

FROM BORDER CONTROL TO POLICY INNOVATION: RETHINKING IMMIGRATION THROUGH THE SELECTIVE RISK-BASED RESILIENCE FRAMEWORK IN INDONESIA

Agung Sulistyo Purnomo

*School of Strategic and Global Studies, University of Indonesia, Jalan Salemba Raya No. 4,
Jakarta 10430*

Margaretha Hanita

*School of Strategic and Global Studies, University of Indonesia, Jalan Salemba Raya No. 4,
Jakarta 10430*

David Ronald Tairas

*School of Strategic and Global Studies, University of Indonesia, Jalan Salemba Raya No. 4,
Jakarta 10430*

Susy Ong

*School of Strategic and Global Studies, University of Indonesia, Jalan Salemba Raya No. 4,
Jakarta 10430*

DOI: 10.13165/VPA-25-24-4-08

Abstract. *This article introduces the Selective Risk-Based Resilience (SRBR) framework as a critical and context-sensitive approach to immigration governance in the Global South, with Indonesia, specifically Bali, as a key case. Rooted in theories of biopolitics, securitization, and postcolonial bordering, SRBR explains how the state regulates foreign mobility not merely through legal enforcement but through cultural values, moral narratives, and selective risk classification. Drawing on critical discourse analysis of government documents, media coverage, and interviews with immigration officials, the study uncovers how migration control in Bali operates as a mechanism to maintain institutional legitimacy and cultural identity amid limited administrative capacity. Beyond its theoretical contribution, this study highlights how SRBR can inform more adaptive and locally grounded public policies. It offers practical insights for policymakers to develop selective visa regimes, enhance community-based monitoring, and align immigration governance with public values. In this way, SRBR supports a more balanced model of migration management that respects both national resilience and human security and has the potential to be applicable across the Global South.*

Keywords: *Selective Risk-Based Resilience, SRBR, immigration governance, public policy, administrative reform, human security*

Introduction

In the past two decades, border management and human mobility have become one of the most crucial issues in global policy. The tension between the right to mobility and the demands of state security continues to increase with the expansion of the migration crisis, digital transformation, and unconventional threats to national sovereignty (Geddes and Scholten 2016; Collyer and King 2015). However, the dominant approach to migration surveillance is still heavily influenced by the security architecture of the Global North, which emphasizes exclusion based on legal status and militaristic logic, even in the context of developing countries in the Global South (Jones and Johnson 2016).

The Global South countries face a different dilemma. On one hand, they are required to be open to the influx of tourists, workers, and international investments. On the other hand, they are overshadowed by sociocultural risks and a legitimacy crisis if they are perceived as too permissive towards foreign mobility (Achiume 2019; Nail 2016). The disparity in institutional capacity, pressure from local morality, and the absence of a contextual oversight framework have often led developing countries to uncritically replicate the exclusion models of the Global North, without considering domestic complexities.

Indonesia, particularly Bali Province, provides a highly relevant empirical context. This island has become a center for tourism-based economic growth (contributing to nearly 50% of the tourist population in Indonesia), but it has also become a hotspot for value conflicts between global mobility and local norms (BPS-Statistics Indonesia Bali Province 2025; Bangso et al. 2023; Hanita et al. 2024). Phenomena such as the proliferation of digital nomads working illegally with tourist visas, selective expulsion of expatriates who violate local moralities, and the “proper behavior for tourists” policy promoted by local officials demonstrate the contestation between economic openness and cultural protection. In practice, immigration in Bali now operates not only through legal logic but also through moral and symbolic filtration (CNA 2024).

Table 1. Comparison of the Number of Foreign Visitors to Bali and Indonesia

| Year | Number of foreign visitors to Indonesia | Number of foreign visitors to Bali |
|------|---|------------------------------------|
| 2022 | 5.889.031 | 2.155.747 |
| 2023 | 11.677.825 | 5.273.258 |
| 2024 | 13.902.420 | 6.333.360 |

Source: BPS-Statistics Indonesia Bali Province (2025)

Unfortunately, until now, there has been no theoretical framework capable of explaining this complex dynamic holistically, namely, one that encompasses the discursive, technocratic, and symbolic dimensions of migration surveillance in developing countries. The classical securitization model (Buzan et al. 1998) is too focused on existential threats to the state, while the risk society theory (Beck 1992) and resilience theory (Chandler 2014) fail to capture the dynamics of selectivity based on local values and moral politics.

Therefore, this article proposes Selective Risk-Based Resilience (SRBR) as an alternative framework for understanding migration control practices in the Global South. SRBR is a governance framework that explains how Global South states manage migration not solely through legal-administrative procedures but through context-driven risk discourses, moral filtering, and symbolic legitimacy. Integrating grand theories of biopolitics, middle-range concepts such as securitization and pre-emptive governance, and applied frameworks such as symbolic bordering and selective mobility regimes, SRBR conceptualizes migration control as a layered strategy of resilience. Rather than replicating the security models of the Global North, SRBR reveals how states such as Indonesia articulate immigration governance as an adaptive response to sociocultural pressures, institutional capacity limits, and the demand for public legitimacy.

