Lund University   VT16
Department of Political Science   Tutor: Erik Ringmar

The Securitization of Migrants

A critical discourse analysis of migration in EU policy

Felicia Matz Wennerhed

Abstract

This thesis studies the European Union's policy *Global Approach to Migration and Mobility* (GAMM) and how migration is discursively described and securitized. GAMM is a foundational framework for EU migration and asylum policy, with a purpose to create dialogue and cooperation with non-EU countries. By analysing official EU policy documents, this thesis aims to map out how migration is discursively constructed and rhetorically described as an issue of security through a critical discourse analysis. The result shows several discourses together forming an overall rhetoric of migration as an issue of security. Firstly, there is a discursive construction of a European community with external borders, consisting of EU and the member states. Furthermore, the study shows a discursive securitization of irregular migration. Irregular migration is posed as an external threat to the EU community, with the potential to cause a future crisis for the European member states. It is also connected to cross-border criminal activity. The ideas of migration motivates political and institutional measures, such as increased border control and surveillance. This is discussed as an exercise of power, showing societal power relations of inequality. The ultimate aim of making these relations of power visible is contributing to societal change.

Key words: EU, GAMM, discourse, discursive power, migration, irregular migration, security, securitization, external threat
Words: 9845

Table of Contents

1   Introduction

In the age of globalization international migration is an increasing phenomenon, that transcends the nation-state sovereignty and emerges into a transnational issue and priority for the international community (Koser, 2007, p.16). Last year the number of international migrants worldwide reached 244 million. Conflict, poverty and inequality are just some of the reasons that drive people to make dangerous journeys in the pursuit of safety and protection (United Nations, 2015, p.5). Today, the ongoing conflict in Syria is one of the biggest causes for migration to Europe (BBC, 2016), and migration has become a prioritized political question in the EU. Last year a total of 264,000 asylum applications were made in EU, solely by Syrian refugees (UNHCR, 2015). Though so many people are in need of shelter and protection, legal ways into Europe are highly limited (Amnesty, 2013). People instead resort to dangerous illegal journeys, risking their own lives to reach Europe. In 2015 approximately one million people crossed the Mediterranean, often in inadequate and unsafe vessels run by people smugglers. The UN Refugee Agency reports that about 3,735 of that million are missing, believed to have drowned in the dangerous journey (Holland, 2015). In all this EU has emerged as an important actor that is actively working for a common European migration policy. The Schengen agreements, an agreement leading to a borderless EU area, has changed the view of migration that used to be closely connected to state sovereignty, to an issue for the European community (Huysmans, 2000). EU has also developed *Global Approach to Migration and Mobility* (GAMM), which constitutes a framework for a common EU migration policy. With this, migration has developed into a politicized question and a matter of security (Huysmans, 2000). Rhetorically motivated by security reasons, EU has increased border control and surveillance and the border agency Frontex has had an increased area of responsibility. Today Frontex controls the external borders of the EU and coordinates the return journeys of irregular migrants (Amnesty, 2013). It seems like EU is developing towards a more controlled and restrictive common migration policy, and at the same time more people are fleeing in need of international protection. This thesis explores how the EU as an international actor, with an agenda of a common European migration policy, is securitizing and rhetorically politicizing migration.

1.1 Purpose and research question

The purpose of this thesis is to explore how migration and migrants are portrayed and formulated in EU policy. EU policy specifically refers to the GAMM policy and preparatory work, reports and press releases regarding the policy. GAMM is a relevant object of analysis, since it lays a common foundation for institutional and political practices in the EU and the member states. In these documents I intend to analyse how migrants are created as a group and how they are defined and divided within this group. I also intend to study how migrants are being securitized and rhetorically constructed as a political issue. I seek to map out this discourse and show its reach and limits. The research question of this thesis is the following:

How are migrants securitized and rhetorically constructed in EU policy?

To answer this question I will use Norman Fairclough's critical discourse analysis. This methodological instrument allows me to deeply study and examine securitization of migration in the texts, and how it is rhetorically described by EU institutions. The method is more specifically explained in the second chapter. Exploring the discourse of migrants in EU policy is of interest since it allows a deeper understanding of how relations of power are reproduced and constructed. Categorizing people, and describe them in a certain way, is central in sustaining and reproducing societal power relations (Mörkenstam, 1999, p.42). In these days, with increasing global migration and fear of transnational crime, this is a relevant political topic and present in the public debate.

This thesis is a descriptive case study, with the GAMM policy as object of analysis. Qualitative case studies are normally not characterized by generalizability (Teorell-Svensson, 2007, p.47). EU is a unique actor in the international arena, and it is hard to apply the result of the study in other contexts. Instead it is more relevant to speak of concepts such as contextualization, internal validity and reliability (Chalhoub-Deville, et al., 2006, p.86). Focus will therefore be on a credible interpretation of the discourse in EU policy, and a discussion of the consequences of how migrants are portrayed.

My interest in the migration issue is founded on my own personal beliefs of equality and social emancipation from oppression. Since this thesis takes the position that no knowledge can be objective, I clarify my own position and recognize that all knowledge is subjective. It is important to reflect upon how I, the researcher, is embedded in social structure and discourse, and how this affect the result of this thesis. According to the social theorist Foucault one can never step out of discourse, and because of this one can never reach the 'truth', instead 'truth' is constructed through the spreading of narratives (Phillips-Winther Jörgensen, 2000, p.21). This thesis do not aim to determine what is true or not, but instead explore perceptions of what is true and false, and how these perceptions are discursively

created. Since I do not seek an objective truth, my own subjectivity becomes irrelevant.

