIARISM REPORT	68
ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL	69

ABBREVIATIONS

CS	Copenhagen School
USA	United States of America
NSC	National Security Council
INA	Immigration and Nationality Act
EBSVERA	Enhanced Border Security and Visa Entry Reform Act
DHS	Department of Homeland Security
ICE	Immigration and Customs Enforcement
ACS	American Community Survey
RAISE	Reforming American Immigration for a Strong Economy
NAFTA	Northern American Free Trade Agreement
TVPRA	Trafficking Victims Protection and Reauthorisation Act
PEP	Priority Enforcement Program
DACA	Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals
EPS	Enhancing Public Safety
IR	International Relations
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

INTRODUCTION

Due to globalisation and increased relations between and among nations the percentage of people migrating from one state to another has also increased and this has caused some nations to politicize immigration activities due to the effects that are being encountered because of immigration. States especially in the western societies securitize immigration in a bid to protect themselves from immigrants. The political structure of immigration within western societies has been referred to as a destabilizing effect and a danger to public society, hence securitization of migrants is becoming the core concept in the issue of immigration with an aim to attract electorate and make gains in politics.

This study will make use of the concept of securitization in order to understand and explain United States President Donald Trump's rhetoric on immigration. Securitisation theory was first brought up by the Copenhagen School of security studies. This theory has provided a foundation on the issue of securitisation and immigration so as to build a clear picture on how the two converge. Economic securitization is a convergence of realism and the constructivism since it combines the survival and security as a social construction. Economic securitization with regards to immigration has been regarded as a retrogressive and illiberal move although states use it to protect their domestic integrity. Newman (2003: 10) notes that policies have been operationalized in the form of visa regulations, carrier sanctions, claims to adjoining (contacting) terrorists and physical closure of borders so as to control the flow of immigration.

Taking a closer look at the US, immigration issue was not, until recently, viewed as a threat to the US economy, national identity or security as in Europe; rather US was

viewed as a welcoming country and the statue of liberty was regarded as a sign to symbolize that it welcomes all nations with open arms. It is of importance to note that immigration and security issues existed way before the September 11, 2001 attacks however it was not regarded as a threat to national security. Rather, it was considered a social issue that every country faces like jobs and welfare. However, the terrorist attacks of September 11 marked the evolution of the concept of immigration as a security threat and this resulted in the creation and implementation of new policies.

Immigration is a diverse and broad issue hence it has been increasingly interconnecting with many other policies such as internal security and border management. The discourse on economic securitization in relation to immigrants encompasses issues like societal threat, terrorism and religious issues such as Islamic issues which is highly linked to the issue of security. Several scholars argue that securitization of immigrants gained greater attention in the western countries since the 9/11 terror attacks in the US (Jaworsky 2011: 43), but although the US tried to increase integration in immigration policies the process seemed not to be as radical and strong in rhetoric as in the case of Donald Trump's approach.

Due to the problems experienced with regards to the issue of immigration, governments in western countries have introduced strict immigration policies because they view immigrants as potential terrorist and a threat to state economy. Due to the fact that immigration issue is becoming more vibrant in US politics, it therefore became a contentious hot debate in the presidential campaigns of 2016 and radical candidates such as Donald Trump framed it as a threat to US economy and security. Trump made it clear that people migrating into the US are the Islamic State (IS) terrorists, hence the issue of illegal immigration and his proposed reforms and remarks about this issue was the signature issue for Donald Trump's presidential campaign and it generated much publicity.

Trump overlooked the distinctions between immigrants and presented them all as one group. His immigration plan was based on three principles which are, first, a nation without borders is no nation hence the need to build a wall across the southern border; second was to enforce immigration laws; and the last was to put US citizens' interest first. During his campaign he promised to make many reforms in the

immigration sector. In 2014, at Conservative Political Action Conference (The Balance 2017) Trump urged politicians to withdraw immigration reforms that favour immigrants because according to him these were the people stealing Americans jobs. This was the first step of Trump's discourse towards the immigration problem. In 2015, during his campaign to presidential seat he proposed to reverse the birth right citizenship of non-native Americans that were born on the US soil by undocumented immigrants, even though the Citizenship Clause of the Fourteen Amendment state that everyone born on U.S soil is automatically an American citizen regardless of the parents (The Balance 2017). In July 2016, Trump put emphasis on border security and the issue of illegal immigration as part of his campaign strategy. He was of the view that many crimes and illegal practices such as the use of drugs were being committed by illegal immigrants hence he proposed to build a border wall and increase border patrol agents for tight security. More so, in the cause of his campaign, he frequently proposed to ban Muslim immigrants and make it stricter for asylum seekers and refugees to enter U.S.; for example, Syrian refugees.

It is of importance to note that Trump's discourse reflects more on economic securitization with regards to immigrants rather than other branches in IR like social welfare, political and environmental issues although they are intertwined. For instance, his rhetoric points out that Americans are being deprived their right to come first in terms of jobs, immigrants are stealing Americans jobs and also the idea that immigrants are killing middle age of Americans who are considered to be the backbone of America's economy; all this shows that his discourse focuses more on economic securitization. More so his rhetoric on trying to limit undocumented immigrants by building a wall, ending birthright citizenship and end the issuing of green cards all shows how he views immigration as the stumbling block pulling US economy down and the need to end it. Hence, this study will mainly focus on the discourse of Trump in economic securitization with regards to immigration.

More so, prior to the presidential seat Trump continued to push towards his rhetoric and the state, on the other hand, found itself implementing executive orders right after his inauguration that goes in line with his rhetoric. On January 27, 2017, he managed to sign an executive order titled "Protecting the Nation from Terrorist Attacks by Foreign Nationals". This was a travel ban for mainly Syrian refugees and suspended entry for seven countries; namely, Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan,

Syria and Yemen. This provoked many people especially those immigrants who were already living in the U.S and it resulted in the state revising the executive order and excluded Iraq, from the suspension. This executive order went in line with Trump rhetoric on banning the Islamic people from entering the country as evidenced by his tweets on the 9th of March 2016 "I think Islam hates us...we can't allow people coming into this country who have this hatred of the United States and of people that are not Muslim". This, therefore, shows that the state implemented executive orders that support Trump's rhetoric indirectly. More so, the state went on to enforce his opinions towards immigration, by signing the Executive order 13768 titled "Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the US" which increased immigration enforcement. This executive order went in line with Trump's rhetoric on November 17, 2015 "Refugees from Syria are now pouring into our great country. Who knows who they are - some could be ISIS. Is our President insane?" this statement shows Trump insecurity about who comes into the US resulting in the state implementing an executive order that supports his statement. From these actions by the state, one may say that Trump's discourse and approach changed the sentiment in the country and was reflected in the implementation of the state.

However, in as much as he had many immigration plans and tried to push for them to be implemented he faced many challenges from the courts and the congress. This, therefore, shows that in as much as a president has the power the audience matters in the decision making of laws in a country. As Buzan illustrated the audience matters in the securitization of anything in a country hence the courts and the congress in this case represents the audience. The congress and the courts managed to deny and delay some of Trump's policies that goes in hand with his rhetoric so as to first review them and see how they would affect the state as well as the individuals in America. The discourse of Trump on securitization is therefore perceived as part of the right-wing populist politics in US, due to his rhetoric on immigration. Trump is a radical populist and the rise of populist, typified conflict at the decision making on both domestic and international level. Populist radical parties thrive on xenophobic, nationalist, and popular sovereignty and ideologies to gain support and reject social inclusion of immigrants as security threats (Middleton 2016: 14-15). This, therefore, raises awareness within a national security context towards the issue of economic

securitization with regards to immigration and the consequences it brings on the nationals of the country.

i. Theoretical Framework

This research makes use of a combined theoretical framework in order to address economic securitization with regards to immigrants in a more clear and concise manner. The first part of the research adapts the analytical framework of securitization as defined by the Copenhagen school so as to view how immigration became a security issue in the United States of America under the discourse of Donald Trump. More so, this research tends not only to take the issue of speech act as the core of the study because this would suffice to view whether immigrants have been securitised or not hence it took another dimension to look at the view of the congress and court so as to have a better understanding on how economic securitization transpires in the United States. Just as Balzacq (2005) claims, “securitization is a result of a collection of factors involving the context, the audience and the political agency”, therefore the study did not only use speech act to address immigration as an economic security matter because this would have risked neglecting various implications around the securitization process.

ii. Statement of the Problem

The political discourse on the current immigration crisis illustrates a shift in the securitisation paradigm marked by emphasis on the language of constituting immigrants as a threat to economy rather than a compassionate and an accommodating one. This has made the US to transform its security responses to the problem of immigration under a stronger rhetoric on strict control of border security. Therefore, it is possible to recognise Trump’s strict rhetoric and discourse on immigration policies, which goes along with traditional understanding of border control. Although many scholars have examined the US immigration security problems, neither study reflects on the rhetoric nature of Trump’s discourse on economic securitisation in relation to immigration. This thesis therefore aims to offer an alternative conceptual framework which can be used to explain how the discourse of Trump on economic securitization with regards to immigrants has affected social relations and caused social instability in the US. It also aims at pointing out how his discourse is affecting US economy in general. This thesis argues that the discourse

of Trump on economic securitisation with regards to immigrants is a right-wing populist politics and has caused consequences in America. It has destroyed social relations with the targeted states and raised arguments within the nationals of the US. This thesis therefore strives to answer the following questions so as to clearly examine the discourse of Trump.

iii. Objectives of the Study

The main objective of the current study is to highlight the discourse of Trump on economic securitization with regards to immigrants as well as giving the general overview of what securitization mean and how it is constructed from the issue of security. It also aims at highlighting Trump's discourse on economic securitization in relation to immigration with regard to the impact it has brought to the US citizens in terms of social life. The study will therefore focus on the following objectives and try to answer the following questions as well

1. What was Trump's rhetoric and plan on immigration in relation to economic securitisation and how did he manage to pursue implementation in relation to his rhetoric?
2. What are the challenges and consequences of Trump's rhetoric on economic securitisation towards US?

iv. Significance of the Study

The concept of security is an issue that has been in the realm of political issues way before the end of cold war, but however it managed to gain more significance after the Cold War given the changing international circumstances. It is in this light that soon after the Cold War, immigration issues have been heavily associated with security issues and this shift, made issues of immigration to be securitised (Ibrahim 2005). More so, immigration issue has been regarded as a racial discourse which has been pushing social construction to fit into the realm of security issues. Immigration is therefore labelled as a threat to the norms of the society which result into extreme measures being taken in response to this threat. Multilateral and bilateral agreements have been signed, international and domestic institutions have been created, extradition and deportation agreements between receiving and sending states have been authorised and conventions and protocols have been ratified to present the linkage between immigration and security. The significance of

this study is to therefore highlight economic securitization in relation to immigrants in the United States focusing on the discourse of Donald Trump. It's significance is on how immigration issues are viewed in relation to economic issues in the US and what consequences are being encountered due to Trump's discourse. It gives one insights on how issues of security are treated in the US and how the rhetoric of Trump has affected the economic and social structure of the US.

This study contributes to a broader view of securitisation practices and policy implementation in relation to Trump discourse. It recognises and upholds the concept of securitisation as well as other approaches brought by other scholars as well, so as to clearly examine and evaluate Trump's discourse. More so, this thesis also examines the challenges and consequences that are brought up by Trump's discourse in the US. It is of importance to scrutinise the rhetoric of Trump and his populist politics in relation to the nationals of America so as to give a clear picture of Trump's discourse. From a social perspective, this thesis clarifies the mechanism that the discourse of Trump is raising different groups of people with different perspectives as evidenced by his discourse and its consequences on the US politics.

v. Justification

The nature of securitization implies the necessity for an immediate response available to government and other civil leaders who are also limited by organizational behaviour. By identifying the constrains placed upon policy makers by the use of securitization language, this thesis will seek to inform policy makers as to the potentially negative effects of addressing the issue of immigration as a security issue rather than a strictly economic and political challenge.

Several research studies have analysed the immigration and home affairs area through the securitisation approach, focusing on policies dealing with legal immigration, irregular immigration and border management, however little research has been done focusing on the discourse of Trump on economic securitization with regards to immigrants. The choice of specifically looking at Trump discourse is to bring out how he managed to securitize economic issues in relation to immigration in the United States of America from the period of his presidential campaign to the period he became the president of the US. It clearly brings out how securitization process takes place and the impacts it brought to both the US immigrants as well as

the nationals of America. In as much as many studies have been done on the issue of securitization of immigrants as well as on the issue of Trump's policies, this study diverges a little from these studies by introducing the discourse of Trump on economic securitization with regards to immigrants and how this discourse have had consequences and effects on the American citizens. This information will therefore give insights on how securitization is done in the US as well as its consequences to the US citizens with regards to immigration issues.