This article contributes to the literature in two ways: first, theoretically, it expands the scope of security and migration studies by explicitly bringing the Global South context into the theoretical design; second, practically, it offers an analytical model that can be adapted by other developing countries in designing more selective, effective, and domestically rooted migration policies. This study employs a critical case study approach, using critical discourse analysis (CDA) techniques on policies, official narratives, and immigration practices in Bali.

The structure of this article is divided into five main sections: after the introduction, the second section presents a literature review highlighting the theoretical gap in migration and security literature in the Global South while introducing the SRBR theoretical framework; the third section explains the research methodology; the fourth section presents the results and analysis from the Bali case study; and the fifth section concludes with theoretical reflections and policy implications.

Literature Review: Theoretical Gap and the SRBR Framework

The literature on contemporary international migration is dominated by the experiences and frameworks of the Global North, particularly Europe and North America (Oliveira Martins and Strange 2019; Boswell 2007a, 2007b). This approach focuses predominantly on refugees, terrorism, and external border control, applying a logic of securitization that emphasizes exclusion based on legal status and militaristic paradigms (Buzan et al. 1998; Lemberg-Pedersen 2019). However, as Squire (2010) argues, migration surveillance is not solely a response to factual threats but also a symbolic and discursive process through

which states classify who is considered risky or legitimate.

In the context of the Global South, especially postcolonial countries such as Indonesia, the logic of surveillance is more complex. It is not only rooted in geopolitical security but also deeply encompasses cultural protection, public morality, and social stability (Achiume 2019; Landau and Freemantle 2010). This creates a fundamental point of tension: these states are pressured to be open to tourists and investment while facing a legitimacy crisis if perceived as too permissive (Achiume 2019; Nail 2016). The resulting governance challenges are distinct, as summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Comparative Migration Logic of the Global North and South

| Aspects | Global North | Global South |
|------------------------|---|---|
| Foundational Principle | The “Liberal Paradox” (tension between open markets and closed borders) | Postcoloniality, state formation, and structural dependency |
| Key Policy Mechanism | Externalization and militarized border control | Typology of regimes (Nationalizing, Developmental, and Neoliberal) |
| Primary Motivation | Control and containment, framed by security and humanitarianism | State-building, economic development, and capitalization on mobility |
| Historical Parallel | Transatlantic slave trade and 19th-century suppression efforts | Colonial legacies and unequal global power structures |
| Primary Challenge | The internal contradiction of liberalism and democratic accountability | Structural dependency and the risk of reproducing internal inequalities |

Source: Bastia and Piper (2024), Gisselquist and Tarp (2019), Adamson and Tsourapas (2020), Lemberg-Pedersen (2019)

As Table 2 illustrates, migration governance in the Global South is characterized by adaptive operations, complex multi-level actor landscapes, and a policy focus that is highly responsive to local dynamics and internal stability. While concepts such as selective mobility regimes (Mau et al. 2015) and symbolic bordering (Yuval-Davis et al. 2018) help explain the discriminatory and non-physical nature of modern borders, they remain grounded in the experiences of the Global North. Similarly, the literature on resilience positions it as a technocratic form of risk management (Chandler 2014), often depoliticizing the cultural repression and inequalities hidden within it.

While theories of securitization and risk society effectively explain the securitizing logic of Northern states, they remain largely silent on the moralizing logic prevalent in postcolonial contexts such as Indonesia. These frameworks accurately describe how states exclude based on legal or terrorist categories but fail to capture how exclusion is justified through discourses of cultural disrespect and public morality. This gap is particularly evident in the literature on resilience, which often overlooks how “resilience” is mobilized to protect symbolic and cultural boundaries, not just physical or economic ones. It is precisely this

gap, the theorization of a morality-driven, culturally grounded selectivity, that the SRBR framework seeks to fill.

To address this theoretical and practical gap, we propose the SRBR framework. SRBR explains how migration control in the Global South is shaped not only by institutional capacity but also by moral values, cultural narratives, and the politics of legitimacy. It bridges critical theories with the grounded governance challenges faced by countries such as Indonesia, offering an interpretive tool that is both analytical and applicable.

SRBR integrates theories across three layers: grand, middle, and applied. These are used to analyze migration governance that includes discourse, institutional logic, and symbolic practices. As detailed in Table 3, rather than being elaborated in isolation, these theories are linked directly to the three core analytical pillars of the SRBR framework: 1) Risk Discourse Production; 2) Mobility Selectivity; and 3) National Resilience.

