

Cultural Parasitism: The Transfer of Foreign Cultural Models as a Threat to National Security

Sabin Sabev

Branch in Veliko Tarnovo
University of Agribusiness and Rural Developments
Plovdiv, Bulgaria
ssabev@uad.bg

Abstract - The present study employs the biological metaphor of parasitism as a heuristic analytical tool, and not as a descriptive or normative characterisation of human beings or communities. The author explicitly emphasises that the analogy refers to systemic-functional models of cultural-institutional interaction, and not to individuals or to ethnic, religious or national groups. In biology, parasitism is a form of symbiosis in which one organism – the parasite – extracts resources from another organism – the host – thereby progressively weakening its viability. When the parasitic load exceeds a critical threshold, the host perishes, and frequently the parasite itself perishes with it. This biological analogy proves heuristically applicable to the analysis of processes observed in contemporary European societies: the large-scale and unregulated influx of cultural models that are fundamentally incompatible with the value system of the host society operates according to the same destructive logic. The foreign cultural model does not adapt to its environment; rather, it reshapes that environment, exhausts its institutional resources, and undermines its capacity for self-reproduction.

The paper examines the transfer of foreign cultural models from migrant communities not as a neutral social process, but as a potential threat to national security in its societal dimension. The study is limited to cases of non-integrated communities with persistently incompatible normative systems, and explicitly distinguishes such cases from: refugees from active military conflicts (Ukraine, Syria), persons fleeing totalitarian regimes (Afghanistan, Iran), and economic migrants with demonstrated capacity and willingness to integrate. The territorial scope of the study covers primarily Germany, France, Sweden, Denmark and the United Kingdom in the period 2010 – 2024.

KEYWORDS: *societal security, migration, cultural integration, parallel societies, national identity*

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, Europe has been confronted with a challenge that cannot be reduced to economic indicators, humanitarian obligations or police statistics. This challenge is of a civilisational order – a question concerning the capacity of the societies of the “Old Continent” to preserve their cultural, value-based and institutional foundations under conditions of an unprecedented scale and pace of incoming foreign cultural models. For decades, this process has been presented as neutral, even beneficial – as “enrichment”, “diversity”, “multicultural dialogue”. Europe is known for its tolerance towards all religions, political beliefs and cultures. Today, when the consequences of such an approach are visible on the streets, in the statistics and in the institutions of nearly every Western European state, it is time for a more honest and uncompromising assessment.

1.1. Object and subject of the study. The object of the study is the processes of cultural-institutional interaction between European host societies and non-integrated migrant communities in the period 2010 – 2024. The subject of the study is the systemic-functional mechanisms through which incompatible cultural models affect the societal security of host states.

1.2. Research aim. The aim of the study is to analyse the applicability of the biological concept of parasitism as a heuristic analytical tool for the investigation of processes of cultural-institutional incompatibility, without transferring this tool onto individuals or groups of people.

1.3. Research questions. The study seeks to answer the following questions: (1) Under what structural conditions does the transfer of foreign cultural models turn from “enrichment” into a systemic threat to the societal security of the host state? (2) What are the measurable institutional indicators of such adverse impact? (3) What lessons applicable to Bulgaria can be drawn from the experience of Western Europe?

1.4. Working hypothesis. The author maintains the hypothesis that, when four conditions are simultaneously present – a scale of migration exceeding the integration capacity; fundamental incompatibility of the transferred normative systems with the liberal-democratic order; political and

Online ISSN 3044-7771

<https://doi.org/10.68302/std2026.vol1.68>

© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Green Future Technologies.

This is an open-access article under the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](#).

ideological factors suppressing the host society's defensive mechanisms; and the formation of stable parallel structures – the process of cultural transfer shifts from an enriching one into a dysfunctional one and threatens the societal security of the host state.

