

Beyond the exceptional. Tracing the repercussions of a security speech act

Abstract

Since the 1980s, debates on security have expanded and security has become a catchphrase in virtually every area of life. In Finland, the government elected in 2003 began its four-year period in power by launching a special Internal Security Programme (ISP) that stressed the threat of social exclusion. Altogether four ISPs have been launched in Finland since 2004. They all repeat the menace of social exclusion. In this article, we examine how these speech acts materialised on the level of legislation. Our study suggests that in Finland, the securitization of exclusion was only accepted in the media. Overall it ‘failed’, as on the level of law, internal security and exclusion were not, in the main, connected when security measures were justified. On the other hand, we contend that by introducing more monitoring and less privacy – especially among youth – the legislation effectively opened novel avenues for ‘security nothings’.

Keywords: Finland, content analysis, internal security, securitizing, social exclusion

1. Introduction

In 2004, the Finnish Government launched a special Internal Security Programme¹ (ISP), drafted by an impressive group of ministers, government officials, experts and NGOs, calling for cross-sectoral co-operation to prevent serious crime, reduce accidents, and increase citizens’ sense of security. The media focused on the fact that the programme defined social exclusion as the main threat to security.² As social exclusion – encompassing unemployment and the accumulation of social and economic disadvantage – had been the core of Finnish social policy discussions since the 1980s (Sandberg 2015), the coupling of exclusion and security threats was a novel take. Since 2004, every newly elected Government has had its own ISP and each has repeated the menace of social exclusion (ISP 2004, 2; ISP 2008, 6; ISP 2012, 12). Each

¹In the European context, internal security may refer to countering of crises, terrorism or organized crime, to law and order, or border security (e.g. Bruun 2016). In the ISPs the term refers to social inclusion and life without fear of crime or disturbances.

²<https://www.hs.fi/kotimaa/art-2000004212754.html>;

ISP also gained wide publicity in the Finnish media³. The reoccurring news about ‘the threat of social exclusion’ seemed to us a textbook example of *securitizing* – reframing societal problems as security issues.

There are probably many reasons why internal security became an issue that needed a special programme in Finland. After 9/11, (in)security became topical globally, and several countries started to revise their security protocols and legislation⁴. Discussions over the blurring of internal and external domains of security had already been vocal in the European security policies since the beginning of 2000 (Duke & Ojanen 2006; Eriksson & Rhinard 2009). In Finland, the new millennium witnessed a shift in the discussions on social problems, as concern over the children and the young became more common: anxiety, depression, problems at school, and substance abuse were reported to be increasing (Bardy et al. 2001, 15-19) as the country suffered yet another economic downturn. Furthermore, in 2002, a 19-year-old student killed 7 and wounded 168 people by setting off a home-made bomb in the Myyrmanni shopping centre. In 2007 and 2008, Finland experienced fatal school shootings.⁵ In the 2003 parliamentary campaign, security was a major theme on every party’s platform⁶. The 2004 launching of the first ISP was hence a delivered political promise, but also a manifesto stressing the importance of “everyday security”.

Security has indeed become a catchword in virtually every area of life, and topics from leisure, through social problems, to climate change may now be framed as questions of security (Balzacq 2015; C.A.S.E. 2006; Mythen & Walklate 2016; McDonald 2012). This change can be labelled as securitization, implying a process in which an actor, through a speech act, reframes a societal condition as a security issue that forms an

³ <https://www.hs.fi/kotimaa/art-2000004562781.html>; <https://yle.fi/uutiset/3-9867084>; <https://yle.fi/uutiset/3-5060362>

⁴ The EU introduced legislation to define terrorism as a criminal act after 9/11 in June 2002 (Framework decision to combat terrorism). This decision was implemented in national criminal codes in Member States. Furthermore, the EU adopted the European Arrest Warrant, took steps to attack terrorist financing, and agreed on mutual legal assistance with the USA. Other concerted measures, including security programmes (e.g. The Tampere programme 1999) have led to a security policy convergence in Member States (Virta 2013).

⁵ In 2007 (Jokela school shooting) and in 2008 (Kauhajoki school shooting). In the aftermath, these were all connected to social exclusion. See Sandberg 2015, 1-2.

⁶ With security, the parties leaning more to the right advocated more resources for the police and zero tolerance of drug use, while parties leaning to the left and the centre advocated measures to fight social exclusion and poverty. The platforms are available (in Finnish) in the Pohtiva database, <https://www.fsd.tuni.fi/pohtiva/>

'existential threat' (e.g. Buzan 1991, 19-20; Buzan, Wæver & de Wilde 1998, 7, 23-33; Wæver 1995). It transforms the way of dealing with the issue by authorizing the raising of the target matter above normal politics, into the domain of the exceptional (Balzacq 2005; Buzan & Wæver 2003, 491; Wæver 1995, 54-57). This "exceptional" has in many cases materialized as punitive measures targeted towards those identified as threats (e.g. Huysmans 2000).

In a liberal democracy, problems and threats are usually encountered through politics and legislation (e.g. Crawford 2009; Demirsu 2017). Legislation thus deserves systematic, empirical scrutiny as it plays a vital role in society. On the one hand, law facilitates, enables and protects. On the other hand, it represses, as it can mobilize physical force in the service of social control. Law has an ideological function, as it embodies the values of some people whilst disregarding those of others (Crawford 2009; Milovanovic 1994, 8-11). Law hence plays an important communicative role by creating institutions and procedures, as well as a vocabulary, which enable normative discussion and initiate and direct actions. By uttering security in legislation, matters that used to be politically insupportable may be reconstructed or retranslated as acceptable, bringing forth exceptional new legislative powers claiming to uphold or deliver 'security' (c.f. Crawford & Hutchinson 2016). As internal security was brought centre stage in politics and in the media, our study asks: What kind of legislation has been enacted in the name of internal security in Finland?