1.2   Material

The material I will be using for my analysis consists of published documents from the European Commission and the European Parliament. I will analyse the policy document of GAMM, and also communications, press releases and reports regarding EU migration policy. The documents are all official publications from the European Commission and Parliament. Because of their political significance and impact on politics in member states in the EU, they make interesting objects of analysis. The material is handpicked and strategically chosen with the aim to create a general picture of migration policy in the EU. To increase generalizability I tried to include a wide range of official EU documents. The documents are dated after 2011, since that year GAMM was revised, and 'mobility' was included in the policy. All the documents used in the analysis is listed under 'primary material' in the reference list.

1.3   Disposition

In this chapter I give an introduction to the subject and present a concrete research question and purpose of this thesis. I also present the material I will be using for my discourse analysis. In the second chapter I explain the method I will be using and what ontological and epistemological assumptions on which I will build the research. In chapter three I present a short historical context of migration in EU, I believe this will increase understanding of the analysis and contextualize the result. I will also present the GAMM policy and its key general content, and finally the central concepts that are used in the thesis.   With this aim to provide a solid foundation for the analysis. In chapter four I will present my theoretical framework, that is the securitization theory. I will explain the process of securitization, and relevant actors involved. In the fifth chapter I present my critical discourse analysis, and the discourses I have mapped out in the documents. Each discourse is presented with concrete examples from the texts and ends with a summary. Finally I discuss the result applying Foucauldian theories of power and summarize a conclusion.

2   Method

The method I will be using is critical discourse analysis (CDA) developed by Norman Fairclough. Fairclough's version is recognized as one of the most developed in the area of critical discourse analysis (Phillips-Winther Jörgensen, 2000, p.55). Below I will firstly present the ontological and epistemological assumptions on which I will build my research. I will then explain the principles and purposes of Fairclough's CDA, and also how I will apply CDA as a method.

2.1   Ontological and epistemological assumptions

In this thesis I will take on a realist approach, assuming there is a real world existing regardless of how we view or understand it. However, in line of Fairclough's own method, it is a *critical* realist approach, meaning that the social world is partly constructed by human action (Fairclough, 2010, p.4). In other words, there is an objective reality, but also a social reality that is discursively constructed. Epistemologically I adopt a subjectivist perspective, which means that knowledge about reality can only be experienced subjectively (Phillips-Winther Jörgensen, 2000, p.11). This means that we can never reach objective knowledge, we are always coloured by our own subjectivity. In accordance with post-structuralist theory I will see language as our access to reality. How terms, metaphors, allegories are used and how societal phenomenons are categorized, shapes our thoughts and behaviour. In the post-structuralist tradition there is a refusal to accept labelling, categorizing and generalisations without problematization (Peoples, Vaughan-Williams, 2010, p.63). Discourse is understood as practices, interpretations and representations that forms different 'regimes of truth', that emerge as certain 'facts' (Peoples, Vaughan-Williams, 2010, p.65). Our worldview is created through our use of language, and in accordance with critical realism, our use of language also creates the actual social world (Phillips-Winther Jörgensen, 2000, p.15). These ontological and epistemological assumptions are the foundations of my analysis. The texts I will analyse will be seen as constituting part of the social sphere in form of discourse.

2.2 Critical Discourse Analysis

The focus of analysis in CDA is not entities or individuals, but social relations, both within the discourse and outside of it. Discourse could be seen as a sort of entity, but it is really a set of complex relations between people communicating with each other through writing, talking, gestures etc. It describes relations in communicative events, like conversations or reading a newspaper article.

According to CDA, there is also relations between the discourse and non-discursive objects. Non-discursive objects are objects in the physical world, and are existing outside of the discourse. That could for example be people, institutions or political systems. The discourse is seen as an important form of social practice that both constitutes the social sphere, but also is constituted by the other social practices (Phillips-Winther Jörgensen, 2000, p.68). The external relations of a discourse are so forth of dialectical character, meaning that discourse reshapes and at the same time mirrors other social practices and structures (Fairclough, 2010, p.4). So, according to Fairclough discourse carries both internal and external relations with non-discursive objects. Therefore, a discourse cannot be seen as an independent entity but rather as a set of relations, and this is what CDA is an analysis of, social relations within and outside of discourse (Fairclough, 2010, p.3).

The power perspective is central in CDA. As Foucault, Fairclough views power as a productive force, a force that produces our social sphere and social relations (Phillips-Winther Jörgensen, 2000, p.69). Power is not seen as solely a force exercised by agents over passive subjects, but as a force spread across social practices, constituting knowledge and social relations. Power separates objects and decides what is possible and what is not in the social sphere. It is seen as both a producing and limiting force (Phillips-Winther Jörgensen, 2000, p.19). Fairclough's view on power differs to the Foucauldian view in the sense that Fairclough also sees power as non-discursive force, for example the use of violent force (Fairclough, 2010, p.4). I will view power in line with Foucault's and Fairclough's theories of power as a producing and limiting force, constituting social relations.

Also ideology is included in the analysis in CDA. Discourse is thought to create and reproduce unequal power relations between social groups, such as between social classes, women and men, ethnic minorities and the majority, and so on. This is understood as ideological effects, if one social group is subjected to another it is ideology. Discourse is considered to contribute to ideology if it contributes to sustaining relations of power and domination (Fairclough, 2010, p.239). CDA does therefore not entirely leave Marxist traditions (Phillips-Winther Jörgensen, 2000, p.69). According to Fairclough CDA is a research that seeks to understand how contemporary capitalism enables or prevent human well-being, and seeks to overcome these obstacles (Fairclough, 2010, p.11). Here, we find a normative element in CDA, which is characteristic for Fairclough's discourse analysis.