1.5. Tasks of the study. To achieve this aim, the following tasks have been set:

- (1) theoretical justification of the heuristic use of the biological analogy with explicit recognition of its limits;
- (2) identification of the structural conditions under which cultural transfer shifts from enriching to dysfunctional;
- (3) comparative review of the experience of selected Western European states;
- (4) formulation of conclusions applicable to the Bulgarian context.

In biology, parasitism is a form of symbiosis in which one organism – the parasite – extracts resources from another organism – the host – gradually weakening its viability. When the parasitic load exceeds its critical threshold, the host perishes, and along with it, usually, the parasite itself. The biological analogy proves surprisingly accurate in analysing the processes observed in contemporary European societies: the mass and unregulated incursion of cultural models fundamentally incompatible with the value system of the host society operates according to the same destructive logic. The foreign cultural model does not adapt to the environment in which it finds itself; rather, it attacks, reshapes and exhausts the institutional resources of that environment and undermines its capacity for self-reproduction. An important methodological clarification: throughout the present paper the term “parasitism” describes relations between cultural-normative models and institutional systems, and not relations between human beings. People are never parasites; only abstract institutional practices of refusal to integrate can be parasitic. In this sense, migrant communities manifest themselves as parasites within the hospitable European community.

Categories of migrants and their differentiation. In the present study, the term “migrant communities” is not used as a homogeneous category. The following groups are explicitly distinguished:

- (a) refugees from active military conflicts (e.g., from Ukraine after February 2022, from Syria in the period 2011 – 2020) – often with high integration potential and similar value systems;
- (b) persons fleeing totalitarian or authoritarian regimes (e.g., from Afghanistan after 2021, from Iran) – with mixed integration potential;
- (c) economic migrants from states with similar normative systems (e.g., from Eastern European countries, Asian states with a high human-development index) – traditionally making a high contribution to the host society;
- (d) communities with stable parallel normative structures – the specific object of the present study.

Only the last category is the subject of the critical analysis; consideration of the first three categories is beyond the scope of

this paper. A further characteristic of these communities is that they profess religious beliefs different from the predominant religion of the host state.

Migration is a historical fact and an enduring part of the development of human civilisation. No analysis can deny that the controlled migration of persons capable of, and willing to, integrate has been, and continues to be, a source of renewal and development for host societies. Many Bulgarians migrated from the Aegean region into the present-day borders of Bulgaria. Bulgaria received and sheltered thousands of Armenian refugees who managed to escape the brutal massacres in Turkey. The problem lies not in the movement of people, but in the transfer of value systems that are structurally incompatible with the foundational principles of the liberal-democratic order – individual liberty, gender equality, freedom of speech, freedom of belief, tolerance of difference, and the rule of law. When these value systems do not merely exist as personal beliefs but become institutionalised in parallel communities that refuse to recognise the norms of the host society, the process ceases to be migration and becomes colonisation from within.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1. Data sources. The study draws on an analysis of the following types of sources:

- (a) official statistical data of Eurostat on migration, employment and social inclusion in the period 2010 – 2024;
- (b) publications of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD);
- (c) official reports of the European Commission and the European Parliament on issues of migration and integration;
- (d) national reports of the German Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF), of Statistics Sweden (SCB), of the French INSEE and of the British ONS;
- (e) publications of the Center for the Study of Democracy (Bulgaria);
- (f) peer-reviewed academic literature in the fields of security studies, migration studies and integration studies.

2.2. Methods. The following are applied:

- (1) analytical method – to decompose the phenomenon under study into constituent elements and to identify key mechanisms;
- (2) comparative method – to juxtapose the integration policies and outcomes in the selected Western European states;
- (3) secondary analysis of statistical data – to assess the empirical manifestations of the processes under examination;
- (4) method of analogy (heuristic application of the biological concept of parasitism), applied with explicit acknowledgement of its limitations.

