

From Threat to Right: Rethinking Immigration Policy Through Competing Global Paradigms

Agung Sulistyo Purnomo^{1*}, Eva Achjani Zulfa², Muhammad Syaroni Rofii², Mohamad Dian Revindo²

¹Immigration Polytechnic & School of Strategic and Global Studies University of Indonesia

²School of Strategic and Global Studies University of Indonesia

*Correspondence Email: theagungpurnomofitsystem@gmail.com

Received: 5 January 2025; Revised: 6 March 2025; Accepted: 18 May 2025

Abstract: *This article critically re-examines how immigration is framed across five dominant global paradigms: security, economic utility, humanitarian obligation, cultural integration, and global mobility. Drawing on a critical interpretive synthesis of interdisciplinary literature, it unpacks the ideological, ethical, and policy logics embedded in each framework. While each paradigm offers distinct insights, the analysis reveals their internal contradictions, blind spots, and overlapping tensions. The paper argues for a pluralistic and ethically grounded approach to migration governance, one that integrates competing logics without collapsing complexity. By mapping these paradigms and their normative stakes, the study offers a conceptual toolkit for designing migration policies that are context-sensitive, morally coherent, and institutionally realistic. It contributes to a growing body of scholarship that challenges technocratic and securitarian approaches to migration, calling instead for frameworks that are attentive to justice, human agency, and global interdependence. In a world increasingly defined by mobility, inequality, and uncertainty, this article contends that rethinking immigration governance is not only possible but necessary. Through a nuanced engagement with diverse schools of thought, it seeks to enrich scholarly debate and inform principled policymaking that reflects both empirical realities and ethical imperatives.*

Keywords: *Immigration Policy; global justice; migration governance; pluralism; mobility rights; security; humanitarianism.*

How to Cite:

Purnomo, A. S., Zulfa, E. A., Rofii, M. S., & Revindo, M. D. (2025). From Threat to Right: Rethinking Immigration Policy Through Competing Global Paradigms. *Journal of Governance*, 10(2), 349–369.
<https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.62870/jog.v10i2.32456>



[This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/)

Introduction

As global interdependence deepens and political divisions sharpen, immigration has emerged as one of the most debated and emotionally charged issues in public life. The contemporary landscape is shaped by increasing cross-border mobility driven by conflict, climate change, economic aspiration, and familial ties. These flows present real opportunities for states but also raise difficult questions about sovereignty, identity, and justice (Haas et al., 2015).

Across diverse geopolitical contexts, immigration provokes sharp tensions that go far beyond the movement of people. In the United States, it is a perennial electoral flashpoint linked to national security and cultural anxiety (Dzordzormenyoh & Boateng, 2023). In Europe, asylum and integration debates strain the legitimacy of the European Union and fuel right-wing populism (Hollifield et al., 2022). In Southeast Asia, migration regimes balancing labor demands with limited rights reflect a mix of formal and informal systems (Asis & Piper, 2008). The Rohingya crisis has further revealed the ethical limits of ASEAN's non-interference norm and the fragility of regional solidarity (Allerton, 2017).

These dynamics are shaped by deeper traditions of thought. In Asia, Confucian communitarianism often frames migrants' roles in relation to collective well-being, sometimes clashing with liberal rights frameworks (D. A. Bell, 2006). Philosophers like Seyla Benhabib and Amartya Sen extend these debates by asking whether justice and dignity can, or should, be confined within national borders (Benhabib, 2004b; Sen, 2009).

Yet despite the urgency of immigration debates, existing scholarship often treats normative frameworks in

isolation, focusing on security, economics, or humanitarianism without examining their interrelations. What remains underexplored is how these paradigms coexist, compete, and structure the moral and institutional terrain of immigration governance.

This article addresses that gap. It critically examines five influential paradigms—the security paradigm, the economic paradigm, the humanitarian paradigm, the cultural integration paradigm, and the global mobility paradigm—and unpacks their philosophical roots, political consequences, and practical limitations. Each of these frameworks reflects distinct worldviews about who belongs, who decides, and what obligations we owe to others (Czaika & De Haas, 2011; Sager, 2016).

The purpose of this study is to systematically deconstruct these five paradigms through a critical interpretive synthesis (CIS) of interdisciplinary literature. It draws on insights from political theory, ethics, economics, and migration studies to illuminate the normative tensions embedded in contemporary immigration policymaking. By mapping the ideational terrain of immigration policy, the article contributes to a more pluralistic and ethically grounded foundation for migration governance.

The contribution of this paper is threefold. First, it synthesizes and clarifies the conceptual structure of major paradigms in immigration policy. Second, it interrogates their underlying normative assumptions, exposing internal contradictions and blind spots. Third, it offers a framework for integrating diverse approaches into a coherent, context-sensitive, and morally robust policy architecture.

The remainder of the article proceeds as follows: the next section outlines the methodological approach used in this conceptual inquiry. Subsequent sections explore each of the five paradigms in depth, followed by a comparative analysis of their intersections and contradictions. The article concludes by identifying policy implications and proposing directions for future research in global migration studies.

Method

This study adopts a conceptual-analytical approach to explore how immigration is framed and justified across different paradigms. Rather than collecting new data, it engages critically with existing theories, empirical studies, and philosophical arguments to map out the competing logics that shape immigration policy. This kind of research is especially useful when the goal is not just to describe patterns but to question the assumptions behind them and to propose alternative ways of thinking.

At the heart of this approach is a method known as critical interpretive synthesis (CIS), which allows for the integration of diverse bodies of literature in a way that produces new conceptual insights (Denyer & Tranfield, 2009; Dixon-Woods et al., 2005). Unlike systematic reviews that emphasize completeness and replication, CIS is more flexible and exploratory. It seeks to connect ideas, highlight tensions, and generate theoretical contributions that are grounded in, but not limited by, the sources it draws from.

In this article, CIS is used to analyze five dominant paradigms of immigration: national security, economic utility, humanitarian obligation, cultural integration, and global mobility. Sources were selected based on their relevance to

one or more of these paradigms. They include peer-reviewed journal articles, policy reports, and foundational texts in political theory, economics, and moral philosophy. The literature spans both global and regional perspectives, with attention to developments in North America, Europe, and Asia.

The analytical process involved several steps. First, key concepts and normative claims within each paradigm were identified, such as sovereignty and exception in the security paradigm or utility and contribution in the economic frame. Next, the paradigms were compared in terms of their ethical logics, policy consequences, and intellectual foundations. Finally, the analysis turned toward identifying blind spots, contradictions, and areas of potential overlap, setting the stage for a more integrative policy framework.