Our study suggests that coupling security threats with social exclusion did not bring about any exceptional rupture in the way social exclusion is dealt with on the level of legislation in Finland. Securitizing exclusion thus 'failed', as exclusion or the excluded were not, in the main, targeted by securitizing language or under the pretext of security on the level of legislation. This said, our analysis nevertheless provides grounds to suggest that securitization somewhat penetrated the legislative level of dealing with social exclusion, by paving the way for novel practices of surveillance and information exchange, particularly regarding the young. The case of Finland thus demonstrates that securitization does not necessarily enter with a 'big bang': it may tiptoe around the processes, disguise itself in discourses of concern, and mask itself in

novel practices that necessitate co-operation between, for example, police and education services. This is why securitization calls for contextual identification beyond the obvious exceptional.

2. Constructing security as exception and routine in theory and practice

2.1 The theory of securitization

The theory of securitization – that is, the idea of a speech act initiating particular preventive and often problematic measures to uphold or increase a sense of security in a given society – has been criticized as well as developed on many accounts. For us, the most interesting aspects of this criticism are the ideas of the exceptional and the routine in securitization, and the difference between a successful and a failed securitizing act (Bourbeau 2014; Bigo 2011; Huysmans 2011; McDonald 2012; Salter 2011; Trombetta 2011). By examining how ISPs have materialized in government bills, we wish to highlight some of the contradictions in the process of securitization. We first discuss the idea of securitization and introduce the context of social exclusion in Finland before presenting the key points of the ISPs.

Buzan et al. (1998), who were among the first to introduce the idea, see securitization as taking place on the third level of the political agenda setting. On the first level, an issue is non-politicized: it is not on any political agenda nor debated in society. The issue becomes politicized when it is raised onto the political agenda and governed via standard political systems or flagged by social activists. On the third level, the standard procedures are discarded, the issue is securitized, and emergency is declared. According to the theory, securitizing may involve the use of the emergency language of threat and enmity, breaking the conventions of secrecy, placing limitations on otherwise inviolable rights, or allocating exceptional resources to a specific task (Buzan et al. 1998, 24–26; Huysmans 2011, 373-4). Hence, the purpose of a securitizing speech act is to cause a reaction, to start the engines of societal defence. Exception is a characteristic of securitization: securitization authorizes something that is not the norm.

This idea of securitization involving exceptionality has been problematized. Borrowing from Bigo (2011), Bourbeau (2014) claims that security is also about mundane, bureaucratic decision-making, based on the logic of routine (see also Solhjell et al. 2018). By concentrating on the exception only, the theory of securitization fails to address continuity in its processes. As Bourbeau (2014, 191) posits,

“Focusing only on moments and places of exception neglects the numerous ways in which security practices are reproduced consistently across time and space. Conversely, an exclusive focus on routine practices does not allow room to account for change, critical junctures, or the impacts of ‘windows of opportunity’ on contemporary security affairs.”

Concentrating on the moments of exception, the securitization theory also reifies elite perceptions and discourses on security and neglects other agents and points of securitization (Bourbeau 2014; Huysmans 2011). Exception overlooks the mundane, more modest ways of forwarding change, those that are negotiated over time and decided on quietly. Huysmans (2011, 375) rightly emphasizes the meaning of “security nothings”, referring to the fact that securitization moves along “unspectacular processes of technologically driven surveillance, risk management, and precautionary governance”. Bourbeau (2014, 195) also suggests that it is namely routine that is at play when securitization actors import and reproduce similar securitizing logics across a variety of domains. These accounts are in line with the speech act theory, especially Searle’s (1965) thoughts on recognition and retranslation: with a speech act, a person always intends to enable the hearer to recognize the meaning of their speech. Recognition in turn requires sincerity and conventionally identified practices. These practices form the contextual circle of what is sayable and credible in each situation and what is not (c.f. Salter 2011). To foster recognition, the securitizing speech act must then connect to accepted conventions and discourses that are credible in a given context.

Shore and Wright (2011, 14) point out an illuminating example of recognition, borrowing from Fairclough’s study of shop-floor workers in the midst of an

organizational change. As they could not adopt the new system 'at face value' and needed to retranslate new ideas into the existing way of organizing things, the workers used their prevalent meanings and vocabulary to understand what they were expected to do. This kind of recognition and retranslation precedes the acceptance of a speech act, as acceptance unavoidably involves repetition and discussion, aiming to amalgamate the issue into existing reality. The amalgamation does not take place at one 'high point', but through routines, with time. Hence, securitization is not only an instant reaction, like an order to attack the enemy; it can also involve processes and practices that use gradual dispersion.

After recognition and retranslation, acceptance is the next step in the securitization process. According to Floyd (2018) and others (e.g. Balzacq, 2011; Buzan et al. 1998, 31), powerful audience's acceptance is a prerequisite for securitization to materialize. Only by having the audience accept the threat can those in power advance the measures of emergency (Balzacq 2005, 185). Given this, McDonald (2012) investigated the acceptance of climate change as a security threat in Australia. He argues that even when most of the national elite accepted the definition of the climate threat, and even when most people were behind the measures needed to tackle it, the outcome was a failure, as voicing security did not silence the political debate nor did it deliver the means with which to tackle the threat (McDonald 2012). Hence, success on one level (acceptance) does not automatically lead to success on another (measures) (also Roe 2008). In addition, it may be harder to evoke emergency measures with threats that include indeterminacy and uncertainty. Climate change is not a straightforward enemy and it cannot be neutralized by a military attack. The same can be said of social exclusion.