In order to answer the main questions of the research one need to first acquire an extensive view on US immigration statistics as well as the US background information on the issue of immigration. Although immigration area is not a new concept in the US context, this research will try to shed light on how it managed to be a security problem in relation to Trump's discourse and the analysis will naturally focus on economic securitization in relation to immigrants by looking at the several tools used in the securitization process. This information is therefore highly relevant so as to clearly understand the process of securitization and the consequences the discourse of Trump brings to the US politics.

vi. Methodology

The study used qualitative research method to gather information on the current study. It made use of both primary and secondary sources such as articles, and published books, journals, state department archives as well as social media surveys such as tweeter. The choice of specifically using primary sources is because it provides first-hand information not prone to bias although the process is time consuming. Secondary sources on the other hand supported this study by providing information that is ethical and statistically reliable since it is information that someone had already researched and analysed although to a lesser extent the details may lack information on current issues. However, both these sources helped to strengthen the weight of this study by providing essential information on the current study so as to be able to clearly relate and make use of some quotations when necessary.

vii. Scope of the Study

The study investigates Donald Trump's discourse before and after the presidential elections in relation to economic securitization with regards to immigrants. It is driven

by the notion to shed light on how he addresses the issue of immigration and how his discourse on economic securitisation has effects or causes consequences in the US. The study focuses specifically on Trump's rhetoric because in as much as security and immigration issues have been a problem in the US Trump's rhetoric seem to surpass all other policy reforms that have been implemented on security and immigration issues before 2016. The goal of the study is to clearly examine his promises during the presidential election campaigns to the period he became the president of America. It tries to evaluate his rhetoric as well as the challenges he faced in trying to put forth his rhetoric to be implemented by the state, by so doing the study will be highlighting how the issue of immigration became economically securitized. The study will also evaluate the extent on which his rhetoric managed to influence the state for implementation and the challenges he faced in trying to put forth his rhetoric for implementation. It also brings out the consequences the discourse of Trump brings to the US citizens with regards to economic securitisation and immigration issues.

vii. Structure of the Thesis

The first chapter of the thesis presents the conceptual framework that is used in order to clearly understand Trump's rhetoric in relation to economic securitisation of immigrants and discuss the literature that clearly points out how securitisation came into picture and how it links with this topic. This section interprets the concept of security in general by highlighting how traditional and post-Cold War schools of thought define the concept of security. By looking at the different views brought up with these schools of thought on the concept of security a clear picture on how security developed into securitisation is noticed. The traditional school of thought provide the foundation on the concept on security and the post-Cold War theories develop this concept by linking and developing it to fit the evolving world politics resulting in the development of securitisation theory. Securitisation theory was brought up into the picture by the Copenhagen school. This theory is of the view that something becomes a security issue when it is presented as posing an existential threat to some objects and need to be dealt with immediately with extraordinary measures. The main argument of this theory is that an issue becomes a security issue not because it constitutes an objective threat to the state (as the traditional theories would claim), but rather because an actor has defined something as

existential threat to some object's survival through a speech act. The concept of securitisation is therefore the backbone of this thesis as it links directly with the issue of Trump's rhetoric with regards to immigration. This section therefore brings out how economic securitisation is linked to the issue of immigration since immigration issues are regarded as the root cause of social and economic instabilities in the US, thereby leading us to the second chapter on US politics and Trump's rhetoric.

The second chapter first presents US politics and immigration statistics in order to have a brief background on how the issue of immigrants was viewed throughout the years in the US. It pinpoints Obama's stance on the issue of immigrants following the economic crisis of 2007 and 2008 and how the Republicans responded to his view. Obama's stance on immigration according to the Republicans was flexible and promoted protection of immigrants which gave them privilege over US citizens in the job market. This therefore resulted in the rise of populist parties which were against the idea of social inclusion and regarded Obama's stance as killing the US economy and social welfare. Trump's rhetoric therefore classifies him as a populist politician as his discourse is in line with the populist viewpoint of isolation and putting American citizens first. A study of Trump's rhetoric towards immigration issues based on his statements and tweets during his campaign shows that he rejects the notion of social inclusion; hence, his stance on promoting strict border control and reducing the issuing of green cards and HB-1 visa. The chapter also highlights how the state initiated a number of executive orders that seem to mirror Trump's rhetoric after he became the president. The study also brings out how the challenges that Trump faced in trying to pursue his rhetoric and the advantages and disadvantages of his discourse on the US politics. The main argument of this study is to show how Trump used immigration issues in order to strengthen his position during the elections and how he brings the issue as the main problem that is causing economic instabilities in the country. The concluding part will provide a summary of the findings and presents the concluding remarks on how Trump's rhetoric developed very strongly on the issue of immigration and how securitisation was a part of it.

CHAPTER I

SECURITISATION AS THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter focuses on the debate surrounding the concept of security as well as the issue of securitization in general. It gives a brief understanding on how security was viewed by traditional theories and how it is viewed in the post-Cold War era. By defining and explaining what security is, this thesis intends to prepare a foundation in understanding the concept of securitization because security issues provides the basic steps towards how securitization became a commonly used concept in international relations. The term security is vague and debatable among different schools of thought due to changes in the political world. It is a concept that has been at the core of International Relations studies since the aftermath of the First World War and it is highly political. Two schools of thought emerged in order to address the concept of security, the traditionalist and the post-Cold War theories. These two main schools of thought both discuss the issue of security but however they diverge in some areas due to the continuous changing world. Traditionalist view security in terms of protection of the state whilst the post-cold war scholars are of the view that the concept of security in the current world is highly linked to absence of threats be it political social or environmental. Although these two schools of thought have contradicting points of view, analysing them gives one a clear picture on the concept of security and how the issue of securitization evolved.

1.1 Traditional Security Approaches

The analytical concept of security, based on the traditionalist point of view, focuses solely on defence of the state against threat to its national sovereignty and territorial integrity from foreign enemies (Sulovic 2010). Traditionalist share the same views as the realist scholars, they relate the issue of security to state survival and military

action. According to them, the world is in anarchy; hence, security is all about state survival against threat and use of military weapons. Security is defined as the ability to withstand aggression from abroad (Lucian cited in Buzan 1991: 17). They are of the view that external circumstances determine the idea of security within a state and it is within the state's ability to protect itself against external forces. One can therefore note that traditionalist clearly define security as absence of military threat.

1.1.1 Realism and Neorealism

Realism has been described as the oldest theory in international politics, as well as the dominant among all the theories. They are of the view that there is need for states to provide security for themselves because the world is an anarchy. These view states insecurity as the core concept in IR and they are of the view that universal moral principles do not guide or protect a nation from its enemies since the world is anarchic. Security is an important factor in the realist theory because according to their point of view there are many factors that need security to play a hand in, for instance man's innate desire for power, conflict of interest arise among states possessing different resource endowments, economic systems and political orders as well as the ordering principle of international anarchy. Security is therefore the core of the realist tradition.

The issue of security became the core of IR studies with the Cold War period which was labelled the Golden Age. The Golden Age according to (Stephen, Rosie and Christian 2017) is also regarded as the period when the realist point of view mattered most in the security studies. During this period, states were considered as the only international actors and security was concerned with the study of threat and the use of military power. Realists view security not as a concept in itself, a condition, status, nor an attribute but rather a study of how to protect state interest and its borders against the world; it managed to find itself situated between power and peace during this Golden Age. During this period, the target was military establishment, equilibrium of nuclear weapons and the difficulties between the Soviet Union and the US. This therefore shows that security during the Golden Age was a concept used to justify the use of military force against other nations all in the name of protecting the state from the anarchic world and threats from other nations. It is in this light that during this period security issues were crafted around military issue because war and use of

military force was norm during this period. In relation with this information neo-realist also imply that security can be classified as a notion championship (Baldwin 1997), these scholars are of the view that security is a contested concept it is just like an applausive concept in their point of view.

In addition, neo-realist emphasises more on security than any other theory in international politics. This theory is of the view that security is the primary motivation of states. According to their point of view security is ultimately a matter of judgment (Baldwin 1997). It considers the issue and amount of protection, security as well as costs to be faced. Security is therefore a zero-sum game according to the realists, it is a competition between and among states; hence, there is always the issue of security dilemma due to insecurities of states. Realists view the concept of security as a geopolitical issue hence the need for zero-sum situation when it comes to the issue of security.

According to the neo-realist scholars since the world is an anarchy state is the key actor in security. They state that states will always pursue offensive military capability in order to expand or defend themselves against threat (Mearsheimer 2002). Power is the crucial point to security in the neo-realist point of view, because power and security are the signs of a strong military country and this would scare their enemies. Thus, security, self-preservation and survival can only be achieved with a strong military (Rudolph 2003: 5). Realist use the Hobbesian attitude towards the issue of security and they believe in arm racing and zero-sum politics (Rudolph 2003:5).

In relation with the above, realism views the world politics as unstable thereby enhancing the idea that security is essential. Security is defined as a factor that is directly linked to protecting the state and its people, with the use of threat and military force. Kissinger (1976) is in line with this view as he stated that "...our national interests is the core security concern". This gives one the perception that security studies according to the realist are strongly linked to the state, as they define state as the guarantor of security, the determinant of state behaviour and its interests. According to the realists, it is within the states' priority to pursue their interests in order to serve the community (Frankel 1996: 15); thus, security is viewed as a concept of protecting nation state against threat.

Realists pointed out to factors that can intensify the basic security problem such as polarity, shifts in overall balance of power, the offense-defence balance and domestic politics. They define security in terms of state and border safety, they are more particular about how to protect the state and its borders against other states. Realists are more centred on power politics which is only limited to the behaviour of the state internationally (outside its territory) but does not address other issues which require state attention; for instance, environmental issues, economic and social welfare of the nation. According to their perspective, power and security is the most essential pre-eminent need of the state.

In the current world, however, it is of importance to note that the realist approach to international politics on a level of practice is unbalanced as it tends to favour the political side at the expense of other state affairs like social and environmental degradation. It is in this light that in spite of all efforts the realists put forward to protect the state against other countries, it fails to balance the international and the internal affairs of the country since it only focuses on the issues of the state and the aim to pursue its goal on providing state survival. From the above information one can note that realist define security in relation to state protection and military power. These views towards security issues are however criticised by the liberal point of view stating that this theory focused only on the state and military activities ignoring other concepts that matters on issues of security and international relations such as individuals. Hence, the need for one to look at the liberalism concept of security.

1.1.2 Liberalism

Liberalism became an important approach in security studies after the Great War. Liberals are more optimistic about the world; they believe in a world without violence and conflict as well as relations among and between states, because they believe that state are not unitary or rational actors in the world. They believe in the law of nature which dictate harmony and cooperation between and among individuals. Peace, according to their view point, can only be achieved through the system of collective security; hence, they usher the notion of a worldwide pluralistic security community. The liberal theory takes individuals as its unit of analysis. State, according to the liberal approach, is sustained and established by individuals; hence, security of these individuals matters most in international politics. Unlike the realists,

liberals do not believe in an anarchic world; they view liberal democracies as a better option in the international system. According to (Stephen, Rosie and Christian 2017) democratic peace theory is the strongest contribution liberals make in international relations studies. They are of the view that democratic nations are legit and cooperating and they are characterised by internal restraints on power. They believe in networking and constructing relations across the world with other countries so as to build international institutions to save and protect the people.

Liberals are of the view that nation state is the core concept in international politics. They emphasise on the idea of creating institutions in order to monitor and secure individuals within a state. They are of the view that institutions such as international organisations as well as other non-governmental organisations prioritise individual needs and security first and this encourage democracy within a country. Liberalism encourage cooperation at both domestic and international levels and they encourage and usher up democracy and the idea of free trade so as to create relations with other countries and suppress conflicts. This, therefore, increase cooperation and provide better relations (McDonald 2004: 549), thereby creating worldwide pluralistic security community.

According to Buzan (1996), realists tend to gloss over the concept of security and power and this tend to make it difficult for one to clearly understand the concept of security. However, according to the liberal perspective, there is need to separate the concept of security and power so as to clearly define and evaluate the core concept of security. They are of the view that the issue of security is ranked differently from country to country; hence, security is not an appraise concept in which states are supposed to compete against each other but rather a country-based system in which countries use to protect their individuals. Baldwin (1997) supports this view suggesting that security promotes and maintains other values in a country; therefore, not only military security is essential in a country, other issues are also of greater value such as economic welfare, economic stability and environmental issues as well as individual freedom. Rudolph (2003) introduced the concept of "societal security" in order to clearly capture the social internal dimension of security so as to understand the concept of security. Societal security is often presented in solely ethno cultural terms and measured by public reactions to demographic changes that significantly alter a polity as an ethnic community (Rudolph 2003).

There are two concepts of security according to the liberal perspective, international collective security and state security. International collective security is whereby different states come together and form organizations that regulate states behaviour and create security measure which all states have to follow in order to protect and sustain security to their national people. For instance, the creation of the League of Nations and NATO led to peaceful relations and ensured security to states and their nationals. This concept of international security ensures the participation of all member countries in order to create security. The liberal understanding of the concept of security is therefore an optimistic pattern which relies on the creation of international organisations in order to maintain peace and create security among countries and individuals. The second security concept that liberalism puts emphasis on is the issue of societal security. Societal security, according to the liberals, is an essential concept because it gives protection to the society members and their identity. They are of the view that rather than protecting the state at the expense of the individuals there is need to look at the concept of security within the societal level in order to protect individuals from ethnic and cultural conflicts. These effects can therefore affect the functioning of the state; hence, it is essential to also look at the issue of security from this angle. More so, there are four primary sources which operationalise threat perception in an area of societal security. These sources are Public opinion polls, public and policy maker discourse analysis, symbolic voting practices and deconstruction of the policies (Rudolph 2003).

However, although the liberals have multiple approaches towards the issue of security, its contributions have been criticised due to the collapse of the League of Nations. More so, in as much as states might agree on creating collective security they tend to stay confined by their self-interest; for instance, Hitler's occupation of the Rhineland in March 1936 and also the US invasion of Iraq in 2003. This, therefore, makes one to conclude that no international institution can act as a stabilizing block for states to pursue their interests because the agreements made within these institutions are based on consent. Hence, basing the concept of security on institutions cannot hold much water on what the concept of security is in international politics.

1.1.3 Neo-Marxism

Marxism is a theory that analyses the social structure and the concept of social classes as well as the nature of the capitalist system. It states that capitalism does not sustain the world but rather it is the main reason for wars. This theory is of the view that cooperative ownership is necessary in order to create a balanced community rather than one person to gain in place of the whole community. The theory suggests the need to create classless societies whereby everyone is equal in order to ensure rebels are suppressed and peace and security remains the order of the day. Marxist theory inspired many revolutions during the Cold War period like China due to its notion of classless societies.

In relation with the above it is of importance to note that all the Marxist theories accept the concept of social inequality, a state in which a group or individuals do not have the same equal status in a society and discrimination in the name of class, ethnicity, gender and race. Marxist theory occupies the foremost place in social-classical theories. Marx did not believe in states as primitive units but rather he granted privilege to economic classes, stretching across the states. This theory states that the struggle between classes is what drives politics, hence there is need to style class consciousness of the proletariat by perpetuating the views that classes in societies do not exist because everyone is essentially the same. The Marxist approaches argue that security is achieved through socialism or the rule of the working class and the well-being of the proletariat depends upon its ownership of the means of production.

Marxists are of the view that IR is more of survival, reproduction and labour rather than state politics and security. The approach challenged the realist concept of anarchy stating that there is more to state interest than the notion of anarchy. They are of the view that realists create mirage to view state as a unitary actor whilst glossing over the idea of capitalism within the society. The notation of Marx that capitalism and capitalist markets distribute wealth and income unequally shows a constant source of conflict. Unlike the realists who view state as the principal actor of international relations and liberals who identify individuals as the principal actor and creation of international institutions as a security measure to protect individuals and the state, Marxists view the issue of capitalism as the source of conflict and class

differences as the main actor in international relations. They are of the view that the issue of capitalism and class differences rule out the idea of peace and democracy within a society and it is this class system that divides the state and creates power structure which leads to the suppression of the less privileged.