This method aligns with a broader interpretivist and normative stance. It sees immigration not as a neutral administrative issue, but as a deeply political and moral terrain, one that demands careful reflection about values, power, and justice. In taking this stance, the paper aims not only to analyze the paradigms at play but also to offer tools for reimagining immigration policy in more inclusive and ethically grounded terms. Rooted in interpretivism and normative inquiry, this approach treats immigration not merely as a policy challenge but as a site of ethical contestation and political meaning. The analysis aims to be both diagnostic and generative, uncovering the conceptual tensions within dominant paradigms while offering normative tools for reimagining migration policy through a more pluralistic and justice-oriented lens.

Result and Discussion

The National Security Paradigm:

Framing Migration as Risk and Threat

Scholars such as Didier Bigo (2002), Jef Huysmans (2006), and Claudia Aradau (2009) have extensively theorized the construction of migrants as security threats through practices of surveillance, border militarization, and discourse. These approaches underscore how immigration becomes securitized not because of empirical threats, but through political framing. Integrating their insights allows a deeper understanding of how fear, identity, and state legitimacy intertwine in modern border regimes.

The national security paradigm conceptualizes immigration primarily through the lens of state sovereignty, border control, and threat mitigation. It gained substantial momentum in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks, when immigration became tightly linked to terrorism, organized crime, and social instability (Bigo, 2002; Boswell, 2007). From this vantage point, migration is viewed less as a demographic or economic phenomenon and more as a matter of internal security and strategic defense.

This paradigm is deeply rooted in realist traditions of international relations, which emphasize state survival, national interest, and the anarchic nature of the global system (D. Bell, 2017; Morgenthau & Thompson, 1993). Realism justifies strict immigration controls as necessary for the protection of sovereign borders and the preservation of national identity. Schmitt's (2005) notion of sovereignty as the power to decide on the state of exception resonates strongly within this paradigm. In times of perceived crisis, states assert the right to suspend normative legal frameworks to reassert control over their territory and population.

One major policy implication of this paradigm is the proliferation of border securitization measures. These include the construction of physical barriers, expanded surveillance infrastructure, biometric data collection, and intelligence-sharing mechanisms (Andreas, 2003; Feigenberg, 2020; Lang, 2024). The European Union's Smart Borders Initiative and the U.S. Secure Communities program exemplify this trend, reinforcing the idea that migration is a phenomenon to be managed through military and police capacities.

Yet the effectiveness of these measures remains highly contested. Empirical research has shown that tighter border enforcement often displaces rather than reduces migration flows, pushing migrants toward more dangerous and irregular routes (Kim & Tajima, 2022). Moreover, studies have found no strong correlation between restrictive immigration policy and reductions in transnational terrorism (Bove & Böhmelt, 2016; Helbling & Meierrieks, 2022). These findings challenge the assumption that migration per se constitutes a security threat.

The paradigm also entails significant normative trade-offs. Critics argue that the security framing of migration risks legitimizing extraordinary measures such as prolonged detention, racial profiling, and mass deportations (Aradau & van Munster, 2009; Esposito & Bosworth, 2024). Such practices may erode civil liberties and disproportionately impact marginalized groups, particularly Muslims and people of color (Cainkar, 2009; Cesari, 2009). Furthermore, the securitization of asylum undermines the protective function of international refugee law by prioritizing border control over humanitarian obligations (Betts, 2013; Milner, 2009).

Philosophically, this paradigm is anchored in Schmittian decisionism and political theology. Schmitt's friend-enemy distinction offers a logic of exclusion that frames migrants as potential adversaries whose loyalty to the host polity is presumed uncertain (Rae, 2016). In this logic, immigration control becomes a mechanism of political purification and moral boundary-setting. As Minca and Vaughan-Williams (2012) suggest, the contemporary border is not merely a line on a map but a mobile apparatus of security, legality, and identity.

Nevertheless, proponents argue that a security-centric immigration policy is essential for public order and social cohesion. Policies like the U.S. Secure Communities program, which identifies and departs undocumented migrants with criminal records, are seen as mechanisms to maintain law and order (Kang & Song, 2022; Pinotti, 2015). Others emphasize the utility of international cooperation, such as the Schengen Information System in Europe, in combating cross-border threats through shared intelligence and coordinated enforcement (Bigo, 2002; Guild, 2010).

In sum, while the national security paradigm addresses legitimate concerns about state sovereignty and public safety, it often does so at the cost of fundamental rights and ethical consistency. Its realist and decisionist roots provide intellectual coherence but also rationalize exclusionary and at times illiberal practices. This paradigm remains dominant in public discourse, especially during periods of political or economic instability, but its moral and empirical limitations suggest the need for critical scrutiny and complementary approaches.

The Economic Paradigm: Market Logic, Labor Flows, and Human Commodification

The economic paradigm frames immigration as a functional response to labor market needs and as a tool for national and global development. Rooted in classical liberal economics, this paradigm treats migrants not as threats but as contributors—individuals whose value lies in their productivity, fiscal impact, and ability to meet demographic and sectoral demands (Dustmann & Frattini, 2014). In this view, borders are not just lines of defense but gateways to economic optimization.

A foundational influence here is David Ricardo's theory of comparative advantage, which argues that countries benefit by specializing in what they do best and trading with others, including labor (Costinot & Donaldson, 2012). Contemporary migration policies often echo this logic, especially those designed to attract highly skilled workers in technology, medicine, engineering, and academia. Points-based immigration systems in countries like Canada, Australia, and the UK are structured around this economic calculus (Papademetriou & Sumption, 2011).

But the story extends beyond the high-skilled. Many economies also rely on lower-skilled migrant labor for jobs in agriculture, caregiving, and construction sectors often marked by difficult conditions and legal precarity (Ruhs, 2013). In Southeast Asia, for example, countries like Malaysia and Singapore have long depended on temporary migrant workers from Indonesia, Bangladesh, and the Philippines to sustain vital sectors while simultaneously restricting their rights and pathways to permanence (Asis & Piper, 2008; Hugo, 2002).

Empirical studies consistently find that immigrants tend to have either neutral or positive effects on host economies. Their presence may slightly reduce wages for low-skilled native workers, but they also increase productivity, fill labor shortages, and contribute more in taxes than they consume in public services (Aiyar et al., 2016; Ottaviano & Peri, 2012). Moreover, migrants often rejuvenate aging populations and stimulate demand in housing, education, and services.

Yet this paradigm also raises critical ethical and political questions. One concern is the commodification of human beings, treating migrants as units of labor whose value is measured only by economic output (Anderson, 2013). This logic underpins hierarchies of desirability, privileging those who bring capital, credentials, or technical skills, while marginalizing others. As Shachar (2006) argues, economic filters often reinforce global inequalities and reduce migration policy to a transactional exercise.

