DETERMINING THE EFFECT OF THE REFUGEE CRISIS ON THE SECURITY LEVELS OF SMALL STATES USING THE DEMATEL METHOD****

Abstract: In the last few years, the refugee crisis is threatening to change the societal, ethnic, confessional and economic flow across the globe. This crisis in its growing and unpredictable development is changing the physiognomy of the modern world and affects the security of all aspects of social life. It also has a particular influence on the security of small states in Europe, especially the ones located along the movement routes of several million migrants. In that same spot are the states of the Balkan Peninsula, including the Republic of Serbia. Actually, the Republic of Serbia represents an important stage of the refugee columns’ path. In addition, this state is small by all its characteristics (both quantitative and qualitative); therefore the refugee crisis can leave a sizeable influence on all levels of the state’s security. The effects of the crisis on the security levels of small states, in the case of the Republic of Serbia, has been described using the DEMATEL method. In investigating this influence, ninety-two experts for different security levels (from public institutions of Serbia) have been surveyed. The survey involved the effects on the following levels of security: human security, societal and national security.
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INTRODUCTION

The analysis of science and professional literature, statements of numerous politicians, news journals and other articles show how much the effect the refugee crisis has on the security of small states, including the Balkan states, which include the Republic of Serbia. For example, in the statement for the german “ZDF” television, the German Chancellor Angela Merkel said that “More of a concern is going to be how to deal with the migrant issue than the financial situation of Greece or the Euro’s stability” (Beta & Tanjug 2015). This shows the attitude of the leading politicians of the European Union towards the refugee crisis. In addition, it is important to mention that the biggest part of the refugees come to Europe via Balkan and Mediterranean routes, as well as the fact that the first on the refugees’ route are the states in the Balkans, but also the Mediterranean states that are in the EU – Italy, France and Spain (Gordić-Petrović etc. 2017).

However, numerous economical, political, religious and ethnical problems which flood the little states in the Balkans – who are still vulnerable from the wounds of previous wars and unextinguished fires in their mutual relations, without a unique strategy and mutual opinion of the refugee crisis – leave a door open to the crisis to affect the security of these states in a particular way. That is why it was necessary to determine how the routes of refugees would affect the security of these small states on a fragile, post-war area. The effect of the crisis on the levels of security of the Republic of Serbia was questioned according to the classical classification of security, but also the classification of the Copenhagen school (Buzan-Waever etc 1998).

All this was the basis of setting the primary goal of the research: Determining the effects of the refugee crisis on the levels of national security of the Republic of Serbia, as a small state.

Based on the primary research goal, the general hypothesis was set, which states: The refugee crisis has a significant effect on the security levels of the Republic of Serbia, as a small state. Considering that Serbia is a small state, the biggest threat of the crisis is on the societal security – her effect on the national security is lower, while the smallest threat for Serbia is on the human security of the refugees themself.

THEORETICAL ASPECTS OF THE RESEARCH

Numerous conflicts of low intensity on the territory of South Africa and Middle East, have led to millions of people migrating, mostly of Muslim religion, towards the countries of the European Union (Todorovic-Milutinovic 2016). All of these events, like centuries before, couldn’t avoid the Balkans, nor the small and mutualy torn and divided countries in it.
The reason of the refugee crisis is an attempt to escape from wars, political prosecution and economical exploitation to the countries of western civilization, which best indicates that the current world peace is like a soap bubble that can pop at any moment and start world wide conflicts.

Aside from the Mediterranean countries of the European Union, the biggest security problems arise in the Balkan countries. This is a result of the routs that the refugees take, publicly known as the “Mediterranean route”, i.e. the “Balkan route”. Data on the number of refugees that take this route is not entirely known, due to the inefficiency and sluggishness of the administration of several states that are in this route. According to the data of UNHCR from 2015, the number of Syrian citizens that seek asylum in Europe is on the rise and represents close to 10% of the total number of citizens that left the country since the start of the conflict. In Europe, from 2011 till the end of 2015, asylum was sought by 500,000 people from Syria, out of which close to 140,000 was during the 2014 alone. The big majority of the refugees also sought protection in Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq and Egypt. Unlike these states, the EU is trying in all possible ways to reduce the influx of refugees in their member countries.