In relation with the above, one may say that Marxist theory qualifies as a theory of international security in international politics because it denounces the idea of capitalism and class differences which creates instability and tension between people, resulting in conflict, rebellion and ethnic wars. Therefore, the only way security can be achieved is to eliminate the class differences so as to achieve a classless and peaceful society.

1.2 Post-Cold War Approaches

In contrast with the traditional approaches, the wideners are of the view that the concept of security should be looked from all angles not only concentrating on nation-state. They are of the view that, the key concept that the traditionalist concentrate more on is protecting the state territory, with the use of military aggression and this does not answer the concept of security in detail. Many questions are left unanswered by the traditionalist approaches; for instance, who is being protected by security and does the issue of security only link with war and the role of the states in international relations. However, the post-Cold War scholars are of the view that due to constantly changing world the concept of security has also evolved from exclusively threats from states and military enforcement onto other fields that also concern the state like environmental, social and economic fields. Therefore, changes can be viewed by analysing the concept of security from the critical perspective, constructivist and the postmodern approaches to security.

1.2.1 Critical Theory

Critical theory challenges state role as the unitary and rational actor because the world is constantly changing; hence, many things are to be considered when looking at the issue of security. The critical perspective does not view the state as an idealised form of community. Critical theory's notion is to provide critical historical explanation of global inequality in order to highlight the removal of socially created constraints on human freedom; thus, it questions the prevailing institutions, social

and power relations in order to evaluate them. This theory defines state power as a constraint upon human autonomy in the contemporary world. Critical theory challenges the hegemonic security discourse of the state power and prevailing practices of global insecurity with questions like what is security, who is being secured and for what reasons and also whose security should be of concern.

Critical theory is of the view that security is socially constructed; hence, it should be analysed starting from social structures and social welfare and due to the fact that the state tends to ignore the social structure of the community it therefore makes the state insecure due to ethnic, social conflicts and rebellions. This approach changed the views of the post-Cold War schools of thought by pointing out both the positive and negative nature of that traditionalist views on security. This critical theory is of the view that historical events such as the Cold War and the 9/11 terrorist aggression in relation to security need to be re-evaluated. Buzan is in line with this view as he suggested that change is feasible, and everything is socially established. This approach therefore does not concentrate more on military power but rather the constantly changing nature of the people's social structure. According to their point of view, states are not the core actors for security; however, they tend to agree with the realist ideologies since they believe in the emancipation of security and this belief tend to make the state do as it deem necessary regardless of the national interest.

This theory challenges the mainstream theories of international relations by focusing more on states and ignoring the idea of freeing people from the modern state and economic system; a concept known as emancipation. This originated from scholars like Immanuel Kant and Marx who pointed out some ideas on how to transform and change the old ideas, thereby broadening and giving a clear picture on global change and ushering up for flexibility to change as the world change. It disputes the idea of putting the state first and gives a deaf ear to other queries of the people within the country. It proposes the re-ordering of the perspective of putting the state on the full front on every situation. Critical theory therefore critics repressive states for ignoring their practices to meet the universal principle of justice, and it ushers up transformative dimensions aimed at transforming national societies. It aims at transformation of state relations and nation societies rooting its argument from the failures of traditional theories as evidenced by history. One can therefore note that transformation on the society and global order is the main critic of the critical theory.

Critical theory, according to Cox (1981), stresses on viewing international politics as a unitary group that was constructed from the economic, ideological and social spheres that are within regions and cities in a state. They are of the view that these spheres are the ones that can quickly notice change within contemporary politics. Therefore, decisions made by the state quickly makes effects to the people rather than the state itself; hence, critical theory argues against the realist perspective of focusing only on state protection and military activities. The concept of power and state security, according to realists, is understood in the context of self-interest; hence, critical theory challenges the idea of realist that truth is absolute in international politics.

In relation with the above, critical theory unrivalled all the disadvantages and failures of the traditional schools of thought as the first step to critic and gives its opinions and contributions within the global system (Hutchings 2001). Its aim is to restore cosmopolitanism drawing from non-instrumental actions and ideal speech assumptions developed by Habermas. It is in this light that critical theory is based on open dialogue and con-coercive communication, it uses speech as its tool for political transformation thereby being able to reconstruct politics from regional to global level. This helps all affected civilians to voice their concern since it provides an open platform to discuss and put forward quires in global governance. Therefore, emancipation is the core concept of critical theory as it provides political reconstruction through dialogue and open discussions from any level of global society.

Critical theory is therefore regarded as a historical-sociological analysis. It invites rethinking of the structures of the modern world politics. It combats the traditional approaches on their failure to look at all angles in international politics and its immediate security needs which make communities to bound themselves due to the consequences encountered by these actions. Hence, it proposes the philosophical inquiry of conditions which emancipation in world politics is possible. Critical theory therefore aims at denouncing the ideology of particularism and exclusion of other nationalities.

1.2.2 Constructivist Approach

This theory emerged in the 90s after the cold war. In Karacasulu and Uzgoren's (2007: 29) point of view, constructivist approach is an idea that emerged due to changes at the international level to show that international relations are socially constructed. Unlike traditional theories which are focused on states and politics, constructivists however diverge from this point of view and focus on the social aspect of international politics. Traditional schools of thought such as realist, liberal and Marxist approaches concentrate more on class differences and the distribution of wealth reshaping the realist point of view of focusing only on state and military force; liberals on the other hand put emphasis more on creating relations and forming institutions and other non-governmental actors in the world.

These theories therefore highlight their perspective on the issue of security for instance realist's link security with the state protection, liberals with the idea of creating other actors so as to come up with common interest and create peace and the Marxists view security as the condition used by capitalists to protect their survival (Adler 1997). However, the constructivists attempt to reconstruct these views of the traditionalist and point out that security can only be better understood through events and different opinions of the nation people or citizens (Kubalkova and Onuf 1998). This theory is of the view that security should be understood and linked more with the citizens and their actions because these are the ones that re-describe the world by looking at different angles so as to clearly understand the issue of security and social relations.

Security, from this perspective, is defined in terms of absence of threat and upholding people's values first (Wolfers 1952: 485, McDonald 2008:65). They argue against realist view of linking security to state only and point out that there is need to codify and drive the meaning of security from norms and values of people's knowledge. The meaning of security therefore has timeless and unconditional meaning since it differs in different situations. It is of importance to note that countries define security in terms of new situation while people and their point of view are prioritised first.

Constructivism is of the view that security gets its meaning when one clearly understands and examines the social and environmental structure in which people reside. They pointed out that security can also be viewed in terms of three cultures of

anarchy namely Lockean, Hobbesian and Kantian (Wendt 1992). These three cultures help in security studies because they bring out three unique and different types of cultures which helps one to clearly understand the concept of security better. It is in this light that one can note that the aspect of security has changed from the traditionalist point of view due to change in the world practises and its inter-subjective meaning of the present condition of the state. Therefore, due to the fact that constructivist view security in terms of shared knowledge and identity, it is considered an instrumental tool which helps to inform the state on how to act and behave by providing knowledge on identity starting from the roots where people reside and provide information on their daily life and this helps to create ideational structures and state identity as well as giving the state a clear picture on which goals to pursue so as to help benefit the people and the state (Agius 2013; 88-89, McDonald 2008: 66). From the above information, one can therefore note that although different meanings have been attributed to the term security; there has been consensus on the concept of security based on the definition of Wolfers (1957) which states that security is a social construction which is based on both main assumptions of traditional theories and in result is changeable hence constructivism view on the aspect on security reflect the idea of social construction.

1.2.3 Postmodernism

Postmodernism believes that International Relations remain a battlefield of contending representations which some attain hegemony over others. It aims at providing information on how some theories in IR provides political effects in the world. They believe that there is a casual relationship between the production of knowledge and power, however it is of importance to note that the aspect of knowledge should be separated from the influence of power. They are of the view that in the current world, modern nation-state is the most desirable form of political organisation rather than the state.

This approach argues for a new way to use to interpret the current global system of security vocabulary to describe a new system of global politics (Cooper 2000: 8). It pointed out that state interest should be linked or understood as part of political system not as part of security. In contrast with the traditionalist approach, post-modernists argue that security do not protect states interest but however should be

viewed as a system of cooperation. This approach highlights the importance of power, interconnectedness, and state relations among the different discourses since it is “power which mobilize rules, codes and procedures to assert a particular understanding through the construction of knowledge” (Dulby 1992: 46). The approach of this theory to discourse analysis is regarded as an essential tool for conflict analysis and management as well as examining how social groups interact where there is a diversity of ethnic identities; for instance, Africa. This, therefore, helps in legitimization of war as an alternative to resolve conflicts by certain groups. More so, it is of importance to note that in as much as post modernism is regraded an essential assert in discourse analysis it is open for other institutions’ contributions in order to stress its impact.

In relation with the above, post modernism is an analytical tool that helps to clearly understand the discourse of conflict management and resolutions within a specified country. It helps to unravel the essence of conflict management and security issues in a clearer way. According to Campbell (1998: 215), post-modernists critically analyse the limits of knowledge and its impacts in order to broaden their perspectives and clearly understand it. It focuses on culture discourses, values, and identities just like the constructivist theory. Constructivist theory focuses mainly on states since they follow constructivist norms in order to interpret international activities. However, the postmodernist on the other hand have a different ideology from the constructivist approach as it brings forth narratives on the creation of states and identities. Postmodernist approach is therefore of the view that the developing world is the fundamental attribute for conflict resolution among different groups insecurity dilemma.

As highlighted above the definition of security is a problematic issue in IR, but however the current study will define security in terms of the post-Cold War approaches because in the current world social state instability and security threats and fear are the main reasons for the creation of organizations that help calm and protect the world relations and these organizations works as a unitary group of different countries and cultures to protect and check the activities of one another. It is in this light that when one is looking at the concept of security there is need to look at the actor of the security proposal, the purpose of taking the issue as a security matter and how the security issue is tackled and acted upon (Williams 2008: 1-9). However,

in a bid to understand and answer all the questions, the concept of securitization therefore comes into the picture. This concept is part of a process-oriented theory whereby actors transform subjects into security, and it helps clarify the concept of security better.

1.3 Securitization Theory

Securitization theory has origins in the Copenhagen School (CS). The leading theorists are L. Austin (1962), Ole Weaver, Barry Buzan, and de Wille. It is a convergence of realism and constructivism since it combines 'survival plus' and 'security as a social construction'. Securitization is when "an issue posed as presenting an existential threat to a designated referent object, justifies the use of extra ordinary measures to handle them" (Buzan, Weaver and de Wilde 1998: 21). The verbalization of security produces a frightening state of affairs where issues are removed from democratic process. Therefore, it is logical to argue that securitization is a process which is 'context dependent, audience centred and politics laden' (Balzacq 2005: 171). Securitization theory is also regarded as a speech act indicating that by just pointing out or claiming something as a security issue response is quickly noticed and action towards the issue is done. It is a process-oriented theory that aims to understand questions posed in security studies like who securitize, in what circumstances and to what end. Classical approaches on security studies link the issue of security to military power disposition and threat whilst securitization unravels how an actor can claim something to be a security issue through a speech act allowing extra ordinary measures to be put into account. Austin cited in Buzan et al (1998: 34) explains the speech act in three ways which are referent, object, and functional action. These help in the construction of securitization because it clearly highlights the actor, the issue at hand and the action to be taken into account.

Securitization, therefore, aims at explaining the ways in which an issue is regarded a security problem by first identifying the problem through a speech act, bringing the issue to the audience and allowing the audience to give in their opinions and then labelling the issue to be securitized and create policies. Securitisation theory is unique in its approach to the issue of security, it clearly examines the capacity of the speech act by articulating the approach of the speech and its influence in the political arena and how this leads to the creation of different pollicises and securitization of

issues. Hence, this theory according to the post-Cold War schools of thought is a socially constructed and intersubjective issue because it takes note and makes sure action is done to protect the referent object faced by threat regardless of its field of study. It is a rule governed practice hence it shows that national security policy is carefully designated by politicians and decision makers.

Securitization theory involves four components which are the securitising agent who makes the securitising statement, the identified threat, the referent object that needs protection from the threat and the targeted references that needs to be persuaded to view the issue as a security problem. For securitization act to be successful, there is need to pose the issue to the audience because they also matter in the decision making. However, it is the entity that makes the security statement that has the overall power to move the issue to another level beyond politics. It is of importance to note that every individual has the ability to stand as a speech actor and propose their issues as an existential threat but however more credit to effectively securitise an issue is given to the post in which the speech actor holds in state politics and also whether the issue is justified to be securitised.

In relation with the above, it is of importance for one to note that issues become security problems through speech act. Speech act is an articulation of language used by specific actors towards a particular threatening issue that need immediate attention and securitising actions (McDonald 2008). Post-Cold War schools of thought are of the view that securitization is a language theory because it has its impact through certain forms of language written or spoken directed to the issue of security (McDonald 2008). Securitisation can therefore be labelled as a weapon used to denounce any threat posed to the security of the state and it holds much weight in a state politics because when an issue is pointed out as a security problem, emergency measures are taken, and even daily politics is suspended in order to solve the issue. Speech act is therefore language centred because it is through language that an issue is considered to be securitized.

However, some scholars dispute the idea of relying on language as the only form of securitization move. They are of the view that variety of things are taken into account in order to securitize an issue; for instance, one can look at images as potential forms of securitization. According to them, images can clearly communicate the need for

security by just viewing them; for instance, the September 11 clearly shows the need for security. They are of the view that language can be limited in trying to clearly communicate the real meaning of security and putting it into action unlike other means like images, which clearly highlight and communicate the essence of security in full detail showing what recalling is taking place on the ground (McDonald 2008). However, according to the Copenhagen school this view is disputed. They are of the view that including these forms of communication as securitization act cannot hold much water as these forms lack clarity and explanation on what will be really taking place hence cannot communicate what security and threat really means. More so, adding images to securitization theory cannot hold water considering that there is need for agency, intentionality, and contestation over meaning (McDonald 2008). Copenhagen school clearly states that securitization move is a highly intentional, strategic action. Waever (1993) is in line with this view stating that the logic around security issue is within the strategic actors imbued with intentionality. More so, if one clearly analyses the issue of using images one can note that images are vague and difficult to interpret making it impossible to clearly come up with a definite intended meaning. Hence, the argument of using images as part of securitization does not hold water for it is poor in communicating emergency measures to a given situation.