Another concern is the informal economy, where undocumented and semi-documented migrants work under precarious and often exploitative conditions. These workers are vital to industries yet are frequently denied basic protections such as minimum wage, workplace safety, and legal recourse (Lewis et al., 2015). Economic integration without legal safeguards can institutionalize vulnerability.

The paradigm also poses dilemmas for sending countries. While remittances provide lifelines to families and communities, the emigration of highly educated professionals, the so-called "brain drain," can undercut domestic capacity in sectors like health and education (Docquier & Rapoport, 2011). In the Philippines, for instance, the

government's labor export model has become central to economic planning, but critics question its social costs and sustainability (Rodriguez, 2010).

From a philosophical standpoint, the economic paradigm is closely tied to utilitarianism and market liberalism. It tends to prioritize outcomes, growth, efficiency, and balance sheets over questions of justice, dignity, or democratic participation. As Joseph Carens (2015) has argued, even economically beneficial immigration policies can be morally hollow if they treat migrants as means rather than ends.

Despite its limitations, the economic paradigm remains politically powerful because of its promise of mutual benefit. It appeals to both liberal and conservative policymakers who seek to balance openness with control. However, without a broader normative framework that addresses rights, power asymmetries, and human development, this paradigm risks legitimizing exclusion under the guise of efficiency.

In short, the economic frame provides important insights into how immigration can serve national and global interests. But to craft migration governance that is not only effective but also just, economic reasoning must be integrated with ethical and humanistic perspectives. This ethical imperative brings us to a different, but no less significant, paradigm: the humanitarian lens.

The Humanitarian Paradigm: Rights, Refuge, and the Ethics of Protection

Malkki's (1996) anthropological critique of the refugee as a dehistoricized, depoliticized figure highlights the tension between humanitarian narratives and the complex biographies of displaced persons. Her work challenges us to reimagine

refugees not as passive recipients of aid but as active political subjects. This aligns with Didier Fassin's (2012) critique of humanitarianism as a regime of compassion that can simultaneously exclude and discipline.

The humanitarian paradigm approaches immigration through the lens of moral obligation, legal protection, and human dignity. It foregrounds the rights and vulnerabilities of individuals on the move, particularly refugees, asylum seekers, stateless persons, and victims of trafficking. Rooted in both international law and moral philosophy, this paradigm challenges states to recognize migration not merely as a regulatory problem, but as a human condition that demands empathy, solidarity, and a principled response.

The legal foundations of this paradigm are anchored in the 1951 Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol, which establish key protections for individuals fleeing persecution. Central to these instruments is the principle of non-refoulement, or the prohibition against returning individuals to countries where they face serious threats to their life or freedom (UNHCR, 2011). Humanitarianism, in this sense, is not merely an expression of charity or discretion but a codified international obligation.

Philosophically, the humanitarian paradigm draws from a rich tradition of ethical thought. Hannah Arendt's (1951) assertion of a "right to have rights" speaks directly to the condition of stateless people, highlighting the paradox that those who need rights most often fall outside the reach of political communities. Immanuel Kant's cosmopolitan ethics and the idea of universal moral law also inform this framework, as do contemporary contributions from thinkers like Seyla Benhabib (2004b), who advocates for

porous boundaries consistent with democratic inclusion.

In practical terms, this paradigm has informed the creation of asylum systems, refugee resettlement programs, humanitarian corridors, and emergency response mechanisms. Countries like Germany and Canada have, at different moments, embraced this approach by accepting large numbers of refugees, such as Syrians in 2015 or Afghans in 2021, as part of a broader commitment to global responsibility. In Southeast Asia, efforts to shelter Rohingya refugees, though uneven and politicized, reflect humanitarian impulses embedded in regional civil society and religious networks (Allerton, 2017).

However, the humanitarian paradigm is not without challenges and contradictions. One recurring tension lies in the gap between legal norms and political will. While most states are signatories to the Refugee Convention, many adopt restrictive interpretations or engage in deterrence policies such as offshore processing, pushbacks at sea, and criminalization of rescue operations (FitzGerald, 2019). These measures often violate the spirit, if not the letter, of international humanitarian commitments.

Moreover, the paradigm is susceptible to selective application and humanitarian fatigue. States may prioritize certain refugee groups over others based on cultural proximity, geopolitical interests, or media visibility. The warm reception of Ukrainian refugees in Europe in contrast to the treatment of Afghans, Syrians, or Africans illustrates this double standard (Ypi, 2012). Humanitarian discourse can also be instrumentalized for political ends, used to justify military intervention or reinforce state control over mobility (Fassin, 2012).

From a policy standpoint, the humanitarian paradigm demands more than emergency relief. It calls for long-term integration strategies, protection of legal status, access to education and employment, and recognition of migrants as rights-bearing individuals. The success of this paradigm rests not only on institutional design but also on political culture, whether societies are willing to uphold ethical obligations even when they are not economically or electorally convenient.

In summary, the humanitarian lens offers a morally compelling and legally grounded vision of immigration governance. It reminds us that behind every migration statistic is a human story marked by hope, fear, and resilience. Yet for this paradigm to endure, it must be defended against cynicism, re-politicized with care, and complemented by policies that turn compassion into concrete rights and durable solutions.

The Cultural Integration Paradigm: Negotiating Identity, Cohesion, and Pluralism

The cultural integration paradigm views immigration not only as a matter of legal entry or economic participation but as a deep social and symbolic process: the negotiation of belonging, values, and identity in plural societies. This paradigm foregrounds questions of cohesion, recognition, and intercultural dialogue, issues that are often overlooked in technocratic policy debates but central to the lived experience of migration.

Historically, immigration has forced societies to grapple with the limits and possibilities of diversity. In Western Europe, postcolonial migration led to the emergence of multicultural policies in countries like the United Kingdom and the Netherlands, while others, like France,

emphasized republican universalism and assimilation. These divergent paths reflect different philosophies of statehood and citizenship, whether cultural difference should be accommodated, managed, or erased (Joppke, 2004; Kymlicka, 1996).

Multiculturalism, at its core, argues for the public recognition of cultural identities and the institutionalization of diversity as a strength rather than a threat. Thinkers like Charles Taylor (1994) have framed this as a matter of "recognition," the idea that individuals and groups require not only legal status but also cultural affirmation to fully participate in public life. This approach has been institutionalized in Canada's Multiculturalism Act and in various EU frameworks promoting minority rights and anti-discrimination.

Yet multiculturalism has come under increasing pressure, especially in the wake of terrorist attacks, social segregation, and political backlash. Critics argue that it can encourage parallel societies, dilute national identity, or undermine liberal democratic values (Joppke, 2004). This backlash has led to what some scholars describe as the "retreat from multiculturalism," marked by policy shifts toward civic integration, mandatory language acquisition, and loyalty oaths, exemplified by the Dutch *inburgering* exam or France's *laïcité* laws restricting religious symbols in public spaces.