It is the *critical* in critical discourse analysis that brings this normative dimension. According to Fairclough CDA is to be used progressively (Phillips- Winther Jörgensen, 2000, p.92). CDA aims to uncover unequal relations of power and ultimately change these. In other words, it has a political purpose of emancipation from oppression (Phillips- Winther Jörgensson, 2000, p.70). This is also ultimately the ambition of this thesis. I want this research to matter outside of the research sphere, I seek to contribute to some sort of change.

2.2.1   CDA methodology

Now that I have presented basic premises and assumptions of CDA I will look to how to use CDA as a method, and describe how I will apply it in my research. Fairclough has developed a concrete model for CDA that contains three analytical dimensions; text, discursive practice and social practice. The first dimension is a detailed analysis of the characteristics of the text, in aim of mapping how the discourse realizes textually (Phillips-Winther Jörgensen, 2000, p.87). When it comes to the textual analysis, a number of different linguistic instruments can be used in CDA, the important thing is that the analysis fits with CDA's principles and purposes (Fairclough, 2010:7). The linguistic selection of a method should be decided depending on the object of research, which is being constructed in the theoretical process (Fairclough, 2010:234). Since I will be using the securitization theory, I will analyse how migration and security are linguistically linked together, mainly by signs and categorization (Bergström-Boréus, 2012, p.373).

The second dimension is that of discursive practice, this meaning the producing of a text that then is consumed and interpreted. In this level of analysis you seek to understand how the text is produced and consumed. The most usual way of doing this is by interdiscursivity and intertextuality, which is studying other discourses and texts the object of analysis is built on (Phillips-Winther Jörgensen, 2000, p.86). In my analysis GAMM will be the central object, but I will also include preparatory work of the policy and reports of its implementation. This way, I hope to create a picture of the production of the text and its implementation will give a sense of how it is consumed.

The third dimension is social practice, which puts the other two levels of analysis in a broader social dimension. The aim is to map social and cultural relations that is the frame of the discursive practice. This opens for normative elements of critical and political conclusions (Phillips-Winther Jörgensen, 2000, p.90). I aim to study what institutional measures EU motivates in migration policy, and how this is a result of discourse. Finally, I intend to discuss how this creates and reproduces societal relations of power and bring a normative element into the thesis.

3 Background

In this chapter I will give a short overview of migration in Europe and the GAMM policy, in order to put my research into context. I believe this will open for new thoughts and broaden my understanding of migration in EU policy. In this section I will also present and define central concepts, with the purpose to be clear and precise in my language and keep a high level of intersubjectivity (Teorell-Svensson, 2012, p.38).

3.1 Europe and migration

During the 1950's and 1960's, there was a large number of migrants coming to Europe mainly for the purpose of labour (Boswell, 2003, p.9). There was a need for workers and countries like France and Germany had a permissive or even promotional migration policy in order to meet the demands of the labour markets (Huysmans, 2000). The migration policies were almost entirely determined by political elites such as labour ministers, employers and trade unions. The legal status of migrants was not considered to be relevant or politically sensitive, it was even considered beneficiary if migrants were illegal, since it made it easier to exploit them as workers (Huysmans, 2000). Furthermore, in the Cold War era a lot of refugees fleeing from communist states were granted asylum as a form of ideological symbolism. In general, migration and refugee policy was not much of a public concern and it was not present in the political debate (Boswell, 2003, p.9). Entering the 1970's, the question became politicized and migration policy became increasingly restrictive. The rhetoric about migrants started to change and in the public debate migration was linked to a range of social questions such as unemployment, welfare, cultural identity and public disorder. The composition of migrants coming to Europe started to change to an increasing number of women and children who required more extensive state engagement (Boswell, 2003, p.10). The year 1968 EU created Regulation No 1612/68 of the Council which made a division between rights of citizens of member states and citizens from third countries. This was the first significant step towards a common migration policy and also a unified Europe with external borders. Before this migration and mobility was strictly a national question and not an issue that EU engaged in (Huysmans, 2000). The last 20 years there has been a further development of a common migration policy and a gradual incorporation of migration into the constitutional structure of the Union (2015/4544/EU). Following the Schengen group and the Single European Act plus a number of legislation and policy-making, EU established migration-related questions in its First Pillar, thus making migration part of the fundamental structure of EU (Huysmans, 2000). Today EU migration

policy includes procedures regarding legal migration, irregular migration, visa, borders, and a Common European Asylum System. EU is also funding member states in purpose of effectively managing migration 'flows' and implementation of EU policies (2015/4544/EU). Today, the Directorate-General of "Migration and Home Affairs" under the European Commission, manage all policies concerning migration. According to the European Commission's own website, they aim to build a common EU migration policy and create a set of legal rules for migration. A fundamental goal for the department is to fight terrorism and organised crime, in order to create a "safer Europe" (European Commission (1), 2016). In 2005 the policy Global Approach to Migration and Mobility (GAMM) was created, which now functions as the fundamental framework for migration in the EU. Under GAMM, the policy Common Agendas for Migration and Mobility (CAMM) and Mobility Partnerships (MP) have been created. They include all of GAMM's objectives, adding a number of targets, commitments and support measures for member states (European Commission (2), 2016). Below I will more thoroughly present the GAMM policy.