2.3. Critical reflection on the methodological limitations of the analogy. The author is aware that analogy between biological and social systems carries the risk of logical fallacies. Social

systems differ substantively from biological ones: they involve volitional and conscious actors, behavioural patterns are plastic and amenable to change, and normative frameworks are subject to democratic deliberation and revision. For this reason the analogy is used solely as a heuristic instrument that helps to discern the structure of the process, and not as a strict causal explanation. The analogy is applied according to the following rigorous criteria of comparison:

- (1) extraction of resources without proportionate contribution – comparable with socio-economic indicators;
- (2) formation of self-reproducing structures – comparable with parallel communities;
- (3) suppression of the “host’s” defensive mechanisms – comparable with institutional dysfunctions.

Beyond these three dimensions the analogy is not, and should not be, applied.

2.4. Period and territorial scope. The study covers the period 2010 – 2024 – an interval in which the consequences of the migration wave of 2015 – 2016 in the EU manifested themselves most clearly. Territorial scope: Germany, France, Sweden, Denmark, the United Kingdom (as reference cases) and Bulgaria (as a contextual case for the application of the conclusions).

2.5. Limitations of the study. The present study is theoretical-analytical in character; it does not offer an original empirical investigation, but rather a secondary analysis of publicly available data and literature. The author does not claim exhaustiveness for the comparative analysis, nor statistical significance for the conclusions. The aim is to propose an analytical framework that may serve as a basis for further empirical research.

3. MAIN BODY

In the biological sciences, classical parasitology distinguishes several phases of parasitic invasion: penetration into the host organism; adaptation to the internal environment and evasion of the immune response; extraction of resources for the parasite’s own reproduction; and, at sufficient load, functional impairment or destruction of the host. An effective parasite “masks itself” – it avoids recognition by the immune system and suppresses the organism’s defensive reactions.

This biological logic finds striking parallels in the social processes accompanying mass non-integrated immigration. The transferred cultural and civilisational model penetrates the host society through migration flows, resists integration by preserving its own structures and norms, extracts resources from the host’s social system – healthcare, education, social benefits without proportionate contribution – and, on reaching a critical mass, transforms the environment in its own image, weakening or destroying the institutional and value-based capacity of the host society. It is reiterated: the term “transferred cultural model” denotes an institutional-normative structure, and not the individuals who carry it. The key element of the parasitic logic is “masking”: political correctness, the understanding that within the framework of one society multiple cultural communities can and should coexist, each preserving its specific values, norms,

language and traditions, without any requirement to adapt them to the culture of the majority, and the fear of accusations of xenophobia, function as immunosuppressants that suppress the natural defensive response of the society. The logic of the analogy is as follows: just as the biological parasite survives because it suppresses the host’s immune response and renders it incapable of defending itself, so cultural parasitism develops unhindered when society is deprived of the very possibility of naming the problem without being morally stigmatised. Society sees the symptoms but is forbidden from making the diagnosis.

One of the clearest manifestations of the parasitic logic is the formation of so-called “parallel societies” – closed communities in which immigrants reproduce the institutional and value-based structure of their place of origin without integrating into the host society. The term entered European political debate from Germany and is used to describe neighbourhoods and communities in which national legislation has effectively been replaced by alternative normative systems – Sharia law, clan justice, kinship law.

Empirical indicators. According to the official reports of the German Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF) and the analyses of the German Economic Institute (IW Köln), a number of neighbourhoods in cities such as Berlin (Neukölln), Duisburg (Marxloh), Bremen (Gröpelingen), and others, exhibit persistent characteristics of cultural-institutional isolation: a consistently lower rate of language proficiency, a higher dependence on social transfers, a lower rate of completion of secondary education, and elevated rates of recorded crime relative to the city averages [1]. Parallel societies are characterised by low rates of intermarriage between the immigrant population and the majority, by functional isolation from the institutions of the host society – their own courts, media, educational structures – by sustained resistance to acquiring the language and cultural norms of the host, by intra-community pressures sanctioning attempts at integration, and by a high degree of dependence on the host society’s welfare system without proportionate contribution through labour and the payment of taxes and dues [2].