Table 3. Theoretical Layers of the SRBR Framework

| Theory Layer | Key Concepts | Brief Description | Contribution to the SRBR Pillar |
|----------------|--|--|--|
| Grand Theory | Biopolitics (Kelly 2010) | The state regulates population and life through supervision, classification, and regulation of the body. | The philosophical basis for Risk Discourse Production: migration is framed as an object of state intervention. |
| Middle Theory | Securitization (Buzan et al. 1998) | The state makes migration a security issue through the construction of a threat discourse. | Supporting Risk Discourse Production and explaining the narrative of migrant threats. |
| | Pre-emptive Justice (Zedner 2007) | Actions are taken before the risk occurs, based on potential threats. | Provides the basis for Mobility Selectivity and preventive interventions. |
| | Governance of Unease (Bigo 2002) | The state manages social uncertainty with surveillance of the “foreigners.” | Relevant for National Resilience based on symbolic stability. |
| Applied Theory | Selective Mobility Regimes (Mau et al. 2015) | Global mobility access is highly selective based on status, nationality, and “capital passports.” | Provides a direct foundation for Mobility Selectivity. |
| | Symbolic Bordering (Yuval-Davis et al. 2018) | Borders are not only physical but are shaped through symbols, narratives, and social norms. | Supporting Risk Discourse Production and discursive understanding of exclusion. |
| | Human Security (Gasper and Gómez 2015) | Security is defined as the protection of sociocultural dignity and values. | Legitimizing National Resilience as a legitimate interest of developing countries. |

As summarized in Table 3, the SRBR framework synthesizes theories across three levels to form three core analytical pillars: 1) Risk Discourse Production, 2) Mobility Selectivity, and 3) National Resilience. These pillars provide the conceptual architecture for understanding immigration governance in the Global South.

To translate this theoretical architecture into an empirical research tool, each pillar is operationalized using a set of analytical indicators. These indicators, detailed in Table 4, serve as the specific empirical entry points for applying the SRBR framework. They guide the collection and analysis of data, allowing us to trace how abstract concepts such as “securitization” or “symbolic bordering” manifest in the concrete language of officials, the logic of visa screenings, and the rhetoric of cultural protection.

Table 4. Analytical Indicators for SRBR Application

| SRBR Pillar | Analytical Indicators |
|---------------------------|--|
| Risk Discourse Production | Officials’ narratives, media framing, and immigration policy language |
| Mobility Selectivity | Visa classification, surveillance operations, community reports, and selection logic |
| National Resilience | Cultural rhetoric, local morality, and symbolic social security |

This operationalization is what enables the application of SRBR to a specific case study, such as Bali. The indicators outlined in Table 4 form the basis for the critical discourse analysis that follows, allowing us to systematically examine texts, institutional practices, and symbolic dynamics in the field.

Research Methodology

This study utilizes a critical qualitative methodology with an exploratory case study strategy, facilitating the evaluation and development of the SRBR framework within the actual context of migration policy in Indonesia. This design was used because SRBR is a novel conceptual framework that has not been thoroughly empirically validated and necessitates comprehensive observation of the state’s symbolic and institutional behaviors. Case studies are seen not as statistical generalizations but as “transferable conceptual insights” (Flyvbjerg 2006; Yin 2018).

Bali was selected due to its status as a highly dynamic site within the context of modern Indonesian migration, characterized by the influences of international tourism, the presence of foreign nationals under diverse visa categories, and local moral governance. This location exemplifies a postcolonial filtering hotspot, where migrant selection is executed through a synthesis of security narratives, cultural ethics, and symbolic considerations (Achiume 2019; Nail 2016). Bali serves as a trial ground for a massive immigration

surveillance activity, such as *Jagratarata* operations. The scale of these operations underscores their centrality to the SRBR model. According to a press release from the Directorate General of Immigration, the nationwide *Jagratarata* operations in Q3 of 2024 resulted in the scrutiny of over 1.293 foreigners within 507 surveillance areas. Over 400 people were deported from Bali, and while not all were for moral violations, officials noted that a significant portion was initiated by community reports of “inappropriate behavior,” demonstrating the tangible effects of public discourse on enforcement attempts (Humas Direktorat Jenderal Imigrasi 2024; NusaBali.com 2024; Wilson 2024).

Bali, as a component of the Global South and intricately linked to the movement of the Global North, facilitates empirical examination of the SRBR framework, which underscores selectivity, social resilience, and the discursive construction of risk. Data were gathered through semi-structured interviews, categorized as shown in Table 5 below.

Table 5. Informant Categorization

| Informant Code | Role and Affiliation | Experience | Interview Date | Focus of Interview |
|----------------|--|------------|----------------|---|
| INF-1 | Chief of Central Immigration Investigator, HQ | 15 years | May 23, 2025 | National policy, high-profile cases, and ops |
| INF-2 | Senior Policy Analyst, HQ | 15 years | May 23, 2025 | Visa policy formulation and regulatory frameworks |
| INF-3 | Chief of the Forensic Digital Identification Team, HQ | 15 years | May 23, 2025 | Cyber patrol and data-driven risk assessment |
| INF-4 | Head of Enforcement, Immigration Office Ngurah Rai | 18 years | May 23, 2025 | Field operations (e.g., <i>Jagratarata</i>) and deportations |
| INF-5 | Visa Screening Officer, Immigration Office, Ngurah Rai | 12 years | May 27, 2025 | Visa application review and risk indicators |
| INF-6 | Public Relations Officer, Immigration Office, Ngurah Rai | 16 years | May 26, 2025 | Community reports and media relations |
| INF-7 | Chief of IT, Immigration Office, Ngurah Rai | 15 years | May 15, 2025 | Surveillance systems and data integration |
| INF-8 | Senior Lecturer, Immigration Polytechnic | 16 years | July 10, 2025 | Critical assessment of policy and legal foundations |

A small and elite interview approach was employed, as the research aims to uncover institutional discourses and rationalities rather than to achieve statistical generalizability. The eight informants were selected for their direct involvement in policy formulation, field operations, and critical analysis, ensuring a holistic view of the SRBR mechanism. Data saturation was indicated when interviews yielded redundant information concerning the core themes of risk, selectivity, and resilience.