McDonald's study nevertheless leaves open the question of time: when can we actually decide that securitization failed? Various exceptional measures may materialize at different stages of the process and to varying degrees: some may take place immediately, others later. Some may have perpetual effects, others only temporary ones. In the process of securitization, acceptance, emergency measures and ultimate success or failure may be poles apart. Translation, acceptance and the

amalgamation of securitization practices in new domains do not necessarily form an instant one-off event; they tiptoe and may even go unnoticed at first. As Crawford and Hutchinson (2016) state, securitization may create both short- and long-term effects, and security measures deployed today can breed insecurities and grievances in the future. This said, the idea of securitization proceeding with a 'big bang' seems reserved for issues dealing with traditional international relations, in which security mainly signifies policies that include a military attack (e.g. Bigo 2016; Wæver 1995, 50). Other measures targeting social or environmental threats might prove to be less dramatic but equally powerful. Bearing this in mind, the process of law-making, in turn, offers an insight into measures that can be regarded as both continuity and change.

2.2 Social exclusion in Finland and in the contents of the ISPs

Social exclusion became a sort of buzzword in European social research during the 1980s (e.g. Castel 1995; Sipilä 1985). Theoretically, social exclusion referred to the fears that the social fabric would dissolve and fragment. Stemming from observations that poverty itself had changed from a short-term experience of income poverty to a persisting, over-generational process linked to complex problems of long-term unemployment, mental health issues and substance abuse, causing a barrier to participation in so-called normal life, social exclusion somewhat displaced the term poverty in social policy discussions. (Berghman 1995; Penttilä et al. 2003; Helne 2002.) In Finland, a major factor causing social exclusion was the severe economic recession in 1991–1995, resulting in a tremendous rise in unemployment, massive cuts in social security spending and the doubling of the number of people in need of income support (Hiilamo et al. 2012). While the redistributive welfare system mainly succeeded in countering absolute poverty, income disparity grew in Finland during 1995–2007. The trend in unemployment has been declining since 1994 but the risk of exclusion, as well the amount of people receiving income support, has persisted (Ilmakunnas & Moisio 2014). Fears of crime and becoming a crime victim nonetheless diminished in Finland

during 2006–2016 (Police Barometer 2016), along with the overall crime rate (assault and drug offences excluded) (Aaltonen & Danielsson 2017, 10-11)⁷.

Historically, freedom from want, poverty and violence is granted in Finland by social legislation, which is based on the ideas of education, prevention and equality. In 50 years, Finland rose from a war-torn, poor, agrarian country to one of the leading nations in terms of quality of life⁸. The social security system is built on the idea of universalism, thus it is a normal part of everyday life in, for example, the form of parental benefits and health services, and does not stigmatize its recipients. Stressing the prevention of social exclusion is thus nothing exceptional in Finland, as the Nordic welfare system, despite entailing high taxes, enjoys wide support among the population (e.g. Korkman 2011). In this vein, securitizing exclusion – and exclusion becoming top priority in government – could be interpreted as a sign of defending the very core of the welfare state and the idea of collectively supporting those in need. This resonates with the account of Schuilenburg & van Steden (2014) who call for a positive understanding of the concept of securitizing, stressing the idea that “an emergency” also has the potential to move matters forward in a positive, non-punitive way. Similarly, Bigo (2006, 402) claims that security only has meaning in democracy if it works to protect the weakest against injustice, exploitation and marginalization. The emergency could then, potentially, materialize in legislation by the allocation of exceptional resources to prevent exclusion by means of social services.

In describing the threats to security and defining social exclusion, the 2004 programme (p. 2) refers to poverty, unemployment, loneliness, social inequality, and substance abuse. According to the ISP2008, over-generational exclusion, with disadvantage accumulating in the same families, is especially alarming. A low level of education and lacking the skills needed in today’s information society, excessive debt, a lack of meaningful hobbies (ISP 2008, 6), and dropping out of school (ISP 2012, 13) are also listed as markers of exclusion. Still, even as the ISPs became famous for declaring social exclusion as the main threat to security in Finland, their outspoken purpose was crime

⁷ If criminality and the number of jailed persons is assessed globally, Finland ranks among the top ten countries with low levels in both. See Global Peace Index, <http://visionofhumanity.org/reports>

⁸ <https://www.socialprogress.org/index/results>

prevention. For example, in 2004 the ISP emphasis was on preventing terrorism, violence and drug offences, and in the 2008 version these were complemented with measures combating racist crimes, illegal migration and the sexual abuse of children. As the list of measures to address the threats to security concentrates on crime prevention, the ISPs actually bring social exclusion parallel to crime and violence. The 2012 ISP, for example, states that

[1] “A particular feature of violence in Finland is that it is closely associated with social exclusion. The usual perpetrator of a violent offence in Finland is a socially excluded man who is an unemployed substance abuser” (ISP 2012, 13).

The programme further states that “Dropping out of school and becoming unemployed increases the risk of a young person becoming socially excluded and involved in criminal activity” (ISP 2012, 13). Hence, the ISPs repeat the scientific discourse of concern over the young that manifested itself in at the beginning of 2000. However, the programmes do not resort to a ‘language of enmity’; they stress the traditions of the Nordic welfare model in which it is society’s responsibility to look after the vulnerable:

[2] “Events and circumstances leading to social exclusion should be dealt with as early as possible before they amount to longstanding, negative effects of insecurity. Society has particular responsibility to ensure the security of vulnerable groups, such as children and the elderly” (ISP 2008, 6, 64).

It is thus clear that in regard to defining solutions to exclusion, the ISPs do not deviate from the definitions of the social security experts who have long stressed the importance of early prevention (e.g. Bardy et al 2001). There is nevertheless a discrepancy between the identified problems and the proposed measures, as the latter are clearly oriented towards preventing crime, not exclusion. The ISPs hence blur the language of (internal) security and social security.

We now turn to our empirical data on government proposals to gauge the materialization of the coupling of social exclusion and internal security as it appears in Finnish law-making.