3.2   Global Approach to Migration and Mobility

A common EU policy was first introduced in Tampere 1999 at the European Council meeting (European Parliament, 1999). The policy had an internal and external dimension, the internal dimension meaning migration issues between the member states, and the external between EU and non-EU countries. In 2005 EU introduced the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility as a strategic framework for EU's external relations. It was intended to coordinate policy instruments and processes used by EU in engaging with third countries, with focus on major sending regions (Hampshire, 2016). GAMM is now the very foundation of EU's external migration and asylum policy. The policy creates a framework for dialogues and cooperation with non-EU countries, based on a number of defined priorities (European Commission (2), 2016). In 2012 GAMM was relaunched and organised into four pillars creating four main objectives of EU migration policy presented as follows:

1. Organising legal migration, fostering well-managed mobility
2. Preventing irregular migration, eradicating trafficking in human beings
3. Maximising the development of migration and mobility
4. Promoting international protection, and enhancing the external dimension of asylum (European Commission (2), 2016)

The main instrument for implementing GAMM is Mobility Partnerships (MP), which are non-binding agreements and communications between EU and third countries (Hampshire, 2016). So far, seven Mobility Partnerships have been signed. Under GAMM there is also Common Agenda for Migration and Mobility (CAMM) that aims to enable return and readmission of irregular migrants, mainly with third

countries. Two Common Agendas have been signed (European Commission (2), 2016). The success of MP and CAMM has been limited since only a handful of countries has entered into these partnerships. Coordinating a common migration policy under EU's 28 sovereign member states is not easy to say the least. The member states are most often unwilling to offer mobility incentives for EU to negotiate with, and their interest is mainly in reducing irregular migration, while third countries are generally interested in increasing mobility opportunities for their nationals (Hampshire, 2016). Therefore, there is contradictory interests between EU and third countries which limits possibilities for cooperation. Critique has been directed towards GAMM and EU's ambitions of a common migration policy, that it is creating an externalization of EU (Collyer, 2012). The increased border controls and regulations have serious complications for the migrants trying to reach Europe, resulting in dangerous attempts of getting pass EU borders, sometimes with death as outcome.

3.3   Central concepts

To be able to keep my language consistent and precise I will below define some of the central concepts of use in this research. I will define 'migrant' and 'security'. I also discuss EU in connection to the 'state', since these are the central actors in my research and object of analysis.

3.3.1 Migrant

According to EU's own definition, the term 'migrant' is broadly defined as a person who leaves one country or region in order to settle in another (European Commission (3), 2015). A migrant can have legal or illegal status, and is considered 'legal' when having legitimate documents and permission to stay in the country. In other words when a person fulfils the criteria for 'membership' (Benhabib, 2004, p.1). The terms 'irregular' migration and 'irregular' migrant(s), are used by the EU in their official documents and defined as "illegally staying third country nationals" (European Parliament, 2008). UNESCO defines irregular migrant as:

> "…people who enter a country, usually in search of employment, without the necessary documents and permits" (UNESCO, 2016).

Before 2008 the term 'illegal' migrant were used in official EU documents, which was criticized. 'Illegal' implies criminality and can also be said to be dehumanizing. This was emphasised by the UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights of NonCitizens, in the final report it is stated that:

> 'Immigrants…even those who are in a country illegally and whose claims
> are not considered valid by the authorities, should not be treated as
> criminals' (United Nations, 2006).

Another term that is sometimes used is 'undocumented' migrant, however, since many irregular migrants actually do possess documents such as ID cards and passport, this can be a misleading term (Blomfield-Morehouse, 2011). In this thesis I will therefore be using the term 'irregular migrant'.

3.3.2 EU and the state

In this research my object of analysis will be the EU as an actor in the international system, not the state. However the concept of 'state' remains important since the EU consists of 28 sovereign European states, EU is not a supranational entity, but a cooperation and partnership (Kaunert-Zwolski, 2013, p.2). Furthermore, the concept of migration is dependent on the concept of the state. 'The migrant' is a creation from the premises of the modern nation-state system built on political membership in form of national citizenship. In the post-Westphalian system borders between territories are created, and regulation of movement across borders is crucial for state sovereignty. Through borders, people are differentiated and categorized as included or excluded (Benhabib, 2004, p.2). Therefore, the 'migrant' is constructed within the frames of the nation-state system, and the state is a central actor when talking about migration.

   The focus of analysis in international studies is normally of the state, since the Westphalian international order presumes states to be the highest sovereign (Buzan, 2007, p.25). But in times of globalisation and the emergence of transnational institutions it is relevant to look beyond state borders and study security in society and community. During the 20th century there has been a European integration process resulting in EU and an emergence of a European community, binding European states and people together (Huysmans, 2000). Although member states has the ultimate freedom to decide their own internal and external affairs, some scholars means that member states' behaviour is affected by operating in a European institutional context. The behaviour is also affected by the construction of a European identity, in relation to the outside world (Kaunert-Zwolski, 2013, p.6). This identity shapes the behaviour and interaction of the member states. Because of EU's impact in the international sphere it can be said that states are not the only important actors in the global sphere, but that also EU and its institutions undoubtedly plays an important role. EU has access to diplomacy, economic incentives/sanctions and military means and also an ability to formulate policy across a range of different areas. These capabilities are no longer confined to state structure (Bretherton-Vogler, 2006, p.11). EU also has an expressed ambition of being a global actor, for example regarding migration policy the aim is to create a common policy through a common set of transnational rules (European Commission (1), 2016). The Treaty on European Union includes a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CSFP) pillar, which gives an overall political direction

to external policy (Kaunert-Zwolski, 2013, p.2). Also through the first pillar, which includes Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) and the area of migration, the EU is making inroads into areas of internal security matters, traditionally reserved for states (Kaunert-Zwolski, 2013, p.3). The last decades EU's role in international politics has increasingly expanded, with legislation and common policy areas crossing the borders between European states. I will view EU as an international actor from a social constructivist perspective, meaning that I will see EU as an actor engaging in formal and informal processes in global politics, and that these processes shapes the identity of the actor itself and relations with other actors (Bretherton-Vogler, 2006, p.12). EU also creates discourse and exercise power when interacting, which is what I seek to study in my analysis.