In relation with the above, it is therefore of importance to note that when an issue is regarded as securitized it is then possible to seek political contribution and authority to solve the problem. According to Buzan et. al. (1998), this would mean that the state can be able to declare a state of emergency, mobilizing the military or attacking the threatening state. However, it is of importance to note that the securitisation of some issues is not solely linked to the original issue that is being securitised but rather to other issues closely linked to the source of the problem; for instance, the issue of securitisation of migrants in the US and Europe is closely linked to the issue of terrorist attacks which happen to be part of the immigrants. Therefore, security issue need to be understood as a diverse phenomenon that is constantly changing and linked to many categories in IR. Hence, it is important to critically analyse the concept linking it with what will be happening in the present time to be able to provide a useful analytical framework for political rhetoric and policies surrounding the problem at hand.

More so, linking the issue of securitisation and economy one can note that it is highly categorised in different camps like mercantilism and neomercantilism. These claim that the state has the responsibility to provide a safe environment for economic process. Therefore, economic securitisation is shaped by the characteristics of political economy. It is in this light that economic securitisation is a highly debatable issue as the capitalist system is building up upon a certain economic insecurity and even benefiting from the latter. Economy provides economic security and it creates its own rules to ensure its stability. Economic securitisation also links with the social aspect of a nation as it is the one that acknowledges the importance of economy as the basis of social fabric and position the state as the provider of equality and social justice in the economic system. It is of importance for one to note that economic securitisation is very diverse; hence, it impacts all sectors, be it individuals or state.

In relation with the above, the world economy is increasingly liberal, and economic nationalist behaviour still highlight the discourse about whether securitisation should be tolerated as a political tool to prioritize an issue in the economic sector. Economic securitisation is triggered by the liberal ideas such as free trade and relatively few restrains in the flow of goods, people, and money. The ongoing existence of traditionalist economic policies and protectionist behaviour, clashes with the globalisation development and the fast and increasingly unrestricted flow of capital and goods. Buzan (1995) describes one aspect of economic security as “the ability of states to maintain independence capability for military production in a global market, it is the relationship of the economy to the capability for state military mobilisation”. It is of importance to note that a strong link between economic power and military strength in the global system cannot be denied. But however, one can note that the securitisation of national economy is not solving the problem but only prioritizing it on the political agenda while at the same time automatically relativizing a securitisation in the military sector in the case of an existential threat.

1.4 Economic Securitization and Immigration

Due to globalisation and increased relations between and among nations, the percentage of people migrating from one state to another has also increased and this has caused some nations to politicise immigration and enforce security actions due to the activities that are being encountered because of immigration. The issue of

securitization has long been there since 1980s, however due to the September 11 attacks and refugee crisis securitization of immigrants became the centre of interest and this resulted in the change of policies and strict security measures in western countries. Many topics such as terrorism and immigration have become institutionalized as a security problem hence it is the quest of the following to clearly elaborate on economic securitization theory in relation to immigration.

The term migration is the movement of people or animals from one place to another in search of better living conditions or the movement of people from one country or city to another. It is a phenomenon that has been imbedded in the history of human society due to increase in globalisation. Immigration has increased in the current world because of many reasons like political (asylum seekers), professional development, economic (usually temporal movement by inhabitant of poor countries to seek better living conditions in richer countries) and also for personal security. This increase in mobility has therefore made migration to be increasingly in discussion of politics and security due to problems that are being encountered as a result of immigration.

The movement of people from one country to another is a practice that was done even back in history and at some point, was considered a threat to other states but however more often as an opportunity. Immigration date back to the period of colonialism. Some scholars would like to argue that immigration dates back to the colonisation period when the Europeans migrated to other parts of the world as missionaries and as traders. This type of immigration was viewed as opportunity but however due to more migration from third world to western countries in the current world, immigration is now labelled as threat to state security (Wohlfeld 2014). It is of importance to note that immigration flows towards the western countries has increases rampantly in the 21st Century due to economic and social instabilities. However, this view correspond to the immigration flow from third world countries in the 19th century when most third world countries regained their independence.

In the current world immigration is as a result of economic and political crises that force people to leave their countries mostly involuntarily. It is a subject that involves a complex flow of people and goods from one place to another. Due to the liberal view of creating a global village and interconnectedness of countries given treaties and

alliances, the flow of people from one country to another has also increased. However, because many problems are being encountered due to migration like economic and environmental problem this caused states to start monitoring the flow of people in their countries. Under the international law, states are entitled to monitor and control the movement of people on their borders so as to protect their nations. It is in this light that states use border controls as their weapon to exercise their sovereign power over their territories (Wohlfeld 2014). States have the power to regulate policies on citizenships and work permits through immigration management and border control policies

More so, when one is looking at the issue of securitization and immigration one can note that societal security is premised on the notion that traditional definitions of security focused solely on the defence of the state against threats to its national sovereignty and territorial integrity from foreign enemies. However, the post-Cold War schools of thought view security as not inherently or necessarily a state centred concept but rather as survival from any threat posed directly to the state of the nation at large or the individual (Swarts and Karakatsanis 2012). Societies promote cultural elements because that is what makes them unique from others. Societal security is strongly linked to identity; social behaviour, beliefs and customs. The sense of belonging is largely created and reproduced by the society itself hence it shows how strongly the sense of national identity exists (Swarts and Karakatsanis 2012). Therefore, because of this reason the protection and perpetuation of cultural characteristics is an important concern of every nation.

In relation with the above, the relevance of societal security to issues of immigration can be highly noticed. This is because the migrants are usually the importers of distinct customs, behaviour value, language, and religion. The idea of immigrants diluting other nation's culture and customs in the current world is usually defined not as an abstract source of cultural diversity, vitality and change but as a threat to the integrity, cohesion and survival of the host society identity (Swarts and Karakatsanis 2012). Immigrants especially those that are illegal are the ones posed as the most dangerous and more inherently criminal than the native inhabitants. Immigration is therefore linked to an array of threats be it in political, social, economic, military, and cultural sectors. It is in this light that immigration is viewed as a worsening menace to national and economic security in the current world (Buzan 1998). Constructivists

bring a clear picture on the issue of societal security and break down how a threat can become a security problem to the society in different perspectives. This, therefore, goes hand in hand with the securitising process as its approach situates the construction of security in political discourse, whereby security is based on the speech act of the policy makers.

In addition, one should note that although globalisation is viewed as threatening to state sovereignty by erasing states capacity to control cross border migrations, the states still retain the power to regulate policies with an aim to achieve their interests by being strict in issuing citizenships and permits (Adamson, 2006: 170-176). More so, contextualising immigration as a security threat depends on the criteria used to identify immigration as a threat and whether immigration is really causing a threat to the nation state. 21st Century immigration issues have become more complex triggering a more detailed discussion in the security sector. Newman & Selm (2003: 8) note that “difference between types of immigrants like asylum seekers, economic migrants, and those displaced by war is theoretical”. Therefore, it is mixed immigration; hence, the process of securitization is that of image casting. The 1990 UN Convention on the Rights of Migrants (UNCRM) defines a migrant in Article 1(1a) as anyone “who is..., to be... or is engaged in” salaried action in a foreign land. A refugee as pointed out by the 1951 Geneva Convention is a person out of his country due to persecution and fear seeking protection and willing to avail for support from another country. Governments, therefore, classify immigration as a politicized situation for the security of the state, citizens, and legal residents, hence establishing a relation between political conflict and socio-economic problems.

Migration, whether voluntary or forced, is linked to the changing nature of international conflict within and between societies (Rwanda 1994, Kosovo 1998-1999, Congo 1990s to 2000s, Eritrea 1998-2000, Syria 2011-present, Yemen 2015-present). It is also explained in terms of socio-economic inequalities in the age of globalization and social transformation; hence, pursuit for better opportunities. However, in the securitization discourse displacement by conflict seems to be dominant (Newman & Selm 2003: 3-4). Immigration has been an issue since WW1 and WW2. During the Cold War period, it continued within the casing of the Berlin wall where migrants from the East to the West were perceived as exercising the right of movement to free themselves from the communist dogma. In the post-Cold War

system, states began to manage immigration rather than just to control unwanted flows. The tight controls were given impetus by the 9/11 attacks on the twin towers in the US. This resulted in the transition of how security of immigrants is viewed, and security became a central topic in International Relations and political studies and also an increase of construction of barriers became highly noticed. In the more present scenario internationalized conflicts have produced a massive refugee surge.

Collective security equals identity; mainly “the ability of a society to persist in its essential character under changing conditions and possible or actual threats” (Waever 1993: 12). It brings out how citizens notice that their cultural norms and values are being diluted because immigrants dissent from theirs. Ethno-cultural bonds are therefore socially constructed; thereby labelling the immigrants as “them” and excluding them from society. Securitisation, therefore, tries to protect the norms and values of the receiving country from being diluted. However, this aspect of securitisation of migrants is sometimes a threatening situation to the citizens because it often raises the aspect of racism and xenophobia leading to social disintegration. For instance, Belgium requires immigrants to sign up to European values to be given asylum and as a way for integration (The Guardian 2016).

A stricter policy formation and approach on immigration dates back to the 1980s. In Europe, “the Schengen Agreement and Convention of Dublin connected immigration to terrorism, international crime, and border control” (Huysmans 2006: 756). The PATRIOT Act was signed after the September 11 terrorist attacks aiming to deport all immigrants that were suspected of terrorism as well as tightening the borders. Securitization with regards to immigrants has been regarded as a retrogressive and illiberal move (IOM 2003: 4) although states protect their domestic integrity. Newman & Selm (2003: 10) note that policies have been operationalized in the form of visa regulations, carrier sanctions, claims to adjoining (contacting) terrorists, physical closure of borders. There is shift from protection of asylum seekers to protection from them (Violation of UNDHR, 1951 Convention); for example, US travel ban, Executive order on Mexican border, Brexit and the consequent policies. In Italy, there is Law Security Set 94/2009. There is increased border control due to problems encountered because of immigration, thus securitization with regards to immigrants is highly recognized in the western countries.

In relation with the above, one can notice that immigration features prominently in the contemporary struggle for state economy. It is in this light that immigrants, asylum seekers and refugees are seen as threat to state economy since they pose a threat in the job market which they are viewed as not the rightful people to possess those jobs. Economic securitisation, therefore, rises due to an increase in unemployment, struggle over distribution of housing, jobs, unemployment benefits, health care and social services which I argued to result from the issue of increase in immigration. An increase in competition in labour markets and distribution of social goods between state nationals and immigrants therefore resulted in economic chauvinism whereby immigrants are not viewed as simply rivals but rather illegitimate recipients of economic rights. Since economic provisions are believed to be the magnet pulling migrants into western countries, economic securitisation with regards to immigration is therefore justified as an instrument used to limit the number of immigrants.

Economic securitisation emerges under a radical or a more moderate form. Radically, economic securitisation portrays immigrants as profiteers who illegitimately gain benefits from the economic system of a community which they do not belong. They are of the view that immigrants are aliens who exploit the society that welcomed them with open arms. Immigrants are viewed as free-loaders who illegitimately take advantage of economic system hence resulting in them being labelled as people committing economic fraud rather than just a competitor (Faist 1994: 61). These problems, therefore, lead to the creation of economic securitisation whereby employment opportunities for immigrants is limited and the need to put the interest and needs of the nationals of a country is given first priority.

However, in relation with the above, one should note that glossing over all immigrants as threat to state economic security will not be giving justice to the matter considering that some immigrants are not terrorist and also immigration between developing countries as well as immigration among the western countries is not considered a threat to a state's economic security.

As highlighted above, coming up with one meaning to security is a problematic issue in IR and political studies, however the current study will define security in terms of the post-Cold War schools of thought because in the current world states' interconnectedness has increased due to globalisation and alliances and

international organisations are formed in a bid to maintain peace throughout the world. Therefore, it is of importance to note that when one is looking at the concept of security there is need to look at the actor, the audience response, the threat and the object being threatened, by so doing one will be able to clearly understand the concept of securitisation in general as well as in terms of economic securitisation. This theory is therefore a process-oriented theory whereby actors transform subjects into security, and it helps to clarify the concept of security

CHAPER II

TRUMP'S DISCOURSE ON IMMIGRATION

US is historically perceived as a country welcoming immigrants and considered home to a plethora of nationalities, cultures, religions, and practices. It has always been open to foreigners coming to work and live in its country and it had never viewed immigration as a threat to state and economic security. More so, its statue of liberty symbolises Americas open arms to immigrants. It is in this light that although security problems began to be more noticed after the September 11 attack, it has always existed as a problem to social security such as jobs and welfare but however to a lesser extent; this therefore shows that the relationship between immigration and security dates back in history. This is evidenced in the Truman Doctrine which was passed by the US president Harry Truman in 1947, this doctrine targeted immigrates and it brought out new immigration foreign policies which were to be exercised during that period.

According to Rosenblum (2002), during the Cold War period immigration policies were lenient and accommodating since people were still suffering from the wounds of war and refugees and asylum seekers were fleeing their countries in search of protection and better living conditions. During this period, immigration was not viewed as a threat to social life but rather as an opportunity, what was more of concern was political conflicts. Policies that were implemented during this period favoured immigrants than in the current world; for example, the 1948 Displaced Person Act, 1953 Refugee Relief Act and 1957 Refugee Escape Act. All these policies accommodated migrants who were seeking protection and better living conditions.

Therefore, due to these acts which were passed by the US, the country became recognised as the defender of liberty and freedom in the world.

More so, the Cold War managed to create a positive image towards viewing the issue of immigration, as reflected by the rapid reduction of US sentiment towards immigration. According to Zolberg (1995), the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 showed that US was a welcoming country since the act was mainly directed at the immigrants that were fleeing the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) that was a communist country. The US went on to implement the immigration Nationality Act (INA) of 1952 which went on to support immigrants to come to their country although it was later on amended in 1965. This act criticised racism in the admission system of immigrants as citizens or for work permits. However, due to the lenient policies the US made towards the issue of immigration, it later on faced problems of many immigrants flocking into the US especially from Mexico and Latin America, and this resulted in competition for jobs and cultural dilution. From the above information one can note that US before the September 11 was highly recognised as the most welcoming state and a defender of liberty and freedom in the entire world.