High-trust societies – such as the traditionally Scandinavian ones – function on the basis of an unwritten social contract: each contributes when, and with whatever, he or she can, and takes only what is necessary. The arrival of cultures in which the welfare system is perceived not as a shared resource but as an object for exploitation undermines the very foundation of this contract [3]. When trust is replaced by suspicion, the foundation of the welfare state collapses.

Since 2015, the Swedish police (Polismyndigheten) has periodically published reports on the so-called “particularly vulnerable areas” (särskilt utsatta områden), in which characteristics consistent with the description of parallel societies are observed: a concentration of population of immigrant origin with a low integration index, a strong influence of alternative normative structures, hindered access for state institutions, and elevated levels of criminality. The specific figures and statistical indicators for the relevant periods are to be cited by the author on the basis of the reports of Polismyndigheten [4].

The arrival of cultural models that not only fail to adapt but actively contest the basic values of the host society – gender equality, tolerance, freedom of speech, the rule of law – constitutes a direct threat to national security. The parasitic

analogy is precise: the foreign organism does not merely exist within the body of the host – it replaces the host's tissues with its own.

The process is deepened by what is termed “demographic inertia”. Under this dynamic, immigrant communities have markedly higher fertility rates than the indigenous population and the demographic balance gradually shifts.

Non-integrated communities form closed electoral blocs vulnerable to manipulation by the clan and religious structures within them. Political parties, instead of struggling for integration, compete for the support of these blocs through concessions (especially during elections) which further entrench the parallel structures.

When internal institutions (police, courts, the educational system, regulators) are compromised – through the political influence of non-integrated communities, through pressure for “cultural sensitivity” which de facto amounts to non-enforcement of the law, or through fear of accusations of racism – the state loses the capacity to protect its own citizens. The parasite has reached the host's immune system.

In what does the weakening of institutions consist:

The principal manifestation lies in the direct political influence of non-integrated communities. When closed immigrant groups form electoral blocs, politicians become dependent on their votes. Instead of insisting on the enforcement of the law within these communities, they make concessions – tolerating parallel normative systems, turning a blind eye to violations, appointing “convenient” persons to key positions. The institution formally exists, but in reality serves alien interests.

The second aspect is the pressure for “cultural sensitivity”. At first glance this sounds reasonable – respect for differences. After all, the motto of the European Union is “United in Diversity”. In practice, however, something else often hides behind this phrase: the police do not enter certain neighbourhoods so as not to be accused of discrimination, social services do not intervene in cases of forced marriage or domestic violence because that is “their culture”, schools grant exemptions from general rules under the pretext of cultural differences. The result is that the law is applied selectively – strictly to the majority, indulgently to the parallel communities.

The most powerful of the three mechanisms is the fear of accusations of racism. The civil servant, the police officer, the teacher, the social worker – each of them knows that any action taken against a member of an immigrant community risks public stigmatisation, the loss of one's career, and exposure to a media campaign. This fear paralyses institutions more effectively than any external pressure.

The ultimate conclusion is that, when all three mechanisms operate simultaneously, the state finds itself in a paradoxical position: it continues to exist formally, with its institutions, laws and budgets, but has lost the actual capacity to enforce them. Citizens pay taxes for institutions that do not protect them and which, in some cases, even act against their interests in the name of “cultural sensitivity”.

The parasitic model presupposes a unilateral extraction of resources without proportionate contribution. In economic terms this manifests itself in disproportionate dependence on social

transfers – without commensurate fiscal participation and labour contribution; pressure on the educational and healthcare systems; rising costs for security – police, border guards, counter-intelligence; and a loss of investment attractiveness in the neighbourhoods and urban zones in which parallel communities form. The Scandinavian models – traditionally regarded as exemplars of the welfare state – face unprecedented strain precisely because of the incompatibility between a universally accessible welfare system that grants benefits and services to all, without exception, by virtue of mere presence on its territory and irrespective of contribution, on the one hand, and the mass arrival of communities with divergent cultural conceptions of the role of the state, on the other.