3.3.3 Security

Security is a politically powerful concept that at the same time lacks an overall definition. It is often narrowly defined in military and strategic terms as the absence of military conflict. (Buzan, 2007, p.28). However, the idea of security includes a wide range of issues and should be more broadly analysed than this. A huge array of threats, dangers and doubts loom over us, like environmental disasters, international terrorism, disease, starvation, criminal violence and economic exploitation. Therefore it is not enough to speak of security as absence of military conflict, there is more threats and dangers to consider. Also, security has an objective and subjective dimension. Being protected from danger is an objective state of security, while subjective security is the actual feeling of safety. Even a well-off individual in a well-off country can experience the feeling of insecurity in different forms (Buzan, 2007, p.50). However, the concept of security does not lend itself a general precise definition, it deals with such a wide range of risks, eventualities and probabilities that is too much to grasp. The concept also has built in contradictions, for example how defence policies can raise threat and insecurity by provoking other states (Buzan, 2007, p.35). Considering all this one could conclude that it could be appropriate to speak of security as the pursuit of freedom from threat, but a general and precise definition is difficult to reach (Buzan, 2007, p.50).

4   Theoretical Framework

In this chapter I will present my theoretical framework, the securitization theory developed in the Copenhagen school by Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver and Jaap de Wilde (Peoples, Vaughan-Williams, 2010, p.75). I will explain the process of securitization, important actors involved and describe how I will incorporate the theory in my analysis.

4.1   Securitization theory

Securitization theory is a study of how social issues are constructed into issues of security (Ayhan, 2009, p.8). According to Buzan, a security issue is when an issue is presented to be an *existential* threat to the object of reference, this being the object that needs to be protected (Peoples, Vaughan-Williams, 2010, p.76). In the securitization process an issue goes from non-politicized, to politicized, and finally to a securitized issue (Peoples, Vaughan-Williams, 2010, p.78). The process consists of three components: a *securitizing act*, a *securitizing actor* and an *audience*. For the process to succeed, two things are required: a level of legitimacy of the actor performing the speech act, and the speech has to contain terms of security (Baele-Sterck, 2015). Also, the text of analysis should be a focus of public attention and it should be a target of political actions, in other words, it should be critically pervasive for the political system (Balzacq, 2011, p.32).

   The *securitizing act* is the rhetorical act of using terms of security in relation to certain events and developments (Peoples, Vaughan-Williams, 2010, p.76). The issue needs to be discursively emphasized as a threat or danger and by that reframed into a situation of insecurity. Policies and the importance of political events depend heavily on how they are politicized through language. Securitization is an effective way of mobilizing political support and institutional means (Huysmans, 2006, p.7). Insecurity means fear, and fear is a powerful instrument for political action (Balzacq, 2011, p.219).

   The *securitizing actor* is the actor that attempts to securitize an issue. The actor needs to be in a position of authority and political legitimacy in order to be able to convince the audience of the threat. In order words, the securitizing actors and institutions need some sort of credibility in the eyes of the audience (Peoples, Vaughan-Williams, 201, p.79). The *audience* is the consumer of the speech act and has the ability to enable the securitizing actor to act. It is of importance that the audience subscribes to the posed security threat, in order for the producing of actual political effects. To succeed with this, the securitizing actor must have an ability to recognise and identify the feelings of the audience (Balzaq, 2011, p.8). In sum,

issues become issues of security through presentation and acceptance as such (Peoples, Vaughan-Williams, 2010, p.78).

Buzan differentiates between securitization in various sectors. Different logics are applied depending on the securitized issue, for example the approach to military threat is different compared to the approach to environmental threats. In every sector there is a distinctive pattern of securitization, with different actors and different audience (Peoples, Vaughan-Williams, 2010, p.80). Migration is an issue that belongs to the sector of society, where the existential threat is direct towards identity, language and culture. Therefore, the sense of community is central in the process of securitization in the societal sector, since the idea of the community preserves the criteria of membership and creates a need to protect a way of life. This creates an internal and external sphere with external threats. Through this creation of external danger and threat the community is preserved and tied together (Huysmans, 2000). A differentiation between us and them, and 'the other', as something that is endangering the culture of the community.

A common analysis in security studies is to see policy as a response to the securitized problem. In other words, the problem comes first and the policy is a reaction to this problem. However, this is a limited interpretation that overlooks how defining practices turns an issue into a security issue by use of language in policy documents, organising specific institutions and creating expectations. When for example the police and department of Home Affairs get responsibility for regulation of migration it affects how migrants are portrayed as problematic (Huysmans, 2000). The process of securitization is to be understood as a performative linguistic action, meaning that the speech act itself not only describe a given reality, but actually produce concrete results (Balszaq, 2011, p.2). This makes context into an important dimension in securitization. According to Balzacq, securitization does not happen in vacuum, but is enabled or constrained in the context it is produced. Securitization is created through language and knowledge gained from interactions and current situations. In other words, securitization can be both discursive and non-discursive (Balzacq, 2011, p.38). Securitization theory assumes that language has both the capacity to create certain expectations and reactions to an event, which is in line with a constructisivtic approach (Huysmans, 2006, p.8).