However, one can argue that US was not solely recognised as the most welcoming country of immigrants as evidenced by the immigration act of 1882 which excluded the admission of convicts and those viewed as mentally ill and the other one which banned Chinese immigrants from entering the US. These views can however be disputed taking into consideration that the act was reversed in 1943 when China and the US became allies again. It is of importance to note that the laws and policies of 1880s towards immigration were centered on elements like restriction based on personal characteristics and protection of American labour. More so, one should note that during the 1870s, 1907 and 1921 the immigration acts that were passed excluded illiterates and restricted admission due to economic depression.

In relation with the above, it is of importance to note that the attacks on September 11, 2001 acted as a catalyst for the transition of immigration policy in the US. These attacks resulted in the link between immigration and security and tight control on the borders. The concern on how to overcome the terrorist attacks eventually blurred the difference between immigration and terrorism in the US. Both immigration and terrorism, according to the US, fall in the same category and this has resulted in very

restrictive policy development towards immigration including the USA Patriot Act in October 2001 and the Enhanced Border Security and Visa Entry Reform Act (EBSVERA) in March 2002. According to Phillip (2017), within 6 weeks after the September 11 attacks the US officials arrested all undocumented immigrants they could get in the country and deported them using the Patriot Act of 2001. This, therefore, usher the view that the USA policies and actions towards immigrants were precipitated by the September 11 attacks.

More so, the USA, in a bid to protect its nationals, created the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) in January 2003. This department was made up of many agencies such as secret service on immigration and border patrol service to mention but a few. It also incorporated the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), and the USA Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services (USAS) which deals with the immigration court system. The September 11 attacks made the US to change its behaviour and actions towards the outside world; it led the US to tighten immigration laws in order to promote the anti-terrorism goals. Hence, one can conclude that due to this attack immigration policy as a sector lost its independent agenda.

1850 marks the first-year of data collection that was done on immigrants and the US natives in America and about 10% of the total population represented immigrants in America (Zong, Btalova and Hallock 2018). It is of importance to note that between 1860 and 1920s the immigrants' percentage increased within the total population from 13% to 15% mainly because of many people migrating from Europe. However, due to the consequences of World War I and the Great Depression there was a sharp decrease in migrants to US between 1921 and 1944. This resulted in the immigrant born children to decline as well up to 5% in the 1970s. However, the number of immigrants started to increase abruptly in the late 1970s due to the immigration act of 1965 which abolished national-region admission quotas. A large scale of immigrants mainly from Latin America and Asia was noticed due to this act.

Since the US has been regarded as the most welcoming country in the world, its immigration flow also increased abruptly for the past few years due to asylum seekers and refugees who flocked in the US from their countries in search of protection and better living conditions. The immigrants in the US comprise of around

14% of the US total population, thus according to Census Bureau data more than 43 million out of the total population of around 323 million are immigrants. More so, both immigrants and their US born children make up to 27% of the US population; hence, this shows that immigrants occupy a lot in the US. It is believed that about half of the total immigrants have lived in the US for more than 100 years and this has contributed to the fall of US economy. Many of the US immigrants came from Central America seeking asylum and some minors who come from third world countries like Africa seeking better living conditions. These immigrants have managed to get different legal rights in the US under the 2008 anti-human trafficking law passed by Obama and it is of importance to note that although the policies and laws target mainly the undocumented immigrants the number of people with overstayed passports outnumbers undocumented immigrants. According to the immigration studies the number of overstayed visa immigrants increased to about 600.000 since 2007.

America experienced a great economic crisis from 2007 to 2008 just like any other country in the world. This was considered to be the worst global financial crisis since the Great Depression in 1929. America's previous administrations had left a big economic mess from the 1970 up to the 2000 and this led to a steep jobless growth that resulted in a ratcheting effect on employment. Although policy makers were all heads in trying to change the economic crisis the situation resulted in market conditions deteriorating from crisis to recession and this continued to add more loss of jobs and unemployment. It is in this light that according to the Republican Party's point of view Obama managed to only make a short-term solution to the economic crisis that existed in the US. His move towards free trade and free global financial markets only helped a few people as compared to the majority in the country. More so, the bailout may have prevented a depression but did not prevent the recession that had grown deep into the roots for the majority of America, many people in the private sector lost their jobs.

In relation with the above, Obama's immigration stance in November 20, 2014 is also viewed as one of the major contributions to the lagging behind economy by Republicans in the current situation. Although it managed to increase resources for border security and direction to Department of Homeland Security, his executive action of creating a new Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program that

benefited many undocumented immigrants is viewed as one of the contributing factors to US economy's downfall. Obama pointed out that immigrants are a net plus for the US economy and society; hence, the need to protect undocumented immigrants with families in the US by making them legal immigrants so as to reduce the number of undocumented immigrants in the US. He pointed out that America will always be a country of immigrants resulting in his plan to protect undocumented immigrants who had lived in the US for more than five years and who had no criminal records. Obama made it clear that he was aware that immigration system was broken; hence, the need for change. He pointed out that mass amnesty would be unfair to the immigrants and mass deportation is practically impossible and contrary to American character of welcoming immigrants. He therefore took the stance to legalise undocumented immigrants and expand his DACA reform, making minor changes to it so that it accommodates more immigrants. His view concerning deportation of immigrants was that it is inhuman to rip off children from their parents considering that the children will be American citizens and the parents will be illegal immigrants. He therefore urged America to show compassion to illegal immigrants who had worked hard and contributed to the success of US economy.

However, these executive actions promised by Obama unveiled controversy within America from different angles including other politicians as well as industrial sector. His actions, according to the Republicans, benefited immigrants more than the American citizens. In their point of view this would unleash competition for jobs in the US and bring fear to some Americans who worry about their positions in the evolving global economy resulting in Economic failure. Many Republicans criticised Obama's stance on immigration by pointing out that Obama broke the law with amnesty, allowing immigrants to directly compete with American workers for jobs just at the point when American citizens are desperate for jobs. Republicans pointed out that although Obama stated that his action would bolster border security his action of deferred deportation will eventually lead to a spike in undocumented entry into the US. More so, industrial groups also reacted to Obama action as they pointed out that Obama's action will negatively impact Congress' ability to accomplish real and lasting reform.

It has been statistically recorded that 43.2 million immigrants lived in the US in 2015, making up to 13.4% of the population (Phillip 2017). This data, according to Philip

(2017), shows a fourfold increase of the population since 1960 when only 9.7 million immigrants lived in the US, accounting for only 5.4% of the total population of the US. It is of importance to note that approximately 2.7 million undocumented immigrants were legalized under the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act in 2015 by Obama (CNN Library 2013). One should note that in 2013 the Department of Homeland Security estimated that there were 11.4 million unauthorized immigrants living in the US and the countries of origin were Mexico with around 59%, El Salvador with 6%, Guatemala with 5%, Honduras with 3% and Philippines with 3%.

In relation with the above, more than 43.7 million immigrants reside in the US in 2016 accounting for 13.5% of the total US population of 323.1 million according to American Community Survey (ACS) data. From 2015-2016 the foreign born population increased by about 449,000 or 1%, which is rate slower than the 2.1% growth experienced between 2014 and 2015 (Zong, Btalova and Hallock 2018). According to the 2017 population survey, immigrants and their US-born children increased to approximately 86.4 million people which is 27% of the overall US population. This increase in immigrants in the US, therefore, triggered candidates such as Trump to use this data and stand in the presidential campaign debate in 2016 proposing measures to reduce immigrants from flocking into America. Trump's rise against the increase in immigrants flocking to the US label him a populist for he raised against the government immigration policies voicing rhetoric and new immigration plans.

Populism is a phenomenon that can emerge in all forms of democratic system. The most exposed to its influence are political systems which experience an institutional transition. Adolfo (2005: 38) states that populism emerge as a result of social factors. He is of the view that due to issues like unemployment, vulnerability, and precariousness, populism rise to defend identity and reject social inclusion. Populist parties are therefore against the idea of globalisation and post-modernisation because they are of the view that it is diluting culture and they feel it is reaping off their identity as a nation. The rise of populism is intensified due to integration of global markets, competitive pressure from third world countries with large pools of human labour, decrease in demand of semi-skilled workers and at the same time large immigration from the undeveloped countries; this is therefore ushering up fear and uncertainty among the US citizens as well as some Europeans. This situation is

therefore exploited by populist parties which long for security and predictability (Betz 2008).

It is of importance to note that immigration is one of the major issues that strengthened the rise of Trump in the US. Trump is of the view that immigration issues are the root cause of all the problems that are being encountered in the US. The growing cultural heterogeneity and religious pluralisation has ushered up the rise of Trump's rhetoric populist politics.

2.1 Trump's Rhetoric on Immigration During His Election Campaign

Immigration has been at the core of the US political debates for many years, as policymakers rated security and humanitarian concerns in a competing economy (Philip 2017). It is of importance to note that for these many years the Congress of the US has been unable to reach a concrete immigration reform. However, immigration became more popular during the presidential campaign of 2016 where Donald Trump played a prominent role. Immigration triggered intense reactions between and among people of different parties during the presidential campaign. Although immigration policy has differed during the Bush and Obama presidencies, Trump's period has managed to make a big significant shift in the immigration system. Donald Trump used the immigration issue to his advantage by making it the core concept of his speeches at rallies during his campaign. It is through these debates on immigration that made him swerve his way through to the presidential seat and enforce new immigration policies. Donald Trump laid out his proposals for immigration policy in an unusual detailed campaign speech in August 3, 2016 and it is through this speech that he gained publicity.

During the 2016 presidential campaign, Trump based his rhetoric on three principles towards immigration, which are total enforcement of immigration law, US interest first and building a wall across the southern border in order to tighten the border against illegal immigrants. Trump's rhetoric linked the issue of immigration to ISIS terrorists entering the country (Edelman 2016) when he tweeted on 17 November 2015: "Refugees from Syria are now pouring into our great country. Who knows who they are - some could be ISIS. Is our president insane?" He went on to launch his bid for the Republican presidential nomination by accusing unauthorised immigrants of committing crimes and bringing drugs in the country as evidenced by his tweet

“...likewise, billions of dollars gets brought into Mexico through the border. We get the killer, drugs & crime, they get money”. According to Trump’s view, all immigrants are the same, regardless of the distinctions such as refugees, asylum seekers, economic immigrants to mention but a few. Trump referred to immigrants as ‘flood’ when he said they are flowing in like water which shows that he glosses over the distinction between migrants and he views them as a singular coherent existential threat; hence, his argument to find measures as to stop the flow of migrants into the US.

One of the plans that Trump stated on his campaign was to put US interest first. According to him, it is the nations’ duty to serve and put its citizens first in decision making of the state (Homeland security 2017). This statement indicated that any immigration changes done in the country should serve the interest of its citizens first; for instance, it must improve security, jobs and wages of the citizens of its own country. Trump put this in his immigration plan because according to him the previous government seemed to have overshadowed the idea of putting its citizens first and focused more on creating a favourable environment for immigrants rather than its citizens as evidenced by his tweet June 19, 2018: “Democrats are the problem. They don’t care about crime and want illegal immigrants, no matter how bad they may be to pour into and infest our country like MS-13. They can’t win on their terrible policies...”; hence, the quest for Trump to put American workers’ needs first. Trump during his campaign stated that free trade and soft immigration policies dragged back the success of America and its economy. It is of importance to note that middle class is the back-bone of American economy and because it is being suppressed due to immigration; the country is therefore developing osteoporosis (Newsday 2017). An increase in immigrants create competition between and among the American people and the immigrants, it also makes salaries to remain low and also increase the rate of unemployment and poor people within the country. According to Trump’s plan, there is need for an increase in the wages paid to people and ensure that every citizen in the US be part of American Dream and help to upgrade communities falling behind so as to boost the economy.

More so, according to Trump’s plan on putting Americans first, it was stated that immigrants will be denied visa due to their cause of harm in the country. He is of the view that it is evident enough that immigration is being used as a way to attack US

citizens as evidenced by the September 11 attacks. He proposed to create jobs for American youth citizens by terminating the J-1 visa programme. His plan states that there is need to put American citizens first by giving them the first preference for jobs before hiring people from outside the country; hence, he proposed reducing issuing of green cards (Newsday 2017) He is of the view that this will increase the monthly wage of workers in the US and help decrease immigration levels. He proposed reducing the green cards given to immigrants, removing the Fourteenth Amendment Act which granted citizenship to everyone born on the US soil under the Reforming America Immigration (RAISE) order he proposed. However, this act of removing the 14th amendment resulted in Trump facing a lot of criticism especially from those born in US and the DREAMERS.

In relation with the above Trump also proposed to terminate the H-1B visa which was implemented during Obama's presidency. The H-1B visa according to the Obama administration seeks to permit residence status on immigrant workers in the US. It also allows work permits to partners of the H-1B visa holders to migrate and work in the US as well. These permits that are issued to spouses of the holders of the H-1B visa were labelled the H-4 visa and it managed to allow more than 100.000 partners of the holders of H-1B visa to migrate into America especially Indians (NBC news 2017). However, Trump proposed to regulate changes on the H-1B and H-4 visa issue. He introduced Enhancing Public Safety in the interior of the US (EPS) and state that such action (H-1B) should be reversed and put America's interest first (Philip 2017). He suggested that there is need for new policies to promote US interest first and remove the ones that suppress US citizens.

Trump also proposed to put total enforcement of immigration law in the US. He was of the view that as long as America lives according to the constitution it will remain a great nation (New York Times 2017). He states that there is need to increase border patriots' officers and there is need to return all criminals that Obama Administration released from their custody with criminal conviction since 2013. His plan stated that all criminals should return to their home country, and any country that denies their people should be expelled from receiving the US visa. He also banned the catch and release style that was practiced when an undocumented migrant was caught, he is of the view that they should be deported back to their countries without delay.