3. Data and Methods

The data were gathered as part of a larger research project called ‘Securitization in the Finnish legislative practice 1991-2018’, funded by the Academy of Finland. First, we examined all the government bills of 1991–2014⁹ and formed a matrix of 6227 bills with information on their connection to security issues. Based on this data, we identified 20 distinct security fields (e.g. internal security, economic security, etc.) using the PDF ‘Find’ command. The search word we used was *turvall** (the basic lemma of the word ‘security’ in Finnish)¹⁰. All in all, 2089 bills returned a hit, and 85 bills were deemed to refer to internal security. In the coding process, in addition to the clear-cut use of the words ‘internal security’, we included words such as ‘security of the citizens’, ‘security of the population’, ‘security of society’ and ‘security of individuals’. Hence, we gauged internal security using a ‘discursive net’ that included a semantic relation to the idea of internal security.¹¹

Next, we narrowed down the data by excluding all the bills that fell outside the timeframe of 2004–2014. We also discarded bills that were cancelled or rejected, or that were not technically laws (budgets). At this point, the amount of bills selected for content analysis was 61. However, some of these only cursorily mentioned internal security¹², whereas others dealt with the internal security of, for example, the USA. Furthermore, some bills mentioned the ‘security of citizens’ in reference to the

⁹ This timeframe was selected due to the project’s initial interest in long-term changes in security policy. The 1990s was a watershed in the Finnish political landscape in many ways, due to the economic recession.

¹⁰ Some of the bills included several varying references to security. To be able to classify each bill into one particular category, we first identified the two most common brands of security. The final classification was then decided on the basis of the content of the bill, according to the most often used reference.

¹¹ Internal security is understood here as the security of people living in a defined territory, forming a society (with a common language, collective memories, etc.). The security of individuals was included in these instances if the text referred to Finns, citizens or the Finnish people.

¹² E.g. Bill 164/2007, which cursorily mentions the 2004 ISP as a reason to call for a co-operative body considering further legislation, or Bill 77/2013, in which only the name of the Ministry of Interior was changed.

maintenance of streets, in effect referring to safety, not security¹³. These were all excluded. Thus, the inclusion criteria for a bill in the final analysis was that it was successfully enacted and included a discourse of internal security in Finland. By discourse, we mean any explanation or argumentation in the text connected to any of the meanings of internal security listed above, which went beyond merely mentioning 'internal security'. This final limitation produced 42 bills for us to qualitatively analyse using NVivo.

We used NVivo to identify and classify the meanings of internal security, to examine the relation to internal security and the level of materiality or exceptionality of the means suggested in the bills. By materiality we refer to the quality (e.g. concrete vs ambiguous; new resources vs no new resources; now vs in the future) of the measures suggested in the bills. All the analysed items were arranged as Nodes. We drew these directly from the text of a given bill, then classified them according to their content.

4. Analysis: Stressing crime and dodging exclusion

4.1 Two groups of bills

The aim of this research was to explore the repercussions of a speech act, declaring exclusion as a security threat. By analysing the 42 bills, we first discovered that the bill with the greatest number of explicit references to security (turvall*) concerned border guards, (430 hits), and that the one with the least concerned youth services, (2 hits). Eleven bills returned 50 or more hits, and 15 bills had less than 10 hits. This initial divide revealed that on the level of legislation, internal security was not so much about citizens as about authorities.

We first classified the bills to determine their connection to particular security themes by identifying the bill's main aim (e.g. crime prevention, guaranteeing of rights, administration etc.) and the essential legislation to which it was connected (e.g. penal

¹³ The Finnish language presented its own dilemmas in the data selection process. The word 'security' is problematic, as we do not have separate words for security and safety: the word for both is 'turvallisuus'. Another problem is that Finnish is an inflected language that uses many compound words. The analysis hence required us to first scan all the documents using the 'Find' command in PDF, and then the 'Word Query' in NVivo.

code, social security legislation, labour legislation, etc.). The bills were grouped into three distinct sets: those connected to criminal offences or the penal code (N=26, 62%); those connected to administrative legislation (N=9, 21%); and miscellaneous laws (N=7, 17%).

We call the biggest group of bills “crime prevention”: this included 62 per cent of all bills containing a reference to internal security. In these bills, the language of security was strongly connected to the broadening of criminalization, the enabling of more police powers, the regulation of preliminary crime investigation, increasing control over migrants, or adding the monitoring of prisoners. Some of the bills did not target the penal code but aimed to change laws explicitly connected to penal issues (e.g. Bill 197/2008 concerning customs offences). The crime prevention group also included laws that specifically addressed immigration or foreigners (Bills 32/2006 and 95/2009 both deal with the Register of Aliens Act, the former regarding human trafficking, the latter taxation), or linking prostitution and economic crime to immigration. Hence, we can safely say that *bills referring to internal security mostly deal with crime, police powers and immigration*.

The second group of bills (21%) we call “administrative bills”. These used notions of internal security to mainly justify changes in the administration of police work or jurisdiction (Bills 4/2007; 126/2008; 58/2009; 64/2013; 346/2014), or to extend co-operation and information exchange between different authorities in non-criminal issues (Bills 59/2009; 1/2010). This group also included bills pertaining to immigration, for example, Bill 90/2007, which deals with altering administrative jurisdiction.

The rest of the bills (17%) referring to internal security were scattered in laws that varied from the rights of the disabled to protecting personal information in the trade register. These bills use internal security as a mere parenthesis; for example, Bill 96/2005 only shortly stated that ‘the prevention of accidents is part of public health work for which guidelines are defined in the ISP’. Key word density was lowest in this third group, at an average of 24, while in the two other groups the average density was 40. We did not analyse this third group of bills in detail.