Cultural integration paradigms often invoke the importance of shared values, but these values are rarely neutral. Debates about headscarves, halal meals, or Islamic schools become flashpoints in broader struggles over secularism, gender equality, and national identity. What is framed as integration may, in practice, mask demands for conformity or serve as a gatekeeping mechanism for inclusion.

Philosophically, this paradigm raises difficult questions about the boundaries of pluralism. Hannah Arendt's (1951) notion of the public realm as a space for visibility and speech reminds us that participation requires more than formal rights; it requires recognition and meaningful access to institutions that shape collective life. If the public sphere is implicitly coded by dominant norms, then minority voices may enter only at the cost of self-erasure.

In practice, some countries have sought hybrid approaches. Singapore, for instance, enforces racial quotas in public housing and promotes multiracialism as a civic identity while also regulating expression and maintaining a dominant narrative of harmony. In Malaysia, a *bumiputera* policy prioritizes ethnic Malays in education and employment, complicating the prospects for integration of migrant workers and refugees. These examples highlight that integration is not a linear process but a contested and negotiated terrain.

From a normative standpoint, the cultural integration paradigm invites us to ask, what kind of society are we building? One that tolerates difference quietly or one that engages with it openly. Successful integration requires not just migrant adaptation but host society transformation. It involves investment in inclusive education, anti-racism initiatives, interfaith dialogue, and cultural literacy.

To sum up, the cultural integration paradigm brings into view the social dimensions of migration, i.e., the textures of everyday life, the clashes of norms, and the possibilities for solidarity across differences. It cautions against both cultural relativism and assimilationist rigidity, urging instead to adopt a pluralistic ethics that embraces complexity without sacrificing cohesion.

The Global Mobility Paradigm: Freedom of Movement and Global Justice Beyond Borders

The global mobility paradigm reframes immigration not as an exception to be regulated, but as a norm of human freedom. It challenges the dominant assumption that states have near-absolute discretion over who may enter or stay and instead posits mobility as a fundamental right on par with freedom of speech or religion. This view draws from cosmopolitan political theory, which holds that justice should not stop at national borders and that the moral worth of individuals transcends citizenship status (Nussbaum, 2006).

In this paradigm, the restriction of movement, particularly for people from the Global South, is seen as a form of structural inequality. Scholars like Joseph Carens (2015) have famously argued that borders function as moral barriers, creating a "birthright lottery" where access to opportunity and safety is arbitrarily distributed based on geography. Just as feudal privilege was rejected in liberal democracies, so too, he argues, should the inherited advantage of citizenship in wealthy nations be open to moral scrutiny.

Empirically, global mobility is deeply unequal. Citizens of the Global North enjoy relatively unrestricted access to international travel, study, and employment opportunities, while many in the Global South face visa restrictions, biometric surveillance, and high financial costs just to apply. This stratification has led scholars like Shachar (2006) to describe the modern border regime as a form of global apartheid, a system that maintains privilege through territorial exclusion and citizenship monopolies.

Despite increasing globalization in trade and capital, the mobility of people

remains tightly controlled. Migration is often framed as a “crisis” rather than a systemic feature of global interdependence. This framing sustains a security-first approach and legitimizes externalization tactics such as offshore detention, carrier sanctions, and bilateral readmission agreements (Guild, 2010; Menjívar & Abrego, 2012). These practices not only undermine human rights but also often shift the burden of migration governance onto less-resourced countries.

The global mobility paradigm offers an alternative by emphasizing principles of shared humanity and global justice. Kukathas (2005) argues that freedom of association logically entails freedom of movement, while Bauböck (2009) calls for a rethinking of citizenship as a flexible, multilayered status rather than a rigid territorial gatekeeping tool. These proposals push us to imagine a world where people are not permanently tied to place but are free to seek opportunity and belonging across borders.

However, the paradigm also faces serious objections. Critics argue that open borders could overwhelm public services, disrupt labor markets, or destabilize social cohesion in host countries. Others raise questions about democratic accountability: how can a polity remain self-governing if membership is not bounded? These are legitimate concerns that the global mobility framework must take seriously.

Nonetheless, the paradigm does not demand total erasure of borders but rather a shift in how we justify and manage them. It advocates for greater mobility rights, more equitable visa regimes, and enhanced pathways to legal migration and political inclusion. It insists that freedom of movement, like other rights, can be balanced but not arbitrarily denied.

Overall, the global mobility paradigm urges us to see migration not as a problem to be solved, but as a reality to be governed justly. It expands the moral horizon of immigration policy beyond the nation-state, asking us to confront the ethical implications of exclusion in an interconnected world. As climate change, economic inequality, and political instability continue to displace millions, rethinking mobility may be not only idealistic but necessary.

Comparative Analysis of Immigration Paradigms

Contemporary immigration policymaking is not only a field of competing interests but also a battleground of competing paradigms. As Schön and Rein (1996) argue, policy debates are often rooted in “frame conflicts,” deeply held normative assumptions that shape how problems are defined and what solutions are deemed legitimate. This article treats immigration paradigms as such frames: ideological formations that structure moral reasoning, policy design, and political imagination. By analyzing their points of convergence and contradiction, we gain insight not only into policy content but also into the values that underpin collective decision-making.

Understanding immigration policy through five distinct paradigms provides valuable insights, but it also presents a challenge: how do we make sense of their competing logics, their normative tensions, and the blind spots they create? A comparative analysis is essential not just to identify differences but to explore the deeper philosophical, ethical, and practical implications of those differences. It helps reveal where paradigms clash, where they overlap, and where they fall short in addressing the complexity of migration in

the twenty-first century (Carens, 2015; Ruhs, 2013).

The first and most visible tension lies between the national security and humanitarian paradigms. One sees the migrant as a potential threat, the other as a vulnerable subject deserving protection. The security paradigm justifies control through exceptionalism and sovereignty (Bigo, 2002; Schmitt, 2005), while the humanitarian frame is animated by moral obligation and international law (Arendt, 1951; UNHCR, 2011). When security dominates, humanitarianism is often subordinated, resulting in deterrence practices, offshoring, and criminalization of rescue operations (FitzGerald, 2019).

This tension is evident in many national policies that prioritize securitization over protection. For instance, the European Union's border control regime, particularly through Frontex, has expanded its surveillance and interception capacities in the Mediterranean while failing to provide adequate legal pathways for asylum (Avdan, 2019). Meanwhile, Australia's offshore processing centers in Nauru and Papua New Guinea have been heavily criticized for violating humanitarian norms under the guise of protecting borders. These practices illustrate how the securitarian logic often crowds out commitments to refugee rights and international obligations.