In relation with the above, Trump's third immigration plan focused mainly on building a wall that would stop migration from Mexico to the US. Just like any other realist, Trump is of the view that borders define the country; hence, there is need for clearly identified borders so as to be recognised as a true nation as well as to protect the nation. He is of the view that due to lack of strict and visible borders Mexico took advantage of that and exported its criminals into the US (The balance 2017). He is of the view that many Mexicans only migrate to the US only to commit crimes and this is supported by 3 million arrests of these immigrants due to violent beating, murder and rapes (Philip 2017) Trump, therefore, proposed that since the government of Mexico is responsible for their people they should pay for the wall that is to be built between Mexico and US in order to stop illegal immigration from Mexico. With this proposal, Trump was of the view that if the Mexicans pay for the border the money will be equivalent to the money US citizens paid for the tax whilst Mexicans were not, and also it will cover the expenses the Mexicans has poses on the US citizens; for example, when dealing with illegal immigrants in their communities. Within this immigration plan Trump stated that there will be increase of fees on visa application and border crossing cards for all the Mexicans until they pay for the construction of the border wall (Philip 2017). More so, Trump proposed to ban all Muslims from getting into America. According to the Fox News Rudy Giuliani was tasked by Trump to construct a Muslim ban strategy in a legal way. This was the first step of Trump towards securitisation of immigrants and he even proposed to state which countries he would ban.

As highlighted above the disqualification of immigrants in relation to economic securitisation is stressed upon through the use of metaphors such as an 'invasion' or 'flood' of asylum seekers or immigrants. These metaphors portray immigrants, refugees, and asylum seekers as serious threat to the economic survival of the state. In a political spectacle, these metaphors help to dramatize the socio-economic problem by framing it in a security discourse due to experiences of economic and social uncertainty which are translated into fear of immigrants and asylum seekers. The securitisation of immigrants in the context of the future of US economy is also embedded in a struggle for political legitimacy in the current world. It is not only a strategy in the socio-economic fight for the protection of economic rights for nationals of the US, but it also plays in the political struggles in which immigrants are

constructed as scapegoats to remedy declining political legitimacy. Thus, the issue of economic securitisation in the current world facilitate a connection between the socio-economic questioning of migration as a financial and economic burden political identity of US economy and its government.

2.2 State Implementation in Relation to Trump's Rhetoric

State implementation in relation to Trump's rhetoric can clearly be noticed and described with the table below. From this table, it can be highlighted that the executive orders that were implemented by the state are a mirror of Trump's rhetoric on economic securitisation with regards to immigration.

STATE IMPLEMENTATION	TRUMP RHETORIC
<p>Executive order on border security which was entitled "Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements".</p>	<p><u>A Nation without borders is not a nation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building a border wall between US and Mexico <p>- "We must have strong borders and stop illegal immigration without that we do not have a country. Also, Mexico is killing U.S on trade. WIN!" June 30, 2015</p> <p>- "I love Mexican people, but Mexico is not our friend. They're killing us at the border and they're killing us on jobs and trade. FIGHT!" June 30, 2015</p> <p>- "EL Chapo and the Mexican drug cartels use the border unimpeded like it was a vacuum cleaner sucking drugs and death right into the U.S". July 13, 2015</p>

<p>Executive order on refugees on the 27 of January entitled “Protecting the Nation from Terrorist Attacks by Foreign Nationals (Number 13769)”.</p>	<p><u>A Nation which does not put its citizens first is not a nation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing issuing of green cards • Terminate the H-B1 visa and the J-1 visa • Ban refugees <p>- “If the ban were announced with a one week notice, the “bad” would rush into our country during that week. A lot of bad “dudes” out there!” June 30, 2017</p> <p>- “Democrats are the problem. They don’t care about crime and want illegal immigrants, no matter how bad they may be, to pour into and infest our Country, like MS-13. They can’t win on their terrible policies, so they view them as potential voters!” June 19, 2018</p>
<p>Executive order on interior enforcement which was titled “Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the US” (Number 13768)</p>	<p><u>A Nation without laws is not a nation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Triple the number of ICE officers • Travel ban of 7 countries • End birth right citizenship <p>- “People, the lawyers and the courts can call it whatever they want, but I am calling it what we need and what it is a TRAVEL BAN!” June 5, 2017</p> <p>- “I think Islam hates us... we can’t allow people coming into this country who have this hatred of the United States and of people that are Muslim.” March 9, 2016</p>

From the above table, one can note that the state began to issue a series of executive orders of Trump's proposed immigration plan soon after he became the president of US in 2017. In January 2017 three executive orders on border security and interior security and also on refugees and visa holders from designated nations were signed. The first signed executive order was on border security which was entitled 'Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements' (Philip 2017). It is in this light that this executive order to some extent denounce emancipation to the immigrants living in the US. The idea that in the executive order section 4 it instructs DHS to increase their numbers in order to control the borders against immigrants therefore highlight a direct link to Trump's rhetoric because it imposes fear into the immigrants thereby suppressing human rights.

More so, in section 5 of this policy, it states the need to construct detention facilities near the border so that the border patrol agents as well as the judges will interview asylum seekers before they are permitted to enter the US. The executive order went on to suggest the detention of non-US citizens and to stop the catch and release style. The state implementation of this executive order therefore shows that it is aligned with Trump's rhetoric for he had mentioned to strictly control the border when he tweeted on March 30, 2015: "The border is wide open for cartel and terrorist. Secure our borders now. Build a massive wall and deduct the costs from Mexican foreign aid!". Trump recommended the need to train these DHS agents in order to perform their duties very well especially on the issue of unaccompanied alien children.

More so, the state also managed to sign an executive order on refugees on the 27 of January entitled 'Protecting the Nation from Terrorist Attacks by Foreign Nationals (Number 13769)'. The order put forward banning the issuance of visa to immigrants of 7 countries. This was travel ban for mainly Syrian refugees and suspended entry for people from Muslim countries; namely, Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria and Yemen. This was a step towards economic securitizing and banning immigrants from coming into the US as the order states the removal of the US refugee admission program (USRAP) for more than 100 days, and the admission number to be reduced from 110,000 to 50,000. According to section 5, the suspension of visas to these

countries was because they were considered a threat to the US security, and the suspension was to last for 90 days. In section 4 the executive order suggested maximum screening of immigrants so as to view whether they can contribute to the state or they can be a problem. This action was one of Trump's proposed way to maximise security and tight control on the borders of the US. The order went on to suspend the resettlement program so as to clearly examine all refugees trying to enter the US before they are given the permission to enter the US soil. The order stated that there is a need to clearly examine refugees on a case by case scenario taking note of the religion so as to be sure the refugees accepted to enter the US will not cause trouble to US; hence, by so doing this will maximise security in US. However, this step towards banning and economic securitisation with regards to immigration provoked many people especially those immigrants who were already living in the US and it resulted in it being blocked by various courts. It was in effect from 27 January until 16 March 2017, when it was suspended by executive order 13780. From this information, one can note that although this executive order was suspended it reflected Trump's rhetoric during his campaign when he tweeted that "Refugees from Syria are now pouring into our great country who knows who they are – some could be ISIS. Is our president insane?" This statement shows that Trump was against the idea of welcoming refugees into the US for they cause a lot of instabilities in the country's economy as well as social welfare.

The state also signed the executive order on interior enforcement which focused on securing public safety in cities and communities. It requested for doubling the number of ICE agents so as to ensure maximum safety to the US nationals. According to section 9 of the executive order on interior enforcement; it prioritised judges that are more for enforcement purposes and denounced the priority of other judges to receive federal grants. More so, in chapter 10, it introduced the Secure Community Program (SCP) which substituted the Priority Enforcement Program of the Obama Administration. This SCP program ushered the detaining of unauthorised immigrants into custody by the jury. The executive order went on to suggest the deportation of all noncitizens who are criminals and have committed fraud or abuse to be deported as there are a threat to the state security and success. This order goes hand in hand with Trump rhetoric as it suggested to phase out president Obama's Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA). This action of DACA gave immunity to the

undocumented immigrants from deportation, allowed them to have work permits and enjoy health benefits. The action managed to enrol more than 70,000 immigrants and according to Trump this is a risk to US economic security. However, this action managed to help many undocumented immigrants to a greater extent as it managed to allow them to work and make a living as well as being exempted from deportation although it did not guarantee them permanent lawful status. However, according to Trump, DACA presents an unconstitutional overreach of executive power. He is of the view that these immigrants are the ones causing the economy to fail and they are taking the US citizens' jobs which is against the notion to put American citizens first. Therefore, from the implemented executive order, one may argue that it mirrors Trump's rhetoric to a greater extent.

However, as highlighted by Buzan and Waever (2009), securitization process takes four steps for it to be regarded as a securitized issue and one of those steps included audience opinion. In this case the audience is represented by the court and before Trump's immigration process was officially regarded as approved. It had to go through the courts first for it to be approved because, according to Buzan, the audience matters in the decision making of the country's decision especially in the process of securitizing a problem.

2.2.1 Opposition to Trump's rhetoric position on societal level.

It is in this light that one should note that the Supreme Court plays a role in the decision making of policies in the US. It stands as the voice of the voiceless; hence, it represents the majority vote when it comes to issues that concern the public for instance the economic securitisation of immigrants in the US. It is of importance to note that immigration federal disputes involve state and localities. More so, according to Buzan (1995), nothing can be securitized without the vote of the public in a country, therefore it is of importance for one to note that the Supreme Court in this case represents the majority view on the issue of economic securitization in relation to immigrants in the US and it managed to be one of the organisations that delayed and criticised Trump's policies.

The Supreme Court in the US balances the issue of authority between the citizens and the state government by making checks and balances on their activities. It is the head of the federal court system in the US and its duty is to interpret and enforce the

law as well as to look at the civil and criminal court cases. It is of importance to note that the constitution also plays a prominent role in the state decision making as it gives power to the Supreme Court to check the President's actions when necessary and also it resides the power to confront the Congress if the law it passes violets the U.S constitution and it has the power to terminate the law if necessary (US legal news 2018). It has the overall say in cases involving laws of Congress and the highest law as well as the audacity to approach the government if their laws breaks one of the rules in the constitution. However, one can note that in as much as the Supreme Court can perform checks and balances on the president, the president power overrides the Supreme Court as it has authority to nominate justice to the court as well as approval of nominations on the Senate votes. More so, the Congress also weakens the Supreme Court's power as it is the one that creates the district and appeals courts, and also its power resides over the laws in the federal system.

Prior to Trump's immigration plan on January 9, 2018, the U.S District Court in San Francisco acted as the voice of the voiceless as it defended the DACA program by stating that the 'Dreamers' were protected until the matter was resolved in court. However, the judgement override Trumps position of terminating the DACA program. The DACA program was launched by former president Obama with an executive order in 2012, and since then it managed to give many dreamers work permit. Hence, the Cato Institute is of the view that eliminating DACA could cost the economy more than \$200 billion over 10 years and the country is not in a position to lose such a big amount of money considering that there are many reforms that need money to be implemented (Gurdus 2017).

In relation with the above, Trump administration faced opposition from the Supreme Court as it delayed his travel ban to be fully implemented. It only allowed the Trump administration to implement its travel ban for a few days while ongoing litigation proceeded. Trump has previously proposed the travel ban on seven countries which he believed were causing problems for the US where citizens of these countries were considered to commit a lot of crimes. More so, on the 17th of October 2017, Federal Courts went on to stop Trump's travel ban as the judges stated that banning a practice based on religion is unconstitutional. Their judgement was based on the evidence they gathered on Trump's own words during his speeches as he claimed the ban on Islamic countries. Trump, therefore, was later forced to replace the order

he signed on the 27th of January 2017 and signed another one on the 6th of March 2017 which exempted Iraq from the seven countries which were banned from entering the US but however he kept his word on not issuing visa to the rest of the countries he had mentioned before. These countries were declared as threats according to the 2016 law concerning immigration visa. However, this executive order did not include legal green card holders, current visa holders as well as diplomats and members of international organisations. This travel ban was however supposed to go into effect on March 16, 2017 and remain for 90 days but unfortunately the ban was again stopped by lower court order as they considered this act to be against the constitution.

More so, the court was also involved on the issue of banning refugees which was proposed by Trump during his campaign. Trump's administration on 24 October allowed refugees from all other countries to come to the US except for 11 countries which they did not disclose the names. Trump stated that the US security would strictly review the threat these countries pose to America as well as their application process to prevent any exploitation by terrorists. The executive order of March 6, 2017 state that refugees will be banned for 120 days except for those already travelling out of the US. Prior to Trump's rhetoric to halve refugees accepted in the US every year, the federal judges agreed to those orders resulting in the state department deporting more than 50,000 refugees as was first proposed by Trump.

2.2.2 Advantages and Disadvantages of Trump's Rhetoric.

Trump's immigration plan of putting America first can be viewed as a necessity for the American citizens since immigrants highly affect most American workers in industries. It is of importance to note that immigrants benefit more in the job market. Immigrants are more likely to take jobs for lower wages and this drives out native-born workers in those areas. However, Kraut (2016) argues that Trump's "America first" rhetoric seeks to marginalise large social communities and seeks to dissolve harmonic relations and citizenship bonds. It is in this light that, according to him, immigration system in the US should reflect liberal democratic values that usher up the inclusive vision of national identity.

More so, Trump faced a lot of criticism on the issue of constructing the border wall. According to some expectations this would cost the state a lot of money thereby

negatively affecting the economy of America considering that the executive order is not clear on the specific source of funding. It would also clash with the land owners on personal property rights of the people living around that area and constructing it could damage the environment as well. This policy therefore faced a lot of criticism from the environment managements as well as the property owners around the area thereby making it prone to rising of rebels in the US. More so, the use of detention for asylum seekers, including both women and children, this act is considered an act of inhumane behaviour since children are also affected by this policy. Liberals are of the view that removal of asylum seekers is applied incorrectly by enforcement personnel and it deprives asylum seekers emancipation which might result in rebellion and social instability within the communities of the US (The Balance 2017).