Before we explain the use of the DEMATEL method, it is necessary to say something about the terminological syntagm of the small states (bearing in mind that the center of gravity of security issues is related to this very syntagm). There are different approaches in the determination of the category of small states. The most common criteria are capacity, strength, i.e. quantitative, and qualitative characteristics. Quantitative definition of a “small state” is considered from a geographical, demographic and economic aspect. From a geographical aspect, small states are ones whose surface is less than 200,000 km².

From a demographic standpoint, a small state is one with less than 15 million inhabitants, while the economic aspect considers the economic and trade potential of the state, i.e. gross national income per capita. (Gordic-Petrovic 2014).

Therefore, small states have limited teritory, relatively small population and limited resources. Small states are sometimes also called “weaker states”, but are also defined negatively as “the states that are not large forces”. However, the United Nation Organization doesn’t share the same opinion, primarily because of the stance in the preamble of the ONU Charter, which says that all states in the would are equal, from a statehood perspective, regardless of their strength seen in the size of the teritory, its population or the level of civilization. It is interesting to note that within this organization there is a Forum of small states, which considers that the states that have a population of less than 10 milion are small states, and according to that categorization, there are 106 small states in the world. Speaking of, contemporary history shows a trend of
growing numbers of small states, and it is predicted that such trend will continue in the future (Gordic-Petrovic 2014).

Qualitative definition of the term “small state”, aside from quantitative indications, takes into account some qualitative indicators which, because they cannot be measured, some authors also refer to as relative indicators of state size. Those indicators may be internal (political will – initiative, national interest, internal security state, economic situation, relations to neighbouring countries) and external (geostrategic position, strategic partners, membership in international organizations, membership in military alliances).

An important indicator of the size and importance of a state is both gross domestic product and gross national income per capita (GDP). The bigger the GDP of a state is, the bigger her economic potential, and local influence. (Gordic-Petrovic 2014).

Based on all these statements, we can conclude that the Republic of Serbia is in every way a small state, both by population and its area, and her economic strength. The Republic of Serbia does not belong to any security block (Republic of Serbia is declared as military neutral), nor is she a member of the EU, and on top of all that has a very complex geopolitical position. The Republic of Serbia, even with numerous attempts to promote mutual trust in the region, unfortunately always runs into antagonisms and hate outbursts. Also, as is in every small state that arose after the bipolar world divide (in the modern sense), public institutions are not yet sufficiently developed, so there is no unique state strategy or defined interests, leaving the state to deal with daily political interests instead. Unfortunately, in this time of uncertainty, which also affects much larger and richer countries, a question is posed – how to face, security-wise, the newest global security threats, including the refugee crisis, and how will it affect in the future not only the development, but also survival of small countries.

From this point of view, we need to answer the basic question of the research and prove the set hypothesis, by researching the influence of the refugee crisis on all security levels of the Republic of Serbia. In this paper, we have questioned the influence of the crisis on human, societal and national security.

RESEARCH RESULTS

Data on the influence of the refugee crisis are collected using the survey technique. Ninety-two security experts (deliberate sample) have been surveyed (questionnaire was of the semi-enclosed type). Questionnaire survey used collected the expert opinions on the mutual influence of the levels of security, as well as the attitudes on indicators – the content of indicators for each level of security individually.
For data processing and the assessment of mutual influence of the security levels in regards to the Republic of Serbia, the DEMATEL method was used (Moghaddam 2010; Sumrit-Anuntavoranich 2013).

This method was used to determine the total number of direct and indirect influences of each factor – the security levels of the rest of the factors – the rest of security levels, but also received influences from the other factors (Moghaddam 2010). On the same principle, content – indicators of each security level were considered. Using the DEMATEL method, connections and the factor influence strength were determined (security level, i.e. indicator) in regards to the refugee crisis, and less important factors were eliminated.

Each of the respondents did an assessment of the mutual influence of the levels of security elements. According to the DEMATEL procedure method, the first step of every respondent was to assess the levels of security by pair, and the assessment of each respondent was shown with a non-negative matrix of assessment of the mutual influence of security levels (Sumrit-Anuntavoranich 2013). Based on individual matrices of mutual influence of security levels of each respondent, average values were calculated and a matrix of direct influence of security levels was formed (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Human security</th>
<th>Societal security</th>
<th>National security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human security</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>1,31</td>
<td>2,63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal security</td>
<td>2,57</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>3,31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National security</td>
<td>1,43</td>
<td>2,42</td>
<td>0,00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the second step, the normalization of the matrix of direct influence was done using formula 1.

\[
D = \frac{x}{\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_{ij}, \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{ij}}
\] (1)

Where, \( D \) – normalized direct influence matrix,
\( X \) – the element of the average matrix of the mutual influence estimate.