5 Analysis

In this chapter I will present my critical discourse analysis of EU policy, including the GAMM policy and preparatory works, press releases, and implementation reports regarding the policy. I have divided the analysis into three different parts. I will first present the discourse of EU as a community, secondly I will present the politicization of migration and lastly the securitization of migration and the object of reference. Each part is presented with concrete examples and ends with a summary. With this I aim to create a good overview of the process of securitization and the relevant actors involved.

5.1 The European community

EU and the member states are discursively constructed as a European community. In this discourse, EU is created as a cultural and political entity but also a physical and territorial one, with external borders that needs to be maintained and put under surveillance. This is a form of Europeanization of migration. Migration is not an issue for the member states, but instead transformed into an issue for Europe as a community. EU emerge as a unitary actor, who has the legitimacy to set up rules and rituals for entry in the community. As discussed above, the concept of external borders is crucial for the concept of migration. Borders creates a differentiation between people and an exclusive membership of the community. The 'migrant' is created with a physical border differentiating and categorizing people into 'national' and 'migrant' (Benhabib, 2004, p.1). 'External EU borders' are continually rhetorically constructed in the analysed documents, as exemplified in the quotes below.

> Over the years, significant progress has been made towards an integrated management of the EU's external borders (2014/096/EU).

> Mobility of third country nationals across the external EU borders is of strategic importance in this regard (2011/0743/EU).

It is emphasised that these external borders of EU needs to be managed and maintained. They need to be well-functioning, with controls and surveillance. This is described as a necessity for maintaining a high level of security and prevent cross-border crime. It is also said to be necessary for the capability of EU to receive *legal* migrants.

> Without well-functioning border controls, lower levels of irregular migration and an effective return policy, it will not be possible for the EU to offer more opportunities for legal migration and mobility (2011/0743/EU).

> A uniform and high standard of border security and management in full respect of fundamental rights is indispensable. Border management policies have a major role to play in counteracting cross-border crime and maintaining a high level of security (2014/0154/EU).

> The integrated border management strategy should be updated based on the experience gained from implementing the current policy instruments. The EU should consider how existing systems and platforms can be integrated and should aim for further cooperation at national level between border guards and other authorities working at the border in order to increase security (2014/096/EU).

Motivating increased border control for security reasons is a way of securitizing migration (Huysmans, 2000). Border control and surveillance is a method of controlling migration and the entering of migrants in the EU. A well-functioning border is said to increase security, implying that the entering of migrants could be a potential issue of security if not controlled. If not monitored, migration could be a danger. In European Commission's report from 2014, *Report on the implementation of the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility 2014/096*, migration is linked to 'cross-border crime' which implies that the entering of migrants could involve criminal activities, which securitizes migration into a criminal threat. The creation of protected external borders also creates an exclusive membership of the community. To be a part of the community the migrant needs certain documents and a legitimate reason and purpose to enter.

> Frequent travellers (business people, government officials, students and researchers) from non-EU partner countries that have biometric travel documents and enhanced document security in place could be offered easier access to the EU (2011/0743/EU).

> Channels for legal migration have been reinforced; there are now clearer conditions for entry and stay and a common set of rights for migrants exists (2014/096/EU).

The rituals needed for entry in the territorial community makes the membership meaningful. Entry is conditioned, and a privilege (Benhabib, 2004, p.1). Through this, protection and control of EU's discursively constructed borders are motivated. The discourse only express an obligation for the migrant, to have the necessary documents and a legitimate purpose, no obligation is put on EU member states to grant entry to migrants, permit citizenship, or give right to asylum. In this way, state sovereignty is placed higher than the right of free movement.

5.2   Politicizing migration

The policy documents contains a distinct discourse problematizing migration. This discourse is not connected to security, but instead seen as a societal and economic burden. In the securitization process an issue goes from non-politicized, to

politicized, and finally to a securitized issue. Politicizing a question is making it part of the political debate, handling it with political and institutional practices (Peoples, Vaughan-Williams, 2010, p.78). Migration is politicized through EU institutions and handled with certain political means. In the EU documents migration is portrayed as a political challenge, a burden and a concern. This is expressed as an issue for the member states, not EU as a community.

> Complex and mixed flows of migrants place pressure on the response capacities of Member States with regard to processing asylum claims […] (2014/096/EU).

> The challenge most frequently identified relates to increased migratory flows and high numbers of asylum applications. Member States are dealing with these pressures on the asylum system in a variety of ways. (2014/0165/EU).

The member states are said to be put under pressure by migration, and that it is caused by a high number of migrants and asylum seekers. The EU member states are in need of 'breathing space' and assistance from EU institutions to be able to handle the arriving migrants. EU is described as having the ability to assist and ease the pressure burden put on the member states. The greater number of migrants, the harder it is for the member states to handle.

> Resort to this mechanism would allow for the immediate protection and reception in the territory of EU Member States for persons concerned, as well as offering a "breathing space" for the national asylum systems of the Member States most directly affected (2011/226/EU).

The most frequent words used in the documents to describe migration is 'concern' and 'challenge'. Language of security is not used in this case, but migration is still posed as problematic. However, migration is not just described as a problem, but is also an opportunity, in this case for EU as an economic power. Migrants are seen as an asset, especially in the labour market.

> It should be considered how to make better use of the various instruments developed under the GAMM to take full advantage of the role that migration can play in addressing labour and skills shortages in Europe (2014/096/EU).