A second contradiction surfaces between the economic and global mobility paradigms. The economic lens evaluates migrants by their utility to the host state (Borjas, 2014; Dustmann & Frattini, 2014), while the global mobility paradigm asserts a right to move irrespective of economic contribution (Carens, 2015; Shachar, 2006). This raises a foundational ethical debate: Should access to mobility be based on merit and market value or treated as a

basic human freedom rooted in global justice (Nussbaum, 2006)?

This debate plays out vividly in visa regimes and labor migration programs. High-income countries often provide fast-track visas to skilled professionals while closing doors to those seeking entry for survival or family reunification. The points-based system in the UK, for example, rewards education and income potential but excludes domestic workers or caregivers who lack formal qualifications. This prioritization reflects how economic logic can be used to mask exclusionary practices under the banner of efficiency (Rodriguez, 2010).

Tensions also arise within the cultural integration paradigm, particularly when intersecting with securitization or assimilationist pressures. Multiculturalist policies may promote recognition (Taylor, 1994), but civic integration often emphasizes conformity over pluralism (Freeman, 1995; Joppke, 2004). Debates about headscarves, religious expression, or language testing exemplify the risks of cultural gatekeeping disguised as cohesion (Kymlicka, 1996, 2012).

In France, for example, *laïcité* has been invoked to justify bans on Islamic headscarves in public schools and the prohibition of abayas. While framed as promoting neutrality and secularism, these policies disproportionately affect Muslim women and reduce space for public expressions of cultural identity (Cainkar, 2009). Rather than facilitating integration, such measures can foster alienation and deepen social division, particularly when they are enforced through legal coercion rather than social dialogue, particularly when intersecting with securitization or assimilationist pressures.

Despite these conflicts, important overlaps exist. For instance, the

humanitarian and global mobility paradigms both emphasize dignity and ethical responsibility. The former appeals to urgent protection, the latter to structural fairness (Bauböck, 2009; Benhabib, 2004a). Together, they support reforms like legal pathways, humanitarian corridors, and burden-sharing agreements (Guild, 2010).

Similarly, the economic and integration paradigms may align in promoting long-term inclusion. Empirical research shows that investing in education, language acquisition, and anti-discrimination fosters both social cohesion and labor productivity (OECD, 2017; Ottaviano & Peri, 2012). Yet, this synergy is fragile when economic worth is used to determine cultural belonging (Anderson, 2013).

Each paradigm also contains significant blind spots. The security lens under-theorizes economic causes of migration and overemphasizes control (Bigo, 2002). The economic lens commodifies migrants and marginalizes informal labor (Lewis et al., 2015). Humanitarianism can obscure structural violence and depoliticize displacement (Fassin, 2012). Integration discourse may sideline race, gender, or legal precarity (Arendt, 1951), while mobility cosmopolitanism risks utopianism if divorced from institutional feasibility (Kukathas, 2014).

What's striking is how few paradigms fully account for migrant agency. Most frameworks speak about migrants, not with or through them. This reproduces top-down models of governance that erase lived experience and resistance (De Genova, 2014; Mezzadra & Neilson, 2013).

Despite contradictions, these paradigms are not mutually exclusive. Each offers partial insight. Security may be

necessary, but so is compassion. Economic utility is real, but so is ethical recognition. The key question becomes, how can we govern migration in ways that reconcile these logics without erasing their ethical tensions (Carens, 2015; Ruhs, 2013)?

One response lies in pluralistic governance: building institutional designs that balance objectives without collapsing complexity. This means engaging cities, states, and international actors in layered responses that uphold rights, manage flows, and build trust (Betts & Collier, 2017).

Another imperative is re-centering ethics and migrant perspectives in policymaking. This entails inclusive participation, intersectional data, and frameworks that resist essentialism while embracing difference (Benhabib, 2004b; Tazzioli, 2019).

All in all, no single paradigm can fully resolve the normative dilemmas and structural tensions of contemporary immigration. But through critical dialogue, these frameworks can illuminate each other's blind spots and generate more inclusive imaginaries. The task ahead is to translate this conceptual synthesis into practice, i.e., into policies that are ethically coherent, politically viable, and institutionally grounded. The following section turns to this challenge by identifying the practical implications of paradigm integration for migration governance at national, regional, and global levels.

Policy Implications

Translating the theoretical insights from these five paradigms into practical policy design is both necessary and challenging. Policymakers rarely operate within the neat boundaries of a single paradigm. Instead, they must navigate overlapping logics, contradictory

demands, and competing moral claims. Effective immigration policy requires more than administrative efficiency or political expedience; it demands ethical clarity, contextual sensitivity, and structural imagination (Carens, 2015; Ruhs, 2013).

First, at the level of national governance, immigration policies must embrace a pluralistic design. Rather than privileging one paradigm over the others, governments should adopt hybrid frameworks that incorporate economic, humanitarian, security, and cultural considerations in balance. For example, while border controls may remain a component of national sovereignty, they should not eclipse the obligation to provide asylum or pathways for regularization. National policies must be recalibrated to foreground not only the management of borders but also the fair treatment and integration of those who cross them (Avdan, 2019).

This means rethinking legal categories such as “refugee,” “economic migrant,” or “irregular entrant,” which often fail to capture the complex motivations behind migration. It also requires investment in data infrastructure that disaggregates migration flows by gender, class, age, and legal status, providing the granular insights necessary to inform inclusive policymaking. In countries like Indonesia or Mexico, where domestic workers and circular labor migrants dominate, such fine-tuned approaches are essential for targeted protection (Rodriguez, 2010).

National governments should also invest in public education campaigns that counter xenophobia and promote intercultural understanding. Policy is not only written in legislation but also embodied in public discourse. Inclusive narratives can reshape how society

perceives newcomers and generate political support for rights-based reforms. In this sense, policy communication is as important as policy content (Cainkar, 2009).

Second, regional cooperation must be strengthened. The political geography of migration rarely aligns with national borders. Refugee flows, labor migration corridors, and climate displacement often occur regionally and thus require multilateral responses. Regional blocs such as ASEAN, the African Union, and the European Union must move beyond security-focused coordination and invest in burden-sharing mechanisms, mobility partnerships, and regional asylum protocols (Dowd & McAdam, 2017).

ASEAN, for instance, has made only minimal progress toward formalizing regional refugee protection. Civil society actors have often filled this vacuum, providing aid to Rohingya refugees and advocating for more humane labor migration frameworks. Policymakers should draw on these grassroots initiatives and institutionalize regional dialogues on mobility and rights. Cross-national databases, joint labor certification systems, and shared reintegration programs are just a few tools that can be scaled up (Asis & Piper, 2008).