Experience demonstrates that the failure of integration is not accidental, but a systemic outcome of the fundamental incompatibility between certain cultural models and the democratic legal order [5]. When immigrant communities import clan solidarity, patriarchal hierarchy, the primacy of religion over secular law, and the collectivist suppression of individual liberty, they do not “enrich” the host society – they erode it from within. It must again be emphasised here that this proposition does not imply that every individual carrier of a given cultural tradition acts destructively. What is at stake are statistically and institutionally measurable tendencies under conditions of an absence of integration policies. The parasite does not contribute to the health of the host but consumes it.

The biological analogy implies that effective counteraction requires recognition (the capacity to identify the threat without ideological constraints), selectivity (distinguishing between migrants capable of integration and carriers of incompatible cultural models), a proportionate response (measures commensurate with the scale of the threat), and the building of immunity (strengthening of national identity, the educational system and the value-based foundation) [6] – [7].

To counter this social parasitism, concrete measures should include: mandatory cultural integration programmes with measurable outcomes and sanctions for non-compliance; limits on the concentration of migrants of the same cultural group in particular neighbourhoods; zero tolerance towards parallel normative systems, with no exceptions on grounds of “cultural sensitivity”; the linking of social benefits to demonstrated integration; and the strengthening of law-enforcement capacity in zones where non-integrated communities are concentrated. All proposed measures should be implemented with unconditional respect for fundamental human rights, with no discrimination on ethnic or religious grounds, and in strict compliance with the European Convention on Human Rights and Article 6 of the Treaty on European Union.

Bulgaria, although not affected by mass non-European immigration to the extent of Western Europe, is vulnerable in two principal respects. As a transit state on the Balkan route, it is exposed to the risks of illegal migration and the potential formation of enclaves. Second, the country is the object of hybrid operations in which migration is used as a tool of pressure – as documented in the report of the Center for the Study of Democracy entitled “Countering Hybrid Threats in Bulgaria” [8].

For Bulgaria, the experience of Western Europe is at once a warning and an opportunity to learn. The early construction of effective institutional immunity – before the critical mass of parasitic load is reached – is significantly cheaper and more

effective than the treatment of an already developed systemic disease.

One of the most substantial yet seldom discussed questions in the debate on mass migration is the moral one. Contemporary political discourse has successfully imposed the notion that any criticism of uncontrolled immigration is a manifestation of moral inadequacy – of racism, xenophobia, or at the very least a lack of empathy. This is perhaps the most effective immunosuppressant, because it attacks not the argument but the moral standing of the one expressing it. Anyone who dares to raise the question of the limits of migration finds himself or herself not a participant in rational dialogue but a defendant before a moral tribunal. Yet, on closer inspection, the moral argument also operates in the opposite direction, and with no less force. Every society has a moral obligation not only to those who arrive from outside, but also to those who are already here – to its own citizens, to their children and grandchildren, to the generations that will inherit the consequences of today's decisions. When a state permits the mass arrival of cultural models that undermine the foundations of its public order, it does not display generosity – it displays irresponsibility towards its own people. Generosity is a virtue only when it does not endanger the survival of the one who exercises it.

There is also another moral aspect that deserves attention: responsibility towards the migrants themselves. When a society admits more people than it can integrate, it does not do them a favour – it condemns them to marginalisation, to life in the ghetto, to unemployment and dependence on social benefits. Genuine humane treatment is not the uncritical opening of the doors but the honest assessment of integration capacity and a consistent policy that ensures that those admitted truly become full members of society and not its peripheral inhabitants. If behind the façade of tolerance there is in fact indifference – “let everyone live as he wishes, so long as it does not affect me” – then the coexistence of different cultures is not a manifestation of respect but of a refusal of engagement. Genuine respect presupposes dialogue, and dialogue presupposes shared rules. When a society refuses to insist on the observance of these rules out of fear of being accused of intolerance, it in fact abdicates its own moral position.