4.2 Increasing police powers and rewriting the penal code

A more detailed look at the “crime prevention” group reveals that the issues regulated in reference to internal security deal with, for example, human trafficking, organized crime, terrorism, and illegal migration (e.g. Bills 34/2004; 26/2008; 197/2008; 61/2012; 164/2013). In addition, international treaties on the prevention of violence against women (the Istanbul Convention, Bill 155/2014), and the protection of children against sexual exploitation and abuse (Council of Europe, CETS 201, Bill 282/2010) are legitimated by references to internal security and crime prevention. These were also the outspoken targets described in the programmes. The bills suggesting a risk assessment of life prisoners (279/2010) and compulsory medical treatment of sexual offenders as a precondition for supervised probationary release (140/2012) were also among those that connected internal security to restricting criminal behaviour. Bill 6/2005 (concerning border guards’ role in crime prevention and especially in the prevention of terrorism) states that

[3] “A Government platform on societally vital activity lists illegal entry and security-endangering movements of population, environmental threats, organized crime, terrorism, and disasters as the main threats to societal security. If realized, these threats may result in disturbances in societally vital functions, and hence jeopardize national security, living conditions, and the security of the people” (p. 9).

To counter these threats, the bill suggests that border guards be granted extended powers to perform criminal investigations, and that their rights to carry out surveillance and control tasks also be extended. These accounts and measures are also repeated in Bill 26/2008, which states that “the bill merely brings an already existing practice of cooperation in crime investigation between customs, border guards and the police under legal regulation”, by allowing the establishment of common centres for crime analysis, and the sharing of information between authorities.

The essential message of Bill 187/2004 (dealing with military executive assistance to the police) is also that terrorism involves actions that seriously endanger society's basic functioning, its judicial system, and the security of the people (p. 7). The bill states that

[4] "While terrorist attacks aimed at Finland or in Finland are highly unlikely, the provisions [regarding the police being able to call for the executive assistance of the armed forces] should be written in such a manner as to enable immediate counter-measures to control the situation and to interrupt any criminal activity" (p. 6).

Bill 155/2014, adjusting the Istanbul Convention to Finnish legislation, in turn, concretely lists the several comments and official reprimands that Finland has received over the years concerning violence against women. The bill states that

[5] "Violence against women is a considerable problem in Finland. Finland has received several comments from international human rights' monitoring bodies. Already at the beginning of the 2000s, the CEDAW committee noted the extensiveness of violence against women in Finland" (p. 14).

The bill asserts that Finland has attempted to solve the problems through various programmes and measures aimed at preventing violence against women, and that the issue has been accepted as part of the first ISP. (Bill 155/2014, pp. 7–8.)

Although the bill lists several projects launched to address the problem of violence against women, it refrains from allocating adequate resources for the shelters needed for victims of domestic violence. Claiming that the Treaty does not unequivocally state the number of required shelters, the bill addresses the strengthening of internal security (i.e. women's security) by making a reference to an upcoming government platform, hence postponing the matter into the distant and rather abstract future (Bill 155/2014, 18). As if it were a consolation, the bill states that the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health nevertheless "will begin preparations to establish a toll-free hotline for victims" (p. 19).

Bill 126/2008 in turn states that one of the goals of the 2008 ISP is to reduce violence. To this end, the bill suggests a new kind of operational model to secure special expertise in dealing with children who have endured abuse or violence. According to the bill, “strengthening the authorities’ expertise and the administrative structure helps implement the goals of the ISP” (p. 6). This is also the main aim of Bill 333/2014 – to prevent familicide. In this Bill, social and health service authorities are granted permission to cooperate with the police in case of concerns regarding their customers.

Further, helping victims of crime is described as internal security *per se*, in both Bill 14/2013, which suggests that the police should be obliged to actively ask victims to allow their contact details to be given to victim support services (p. 8), and Bill 293/2014, which enacts a system of crime victim compensation. Here, the ISP emerges as the main reason for enacting legislation (p. 3) and the bill also explicitly borrows the language of the ISP, as it states that

[6] “Safeguarding the wellbeing of the populace, education and employment forms the basis of Finnish criminal policy and a secure society. The amount of crime in society can be reduced in many ways. The most efficient way is prevention” (p. 17).

The reasoning behind the statement is nevertheless connected to the need for the perpetrator to be liable for their actions. According to the bill, this is best achieved by engaging the perpetrators in preventive work by making them partly pay the costs of the crime victim settlement (Bill 293/2014, 17). The perpetrators, who in many cases are socially deprived and excluded themselves, are then actually forced to pay an additional penalty fee.

Finally, bills targeting immigration and immigrants repeat the primacy of crime prevention in enhancing security. For example, Bill 95/2009 suggests that to fulfil the goals of the 2004 ISP, the authorities’ rights to share information on foreign workers (i.e. whether the foreign national poses a security threat to society, p. 7), and on corporations employing foreign nationals, need to be expanded. Although the bill hints at the goal of protecting vulnerable foreign workers, it nevertheless mainly stresses

the prevention of crime as its prime ambition (p. 8; also, Bill 32/2006 on preventing human trafficking).

4.3 Reforming administration and expanding co-operation

The bills on police administration (Bills 4/2007 and 346/2014), the education of police officers (Bill 64/2013), and youth (Bill 1/2010) in turn build a connection to internal security that fall under the category of 'administrative reorganizing'. They mainly aim to enhance internal security by changing the internal command hierarchy of the police or other authorities.

One of the bills with the most references to security is Bill 346/2014, which suggests that the Finnish Security Intelligence Service's (Suojelupoliisi (SP), in Finnish) administration should be reorganized so that it is governed directly by the Ministry of the Interior. The reasons for the reform are justified by stating that the line between internal and external security has become blurred. This paves the way for both a new definition of the SP, and for the suggested administrative move to enable the SP to be closer to strategic, political decision-making and greater resources (pp. 3–4, 8–9).