Data were analyzed using Fairclough's (1995) three-level CDA framework: 1) textual analysis of linguistic features; 2) discursive analysis of institutional narrative production; and 3) sociopolitical analysis linking discourse to power structures. Each data point is encoded utilizing NVivo 12 software to discern narrative patterns and discourse classification, subsequently organized into the three pillars of SRBR: Risk Discourse Production, Selectivity Regime, and National Resilience.

To guarantee the accuracy and dependability of the data, source triangulation was performed using interviews, official documents, and media analysis. Member checking was conducted on select key quotations to verify accuracy. All research procedures comply with the relevant social research ethics code, encompassing informed permission, secrecy of identification, and the right to withdraw from the study at any point. The researcher acknowledges their role as a citizen and a non-neutral academic, thereby actively employing reflexivity in the interpretation process. The power dynamics between the researcher and state informants (officials) are acknowledged as integral to the framework of postcolonial research. Consequently, this methodology not only conforms to the standards of academic rigor but also facilitates the empirical implementation of the SRBR framework. This section will show the results of a field study that incorporates the narratives of state actors, risk representation, and surveillance practices related to international mobility in Bali.

Results and Discussions: Application of Critical Discourse Analysis in SRBR

The CDA approach used in this study follows the three-layered model of analysis: textual, discursive, and social. At the textual level, the study examined the language used by informants, particularly keywords, metaphors, and repeated phrases such as “misbehaved foreigner,” “disrupting culture,” or “Bali is not a free place.” At the discursive level, the analysis traced how narratives were circulated through media reports, community complaints, and inter-agency coordination meetings, revealing how certain discourses gained institutional traction. Finally, at the social level, the study connected these discourses to broader dynamics of postcolonial identity, legitimacy, and risk governance in Indonesia, particularly in the context of mass tourism and cultural preservation. These three layers were not treated separately but iteratively woven through the SRBR analytical pillars.

The coding process followed three stages:

- 1) Open coding: Meaningful phrases and expressions were extracted to form initial themes (e.g., “viral foreigners,” “sacred site violations,” “investor one man show,” and “middleman villa”).
- 2) Axial coding: These codes were grouped around SRBR sub-dimensions such as moral risk, cultural legitimacy, procedural ambiguity, and local collaboration.
- 3) Selective coding: Key storylines and dominant rationalities were identified to explain how the state constructs, interprets, and responds to perceived migrant risks.

This layered coding process enabled a robust mapping of how risk, legitimacy, and resilience emerge not only from legal violations but also from symbolic and moral interpretations shaped by local culture and public expectations. For instance, Informant 1, a national-level official with field experience in Bali, observed, “Many viral cases... foreigners start to take over businesses at the micro or small level.” This quote illustrates how economic domination by foreigners is perceived as a form of social threat, reinforcing the risk discourse dimension of SRBR. Similarly, the perception of cultural disrespect was highlighted by Informant 5: “We have received reports from the community about the ‘*bule*’ (foreigner) appearing to harass the local culture, even though it is not necessarily a violation of the law.” Here, public perception alone, even without legal evidence, becomes a trigger for state action. This reveals a pre-emptive governance logic aligned with the selective mobility pillar of SRBR, where cultural legitimacy becomes a condition for inclusion.

Another layer of SRBR is seen in the use of technology as anticipatory control, shown in Informant 3’s description: “We have also done pre-emptive... with cyber patrol... from open source in cyberspace.” This suggests that risk classification is now shaped by digital behavior and national origin, representing the anticipatory resilience logic embedded in current surveillance infrastructures. Lastly, Informant 7, a high-level IT and immigration official, stressed the balancing act between openness and sovereignty: “We support openness but also ensure that Indonesia’s cultural and legal sovereignty is not compromised.” This confirms that resilience in immigration governance is not merely technical but also symbolic and moral, ensuring that global mobility aligns with local value systems.

Through these excerpts, the study demonstrates how the SRBR framework operationalizes discourse and policy by embedding risk perceptions into governance rationales. CDA has proven effective in capturing these layered dynamics, and the open coding process provides a transparent pathway from raw data to conceptual abstraction.

• Risk Discourse Production

CDA of informant transcripts revealed that the state produces risk categories of foreigners not only based on violations of the law but also local moral and manneristic narratives. Informant 1, the chief of Central Immigration Investigator, stated, “If foreigners are drunk or naked in a place of worship, it is not only a violation of ethics but also a violation of our identity as a nation.” This statement reflects how surveillance practices against migrants are situated within a framework of collective morality, rather than simply positive law. In SRBR, this shows the work of the Risk Discourse Production pillar formed from the synthesis of securitization theory and symbolic bordering (Buzan et al. 1998; Yuval-Davis

et al. 2018). Informant 2, who works at the headquarters, added that in some cases, a visitor who causes social unrest, for example, can be detained based on public exposure, so that the framing of the public and the media is the basis for the legitimacy of intervention. Phrases such as “wild *bule*” (misbehaved foreigner), “disrespectful digital nomads,” and “norm breakers” often appear in discussions and news, reinforcing the discursive logic of selection and restriction (Direktorat Jenderal Imigrasi 2021; Indo Bali News 2024; Metro TV 2023; Direktorat Jenderal Imigrasi 2023). The results of the coding show the dominance of the themes of “morality,” “social disturbance,” and “cultural framing” as the foundation for the production of risk discourse.