Each element of the direct influence of security level matrix was divided by a maximum value of the sums of columns and rows of the matrix of direct influence and a new matrix was formed – a normalized matrix of direct influence (Table 2).
Table 2: Security levels direct influence normalized matrix (Gordić- Petrović etc 2017).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Human security</th>
<th>Societal security</th>
<th>National security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human security</td>
<td>0,000</td>
<td>0,220</td>
<td>0,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal security</td>
<td>0,433</td>
<td>0,000</td>
<td>0,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National security</td>
<td>0,241</td>
<td>0,407</td>
<td>0,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the next step, the total influence matrix was used to show the total relations between each security level pair. Elements of the total influence matrix were calculated using formula 2, and the matrix was shown in table 3.

\[
T = D(I - D)^{-1} u
\]

\[
T = \left[t_{ij}\right]_{n \times n}, i, j = 1,2,...n
\]

Where:
- \(T\) – total influence matrix,
- \(I\) – individual influence matrix,
- \(t_{ij}\) – total influence matrix element.

Table 3: Levels of security total influence matrix (Gordić et, 2017).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Human security</th>
<th>Societal security</th>
<th>National security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human security</td>
<td>0,668</td>
<td>0,863</td>
<td>1,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal security</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>0,926</td>
<td>1,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National security</td>
<td>0,900</td>
<td>0,992</td>
<td>0,951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the previous table we can determine whether the refugee crisis has an influence on a certain level of security by calculating the value treshold. The value treshold gives us data about the direction of influence, i.e. if the level of security has an influence over other levels of security or if it is the other way around. The value of the elements in the total influence matrix larger than the value treshold indicates that there is an influence, and value below the value treshold indicates that there is a dependence.

Value treshold is calculated as an arithmetic mean of the direct influence of security levels matrix using formula 3 and it equals 1.04. Bearing in mind that
no security level has all values below the value threshold, we can determine that all security levels are important from the standpoint of potential endangerment from the refugee crisis (table 4).

\[ \alpha = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} t_{ij}}{N} \]  

(3)

Where:
\( \alpha \) – value threshold,
\( N \) – total number of matrix T elements.

Table 4: Comparison of matrix elements of total influence of security levels with threshold value (Gordić-Petrović etc. 2017).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Human security</th>
<th>Societal security</th>
<th>National security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human security</td>
<td>0,668</td>
<td>0,863</td>
<td>1,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal security</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>0,926</td>
<td>1,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National security</td>
<td>0,900</td>
<td>0,992</td>
<td>0,951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By calculating the sum of mutual influence, we get the total value of all security levels (table 5). Range of the refugee crisis’ influence on security levels is determined according to the value of the sum of influence.

Table 5: Ranking of the influence of security levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Human security</th>
<th>Societal Security</th>
<th>National security</th>
<th>Total individual influence of the level</th>
<th>Level ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human security</td>
<td>0,668</td>
<td>0,863</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>2,751</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal security</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>0,926</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>3,764</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National security</td>
<td>0,900</td>
<td>0,992</td>
<td>0,951</td>
<td>2,843</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As you can see in table 5, based on the mutual influence of security levels, refugee crisis mostly endangers societal security, then national, while the least threatened is human security.

The same way as for all security levels, the effect of the crisis on the indicators of each level was determined.
Table 6: Ranking of the influence of the human security factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Ecological security</th>
<th>Security of social communities</th>
<th>Economic security</th>
<th>Political security</th>
<th>Personal security</th>
<th>Total individual factor influence</th>
<th>Factor ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecological security st</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>1,845</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>1,876</td>
<td>1,522</td>
<td>8,908</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security of social communities</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td>1,574</td>
<td>1,895</td>
<td>1,795</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>8,484</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Security</td>
<td>2,008</td>
<td>1,974</td>
<td>1,890</td>
<td>2,005</td>
<td>1,578</td>
<td>9,455</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Security</td>
<td>1,924</td>
<td>1,852</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td>1,556</td>
<td>9,085</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Security</td>
<td>1,726</td>
<td>1,696</td>
<td>1,866</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>1,267</td>
<td>8,335</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As you can see in table 6, based on the mutual influence factor, human security can mostly be endangered by threatening economic security, and least by threatening personal security.