In relation with the above, the executive order on interior enforcement and increasing the ICE agents will impose fear not only on the immigrants but as well as the US nationals at large. This act will result in separation of families as the children born on the US soil will remain behind whilst their parents are deported. More so, the refugee screening program will lead to discrimination of religion and this will pave way for terrorist to recruit more people as well as clearly forming groups in the name of being religiously discriminated. This act might trigger other countries to follow in the same line, as they will not want the rejected refugees to flock into their countries as well and by so doing the world will face problems of morality, racism, and xenophobia all in the name of security. More so, it is of importance to note that not all Muslims are terrorists; some are even fleeing from the ISIS for protection as much as other refugees, for instance, in Syria. From above information, one can therefore note that due to these executive orders the US is losing its title as an immigration safe nation. The step it has taken however according to some radicals will harm its dignity on moral in the world and will limit its power to influence other nations to collaborate with it on humanitarian as well as its long-term relations with other allies.

In relation with the above, it is of importance to note that immigration makes America more prosperous to some extent, because it increases labour supply, resulting in a more stable division of labour and intensive development and a rise in the economy. According to Yglesias (2018), immigrants raise income for the average skilled workers of US since most of them are low skilled. More so, even if the immigrants are highly skilled, this would be an advantage because they can help in raising the

economy of the state. It is of importance to note that an increase in labour supply has no effect on anyone in America but rather as the liberal Economic Policy Institute emphasizes “earlier immigrants are the ones mostly affected by immigration because these are the people whose skills are mostly to put them in direct competition with new immigrants” (Yglesias 2018). More so, one should note that there is no competition on jobs between the immigrants and U.S. born workers because immigrants don’t usually tend to choose which type of job they would want because they will be desperate and just want to earn a living regardless of them working in positions they don’t have a profession in.

Trump’s policy of putting America first counterpoise the interest of native and those of newcomers. According to history, America has been regarded as the place of refuge for the oppressed. However, according to some radicals immigration to the US has never been viewed as an act of charity but rather a strategy for national greatness. More so, immigration also enriches culture and expands options as well as strengthening the federal budget. This is so because unauthorised workers receive low wages at the same time contributing to the tax base of the government. Therefore, the fact that illegal immigrants are paid low wages and are paying taxes at the same time shows that they are important contributors to the US economy considering that they don’t tend to enjoy the benefits of these taxes. From above discussion, one can therefore conclude that there is need to take a closer look at the rhetoric of Trump so as to understand its contributions as well as its defects as highlighted above.

2.2.3 Consequences of Trump’s Populist Politics for US Citizens

In the case of the US, Trump’s rhetoric towards immigration proves that he aims at protecting American economy and culture from ethno cultural foreign threats, especially that of immigrants. Trump can be classified as an extreme right-wing populist (Betz 1993) since he is of the view that globalization is threatening Americans economy, cultural identity and social life. He is a populist due to his instrumentation of sentiments of anxiety and disenchantment and his appeal to the common man and his allegedly superior common sense (Betz 1993: 413-414). However, his populist politics in relation to his discourse on economic securitization

with regards to immigrants has proven to have some consequences on democracy in the US.

A democratic system is whereby power flows from the people to the leaders of government who hold power. It is whereby the people are sovereign and are the highest form of political authority. Democratic system can easily become vulnerable to populism, propaganda, and criticism because it has no automatic barriers against populists (Pasquino in Albertazz, McDonnell 2008: 22). Some scholars label populism as illiberal democracy because they are of the view that populism rejects all limitations on the expression of popular will such as protection of minority rights and independence of key institutions (Mudde 2004). In this light, one can note that Trumps' rhetoric appears as a serious threat to democratic system.

Trumps' political assumptions belies it as a threat to democratic system because he is characterised as someone quick to make decisions which is a common characteristic of populist leaders and this threatens democracy in a country. This, however, characterises Trump in a broader way considering his quick immediate reaction to sign 30 executive orders within 100 days of being on the presidential seat. Trump signed many executive orders like on border security, interior enforcement as well as on refugees to mention but a few within 100 days in the presidential office. This, therefore, qualifies Trump's doctrine as a threat to democracy because he could not wait to debate the executive orders first before enforcing them as part of the law. It is in this light that populist parties become victims of the truth due to their plebiscitary view on democracy. They are quickly influenced by public opinion thereby becoming more responsive and irresponsible in making decisions (Decker 2003). Populist actors diminish the quality of decision making by quickly rushing into conclusions rather than negotiating and being patient. Due to this characteristic of right wing populist actors, Donald Trump's populism threatens the fundamental rules of democratic system.

More so, due to the notion that populist discourse is often intolerant, xenophobic and racist, by legitimizing the exclusion of 'others' that do not fit into their definition of 'the people' Trump's discourse on economic securitisation of immigrants is therefore a good example of populist politics. His rhetoric on banning seven nationalities which happen to be all Muslims shows that he is filled up with the idea of 'us' versus 'them'.

However, this discourse appears to cause consequences on US economy because it makes a clear antagonism between 'allies' and 'enemies', it takes a hard-line position towards Muslim foreigners and multiculturalism which is a factor that can affect US economy due to this discrimination. It diminishes the sovereign right towards those Muslim citizens who hold US citizenships and those that were born on the US soil which causes problems for workers in the business industry. From this information, one can therefore note that Trump's rhetoric causes re-politicisation of certain issues towards the business industry; for instance, the reversal of the H-B1 visa and the abolishment of DACA program which were considered as contributing factors to the US economic success because they provided more cheap labour.

Trump's discourse also presents hostility towards intellectual economic and political parties. The idea of delegitimizing his political opponents implies that they are not viewed as adversaries but enemies. It is in this light that populists have a tendency of rejecting symbolic framework in which political stage for democratic political struggle is defined (Abts & Rummens 2007). This, therefore, creates a permanent situation of conflict which is not conducive to an acceptable democratic outcome. Held (1996: 63-64) is in line with this view as he suggests that law notion of individual and civil rights, devotion to conspiracy theories, sharing some inspirational themes with communism and fascism, and most of all foreign policy based on isolationism can be a dangerous idea for democracy maintenance.

More so, Trump's rhetoric can be labelled as a threat to US economy and democracy because it holds the potential of providing the state with a moral status that it otherwise lacks. It is in this light that once a state turns into embodiment of the virtuous people the defence mechanisms developed against tyranny, such as freedoms, checks and balances, the rule of law, tolerance, autonomous social institutions, individual and group rights, or pluralism are inevitably under threat. It is in this light that Trump's rhetoric has no programme of self-limitation once the liberation of the oppressed people is achieved. More so, it undermines the civility of the relations among citizens. It erodes the respect for the dignity of political opponents and of minority groups and weakens the culture of reasoned debates. This, therefore, shows that Trump's discourse pose polarization effects on US economy and democracy.

The establishment of a political frontier between 'us' and 'them' does not pit some dominated groups against others, as does Trump's rhetoric which presents immigrants as being responsible for the problems of the popular classes, but instead constructs an 'us' that articulates resistance against the post-democratic regression caused by the hegemony of neo-liberalism. The idea that the right-wing populist parties claim that they are the only actors who represent 'the people' in a nativist and culturalist sense, manifest a deeply authoritarian mind-set. They tend to construct and reinforce threat and danger scenarios; for instance, political fear caused by arbitrary defined scapegoats. Trump, therefore, promises to solve these problems and creates hope to save 'the people' by protecting borders and attempting to turn back the clock. However, this notion causes consequences for democracy because it can change liberal democracy into illiberal democracy or even autocracy. Historically, right-wing populist parties in central Europe since 1989; the date which fall the Iron Curtain and the meteoric rise of parties such as Austria Freedom Party, allow important insights into the right-wing political ideologies and practices. It is of importance to note that exclusionary politics propagated in the 1990s against migrants from former Eastern European Communist countries are similar to current exclusionary discourses directed against 'others' both inside and outside of the respective national states.

In relation with the above, it is in this light that Trump's discourse can be viewed as exploiting globalisation issues beyond the economy. There are three issues that can be put into consideration when looking at this issue, immigration, liberal social values, and liberal democracy. Populism has long been associated with opposition to immigration and liberal social values such as gay marriage. This influence has grown to focus their opposition to the 'elite' on the range of ancillary institutions and actors such as the judiciary, media, and academia at the core of liberal democracy. This, therefore, shows that Trump's discourse has consequences of weakening non-majoritarian institutions like courts and the media. As Mudde (2004) pointed out, populists are not only anti-democratic but rather anti-liberal democracy. This point is incisive in understanding the precise nature of Trump's rhetoric as 'threat' to democracy. Trump views liberal democracy and its core values of law, representative democracy and protection of minorities as the root cause of US problems and perceived national degradation. Trump, therefore, increased his rhetoric against the

'fake news' media outlets he accused of not reporting the truth on his Presidency. It is within the populist actors' nature that they take these actions not only because they perceive them as a roadblock to their power, but also because they are hugely symbolic for their supporters. Judges, journalists, and academics are targets for Trump's discourse as they are embodiments of the pro-globalisation elite that populists and their voters revile. Whereas some perceive their work as intrinsic to the functioning of a modern and prosperous state, Trump views them as closed, overpaid, wastrels facilitating the demise of the state with their subservience to a globalised elite.

In relation with the above, there is a growing cultural gap across democratic state being exploited by Trump's populist politics that transcends economic divides. The narrative of populism has moved into opposition to the institutions and actors who they perceive facilitate policies; austerity, immigration, and premarket reforms that they oppose. The ability of populist politics to galvanise new forms of political engagement is very important in an area of decline in formal political participation such as turnout and party membership (Skocpol & Williamson 2012: 197) and this can apply to Trump's rhetoric. More so, his rhetoric may erode democratic institutions and usher competitive authoritarian regimes (Levisky & Loxton 2012). Trump's discourse is also closely related to political polarization and under some conditions may push party systems to the verge of collapse (Pappas 2013). In addition, this discourse plays a constitutive role in political realignments, in which moral boundaries between groups are redrawn and categories of 'us' and 'them' emerge (Laclau 2005; Fella & Ruzza 2013). This, therefore, shows that Trump's discourse is causing consequence of polarization of political debate in the US.

CONCLUSION

As highlighted above Trump's discourse is strongly linked to the concept of securitisation which can be clearly understood by first looking at different schools of thought. The views of these schools of thought on the issue of security cemented the foundation of the study so as to make one understand the process of securitisation. The study clearly highlighted that traditionalist school of thought often link the concept of security with state concerns and the post-Cold War theories develop traditionalist perspective on security by making it suit the constantly changing world. The post-Cold War theories are more flexible on the concept of security. They look at different angles such as economy, environment as well as social welfare in order to clearly understand the concept of security. This, therefore, shows that the understanding on the concept of security changes with time as highlighted in the above discussion. Thus, viewing the concept of security from different angles resulted in the formation of securitisation theory.

As highlighted above, securitisation theory state that security is a speech act which solely by uttering something as a security issue immediate action is done. This study took the Copenhagen view of what securitisation theory is and made it the main framework of this study. The theory state that securitisation is when an issue posed as presenting an existential threat to a designated referent object, justifies the use of extra ordinary measures to handle them. It is a process-oriented theory that aims to understand questions posed in security studies like who securitize, in what circumstances and to what end. This theory, therefore, helped as a foundation for the above study to clearly understand the concept of securitisation in relation to Trump's discourse. It managed to bring the chronology of how he managed to securitise immigrants with regards to economic issues starting from his rhetoric during his campaign to the period he became the President of United States of America. More so, this information helps to contribute in the field of international relation as well as political science as it provides information of economic securitisation with regards to immigrants specifically following Trump's discourse in the US. It provided information on how security develops to become securitised and how economic securitisation and immigration are interlinked.

In trying to bring out Trump's position on immigration issues and where he is coming from the study gave a brief background on the politics of US looking at the immigration statistics since the 80s and how Obama viewed the issue of immigration during his rule and the 2007-2008 economic crises. From above discussion, Obama's view on the issue of immigration seemed more accommodative and compassionate towards immigrants since he deferred from deporting illegal immigrants and reformed his DACA program to allow more immigrants into the country. This action raised controversy with the Republicans as well as some industrial sectors as they viewed this move as one of the factors that would bring the US economy down. This, therefore, resulted in the rise of populists such as Trump who preach total isolation and strive to put American people's views first.

Trump is of the view that US economy and social welfare is affected by immigrants. He stated in his tweets and statements that immigrants are the ones bringing drugs, crimes, killing American people on jobs and trade. He indirectly blames the previous government for these problems America is facing since he tweeted that politicians such as Clinton are the ones who created the rust belt allowing jobs to be stolen from US by other countries like Mexico. Trump's stance on immigration issue is clearly accommodative as evidenced by his rhetoric and his immigration plan to end green cards and HB-1 visa which allowed immigrants to work in the US. He is of the view that there is need to tighten border security by increasing ICE agents at the borders. He even proposed building a wall between US and Mexico in order to try and block them from illegally migrating into the US. Trump's viewpoint is mainly focused on protecting US security as well as its economy and social welfare.

Trump's rhetoric shows that he is more concerned about the economy of US, mainly as evidenced by his statements and tweets. Economic securitisation with regards to immigration is essential according to Trump's viewpoint. He stressed his points towards economic securitisation of immigrants by using different metaphors, such as 'flood', in order to clearly impact the audience on how immigration issue is negatively affecting US economy and the need for quick measures to be taken. These metaphors made the audience view immigrants as a serious threat to their social life and state economy resulting in fearing them and supporting Trump's rhetoric. As highlighted above, economic securitisation interlink with the issues of social welfare as well as political identity thus the securitisation of immigrants in the context of the

future of the US economy embed in a struggle for political legitimacy as well. Hence, the securitisation of immigrants in relation to the discourse of Trump is not only a strategy in economic fight for protection of economic rights for American citizens but a play in the political struggles in which immigrants are constructed as scapegoats to decline political legitimacy thereby creating consequences in the US politics.

More so, the state implemented executive orders that mirror Trump's rhetoric and his immigration plan soon after he became the President of the US. As highlighted above, this shows that the state just as the audience seem to be influenced by Trump's rhetoric. Although the executive orders are not rhetoric they mirror Trump's rhetoric for instance the executive order entitled 'Protecting the Nation from Terrorist Attacks by Foreign Nationals' goes in line with Trump's rhetoric on banning Muslims from entering the US. The executive order on Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior mirrors Trump's rhetoric on the issue of immigrants like Mexicans who he claimed were killers and brought drugs into the US. Therefore, attempts at implementation show that Trump's rhetoric changed the sentiment in the US that triggered the need for tight national security in order to protect the nation. However, in as much as Trump pushed for his rhetoric to be implemented the Congress and courts played a crucial role in making the executive orders not to be implemented as they were presented to be against the constitution.