Other bills falling under the category of administration make references to internal security in connection to, for example, creating a new police information technology centre to better answer to the needs of internal security authority (Bill 4/2007). Bill 64/2013 in turn uses security language to convince the audience of the need to enhance the status of police training with a Police Academy curriculum reform which would enable officers to become "more explicit experts in security" (p. 11).

The most interesting bill in the administrative group is Bill 1/2010, as it is the only one in the entire data that explicitly addresses exclusion. It is also the 'poorest' in terms of using the word 'security' (key word, N=2). Nevertheless, this bill is the clearest in its references to the language of internal security. It starts by stating that:

[7] "Securing the wellbeing of children and the young is vital for Finland. Changes in the demography and welfare expenditures ratio require societal participation from the young.

By securing active citizenship, education and employment, and by preventing exclusion, the future of the welfare state is ensured” (p. 3).

While highly instrumental in its goal, this bill recognizes that the young need better social services, particularly assistance in attaining education and employment. The need for social services is in turn connected to growing amounts of loneliness, dropping out of school, and withdrawing from military service, that is, markers of exclusion (p. 4). The bill goes on to state that

[8] “Exclusion is a threat to the young themselves, to their families, and to society. According to the Internal Security Programme, exclusion is the most crucial threat to internal security” (p. 8).

To counter this threat, the bill suggests more co-operation between various authorities, less privacy orders pertaining to sharing information between authorities, and establishing youth work patrols. The security of the young would then, according to the bill, be improved by

[9] “[a] network of multisector authorities that monitors the circumstances of the young and gives advice for local level decision-making. The network would not deal with individuals but would discuss matters concerning the functionality of services on a general level” (p. 9).

The organizing of the youth work patrols (to find young people in need of assistance), is in turn formulated as follows: “The municipality may organize youth work patrols if necessary” (p. 9). However, according to the bill, the means described must not cause further expenses to municipalities.

5. Results: The absence of social exclusion in legislation referring to internal security

In this article, we set out to systematically examine how prevalent the idea of internal security has been as a justification for legislation and how social exclusion has been addressed in the bills referring to internal security. The results of our analysis suggest

that social exclusion – the main threat to internal security, according to the ISPs – was actually quite absent in the examined government bills. Internal security was mainly used as a justification in proposals aimed at tackling serious crime, or in those aiming to restructure police organization. Hence, the speech act that raised internal security onto the political agenda was recognized and retranslated within those quarters that were already familiar with the vocabulary of policing and security. This resulted in legislative measures being aimed at the consequences of social exclusion (crime) rather than at the root causes introduced in the ISPs (substance abuse, lack of education, poverty).

Although all the ISPs gave license to seize social exclusion by defining it as the most pressing internal security issue, the legislator seems to have hesitated to use securitization vocabulary to legitimate the new legislation targeting social exclusion. Hence, we are not suggesting that no bills addressed social exclusion during the time span under scrutiny. What we are suggesting is that the securitization of exclusion was not recognized as a proper portrayal of solving the problem and hence did not invite retranslation or acceptance among those parties preparing social and health legislation. So, notwithstanding the heavy support of several ministries and politicians, even the media, or the exceptionality of the initial speech act, the securitization of social exclusion ‘failed’ because it did not attract retranslation on the level of legislation. The ISPs gave strong backing to bills dealing with traditional policing and crime control, but security language was not mainstreamed in connection to preventing exclusion. Unlike the ISPs, the bills did not resort to constructing dangerous ‘others’, except the youth bill. In this particular bill, youths were portrayed as a threat along the lines that appropriate the historical discourses of children and youths as a problem in need of normalising measures (c.f. Jenks 2005). With the young, the securitizing went the furthest, as legislation granted the authorities rights that can be interpreted as increasing monitoring and compromising privacy.

In the Nordic context, social inclusion and equal life opportunities are political goals few would resist. Finnish criminal and social policies are deeply rooted in the humane traditions of a social-democratic welfare state that stresses equality, collectivism and

universal rights (e.g. Lahti 2017). The marginalized are not traditionally portrayed as threats to society or enemies within, but as individuals in need of social assistance. We propose that, in the main, this tradition persisted, forming a crucial reason as to why the portrayal of social problems as security threats did not fully penetrate Finnish legislation (c.f. Palola 2014).

However, if we had anticipated that securitizing exclusion would have resulted in exceptional resources to reduce suffering, we were disappointed. If we compare the justifications in the bills related to terrorism and police powers to those related to violence against women and the exclusion of the young, the remote threat of a terrorist attack was responded to with more immediacy, exact powers, extended rights, and carefully defined agency and jurisdiction, whereas the very real security threats to women and the young – most likely resulting from social exclusion – were mainly met with bureaucracy. Even the highly damaging consequences of violence against women did not invite emergency actions. This was a striking contradiction to the message of the ISPs, confirming the idea that securitizing is, fundamentally, a restricting manoeuvre that does not coincide with benevolence.

We suggest that the main outcome of securitizing social exclusion was a blurring of the meaning of prevention. Redefining social assistance as security and introducing cooperation between police and, for example, education authorities may introduce novel ways of control. The prevention of exclusion then becomes part of (crime) prediction, whereas assistance becomes tied to control (c.f. Bigo 2016: 1078-1080). This was manifested to some degree in the bills that presented more monitoring, less privacy and further sharing of information between authorities as solutions to the root causes of social exclusion, hence blurring the line between social security and internal security. To some degree our results also suggest that highlighting the problem of social exclusion was mere political rhetoric, aimed at pacifying the electorate.