- **Selectivity Regime and Adaptive Surveillance Practices**

The second pillar of SRBR, Mobility Selectivity, is evident in administrative filtering practices that combine spatial data, institutional intuition, and local symbolic pressures. Informant 6 mentioned, “Bali Immigration implements a selective visa policy to screen which foreigners are beneficial to the country, and if it harms the community, we will definitely deport them.” This shows the implementation of a risk-based selection regime that looks not only at the documents but also at the individual’s background, behavior, and potential for social disturbances. Operation *Jagratarata* and the strengthening of community-based supervision by TIMPORA (Foreigner Surveillance Team) are the main instruments that allow the adaptation of institutional responses to various profiles of migrants. Thematic coding shows a strengthening of the themes of “preventive intervention,” “risk classification,” and “social reporting,” which emphasizes that Indonesia’s surveillance model is not neutral but rather highly contextual and selective. This is in line with the logic of pre-emptive governance (Zedner 2007) and selective mobility regimes (Mau et al. 2015) that form the heart of this pillar.

- **National Resilience and Sociocultural Justification**

The last pillar in the SRBR framework, National Resilience, emerges through the articulation of the discourse of “protection of local culture” voiced by almost all informants. In addition, Bali’s governor (2025) asserts, “Bali is a home that is open to foreign tourists. However, everyone who comes to Bali is obliged to respect local laws, customs, and culture. There is no room for actions that disturb public order, let alone endanger the community.” This speech shows how the security discourse has shifted from the issue of physical threats to the protection of local norms, culture, and morality. The concepts of human security (Gasper and Gómez 2015) and governance of unease (Bigo 2002) work simultaneously to explain this phenomenon, and the state acts as a protective agent of social discomfort not just a physical gatekeeper. Coding detects high frequencies in the categories of “cultural protection,” “symbolic legitimacy,” and “public propriety” as the basis for the state’s exclusive actions. Even the chief of IT at the Immigration Office (INF-7), a local official, emphasized, “Surveillance is not a symbol of tension, but... maintaining state sovereignty and harmony in a pluralistic society.” This strengthens the argument that SRBR is able to explain the dimensions of non-material protection that have been missed in conventional migration approaches.

- **Internal Dynamics and Institutional Fragmentation**

The effectiveness of SRBR in practice depends heavily on the coordination capacity between agencies. The second pillar of SRBR, Mobility Selectivity, is evident in adaptive yet often contradictory practices. As a local visa officer (INF-5) noted, the intent is to “screen which foreigners are beneficial.” However, this selectivity is not a purely technocratic process. It is fundamentally shaped by what Informant 8 termed “epistemic conflict” between the logic of open economics and cultural securitization. This internal tension is a defining feature of SRBR in practice. For instance, while Operation *Jagratara* represents a strict enforcement logic, its implementation is often asynchronous with tourism promotion campaigns run by a separate ministry. This “regulatory ambiguity” is not a failure of the system but rather the very context within which SRBR’s adaptive resilience is negotiated. The state’s ability to navigate this internal friction, for example, by deporting a viral offender to placate public outrage while simultaneously welcoming investors, demonstrates SRBR’s core function: maintaining legitimacy amid competing pressures. Informant 4 commented, “Through an integrated, synergistic, and firm approach, it is hoped that Bali can remain a safe and comfortable destination for foreign tourists and investors.”

- **SRBR as an Adaptive and Contextual Framework**

Despite this complexity, field data show that the SRBR approach provides a fairly adaptive framework in responding to these tensions. The chief of the Forensic Digital Identification Team (INF-3) stated, “We have started using risk mapping, intelligence data from the center, and community reports. So not all foreigners are treated equally.” This marks a shift from a generalization-based approach to context-based selection logic. SRBR serves not as a universal formula but as a heuristic framework that allows for local adaptation to migration challenges. One of the SRBR’s strengths, as seen from these results, is its flexibility in accommodating sociocultural pressures, limited resources, and the need to maintain a national image. Coding also supports the strengthening of the core themes of “contextual adaptation” and “institutional resilience,” two indicators that are the foundation of policy effectiveness in developing countries.

- **Social Legitimacy and Symbolic Effects of SRBR**

One of SRBR’s strengths is its ability to build social legitimacy in the midst of local communities that feel culturally threatened. The operationalization of SRBR can be traced through a specific case that occurred in Tabanan Regency in mid-2022, when a foreign national posted a video of himself climbing a sacred banyan tree near a Hindu temple on social media (CNN Indonesia 2022; Kompas.com 2022). The process unfolded as follows:

- 1) 1) Risk Discourse Production: The video went viral on local Balinese social media channels. The discourse was framed not around a specific law but around terms such as “*tidak sopan*” (disrespectful) and “*merusak kesakralan*” (destroying sacredness).
- 2) 2) Mobility Selectivity: The viral discourse triggered institutional action. Community reports flooded the TIMPORA network, which were then formalized into a report for the Ngurah Rai Immigration Office (INF-6). The individual was flagged

not for a specific visa violation initially but under a broader category of “potential public order disturbance.”