> Migration and mobility in the context of the Europe 2020 Strategy aim to contribute to the vitality and competitiveness of the EU (2011/1353/EU).

Migrants are seen as a possibility to enhance competitiveness and address labour shortage. These quotes do not describe migration as problematic, but as an economic opportunity. This is also a way of politicizing migration, transforming it into an economic interest. It can be said that migration is discursively politicized in two ways. Firstly, it is constructed as a problem, a challenge and a burden for the member states' economies and institutions. Secondly, migration is constructed as an economic opportunity in the labour market, potentially increasing the vitality and competiveness of EU, by addressing issues such as labour shortages. Since migration is seen as an economic opportunity, it is expressed in positive terms, but with the need to control and limit it.

5.3 Securitizing migration

Migration is continually securitized throughout the EU policy documents in two main ways. The first is through posing a potential future crisis caused by large inflows of migrants. The second is the frequent connection with criminal activity. Below, I will first present the object of reference and after that how migration is connected to crime and a potential future crisis.

5.3.1 The referent object

In the securitization process there is an actor performing a securitizing speech act, and an audience to whom this act is directed to (Peoples, Vaughan-Williams, 2010, p.78). There is also a referent object, which is what needs to be protected from the posed threat. As discussed above, there is a discourse of a European community emerging in the texts, unifying the member states as part of a society. In the securitizing process of migration the community of EU and its member states becomes the referent object. This mainly from an economic perspective. Migration is said to potentially destabilize the economy, either by overburden the economy of the member states, or overburden the economy of EU, and by that compromising EU's ability to compete on the global market. At some points, also European societies and 'social cohesion' are expressed as an object of reference.

> In case of crises or conflicts, variations in flows are difficult to cope with and could destabilise economies and weaken social cohesion (2011/1353/EU).

Social unity is described as an object of protection, it is not desirable with a weakened social cohesion. This could be seen as an ambition to keep the European community homogenous, preserving culture and traditions of the community.

> In the area of security, legislation and practical cooperation now provide common tools to help protect European societies and economies from serious and organised crime (2014/096/EU).

> Europe is part of a globalized and interconnected world where international mobility is expected to increase. More people will want to come to Europe – some temporarily, such as tourists, students and service providers, others on a more permanent basis to work or to seek protection. The EU will be faced with demographic changes, urbanisation, increasingly diverse societies and shortages on the labour market (2014/0154/EU).

What is expressed as referent objects in these quotes, are *European* economies and societies. At points the threat is directed towards EU member states, for example when flows of migration are described as putting pressure on economy and institutions of the member states. When the referent object is mentioned, it is often connected to a 'in case of' scenario. If potentially an extreme would happen, in form of a crisis, it might be a danger to the community or the economy of EU.

Migration is not only portrayed as a security issue for the community of EU and the member states, but also for the migrants themselves. It is recognized that migration is a dangerous activity for the people involved, and that it is important to consider that migrants are victims. Therefore also migrants are an object of reference in the securitization process. Migrants are said to be victims of cross-border crimes, for example in the form of human trafficking. Also they are exposed to abuse and exploitation once in the EU, particularly in the labour market. In the EU documents there is an expressed ambition to increase the safety of migrants, and also make sure that they are not being exploited once in the EU. Human rights are said to be an important part of migration policy, and should be included in all four pillars of GAMM.

> Here again, many migrants are subjected to exploitation, abuse and deception. Recruiters, intermediaries, employers or organised crime rings can all prey on unaware migrants (2011/0743/EU).

> Immigrants who are staying illegally are highly vulnerable to labour exploitation, and should be seen as victims (2011/743/EU).

> Going beyond the traditional agenda, the EU is working towards putting in place a more comprehensive framework to accompany and protect migrants along their migratory route, which should also take into account the social consequences of migration (2011/0743/EU).

At times, as in the quote below, it is unclear to whom the issue of security is directed towards, and both the migrant and EU member states could be included in the term of security. A specific object of reference is not mentioned.

> The Mobility Partnership (MP) is to be built in a balanced way around all four pillars of the GAMM, notably with commitments on mobility, visa facilitation and readmission agreements. It may, where appropriate, also include linkages to broader security concerns (2011/0743/EU).

In sum, two different referent objects are discursively constructed in the EU documents, the EU and the member states, and the migrants themselves. It is not just the EU community and the member states that are seen as being exposed to threats, EU also recognizes the migrants as victims and exposed to dangerous situations. In the policy documents there is an expressed ambition to protect the migrant, at the same time migration 'inflows' are posed as a threat and needs to be regulated. This duality of migrants as a potential threat and victims is continuing throughout the documents.

5.3.2 Future crisis and criminal activity

The concept of migration is rhetorically linked to security throughout the EU documents. Terms as 'threat', 'crisis' and 'emergency' are frequently used in relation to migration. This motivates EU's 'protection measures', and 'crisis management', implying a danger of migration. Migration is also continually

described as a 'flow'. This term creates an image of migrants as a force, or a phenomenon, not as people. A 'flow' has an intimidating undertone, and implies that migration needs to be managed and controlled. It is explicitly expressed in the EU documents that migrants should not be described in this way, but instead as people.

> The GAMM should also be migrant-centred. In essence, migration governance is not about 'flows', 'stocks' and 'routes', it is about people. (2011/0743/EU).

Still, migration 'flows' are frequently mentioned in the analysed EU documents.

> This declaration provides the basis for a possible significantly strengthened dialogue and cooperation on managing migration flows between countries along the Silk Route, which has been rather limited in the past (2014/096/EU).