Table 7: Ranking of the influence of human security factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Religious identity</th>
<th>National identity</th>
<th>Total individual factor influence</th>
<th>Factor ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious identity</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National identity</td>
<td>0,000</td>
<td>0,998</td>
<td>0,998</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When societal security is in question, based on mutual influence factor, no sizeable difference is determined.

Table 8: Direct influence of national security factors matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Economic threats</th>
<th>Increased intolerance, extremism and violence</th>
<th>Social disorganization in critical areas</th>
<th>Criminal activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic threats</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>2,98</td>
<td>2,38</td>
<td>2,81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased intolerance, extremism and violence</td>
<td>3,17</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>3,17</td>
<td>2,33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social disorganization in critical areas</td>
<td>2,95</td>
<td>2,38</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>2,76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal activity</td>
<td>3,45</td>
<td>2,86</td>
<td>3,45</td>
<td>0,00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9: Ranking of the influence of national security factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Economic threats</th>
<th>Increased intolerance, extremism and violence</th>
<th>Social disorganization in critical areas</th>
<th>Criminal activity</th>
<th>Total individual factor influence</th>
<th>Factor ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic threats</td>
<td>1,809</td>
<td>1,864</td>
<td>1,907</td>
<td>1,921</td>
<td>7,501</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased intolerance, extremism and violence</td>
<td>2,120</td>
<td>1,689</td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td>1,841</td>
<td>7,67</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social disorganization in critical areas</td>
<td>2,021</td>
<td>1,804</td>
<td>1,695</td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td>7,307</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal activity</td>
<td>2,323</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>2,213</td>
<td>1,808</td>
<td>8,424</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As you can see in table 9, based on the mutual influence factor, national security can be influenced the most by increasing criminal activities, and the least in the case of disorganizing society in critical areas.

Based on the results of the research, the set hypothesis is confirmed and the general goal of the research is reached, i.e. the level of influence of the refugee crisis on various security levels was determined, and how big of a threat the crisis is to societal, national and human security.

**DISCUSSION**

Research results show that the greatest danger for the Republic of Serbia, and thus to other countries with a small population, is societal security. Namely, in such environments it is difficult to assimilate into the population, which makes it possible for a domestic nation to be left without a collective – national identity as a center of gravity of a nation’s peculiarity (Anderson 1991). Bearing in mind the centuries worth of experience of the Serbian people it is justifiable to include the religious identity as one of the basic indicators of societal security, and its endangerment is the consequence of a number of factors (open market of the Western Europe, BREXIT, economical crisis, industrialization in the period of SFR Yugoslavia). For example, the most capable and knowledgable, mostly young people, are leaving towards the Western Europe. All of this has led to a difficult demographic situation, and the main identifiers resulting from it are the increased age of the nation and numerous areas that are now left without a working population. In such a situation, the influx of a large number of refugees could lead to significant changes in the matters of national and religious identity in the Republic of Serbia.
The big part of Europe is aware of the problems endangering societal security; most states are trying to preserve their national identity through the cultural – ethnical principles of nation and state. These countries, whose concept of nation – state has been adopted by the majority of other European countries, have been under the influence of large capital, global corporations in the previous periods. In search for labor force, they have imported a large number of Arab population, thus increasing multiculturalism of European Union, but the problem arises when multiculturalism grows into multinationality (Gordić-Petrović etc. 2017).

Unlike the cultural – ethnic principle of nation and state, the state – territorial princip allows for multiculturalism to take place through civic organizations, but the very idea of multinationalism is punishable and disallowed (examples: USA, Great Britain). Therefore, while others are being protected by all applicable means, especially in the countries in which Orthodoxy is dominant, so-called citizenship is created, based on atheism – the greatest paradox of false civil society. Those who are bothered by Orthodox believers are also negative towards Serbian Orthodox Church, because of the presumption that the civil society needs to be atheistic, or in the best-case scenario agnostic. Under such conditions of pseudo citizenship, the Republic of Serbia is faced with a refugee crisis and the economic difficulties (Gordić-Petrović etc. 2017). Under these conditions, the system of security of the Republic of Serbia has to react proactively, using all of its functions, in order to protect the cultural, national and religious identity of its people and the sovereignty of their own territory (Smith 1991). Incorrect refugee policy would allow for backdoor entry of other confessionalities into the territory of the Republic of Serbia, under the pretext that someone else would later correct this issue. If it comes to this, that someone else will only be able to ascertain the situation in which Serbs no longer have their own religious and national identity, and their own state.