- 3) 3) National Resilience: The immigration office’s subsequent investigation and eventual deportation of the individual was publicly justified by Informant 4 as necessary to “maintain harmony and respect for local cultural norms,” directly invoking the rhetoric of sociocultural protection.

This case exemplifies how SRBR functions: a moral transgression, amplified through digital media, is converted into an administrative risk category, leading to a selective enforcement action that reinforces the state’s role as the guardian of cultural resilience.

This shows that migration policy in Bali is not only about human mobility but also about the symbolic security of the local community. Within the framework of SRBR, the pillars of National Resilience are not read solely as physical protection but as value protection, a concept derived from the theory of human security and postcolonial power. The narrative of local morality, customs, and ethics became a powerful instrument of legitimacy, and the coding results showed a strong correlation between “selective action” and the themes of “social legitimacy” and “protection of local identity.” Thus, SRBR allows the government to respond to public unrest without sacrificing policy rationality.

- **Critical Evaluation and Regionalization Prospects**

However, the effectiveness of SRBR also faces structural limitations. Informant 8, a senior lecturer at Immigration Polytechnic Indonesia, argues, “This framework is good, but we still lack an integrated data system. So sometimes decision-making is not completely evidence-based. Moreover, our immigration law confirms that preventive and repressive actions can be carried out just based on suspicion.” This indicates the need to strengthen digital capabilities and coordination between sectors if SRBR is to be used as a long-term policy. Outside the Indonesian context, these results suggest that SRBR has the potential to be translated to other Global South countries facing similar pressures, i.e., economic openness, resource constraints, and local value protection challenges. The potential for regionalization under the ASEAN Migration Governance Framework is promising, particularly if advanced through policy interoperability indicators, collective risk management, and the enhancement of institutional capacity. With its multi-pillar structure and contextual flexibility, SRBR can be an alternative framework to the dominant hard security-based exclusion model in the Global North.

- **Academic and Policy Implications**

The main contribution of this study lies in the development of the theoretical framework of SRBR as a hybrid approach in migration and security studies. By combining biopolitical, securitization, and postcolonial filtering perspectives, SRBR offers an alternative to the threat-based securitization model widely developed in the Global North (Buzan et al. 1998; Yuval-Davis et al. 2018). SRBR shows that the logic of surveillance in the Global South is not always imitative but can evolve contextually based on local values, cultural pressures, and the tension between economic and moral logic.

In addition, this study expands the application of CDA in migration policy studies by

displaying the relationship between discourse practices, policy regimes, and postcolonial sociopolitical structures. As a result, SRBR can be seen not only as an analytical tool but also as an epistemological contribution to critical migration studies, especially in filling the gap between bordering studies and global governance in the Global South region (Achiume 2019; Nail 2016).

From a policy perspective, the implementation of SRBR in Indonesia, particularly through the Bali case study, shows that selective, risk-based, and sensitive migration management can strengthen public legitimacy while maintaining social stability.

Some policy points that can be drawn are as follows:

- 1) 1) Need for a data-driven migrant risk classification system: The implementation of SRBR requires integrated spatial, historical, and social intelligence data to make accurate and fair selective decisions.
- 2) 2) Strengthening the capacity of local immigration institutions: The state needs to invest in training and coordination between institutions (immigration, tourism, intelligence, and local government) so that the implementation of selectivity is not discriminatory but proportional.
- 3) 3) Integration of local values and norms in policy: The SRBR emphasizes that successful migration policies in developing countries must respect local cultural values, without falling into discrimination or xenophobia. This is a strong argument for strengthening human security-based regulations.
- 4) 4) Regionalization of SRBR within the ASEAN framework: The SRBR model has great potential to be adapted by ASEAN countries facing similar dilemmas. Cooperation mechanisms between immigration, information sharing, supervision systems, and standardization of risk indicators can be the first step in regional implementation.

By drawing on Indonesia's concrete experience and demonstrating the effectiveness of the SRBR framework in addressing the tensions between global mobility and local security, this study offers a new direction for more adaptive, equitable, and contextual migration policy formulation in the Global South.

Conclusion

- The SRBR framework moves beyond the outdated binary that views Global South immigration governance either as a weak imitation of Northern securitization models or as merely chaotic and corrupt; it provides a dedicated theoretical tool for contexts where these existing models fall short.
- SRBR allows us to see that what appears as institutional ambiguity or inconsistency (e.g., deporting a tourist for a viral post while welcoming digital nomads) is not a failure of governance; it is, in fact, a sophisticated strategy of adaptive resilience to navigate complex pressures.