One of the most insidious aspects of cultural parasitism is its temporal logic – the way the consequences accumulate with each successive generation and at a certain point become practically irreversible. The first generation of immigrants, even when it does not integrate, retains a certain awareness of its status as a “guest” in a foreign society. The second generation, however, is already born on the territory of the host state and bears its citizenship, yet is frequently raised entirely within the confines of the parallel community – with its values, its language, its norms. This generation is formally a citizen but factually a foreigner in its own state. The third generation not only does not integrate, but often radicalises its positions – precisely because it senses the painful contradiction between its formal belonging and its real isolation.

This generational effect is of key importance for understanding the problem, because it shows that cultural parasitism is not a self-correcting process. The widespread belief that “in time, everyone integrates” is not only unconfirmed by experience, but is also a dangerous misconception. Under certain conditions – critical mass of the parallel community, geographical concentration, the presence of internal mechanisms

sanctioning integration – time works not for integration, but against it. Every new generation raised within a parallel society is further from the host culture, not closer to it.

The question of irreversibility is perhaps the most uncomfortable one in the entire debate. Is there a point beyond which the process can no longer be reversed? In the biological analogy, the answer is unambiguous: when the parasitic load exceeds a certain threshold, the host perishes regardless of the treatment undertaken. In the social context, the threshold is not so categorical, but it is no less real. We would not wish to imagine what the outcome would be. When parallel communities reach such demographic, economic and political volume that they are able to dictate terms to the host society, the balance of power is irreversibly shifted. For this reason the question of time is so critical. Every year, indeed every month, of delay in undertaking measures does not merely preserve the status quo, but worsens the situation irreversibly. A child born today within a parallel society will, in twenty years' time, be a citizen with the right to vote, but with values formed outside the civilisational perimeter of the host society. The politician who today postpones a decision, in order not to be accused of intolerance, will tomorrow face a problem that no longer admits of a solution.

European host societies find themselves in a state of profound clash between reality and conviction – a contradiction between what they observe and what they are permitted to think. They observe the formation of parallel societies, sense the erosion of social trust, encounter the everyday consequences of failed integration, and yet are afraid to comprehend and to name these phenomena out of fear of social stigmatisation. The internal contradiction is usually resolved in one of two ways: either by adjusting beliefs to fit reality, or by denying reality so as to fit beliefs. The prevailing tendency in liberal societies is the second – denial.

This denial is institutionalised. The media avoid certain topics or present them in sanitised form. The academic milieu isolates and marginalises the researchers who address them. Politicians refrain from raising them, except in the context of electoral campaigns in which populist rhetoric replaces analytical rigour. The result is paradoxical: the more serious the problem, the more difficult it becomes to discuss; the more action is required, the more impossible decision-making becomes. Society resembles a patient who refuses a diagnosis for fear of hearing an unpleasant truth.

This internal contradiction has a further, no less dangerous, consequence: it pushes the debate from the rational space of analytical discourse towards the emotional extremes of populism. When the legitimate concerns of citizens are silenced by leading politicians and “experts” in the media, those concerns do not disappear; they find expression in extreme forms – in movements that replace analytical critique with racial rhetoric, and in parties that offer simple solutions to complex problems. By a cruel irony, it is precisely the refusal of rational debate on the topic of migration that creates the conditions for the rise of the far-right movements which are then themselves used as an argument for further silencing of critical voices. The vicious circle closes.

In order for this imbalance to be resolved in a healthy manner, what is required above all is the restoration of the capacity for open and honest conversation. This means separating analytical debate from moral blackmail. The fact that far-right movements

also criticise migration does not mean that all criticism of migration is far-right. The fact that racists reject multiculturalism does not mean that every rejection of multiculturalism is racism. This elementary logical distinction is the first step towards overcoming the internal contradiction and restoring the analytical capacity of the host society.