6. Conclusion: Identifying ‘security nothings’ beyond the exception

Despite the ‘failure’ of the securitization of social exclusion, we need to remember that securitization is a process. During this process, high points are followed by low points:

routines, procedures and decisions executed at dispersed locations. Here, one of the key elements is time. In our case study, the means of less privacy, more sharing of information and monitoring the everyday life of the young represent partial penetration of securitizing, as these measures introduce practices, routines and language that are not traditionally used in social work. The very idea of securitizing social exclusion exemplifies how importing the idea of risk management and precautionary governance has the capacity to reproduce the logics of securitization across a variety of domains (c.f. Bourbeau 2014, 195). The permissions and procedures represented in Finnish legislation form small junctures and actions that can be identified as 'security nothings'. These nothings are disguised in well-meaning practices, produced in accordance with social scientific knowledge. But they speak the language of securitizing – that of precaution and surveillance –not that of social security and care.

Researching legislation nevertheless unveils only one level of securitizing, that of political discourses and decision-making. To identify securitization beyond the level of security discourse would require examining practices of preventing social exclusion in their own right, in instances where legislation is translated into the everyday level of social work, care and beyond. Moreover, concentrating exclusively on social security and examining, for example, the recommended measures of preventing exclusion could paint a rather more unfavourable picture of the persistence of the Nordic liberal model in the face of securitizing.

Funding information:

This work was supported by a grant from the Academy of Finland, grant number 283553, awarded to Anne Alvesalo-Kuusi.

Aknowledgments:

The authors would like to thank Associate Professor Steven Bittle for his support and valuable comments on the earlier versions of the manuscript.

References:

Aaltonen, Mikko & Petri Danielsson. 2017. Rikollisuuden rakenne ja kehitys. [The Development and Structure of Crime.] In *Rikollisuustilanne 2016*. Helsinki: Helsinki University.

Balzacq, Thierry. 2005. "The Three Faces of Securitization: Political Agency, Audience and Context." *European Journal of International Relations* 11(2): 171-201.

Balzacq, Thierry. 2011. (ed.) *Securitization Theory. How Security Problems Emerge and Dissolve*. London: Routledge.

Balzacq, Thierry. 2015. "The 'Essence' of Securitization: Theory, Ideal Type, and a Sociological Science of Security." *International Relations* 29(1): 103-113.

Bardy, Marjatta, Minna Salmi and Tarja Heino. 2001. *Mikä lapsiamme uhkaa? Suuntaviivoja 2000-luvun lapsipoliittiseen keskusteluun*. Helsinki: Stakes. [What is Threatening our Children? Guidelines for the Child Policy Discussions in 2000s.]

Berghman, Jos. 1995. Social Exclusion in Europe: Policy Content and Analytical Framework. In *Beyond the threshold*, ed. by Graham Room. Southampton, Policy Press.

Bigo, Didier. 2006. "Internal and External Aspects of Security." *European Security*, 15(4): 385-404.

Bigo, Didier. 2011. "The Mobius Ribbon of Internal and External Security(ies)". In *Identities, Borders, Orders: Rethinking International Relations Theory*, ed. by Albert, Mathias, David Jacobson and Yosef Lapid, 91-116. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bigo, Didier. 2016. "Rethinking Security at the Crossroads of International Relations and Criminology." *British Journal of Criminology* 56(6): 1068-1086.

Bourbeau, Philippe. 2014. "Moving Forward Together: Logics of the Securitisation Process". *Millenium: Journal of International Studies* 43(1):187-206.

Bruun, Kari. 2016. "Problematizing internal security: Crime, community and social exclusion." *Cogent Social Sciences* 2(1).

Buzan, Barry. 1991. *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*. 2nd ed. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Buzan, Barry, and Ole Wæver. 2003. *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Buzan, Barry, Ole Wæver, and Jaap de Wilde. 1998. *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

C.A.S.E. 2006. "Critical Approaches to Security in Europe: A Networked Manifesto." *Security Dialogue* 37(4): 443-487.

Castel, Robert. 1995. Les pièges de l'exclusion. [Pitfalls of Exclusion.] *Lien Social et Politique* 34, 13-21.

Crawford, Adam. 2009. "Governing Through Anti-Social Behaviour". *British Journal of Criminology*, 49(6): 810–31.

Crawford, Adam and Steven Hutchinson. 2016. "Mapping the Contours of 'Everyday Security': Time, Space and Emotion." *British Journal of Criminology* 56(6): 1184-1202.

Demirsu, Ipek. 2017. "Talking Security and Rights: The Framing of Counter-Terrorism Legislation in the UK." *Journal of Language & Politics* 16(5): 658–82.

Duke, Simon and Hanna Ojanen. 2006. "Bridging Internal and External Security: Lessons from the European Security and Defence Policy." *Journal of European Integration*, 28(5): 477-494.

Eriksson, Johan and Mark Rhinard. 2009. "The Internal-External Security Nexus: Notes on an Emerging Research Agenda". *Cooperation and Conflict* 44(3): 243–267.

Floyd, Rita. 2018. "Parallels with the Hate Speech Debate: The Pros and Cons of Criminalising Harmful Securitising Requests." *Review of International Studies* 44(1): 43–63.

Helne, Tuula. 2002. *Syrjäytymisen yhteiskunta*. [The Society of Exclusion]. Helsinki: Stakes.

Hiilamo, Heikki, Heikki Niemelä, Pertti Pykälä, Marja Riihelä, and Reijo Vanne. 2012. *Sosiaaliturva ja elämänvaiheet. Suomen sosiaaliturvan kehitys esimerkkien ja tilastojen valossa*. [Social Security and the Cycle of Life. The Development of Finnish Social Security in Light of Statistics and Examples.] Helsinki: Kelan tutkimusosasto.

Huysmans, Jef. 2000. "The European Union and the Securitization of Migration." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 38(5): 751–777.

Huysmans, Jef. 2011. "What's in an Act? On Security Speech Acts and Little Security Nothings." *Security Dialogue* 42(4-5): 371–83.