Effective regional cooperation also demands stronger legal harmonization. Shared definitions of legal status, recognition of regional residence rights, and mutual recognition of skills and qualifications can ease mobility and reduce bureaucratic friction. The African Union’s Free Movement Protocol, though imperfect, offers a model for how regions might embed mobility rights into binding legal frameworks (Zimbalist, 2025).

Third, global institutions must be reimagined to better support equitable mobility. Current global governance

structures, led by the UNHCR, IOM, and the Global Compact on Migration, often rely on soft law and voluntary cooperation. While these platforms offer frameworks for coordination, they lack enforceability and distributive justice mechanisms (Betts & Collier, 2017).

This might involve expanding the mandate of the International Labour Organization to cover informal migrant work or creating a global fund for climate-displaced persons, an idea already under discussion in UN climate forums. Furthermore, global governance must amplify the voices of migrant-sending countries, many of which are underrepresented in current decision-making spaces. More inclusive multilateralism is not only fairer but also more effective in responding to the root causes of forced mobility (Nussbaum, 2006).

Global institutions must also play a more active role in monitoring compliance. Independent bodies with investigatory powers, migrant ombudspersons, and international tribunals could be mechanisms for accountability. In a globalized world, migration justice cannot depend solely on state discretion.

Fourth, ethical principles must become guiding pillars of migration policy. Drawing from cosmopolitan theory, governments should adopt normative baselines that affirm the dignity, agency, and equality of all migrants, regardless of origin or legal category. This includes the principle of non-refoulement, but also broader commitments to inclusion, participation, and social recognition (Benhabib, 2004a).

States should resist the tendency to frame migrants as burdens or threats and instead develop policies that see them as partners in democratic renewal and social resilience. Narratives of contribution,

solidarity, and reciprocity can foster greater legitimacy and public support for inclusive policies. Ethics should not be an afterthought; it should be the foundation (Carens, 2015).

Ethical policymaking also requires rejecting false trade-offs. Security need not come at the expense of compassion; integration need not require assimilation. Policies should be designed to hold tensions rather than eliminate them, to manage the plural realities of migration with nuance and flexibility. For instance, rather than imposing blanket bans on religious symbols, governments can foster civic dialogue that engages with competing values openly and respectfully (Taylor, 1994).

Fifth, pragmatic reforms must accompany normative commitments. Policy windows, such as post-crisis reconstruction, electoral cycles, or international summits, can be used to advance progressive migration frameworks. These reforms might include regularization programs, expanded visa categories for care workers, gender-sensitive asylum procedures, or anti-discrimination laws. The key is to move beyond symbolic politics and toward institutional transformation (Ruhs & Martin, 2008).

Several countries provide instructive examples. Portugal's inclusive regularization scheme during the COVID-19 pandemic prioritized public health over exclusion and served as a model for rights-based governance (Dentico, 2021). Similarly, Canada's community sponsorship programs demonstrate how civil society can complement state efforts in refugee resettlement. Such models show that political will, when aligned with ethical conviction, can produce humane and effective migration outcomes.

These reforms should be complemented by long-term institutional investment. National human rights commissions, ombuds offices for migrants, and legal aid systems must be empowered and resourced. Without robust institutions, policy innovation risks remaining symbolic or short-lived.

Finally, migration policy must be situated within broader struggles for global justice. Addressing the root causes of displacement, conflict, inequality, and environmental degradation requires action far beyond the migration policy domain. Development aid, climate finance, and fair trade agreements all shape the conditions under which people move or stay. A holistic approach recognizes that migration is not a standalone issue but a symptom of deeper global asymmetries (Sen, 2009).

Linking migration to global justice also means rethinking global citizenship. Scholars such as Bauböck (2009) argue for nested or overlapping forms of membership that reflect the fluid and transnational realities of identity and belonging. Legal innovations such as transnational voting rights, regional citizenship, or portable social protections are worth exploring.

To summarize, the policy implications of this study are both ambitious and grounded. They call for a shift in mindset from managing migration to governing it ethically, from reacting to flows to anticipating needs, and from viewing mobility as a threat to embracing it as a constitutive element of global interdependence. By integrating plural paradigms into coherent, rights-based, and context-sensitive policy architectures, states and societies can move toward a more just and sustainable migration future.

Conclusion

This article has examined the complex and often competing paradigms that shape contemporary immigration policy: national security, economic utility, humanitarian obligation, cultural integration, and global mobility. Each of these paradigms offers a distinct lens through which immigration is framed, justified, and contested. Taken together, they reflect not just different policy instruments but fundamentally different moral worldviews, each with its own assumptions about the rights of migrants, the role of the state, and the nature of political community.

Through a critical interpretive synthesis, the study has shown that while each paradigm contributes important insights, none alone can account for the ethical and practical demands of modern migration. The security paradigm provides order but often marginalizes compassion. The economic paradigm promotes efficiency but risks commodifying human lives. The humanitarian paradigm foregrounds dignity but can be selectively applied. The cultural paradigm centers cohesion but may mask power asymmetries. And the mobility paradigm imagines justice beyond borders but can appear utopian in practice.

The central argument advanced here is that immigration policy must move beyond these siloed frameworks. What is needed is a pluralistic, ethically anchored approach that embraces the tensions among paradigms rather than erasing them. Such an approach requires intellectual honesty, normative clarity, and institutional innovation. It must take seriously the global realities of inequality and displacement while refusing to reduce migrants to mere categories of threat, labor, or pity.

These findings speak not only to academic theory but also to urgent political practice. As societies confront demographic shifts, labor shortages, and rising displacement, migration will remain a defining issue of the 21st century. How we govern it, who we welcome, how we define membership, and what rights we uphold will shape the future of liberal democracy, social cohesion, and global justice. This is not just about policy design but about the moral character of political life.

Yet the road ahead is not without complexity. Political polarization, institutional inertia, and structural inequality make reform difficult. Ethical commitments can be diluted in the heat of electoral cycles or securitized crisis narratives. Even well-intentioned policies may reproduce exclusion when enacted without listening to migrant voices. These realities demand not despair, but critical vigilance and humility.

At the same time, there are reasons for cautious optimism. Across the globe, civil society groups, municipal governments, and transnational networks are pioneering creative forms of governance, from sanctuary cities to humanitarian corridors to portable social protections. These initiatives remind us that innovation often begins below the state level and that justice is a project continually under construction.

While this article offers a critical conceptual analysis of five dominant paradigms in immigration policy, it also carries certain limitations. First, the study is primarily theoretical and interpretive; it does not include original empirical data or case-specific fieldwork. As such, the conclusions drawn here are necessarily abstract and require empirical validation in diverse policy contexts. Future research could build on this foundation by

conducting comparative case studies that examine how these paradigms interact in real-world policymaking, particularly across different regions of the Global South and Global North.