- The framework provides the analytical lens to identify and analyze borders not just in laws and fences but in everyday practices, such as community complaints, media narratives, and the moral judgments of local officials. It takes cultural sovereignty seriously as a legitimate security imperative.
- SRBR equips policymakers to design and evaluate migration policies based on contextual legitimacy rather than just technical compliance or imported models. It advocates for policies that are effective because they are seen as fair and protective by the local populace.
- By centering the experiences of the Global South, SRBR does more than offer a new model; it challenges the entire field to rethink its core assumptions about what constitutes effective, equitable, and resilient migration governance in a diverse world.

References

1. Achiume, E. Tendayi. 2019. "Migration as Decolonization." *Stanford Law Review* 71 (6): 1509–74.
2. Adamson, Fiona B., and Gerasimos Tsourapas. 2020. "The Migration State in the Global South: Nationalizing, Developmental, and Neoliberal Models of Migration Management." *International Migration Review* 54 (3): 853–82. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0197918319879057>.
3. Bangso, Febby Dt., Sundring Pantja Djati, Himawan Brahmantyo, and Margaretha Hanita. 2023. *Revitalizing Bali's Tourism: The Government's Role in Driving Innovation and Change After COVID-19*. Vol. 1. Atlantis Press SARL. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-048-0_57.
4. Beck, Ulrich. 1992. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
5. Bigo, Didier. 2002. "Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease." *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 27 (1_suppl): 63–92. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03043754020270S105>.
6. Boswell, Christina. 2007a. "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>.
7. Boswell, Christina. 2007b. "Theorizing Migration Policy: Is There a Third Way?" *International Migration Review* 41 (1): 75–100. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2007.00057.x>.
8. BPS-Statistics Indonesia Bali Province. 2025. "Number of Foreign Visitor to Bali Dan Indonesia, 1969-2024." 2025. <https://bali.bps.go.id/en/statistics-table/1/MjgjMQ==/number-of-foreign-visitor-to-bali-dan-indonesia--1969-2023.html>. Date accessed 06-09-2025
9. Buzan, Barry, Ole Wæver, and Jaap de Wilde. 1998. *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
10. Chandler, David. 2014. *Resilience: The Governance of Complexity*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315773810>.
11. CNA. 2024. "Indonesia's Bali Tightens Immigration Controls as Tourist Arrivals Surge by Nearly 1 Million to 3.89 Million." ASIA. 2024. <https://www.channelnewsasia.com/asia/indonesia-bali-tightens-immigration-controls-tourists-4522221>. Date accessed 09-05-2025

12. CNN Indonesia. 2022. "WN Australia Panjat Pohon Sakral Di Pura Desa Adat Bali" 2022. <https://www.cnnindonesia.com/nasional/20220612151736-12-807955/wn-australia-panjat-pohon-sakral-di-pura-desadat-bali>. Date accessed 08-09-2025
13. Collyer, Michael, and Russell King. 2015. "Producing Transnational Space." *Progress in Human Geography* 39 (2): 185–204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132514521479>.
14. Crawley, Heaven, and Joseph Kofi Teye. 2024. "South–South Migration and Inequality: An Introduction." In *The Palgrave Handbook of South–South Migration and Inequality*, edited by Heaven Crawley and Joseph Kofi Teye, 1–24. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-39814-8_18.
15. Direktorat Jenderal Imigrasi. 2021. "Imigrasi Bali Deportasi Bule Lagi Kali Ini WNA Rusia Yang Sempat Viral Lakukan Aksi Berbahaya Di Laut." 2021. <https://www.imigrasi.go.id/berita/2021/02/22/imigrasi-bali-deportasi-bule-lagi-kali-ini-wna-rusia-yang-sempat-viral-lakukan-aksi-berbahaya-di-laut?lang=en-US&utm>. Date accessed 14-06-2025
16. Direktorat Jenderal Imigrasi. 2023. "Imigrasi Ngurah Rai Deportasi Bule Italia Pelaku Video Asusila." 2023. <https://www.imigrasi.go.id/berita/2023/09/26/imigrasi-ngurah-rai-deportasi-bule-italia-pelaku-video-asusila?utm>. Date accessed 14-06-2025
17. Fairclough, Norman. 1995. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London and New York: Longman Publishing. <https://rgs-ibg.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1475-5661.2008.00291.x>.
18. Flyvbjerg, Bent. 2006. "Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research." *Qualitative Inquiry* 12 (2): 219–45. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800405284363>.
19. Gasper, Des, and Oscar A. Gómez. 2015. "Human Security Thinking in Practice: 'Personal Security', 'citizen Security' and Comprehensive Mappings." *Contemporary Politics* 21 (1): 100–116. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13569775.2014.993906>.
20. Geddes, Andrew, and Peter Scholten. 2016. *The Politics of Migration and Immigration in Europe*. Sage Publications.
21. Gisselquist, Rachel M., and Finn Tarp. 2019. "Migration Governance and Policy in the Global South: Introduction and Overview." *International Migration* 57 (4): 247–53. <https://doi.org/10.1111/imig.12623>.
22. Hanita, Margaretha, Febby Dt Bangso, and Mukti Aprian. 2024. "Beyond Attraction: Unveiling Bali's Cultural Community's Role in Bolstering Tourism Resilience amidst the COVID-19 Pandemic." *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management* 34 (November): 100953. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2024.100953>.
23. Humas Direktorat Jenderal Imigrasi. 2024. "Silmy Karim: Operasi Jagratara, Komitmen Imigrasi Pastikan WNA Patuhi Aturan." *SIARAN PERS Nomor: SP/IMI/09/2024/19*, 2024.
24. Indo Bali News. 2024. "Berulah Mengganggu Ketertiban Dan Overstay Di Bali, Bule Rusia Dideportasi." 2024. <https://indobalinews.pikiran-rakyat.com/bali-nusra/pr-888860491/berulah-mengganggu-ketertiban-dan-overstay-di-bali-bule-rusia-dideportasi?utm>. Date accessed 14-06-2025
25. Jones, Reece, and Corey Johnson. 2016. *Placing the Border in Everyday Life (Border Regions Series)*. London: Routledge.
26. Kelly, M G E. 2010. "International Biopolitics: Foucault, Globalisation and Imperialism." *Theoria: A Journal of Social and Political Theory* 57 (123): 1–26. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41802469>.
27. Kompas.com. 2022. "10 Fakta WNA Berpose Telanjang Di Bali, Demi Konten Dan Kena