Research shows that the refugee crisis has a significant impact on the national security of the Republic of Serbia. While discussing national security, we are not limited by the classic concept of military security threats. Namely, the paper discusses a new concept of national security, with the following basic indicators (that were investigated in the paper): increased intolerance, extremism and violence, societal disorganization in critical areas, criminal activities, and economic threats. Increased intolerance, extremism and violence is not a characteristic of Serbian people (example being the numerous wars led during XX century). In addition, it is necessary to state that sociologists and demographers differ negative factors and positive factors in studying the causes of contemporary refugee crisis. Negative factors refer to places of origin of refugees and represent the reasons for leaving. They mainly include poor healthcare, unsafe enviornment as a result of war, unrest, inability of religious expression, inability of political expression and ideas, unemployment, poor living conditions, lack of educational opportunities and others. Unlike the negative, the positive factors
relate to the places refugees set as their goal, and they explain the reasons why
the migrant has chosen that place or that state. They include physical security,
family reunion, better healthcare, higher living standards, better education, job
satisfaction, and more. Therefore, we can conclude that for the majority of refu-
gees, the Republic of Serbia is only a transit station in search for a better life,
because of which the national security is not directly under threat by this indica-
tor. Bearing in mind the experience so far, except in extreme situations, societal
disorganization in critical areas is also not compromised, and the fact that the
Republic of Serbia is not the ultimate destination of refugees means that there
are no immediate threats of economic endangerment either. There is also dan-
ger from criminal activities and regional security threats (Gordić-Petrović etc.
2017). Across the territories of the Republic of Serbia, as well as the Balkans in
terity spans Mediterranean route of human smuggling operations. There are
frequent illegal crossings over state borders, thus questioning the ability of the
state to establish control over its teritory (Vietti-Scribner 2013). Additionaly,
there is a possibility of misuse of false identities, smuggling people and weapons,
drugs, cultural goods from the areas affected by war and so on.

Based on the research results, we can see that the refugee crisis is least im-
 pactful on human security. Serbian people have historically shown kindness and
hospitality towards refugees. The refugee columns of the 20th century arrived
to Serbia never having to face xenophobia (for example, during the year 1995,
Serbia recieved 300.000 people after the exodus from the teritory of the Repub-
lic of Croatia). Faced with the above mentioned problems, state institutions
have developed effective mechanisms in the event of large refugee inflow, which
resulted in very rare incidents between the domicile population and refugees.
Institutions have been very effective in keeping the refugee population under
vigilance, keeping the order among them.

CONCLUSION

The refugee crisis is one of the more serious events that have marked the
XXI century so far. Migrations of Muslim world from North Africa and the Mid-
dle East are measured in millions and threaten to change the already shaken de-
mographics of the European continent.

Keeping in mind the fact that most of the refugees wish to reach the territories
of the developed countries in the Western Europe, one could conclude that the
danger to the levels of security of small states is relatively low. However, the key
powers of the European Union are attempting, in every way possible, to spread
the migrants across the whole of Europe. In case of such denouement, the eco-
nomic and societal security of small states would be significantly endangered.
Therefore, it is necessary for political leadership to repeatedly insist on agreements to solve the refugee crisis issues. Only by such proactive action, towards the key countries of the European Union, is it possible to reduce the influx of refugees and their stay inside the territory of small states, including the Republic of Serbia.

Indicators of this research can be the basis for future research in this area. Namely, by applying various methods of group decision-making with the use of expert assessments it is possible to assess, at expert level, the trends of further development of the refugee crisis, as well as other global flows and their influence on all spheres of social life, including the state security.

Only through continuous monitoring of events and their systematic analysis is it possible to create conditions for proactive state action and prevention of vulnerabilities caused by negative global flows, refugee crisis categorized as one of them.
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