Second, this study has focused on widely recognized paradigms rooted in Western political thought and global institutional practices. Further work is needed to integrate alternative epistemologies such as indigenous, feminist, or decolonial perspectives that may offer additional critiques and new conceptual tools for reimagining migration governance.

Finally, while this article emphasizes the potential for pluralistic policy integration, it does not fully explore the political feasibility of such integration in highly polarized environments. Future inquiry should investigate not only what ethical migration policy ought to look like, but how it can be mobilized politically, institutionally, and culturally in an increasingly fragmented world.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank everyone who helped us during the article process.

References

- Aiyar, S., Barkbu, B., Batini, N., Berger, H., Detragiache, E., Dizioli, A., Ebeke, C., Lin, H., Kaltani, L., Sosa, S., Spilimbergo, A., & Topalova, P. (2016). The Refugee Surge in Europe: Economic Challenges. *Staff Discussion Notes*, 16(2), 1. <https://doi.org/10.5089/9781513552590.006>
- Allerton, C. (2017). Contested Statelessness in Sabah, Malaysia: Irregularity and the Politics of Recognition. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, 15(3), 250–268.

- <https://doi.org/10.1080/15562948.2017.1283457>
- Anderson, B. (2013). *Us and Them? The Dangerous Politics of Immigration Control*. Oxford University Press.
- Andreas, P. (2003). Redrawing the Line: Borders and Security in the Twenty-First Century. *International Security*, 28(2), 78–111.
- Aradau, C., & van Munster, R. (2009). Exceptionalism and the “War on Terror”: Criminology Meets International Relations. *British Journal of Criminology*, 49(5), 686–701.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azp036>
- Arendt, H. (1951). The Origins of Totalitarianism. In *On Violence* (New Editio). Duke University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1006/abbi.1999.1419>
- Asis, M. M. B., & Piper, N. (2008). Researching International Labor Migration in Asia. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 49(3), 423–444.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.2008.00122.x>
- Avdan, N. (2019). Visas and Walls: Border Security in the Age of Terrorism. In *Visas and Walls*. University of Pennsylvania Press All.
<https://doi.org/10.9783/9780812295696>
- Bauböck, R. (2009). Global Justice, Freedom of Movement and Democratic Citizenship. *European Journal of Sociology*, 50(1), 1–31.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S000397560900040X>
- Bell, D. (2017). Political realism and international relations. *Philosophy Compass*, 12(2), 1–16.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/phc3.12403>
- Bell, D. A. (2006). *Beyond Liberal Democracy: Political Thinking for an East Asian Context*. Princeton University Press.
https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004479135_004
- Benhabib, S. (2004a). Kantian Questions, Arendtian Answers: Statelessness, Cosmopolitanism, and the Right to Have Rights. In S. Benhabib & N. Fraser (Eds.), *Pragmatism, Critique, Judgment Essays for Richard J. Bernstein* (p. 404). The MIT Press.
- Benhabib, S. (2004b). *The Right of Others: Aliens, Residents, and Citizens*. Cambridge University Press.
www.cambridge.org
- Betts, A. (2013). *Survival Migration: Failed Governance and the Crisis of Displacement*. Cornell University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/eev054>
- Betts, A., & Collier, P. (2017). *Refuge: Transforming a Broken Refugee System*. Penguin Random House.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/scu.2020.0053>
- Bigo, D. (2002). Security and immigration: Toward a critique of the governmentality of unease. *Alternatives*, 27(SUPPL. 1), 63–92.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/03043754020270s105>
- Borjas, G. J. (2014). *Immigration Economics*. Harvard University Press.
- Boswell, C. (2007). Migration Control in Europe After 9/11: Explaining the Absence of Securitization*. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 45(3), 589–610.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2007.00722.x>
- Bove, V., & Böhmelt, T. (2016). Does Immigration Induce Terrorism? *The Journal of Politics*, 78(2), 572–588.
<https://doi.org/10.1086/684679>
- Cainkar, L. A. (2009). *Homeland Insecurity: The Arab American and Muslim*

- American Experience after 9/11* (1st ed.). Russell Sage Foundation.
- Carens, J. H. (2015). An overview of the ethics of immigration. In *New Challenges in Immigration Theory* (1st ed., p. 22). Routledge.
- Cesari, J. (2009). Muslims in the West after 9/11: Religion, politics, and law. In D. Bigo, E. Guild, & R. B. J. Walker (Eds.), *Muslims in the West after 9/11*. Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203863961>
- Costinot, A., & Donaldson, D. (2012). Ricardo's Theory of Comparative Advantage: Old Idea, New Evidence. In *NBER Working Paper* (17969; JEL No. F11,Q11,Q15,Q17,R14). Springer International Publishing.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-25984-5_301698
- Czaika, M., & De Haas, H. (2011). The effectiveness of Immigration Policies A Conceptual Review of Empirical Evidence. In *The IMI Working Papers Series* (33; 3, Issue 33). www.migrationdeterminants.eu
- De Genova, N. (2014). Spectacles of migrant "illegality": The scene of exclusion, the obscene of inclusion. In *The Language of Inclusion and Exclusion in Immigration and Integration* (1st ed., p. 19). Routledge.
- Dentico, N. (2021). The Breathing Catastrophe: COVID-19 and Global Health Governance. *Development*, 64(1-2), 4-12.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/s41301-021-00296-y>
- Denyer, D., & Tranfield, D. (2009). Producing a systematic review. In D. A. Buchanan & A. Bryman (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational research methods* (pp. 671-689). Sage Publications Ltd.
- Dixon-Woods, M., Agarwal, S., Jones, D., Young, B., & Sutton, A. (2005). Synthesising qualitative and quantitative evidence: a review of possible methods. *Journal of Health Services Research and Policy*, 10(1), 45-53.
<https://doi.org/10.1258/1355819052801804>
- Docquier, F., & Rapoport, H. (2011). Globalization, Brain Drain and Development. In *Journal of Development Economics* (5590; IZA Discussion Papers).
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2012.11.002>
- Dowd, R., & McAdam, J. (2017). International Cooperation and Responsibility-Sharing to Protect Refugees: What, Why and How? *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, 66(4), 863-892.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020589317000343>
- Dustmann, C., & Frattini, T. (2014). The Fiscal Effects of Immigration to the UK. *The Economic Journal*, 124(580), F593-F643.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/ecoj.12181>
- Dzordzormenyoh, M. K., & Boateng, F. D. (2023). Immigration Politics and Policymaking in the USA (2017-2021): Examining the Effect of Geopolitics on Public Attitude Towards Immigration Policies. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 24(3), 1281-1303.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-022-01004-6>
- Esposito, F., & Bosworth, M. (2024). Gender, Violence and Regimes of Vulnerability in Immigration Detention. In *Immigration Detention and Social Harm* (pp. 137-154). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003370727-11>