There is also a deeper question that is rarely raised: what becomes of a society that systematically suppresses its own instincts of self-preservation? In the biological analogy the answer is known: an organism whose immune system is suppressed is not merely vulnerable to parasites – it is vulnerable to everything. A society that has lost the capacity to distinguish between enriching interaction and destructive invasion is a society in profound crisis – a crisis not of tolerance, but of self-awareness. The restoration of this self-awareness, with a clear understanding of one's own values, one's own boundaries and one's own right to exist, is the most important precondition for any effective policy on migration and integration.

4. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The present study has several substantial limitations that should be explicitly acknowledged.

First, the methodology relies primarily on analogical and comparative analysis, without an original empirical investigation.

Second, the use of a biological analogy to describe social processes, even when limited to institutional-normative models, carries the risk of unwarranted generalisation and should be regarded as a heuristic instrument rather than a strict explanatory theory.

Third, the comparative analysis is confined to a small number of Western European states and may not adequately reflect other regional contexts.

Fourth, the study does not examine in detail successful integration practices that would offer positive counter-argumentation.

To overcome these limitations, future research could:

- (a) conduct quantitative analyses of correlations between particular integration policies and measurable social outcomes;
- (b) include comparative case studies of successful integration (e.g., in Canada, Australia);
- (c) develop empirical indicators for establishing the “critical threshold” inferred above by analogy;
- (d) investigate the development of the problem in the Bulgarian and Eastern European context.

5. CONCLUSION

The parasitic analogy, applied to the processes of cultural transfer under mass non-integrated immigration, reveals a logic

that is at once clear and disquieting. The analogy applies to institutional-normative models, not to individuals or to groups of people. The parasite – the foreign cultural model, transferred without adaptation – penetrates the body of the host (the receiving society), suppresses its immune system through political correctness and multiculturalist ideology, extracts resources through the welfare systems without proportionate contribution, forms its own structures – parallel societies – which displace the tissues of the host, and at sufficient load destroys the capacity of the host society to function as a cohesive unit.

Of course, the analogy has its limitations: human beings are not micro-organisms, and a society is not a biological organism. A range of immigrant communities integrate successfully and contribute to the development of their host societies. The key question, however, is not whether integration is possible, but under what conditions the transfer of cultural models passes from enrichment to destruction. That threshold is crossed when the scale of migration exceeds the integration capacity of the host society; when the transferred cultural model is fundamentally incompatible with the basic values of the host; when political and ideological factors suppress the defensive mechanisms of the society; and when stable parallel structures form and reproduce themselves [9].

It is essential that the science of security treat cultural parasitism not as a metaphor, but as an analytical instrument enabling the understanding of processes that undermine the cultural and identity-based resilience of European nations. Precisely because the consequences of ignoring the problem are irreversible, and because a parasite, left uncontrolled, ultimately destroys its host, early diagnosis and a decisive immune response are not manifestations of intolerance, but of responsibility for the survival of the host society and its civilisational identity. At the same time, every practical response must, without exception, respect the rule of law, fundamental human rights, and the prohibition of discrimination.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge (BAMF), Migrationsbericht 2022. Nürnberg: BAMF, 2023.
- [2] J. Huysmans, *The Politics of Insecurity: Fear, Migration and Asylum in the EU*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- [3] T. Theiler, “Societal Security and Social Psychology,” *Review of International Studies*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 249–268, 2003.
- [4] Polismyndigheten, *Lägesbild över utsatta områden – risker, konsekvenser och åtgärder*. Stockholm, 2023.
- [5] V. Bello, *International Migration and International Security: Why Prejudice Is a Global Security Threat*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2017.
- [6] B. Buzan, O. Wæver, and J. de Wilde, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1998.
- [7] B. Buzan, *People, States and Fear: The National Security Problem in International Relations*, 2nd ed. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1991.

[8] Center for the Study of Democracy, Countering Hybrid Threats in Bulgaria. Sofia: CSD, 2023.

[9] O. Wæver, B. Buzan, M. Kelstrup, and P. Lemaitre, Identity, Migration and the New Security Agenda in Europe. London: Pinter Publishers, 1993.