The action of the state of not taking Trump's rhetoric and implementing it therefore shows that the audience matter in the securitisation of issues within a country. This information shows how the Copenhagen school theory on securitisation has strengthened this study. The courts and the Congress in this case represented the majority view and managed to check and balance Trump's policy approach so as to have laws that best suit American citizens. The courts and Congress held back Trump's decisions on banning Muslims since they find it to be against the constitution and the American culture that does not aim to discriminate other people based on religion, thus instead of calling it the Travel Ban as Trump wanted it to be they named it Protecting the Nation from Terrorist Attacks. These actions played by the Congress and courts clearly show securitisation process as the audience matter in the decision making of the state.

However, Trump's discourse on economic securitisation regarding immigrants can be viewed as causing consequences to the US in terms of the state economy as well as social welfare and democracy. As highlighted above, the discourse is affecting the industry sector due to the deportation and blocking of immigrants to enter the US whom are considered as boosting the economy since they are working tough jobs and being paid low wages thereby benefiting the consumer and the state. This idea of deporting immigrants has ushered up the issue of racism and discrimination within the working industries as well as socially creating an unstable environment for working and socialising within the state. More so, one can note that Trump's rhetoric also affect democracy within the country since it is evidenced that it is caused re-politicisation of some issues, polarisation of political debate, weakening of majoritarian institutions and ultimately changing liberal democracy into illiberal democracy or even autocracy.

More so, from the current study one can note that the expressed information on Trump's discourse gives room for comparison on his rhetoric and the actual policies the state managed to implement after he became the president. It shows how he managed to influence the state to implement policies that mirror his rhetoric and how his rhetoric was challenged resulting in him softening some of his policies as well as diverting from some of his plans. The study also brought out the issue of his rhetoric in a more clearer way. It brought out the notion that Trump can be labelled a radical populist leader due to his elements of being a strong nationalist, patriotism and more ethno cultural due to his strong stance on wanting to make the border stricter so as to stop high flow of immigrants into the US. He is against the idea of social inclusion, free trade and state social relations and advocate for individualism. His rhetoric as pointed out above is more of xenophobic since it promotes anti immigrants as highlighted by his tweets and speeches on refugees, Muslims and Mexicans. From his discourse one can note that he constantly denounces social inclusion because according to him it is pulling down US economy and threatening the country's security as well.

From above information, one can therefore conclude that the process of economic securitisation with regards to immigrants in the US is one of the essential concepts that drives Trump's rhetoric and politics, and affects the state economy as well as democracy. It is an essential topic that one can even broaden and look at it from

different angles like social and political aspect and how his discourse contributes to the isolation of US from the rest of the world or how his discourse is reaching back to the pre-Westphalia world.

REFERENCES

- Abts, K. and Rummens, S. (2007). Populism versus Democracy. *Political Studies*,
- Akkerman, T. 2003. Populism and democracy; challenge or pathology? *Acta Politica*
- Adler, E. (1997). Seizing the Middle Ground: *Constructivism in World Politics*.
European Journal of International Relations. 3, 319.
- Adamson, F, B. (2006). Crossing Borders: International Migration and National Security. *International Security*, 31(1). 165-199.
- Agius, C. (2013). Social Constructivism. In A. Collins 3rd (eds). *Contemporary Security Studies*, (pp 88-103). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baldwin, D. A. (1993). Neoliberalism, Neorealism, and World Politics. In David, A. Baldwin (eds). *Neorealism and Neoliberalism* (pp1-25). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Baldwin, D. (1997). The Concept of Security. *Review of International Studies*, 23(1), 5-26
- Balzacq, T. (2005). Three faces of securitization: Political agency, Audience and Context. *European Journal of International Relations*, 11(2), 171-201 Sage publications.
- Betz, H. G. (1993). The New Politics of Resentment: Radical Right-Wing Populist Parties in Western Europe. *Comparative Politics*, 25(4), 413-427.
- Betz, H.G. (2008). The growing Threat of the Radical Right in: Merkel, P. H. and Weinberg Leonard.2008. *Right-Wing Extremism in the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Routledge p74-96.
- Buzan, B. (1995). The Level of Analysis Problem in International Relations Reconsidered. In K. Booth & S. Smith (eds), *International Relations Theory Today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Buzan, B., Wæver, O. (2009). Macrosecuritisation and security constellations: reconsidering scale in securitisation theory. *Review of International Studies*, 35(2), 253-276.

- Buzan, B., Wæver, O., and de Wilde, J. (1998). *Security: A New Framework for analysis*. Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Campbell, D. (1998). *Writing security: United States foreign policy and the politics of identity*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.
- CNN Library. (2013 June 22). Immigration Statistics Fast Facts. Retrieved from <https://www.cnn.com/2013/11/06/us/immigration-statistics-fast-facts/index.html>
- Cooper, R. (2000), The Post-modern State and the World Order, Demos.
- Cox, R. W. (1981). Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory. *Millennium-Journal of International Studies*, 10(30).
- Dalby, S. (1992). Security, Modernity, Ecology: The Dilemmas of Post-Cold War Security Discourse. *Alternatives*, 17(1), 95-134.
- Dably, S. (2003). Contesting and Essential Concept in Keith Krause and Michael C. Williams (eds) *Critical Security Studies*. London: Routledge: 3-32.
- Decker, F. (2003). The Populist Challenge to Liberal Democracy. *Berliner Republik*, 3
- Edelman, M. (1988). *Constructing the Political Spectacle*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Faist, T. (1994). How to Define a Foreigner? The Symbolic Politics of Immigration in German Partisan Discourse, 1978-1992. In Baldwin-Edwards, M and Schain, M. A. (eds), pp. 50-71.
- Fella, S. And Ruzza, C. (2013). 'Populism and the Fall of the Center-Right in Italy: The End of the Berlusconi Model or a New Beginning?' *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 21(1), 38-52.
- Frankel, B. (1996). Restating the Realist Case: an introduction in Benjamin Frankel (ed) *Realism: Restatements and Renewal* London: Frank Cass and Company Limited: 9-10
- Glaser, C. L. (2010). Realism. In A. Collins (eds), *Contemporary security studies* (pp 136-151). New York: Oxford University Press.

- Gurdus, E. (5 Sept 2017). Ending DACA could cost the economy up to \$200 billion, CATO expert says. *CNBC*, Retrieved from <https://www.cnbc.com/2017/09/05/ending-daca-could-cost-economy-up-to-200-billion-cato-expert-says.html>.
- Held, J. (1996). Populism in Eastern Europe. Racism: *Nationalism and Society*. New York: Columbia University Press. (pp 1-20, 62-106).
- Homeland Security. (2017). US Department of Homeland Security: Washington DC 20528. Retrieved from <https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/3469363/Trump-Immigration-Enforcement-Policies.pdf> accessed 27 March 2018
- Huchings, K. (2001). The Nature of Critique in Critical International Relations Theory. Richard Wyn Jones (eds), *Critical Theory and World Politics*, (pp 79-90). Boulder and London: Lynne Reinner.
- Huysmans, J. (2006). *The Politics of Insecurity: Fear, Migration and Asylum in the EU*. London: Routledge
- Ibrahim, M. (2005). "The Securitisation of Migration: A Racial Discourse", *International Migration*, 43:5, (pp 163-187).
- Karacasulu, N. and Uzgoren, E. (2007). Explaining Social Constructivist Contributions to Security Studies.
- Kissinger, H. (1976). Documentation: Foreign Policy and National Security. *International Security*, 1(1), 182-191
- Krause, K., Williams, M.C. (1996). *Broadening the Agenda for Security Studies: Politics and Methods*. *Mershon International Studies Review*, Vol. 40. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2246>
- Kraut, A. (2016). Make America Great Again...Again? *CMS Essays*, New York: CMS. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.14240/cmsesy010316>.
- Laclau, E. (2005). *On Populist Reason*. London: Verso.

- Lebowitz, L. and I. Podheiser. 2001-2002. "Summary of the Changes in Immigration Policies and Practices After the Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001: The USA Patriot Act and Other Measures." *University of Pittsburgh Law Review* 63, pp.873-888.
- Levisky, S. And Loxton, J. (2012). Populism and competitive authoritarianism: the case of Fujimori's Peru. In Mudde, Cas and Cristobal Rovira Kaltwasser (eds). *Populism in Europe and the Americas*. Cambridge University Press.
- Loelsher, G. (1993). *Beyond charity and International co-operation in refugee crisis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (2002). Realism, the Real World and the Academy, in *Realism and Institutionalism in International Studies*, edited by Michael, Brecher and Frank P. Harvey. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- McDonald, P. J. (2004). Peace through trade or free trade? *The journal of Conflict Resolution*, 48(4), 547-572.
- McDonald, M. (2008). Constructivism In *Security Studies: An Introduction*, P. Williams 2nd (eds). 63-76. New York: Routledge.
- Morgan, H J. (1978). *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* 5th edition New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Morgan, P. (2010). Liberalism. In Collins, A (eds), *Contemporary security studies* (pp34-48). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mudd, T. (2018 February 02) Fox News. Populism that elected Trump is sweeping world and can have unexpected consequences. Retrieved from <http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2018/02/07/populism-that-elected-trump-is-sweeping-world-and-can-have-unexpected-consequences.html>
- Mudde, C. (2004). The Populist Zeitgeist. *Governance and Opposition*, 39(4), 542-563.
- Newman, E. And Selm, V. (2003). *Refugees and forced displacement: International Security, Human Vulnerability and the State*. New York: UN University Press.

- Pappas, T. S. (2013). 'Populist Democracy: Post-Authoritarian Greece and Post-Communist Hungary', *Opposition and Government*
- Phillip, L. M. (2017). President Trump and US Migration after 100 Days, 14(2), 319-328. Retrieved from www.migrationletters.com
- Rosenblum, M. (2004). "Moving Beyond the Policy of No Policy: Emigration from Mexico and Central America." *Latin America Politics and Security*, 46(4), 91-125, Retrieved from Academic Search Premier Database.
- Rudolph, C. (2003). Globalization and Security, *Security Studies* 13:1, 1-32
- Skocpol, T. and Williamson, V. (2012). *The Tea Party and the Remaking of Republican Conservatism*. Oxford University Press
- Stephen, M., Roise, W. and Christian, S. (2017). *International Relations Theory*. E-International Relations Publishing.
- Sulovic, V. (2010). Meaning of Security and Theory of Securitisation: On the concept of security. (pp1-7). Retrieved from [www.bezbednost.org/upload/document/sulovic \(2010\) meaning of secu.pdf](http://www.bezbednost.org/upload/document/sulovic%20(2010)%20meaning%20of%20secu.pdf)
- Swarts, J., and Karakatsanis, N, M. (2012). The Securitization of Migration: *Greece in the 1990s*. *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*,_14(1).
- United Nations Development Program: Human Development Report 1994.
- Vitali, A. (2017 MARCH 06). NBC NEWS, President Trump Sign New Immigration Executive Order. Retrieved from <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/white-house/president-trump-signs-new-immigration-executive-order-n724276>
- Waleed, A. (2018 July 27). The New York Times. Immigration as a Security Threat. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/07/27/opinion/australia-immigration-as-a-security-threat.html>
- Walker, R. B. J. *Security*. (1990).
- Weaver, O. (1993). "Societal Security: The Concept." In: Waever, O., B. Buzan, M. Kelstrup and P. Lemaitre, *Identity, Migration and the New Security Agenda in Europe*. London: Pinter Publishers, (pp.17-40).

Sovereignty, and the Challenge of World Politics. *Alternatives: Global, local, Political*, 15(1), 3-27.

Weaver, O. (1993). Securitization and Desecuritization 39-44; Buzan, Waever and De Wilde, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, 33-35; Balzacq, "The Three Faces of Securitisation: Political Agency, Audience and Context," 191-193

Wendt, A. (1992b). The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory. *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 18(4), 615-628

Williams, D. (2008). *Security Studies: An Introduction*: New York. Routledge.

Wohlfield, M. (2014). Is Migration a Security Issue? In Grech, O and Wohlfield, M. *Migration in the Mediterranean: Human Rights, Security and Development Perspectives* (eds). Malta: MEDAC.

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

Yglesias, M. (2018). Vox, Donald Trump's cruel immigration politics is a scam. Retrieved from <https://www.vox.com/2018/6/18/17474232/trump-immigration-scam>

Zolberg, A. R. (1995). *From Invitation to Interdiction: US. Foreign Policy and Immigration since 1945*. In Peoples, Threatened Borders.

Zong, J., Batalova, and Hallock, j. (2018). *Frequently Requested Statistics on Immigrants and Immigration in the United States*, Migration Policy Institute. Migration Policy Institute.

PLAGIARISM REPORT

ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL



BİLİMSEL ARAŞTIRMALAR ETİK KURULU

16.07.2018

Sayın Memory Edlight Kanganga

Bilimsel Araştırmalar Etik Kurulu'na yapmış olduğunuz **“Trump's Discourse On Economic Securitisation Regarding To Immigration”** başlıklı proje önerisi, sadece ikincil kaynak kullanıldığı için Etik Kuruluna girmesine gerek yoktur. Bu yazı ile birlikte sadece ikincil kaynak kullanmak şartıyla araştırmaya başlayabilirsiniz.

Doçent Doktor Direnç Kanol

Bilimsel Araştırmalar Etik Kurulu Raportörü

Not: Eğer bir kuruma resmi bir kabul yazısı sunmak istiyorsanız, Yakın Doğu Üniversitesi Bilimsel Araştırmalar Etik Kurulu'na bu yazı ile başvurup, kurulun başkanının imzasını taşıyan resmi bir yazı temin edebilirsiniz.



BİLİMSEL ARAŞTIRMALAR ETİK KURULU

16.07.2018

Dear Memory Edlight Kanganga

Your project "Trump's Discourse on Economic Securitisation Regarding To Immigration" has been evaluated. Since only secondary data will be used the project it does not need to go through the ethics committee. You can start your research on the condition that you will use only secondary data.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Direnç Kanol

Rapporteur of the Scientific Research Ethics Committee

Note: If you need to provide an official letter to an institution with the signature of the Head of NEU Scientific Research Ethics Committee, please apply to the secretariat of the ethics committee by showing this document.