- Fassin, D. (2012). *Humanitarian Reason: A Moral History of the Present*. University of California Press. <http://www.ucpress.edu/book.php?isbn=9780520271173>
- Feigenberg, B. (2020). Fenced Out: The Impact of Border Construction on US-Mexico Migration. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 12(3), 106–139. <https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20170231>
- FitzGerald, D. S. (2019). *Refuge beyond Reach: How Rich Democracies Repel Asylum Seekers*. Oxford University Press.
- Freeman, G. P. (1995). Modes of immigration politics in liberal democratic states. *International Migration Review*, 29(4), 881–913. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2547729>
- Guild, E. (2010). The European Union after the Treaty of Lisbon: Fundamental Rights and EU Citizenship. *Centre for European Policy Studies*, May 2010, 9.
- Haas, H. de, Castles, S., & Miller, M. J. (2015). The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 38(13), 2355–2355. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2015.1050048>
- Helbling, M., & Meierrieks, D. (2022). Terrorism and Migration: An Overview. *British Journal of Political Science*, 52(2), 977–996. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123420000587>
- Hollifield, J. F., Martin, P. L., Orrenius, P. M., & Hérán, F. (2022). Controlling Immigration. In J. F. Hollifield, P. L. Martin, P. M. Orrenius, & F. Hérán (Eds.), *Controlling Immigration: A Comparative Perspective* (4th ed.). Stanford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781503631670>
- Hugo, G. (2002). Effects of international migration on the family of Indonesia. *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*, 11(1), 13–46. <https://doi.org/10.1177/011719680201100102>
- Huysmans, J. (2006). *The Politics of Insecurity Fear, migration and asylum in the EU*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.7202/017058ar>
- Joppke, C. (2004). The retreat of multiculturalism in the liberal state: theory and policy. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 55(2), 237–257. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2004.00017.x>
- Kang, S., & Song, B. K. (2022). Did Secure Communities Lead to Safer Communities? Immigration Enforcement, Crime Deterrence, and Geographical Externalities. *The Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*, 38(2), 345–385. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jleo/ewab013>
- Kim, D., & Tajima, Y. (2022). Smuggling and Border Enforcement. *International Organization*, 76(4), 830–867. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S002081832200011X>
- Kukathas, C. (2005). Language Rights and Political Theory. *Perspectives on Politics*, 3(01). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592705280143>
- Kukathas, C. (2014). The Case for Open Immigration. In A. I. Cohen & C. H. Wellman (Eds.), *Contemporary Debates in Applied Ethics* (2nd ed., p. 376). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Kymlicka, W. (1996). *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights* (paperback). Oxford University Press.

- <https://doi.org/10.1093/0198290918.001.0001>
- Kymlicka, W. (2012). Multiculturalism: Success, Failure, and the Future. In *Migration Policy Institute*.
- Lang, I. G. (2024). Security-centric approach in the use of digital technologies in EU migration and asylum policies. *Transnational Legal Theory*, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20414005.2024.2399934>
- Lewis, H., Dwyer, P., Hodgkinson, S., & Waite, L. (2015). Hyper-precarious lives. *Progress in Human Geography*, 39(5), 580–600. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132514548303>
- Malkki, L. H. (1996). Speechless Emissaries: Refugees, Humanitarianism, and Dehistoricization. *Cultural Anthropology*, 11(3), 337–404. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203979549-17>
- Menjívar, C., & Abrego, L. J. (2012). Legal Violence: Immigration Law and the Lives of Central American Immigrants. *American Journal of Sociology*, 117(5), 1380–1421. <https://doi.org/10.1086/663575>
- Mezzadra, S., & Neilson, B. (2013). *Border as Method, or, the Multiplication of Labor*. Duke University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822377542>
- Milner, J. (2009). Refugees and the Regional Dynamics of Peacebuilding. *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 28(1), 13–30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdp015>
- Minca, C., & Vaughan-Williams, N. (2012). Carl Schmitt and the Concept of the Border. *Geopolitics*, 17(4), 756–772. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2012.660578>
- Morgenthau, H. J., & Thompson, K. W. (1993). *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace. Brief Edition* (6th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2006). *Frontiers of Justice: Disability, Nationality, Species Membership*. Harvard University Press.
- OECD. (2017). *Better Policies for Better Lives. Members and Partners*. <http://www.oecd.org/about/membersandpartners/>
- Ottaviano, G. I. P., & Peri, G. (2012). Rethinking the Effect of Immigration on Wages. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 10(1), 152–197. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1542-4774.2011.01052.x>
- Papademetriou, D. G., & Sumption, M. (2011). Rethinking Points Systems and Employer-Selected Immigration. In *Migration Policy* <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/rethinkingpointssystem.pdf>
- Pinotti, P. (2015). Immigration Enforcement and Crime. *American Economic Review*, 105(5), 205–209. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.p20151040>
- Rae, G. (2016). The real enmity of Carl Schmitt's concept of the political. *Journal of International Political Theory*, 12(3), 258–275. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1755088215591301>
- Rein, M., & Schön, D. (1996). Frame-critical policy analysis and frame-reflective policy practice. *Knowledge and Policy*, 9(1), 85–104. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02832235>
- Rodriguez, R. M. (2010). *Migrants for Export: How the Philippine State Brokers Labor to the World*. University of Minnesota Press.

- <https://muse.jhu.edu/book/24439>.
- Ruhs, M. (2013). *The Price of Rights: Regulating International Labor Migration*. Princeton University Press.
- Ruhs, M., & Martin, P. (2008). Numbers vs. Rights: Trade-Offs and Guest Worker Programs. *International Migration Review*, 42(1), 249–265. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2007.00120.x>
- Sager, A. (2016). Methodological Nationalism, Migration and Political Theory. *Political Studies*, 64(1), 42–59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9248.12167>
- Schmitt, C. (2005). *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Sen, A. (2009). The Idea of Justice. In *Journal of Human Development*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649880802236540>
- Shachar, A. (2006). *The Race for Talent: Highly Skilled Migrants and Competitive Immigration Regimes* (883739; UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LEGAL STUDIES).
- Taylor, C. (1994). The Politics of Recognition. In A. Guttman (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition* (p. 25). Princeton University Press.
- Tazzioli, M. (2019). *The Making of Migration: The biopolitics of mobility at Europe's borders*. Sage Publications Ltd.
- UNHCR. (2011). The 1951 Convention and its 1967 Protocol. In *UNHCR* (p. 16). UNHCR.
- Ypi, L. (2012). *Global Justice and Avant-Garde Political Agency*. Oxford University Press.
- Zimbalist, Z. (2025). Regional Economic Communities and Attitudes Toward Free Cross-Border Movement in Africa. *International Migration Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01979183241303703>