- Deportasi.” 2022. <https://travel.kompas.com/read/2022/05/07/083906127/10-fakta-wna-berpose-telanjang-di-bali-demi-konten-dan-kena-deportasi>. Date accessed 08-09-2025
28. Landau, Loren B, and Iriann Freemantle. 2010. “Tactical Cosmopolitanism and Idioms of Belonging: Insertion and Self-Exclusion in Johannesburg.” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36 (3): 375–90. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691830903494901>.
29. Lemberg-Pedersen, Martin. 2019. “Manufacturing Displacement. Externalization and Postcoloniality in European Migration Control.” *Global Affairs* 5 (3): 247–71. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23340460.2019.1683463>.
30. Martins, Bruno Oliveira, and Michael Strange. 2019. “Rethinking EU External Migration Policy: Contestation and Critique.” *Global Affairs* 5 (3): 195–202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23340460.2019.1641128>.
31. Mau, Steffen, Fabian Gulzau, Lena Laube, Natascha Zaun, Fabian Gülzau, Lena Laube, and Natascha Zaun. 2015. “The Global Mobility Divide: How Visa Policies Have Evolved over Time.” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 41 (8): 1192–1213. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2015.1005007>.
32. Metro TV. 2023. “Bule Pelaku Video Asusila Di Bali Dideportasi.” 2023. <https://www.metrotvnews.com/read/NA0CX0Oj-bule-pelaku-video-asusila-di-bali-dideportasi>. Date accessed 14-06-2025
33. Nail, Thomas. 2016. *Theory of the Border*. New York: Oxford University Press.
34. NusaBali.com. 2024. “Operasi Jagratara, Ditjen Imigrasi Amankan Ribuan WNA: Tiga WNA Diamankan Imigrasi Ngurah Rai.” 2024. <https://www.nusabali.com/berita/174749/operasi-jagratara-ditjen-imigrasi-amankan-ribuan-wna?utm>. Date accessed 14-06-2025
35. Pemerintah Provinsi Bali. 2025. “Tegas Dan Keras, Gubernur Koster Datangi Imigrasi Langsung Deportasi WNA AS Pelaku Kriminal Di Pecatu.” 2025. <https://www.baliprov.go.id/web/tegas-dan-keras-gubernur-koster-datangi-imigrasi-langsung-deportasi-wna-as-pelaku-kriminal-di-pecatu/>. Date accessed 07-09-2025
36. Squire, Vicki. 2010. *The Contested Politics of Mobility: Borderzones and Irregularity*. Routledge.
37. Wilson, Natalie. 2024. “Bali Immigration Law Crackdown Includes Potential 20-Year Jail Sentence for Tourists | The Independent.” INDEPENDENT. 2024. <https://www.independent.co.uk/travel/news-and-advice/bali-tourists-jail-sentence-visa-immigration-b2625616.html>.
38. Yin, Robert K. 2018. *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods*. 6th ed. London: Sage Publications.
39. Yuval-Davis, Nira, Georgie Wemyss, and Kathryn Cassidy. 2018. “Everyday Bordering, Belonging and the Reorientation of British Immigration Legislation.” *Sociology* 52 (2): 228–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038517702599>.
40. Zedner, Lucia. 2007. “Pre-Crime and Post-Criminology?” *Theoretical Criminology* 11 (2): 261–81. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480607075851>.

Agung Sulisty Purnomo, Doctoral Student at the School of Strategic and Global Studies, Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia.

E-mail: theagungpurnomofitsystem@gmail.com

Margaretha Hanita, Associate Professor at the School of Strategic and Global Studies, Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia.

E-mail: margaretha.hanita@gmail.com

David Ronald Tairas, Associate Professor at the School of Strategic and Global Studies, Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia.

E-mail: davidronaldtairas@yahoo.com

Susy Ong, Associate Professor at the School of Strategic and Global Studies, Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia.

E-mail: susy.ong66@gmail.com



This article is an Open Access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 (CC BY 4.0) License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).