Ilmakunnas, Ilari and Pasi Moisio. 2014. Köyhyys- ja syrjäytymisriski Suomessa EU2020-tavoitteen valossa. [Risk of Poverty and Exclusion in Finland in Light of EU2020 goals.] In *Suomalaisten hyvinvointi 2014*, ed. by Vaarama, Marja, Sakari Karvonen, Laura Kestilä, Pasi Moisio and Anu Muuri (eds.). Tampere: THL.

ISP 2004. *Arjen turvaa. Sisäisen turvallisuuden ohjelma 2004*. [Everyday Security. Internal Security Programme.] Helsinki: Ministry of the Interior.

ISP 2008. *Turvallinen elämä jokaiselle. Sisäisen turvallisuuden ohjelma 2008*. [A Safe Life for Everyone. Internal Security Programme.] Helsinki: Ministry of the Interior.

ISP 2012. *Turvallisempi huomina. Sisäisen turvallisuuden ohjelma 2012*. [A Safer Tomorrow. Internal Security Programme.] Helsinki: Ministry of the Interior.

Jenks, Chris. 2005. *Childhood*. London: Routledge

Korkman, Sixten. 2011. "Onko hyvinvointivaltiolla tulevaisuutta?" [Does the Welfare State Have a Future?] Helsinki: Elinkeinoelämän Valtuuskunta.

Lahti, Raimo. 2017. "Towards a More Efficient, Fair and Humane Criminal Justice System: Developments of Criminal Policy and Criminal Sanctions during the last 50 years in Finland." *Cogent Social Sciences* 3(9).

McDonald, Matt. 2012. "The Failed Securitization of Climate Change in Australia." *Australian Journal of Political Science* 47(4): 579-592.

Milovanovic, Dragan. 1994. *A Primer in the Sociology of Law*. Albany, New York: Harrow and Heston.

Mythen, Gabe and Sandra Walklate. 2016. "Counterterrorism and the Reconstruction of (In)security: Divisions, Dualisms, Duplicities." *British Journal of Criminology* 56(6): 1107–1124.

Palola, Elina. 2014. "Tätä lakia voidaan soveltaa ainoastaan erittäin harkiten". Nuoret koulutuspudokkaat ja toimeentulotuen perusosan alentamisen harkinta. ["This law may be applied only with great caution". Using Discretion in Reducing the Basic Income Security of Young Dropouts.] In *Harkittua? Avauksia sosiaaliturvan harkintavallan tutkimukseen* ed. by Laura Kalliomaa-Puha, Toomas Kotkas, and Marketta Rajavaara, 96-113. Helsinki: Kelan tutkimusosasto.

Penttilä, Irmeli, Olli Kangas, Leif Nordberg, and Veli-Matti Ritakallio. 2003. *Suomalainen köyhyys 1990-luvun lopulla – väliaikaista vai pysyvää?* [Finnish poverty in the end of 1990s – transient or persistent? Helsinki: STM.

Police Barometer 2016. Helsinki: Ministry of Interior.

Roe, Paul. 2008. "Actor, Audiences and Emergency Measures." *Security Dialogue* 39/6: 615-635.

Salter, Mark, B. 2011. "When Securitizing Fails: The Hard Case of Counter-terrorism Programs". In *Securitization Theory. How security problems emerge and dissolve*, ed. by Thierry Balzacq, 116-132. London: Routledge.

Sandberg, Otso. 2015. *Hallittu syrjäytyminen - Miten syrjäytymisestä muodostui lähes jokaiseen meistä ulottuva riski?* [Controlled exclusion – How exclusion became a risk touching us all?] Tampere: Tampere University Press.

Schuilenburg, Mark and Ronald van Steden. 2014. "Positive Security: A Theoretical Framework". In *Positive Criminology: Reflections on Care, Belonging and Security*, ed. by Mark Schuilenburg, Ronald van Steden and Brenda O. Breuil 19-32. The Hague, NL: Eleven International.

Searle, John. 1965. "What is a Speech Act?" In *Philosophy in America*, ed. by Max Black, 221-239. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Shore, Cris, and Susan Wright. 2011. "Conceptualising Policy: Technologies of Governance and the Politics of Visibility" in *Policy Worlds. Anthropology and the Analysis of Contemporary Power*, ed. by Cris Shore, Susan Wright, and Davide Però, 1–25. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Sipilä, Jorma. 1985. *Sosiaalipolitiikan tulevaisuus*. [The Future of Social Policy.] Helsinki: Tammi.

Solhjell, Randi, Elsa Saarikkomäki, Mie, B. Haller, David Wästerfors, and Torsten Kolind. 2018. "We are Seen as a Threat. Police Stops of Young Ethnic Minorities in the Nordic Countries." *Critical Criminology* 27(2): 347–361.

Trombetta, Maria J. 2011. "Rethinking the Securitizing of the Environment: Old Beliefs, New Insights". In *Securitization Theory. How security problems emerge and dissolve*, ed. by Thierry Balzacq, 135-150. London: Routledge.

Virta, Sirpa. 2013. "Governing Urban Security in Finland: Towards the 'European model'". *European Journal of Criminology* 10(3): 341-353.

Wæver, Ole. 1995. "Securitization and Desecuritization". In *On Security* ed. by Ronnie Lipschutz, 46-86. New York: Columbia University Press.

About the Authors:

Liisa Lähteenmäki is a post-doctoral researcher and adjunct professor in sociology of law at the University of Turku, Finland. During 2018-2020 she is also a fellow at the Turku Institute of Advanced Studies, TIAS. Her main research interests focus on critically analysing language and metaphors used in processes of enacting legislation. <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2318-213X>

Anne Alvesalo-Kuusi is a professor in sociology of law at the University of Turku, Finland. She has studied extensively in the area of economic and corporate crime control and criminal policy. In particular, her studies have focused on the problems of policing safety crimes and the misuse of migrant labour in Finland.