> Turkish territory represents another important point of transit of irregular migration flows directed towards the EU both through the Thracian region and across the Mediterranean waters (2013/0869/EU).

There is a distinct narrative of a potential future emergency, a future crisis, where the number of migrants are so high it exceeds the member states capacity to handle it. The threat is posed as a 'massive influx' or 'flow' of migrants arriving to EU's external borders. Money and political means are invested in measures and instruments for crisis management in case of a state of emergency. This can be said to be a form of institutional securitizing, creating the image of a future danger caused by massive 'migration flows'.

> In order to enhance the preparedness of the Union to handle mass influxes, the existing framework on temporary protection should be evaluated, and if necessary, amended to make it a more practical and flexible instrument (2014/096/EU).

> A mechanism for early warning, preparedness and crisis management is now anchored within the Dublin Regulation (2014/096/EU).

> In addition, emergency measures were funded in 2013 under the European Refugee Fund (ERF) for a total amount of EUR 36.34 million to respond promptly to the consequences from the Syrian crisis, of which EUR 28.34 million were made available from October 2013 (2014/0165/EU).

Migration is also rhetorically put in relation to criminal activities. Trafficking of humans, drugs and arms, corruption, terrorism and radicalisation is continually used in connection to migration. Organized criminal groups are expressed as a security risk that needs to be addressed. This motivates increased border control and surveillance. It is a clear securitizing move, since criminal activity creates insecurity and fear.

> Penetration of the EU's economy by organized criminal groups is a security risk. Serious crimes with a cross-border dimension, such as corruption, trafficking in human beings, drugs, firearms and other illicit goods, and sexual exploitation of children cause grave harm to victims and to society as a whole. A number of those threats are growing in scale. Organised crime is increasingly flexible and is developing its activities within and beyond Europe's borders. It continues to pose an important threat to the EU's internal security and can have destabilising effects on third countries (2014/0154/EU).

Mainly 'irregular' migration is linked to criminal activity. Refugees or legal migrants does not seem to be discursively connected to crimes. This creates a differentiation and categorization of migrants. Refugees are often spoken of as victims and in the need of protection. Legal migrants are seen as an economic opportunity, while irregular migrants are connected with criminal activity and not wanted in the territorial community. The need to 'fight' or 'combat' irregular migration is often expressed.

> Following the 15th EU-China Summit in September 2012, where it was agreed to explore possibilities of facilitating mobility and strengthening cooperation on fighting irregular migration, cooperation with China on these issues has slowly progressed (2014/096/EU).

The crimes are described as 'cross-border crimes', and often caused by 'organised criminal groups'. They are described as a threat to EU's *internal* security, and therefore a threat to the member states. This connects mobility across borders with criminal activity. The crimes are also said to increase, and develop both within and outside of EU's external borders. This is also a securitizing move.

> European internal security also means acting beyond EU borders and in cooperation with third country partners. Radicalisation, fight against trafficking of human beings and fight against drug trafficking for example require such cooperation (2014/096/EU).

> A broad understanding of security means that irregular migration also needs to be considered in connection with organised crime and lack of rule of law and justice, feeding on corruption and inadequate regulation (2011/1353/EU).

Terrorism and violent extremism is mentioned in the Commission's report from 2014, *Report on the implementation of the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility 2014/096*. This connects terrorism with migration and mobility across EU borders which is a clear securitizing move. This is however only mentioned once in the EU documents analysed, it is not frequently expressed.

> Over the past years several terrorist attacks have taken place, mostly by individuals or smaller groups but many with severe consequences. The threat from terrorism and violent extremism will pose a serious challenge to the EU in the coming years. There is a worrying trend with mostly young people going to other countries such as Syria to become foreign fighters (2014/096/EU).

To summarize, there are two prominent securitizing moves emerging in the EU documents. The first is the narrative of connecting migration to a future crisis or emergency. A potential state of emergency caused by 'massive inflows' of migrants are created and posed as a threat. This motivates EU to implement political emergency measures and crisis management. The second is connecting migration to criminal activities and radicalisation.

6   Discussion

In the EU policy documents, there is a discourse constructing EU and the member states as a *European community*. EU is described as a unity, together the member states form a cohesive European community and society. This community is described as having external borders and people cannot enter the community without a 'membership', in form of a European citizenship. Without necessary documents and permission for entry, migrants are categorized as 'irregular'. This construction of EU borders and membership is crucial in migration and in migration policy. The very concept of 'border' divides and categorizes people in different groups, 'citizens' and 'migrants' (Benhabib, 2004, p.1). The 'migrant' is therefore discursively created *through* the idea of Europe as a community and EU external borders. In other words, the concept 'migrant' is dependent on the concept of EU external borders. This is a rhetorical categorization of people. People are linguistically categorized in EU citizen/migrant, self/other. According to the structural linguistic Derrida, this way of creating binary oppositions in language is a way of escaping the inherent instability of meaning, and create an impression of international politics as stable and indisputable (Peoples, Vaughan-Williams, 2010, p.67). Basically, it's a way to make sense of international relations. These terminological oppositions rely on each other's existence, without the second term, the first cannot function (Peoples, Vaughan-Williams, 2010, p.64). In this way, migrants are rhetorically constructed, and dependent of the existence of the European community. In accordance with Foucauldian theories, this categorization is a form of exercising power (Phillips, Winther-Jörgensen, 2000, p.20). It is a way of creating a European identity, since identity is constituted by difference. (Peoples, Vaughan-Williams, 2010, p.68). It is also a way of legitimating different treatment of people. For example, as mentioned above, in 1968 EU created Regulation No 1612/68 of the Council which made a division between rights of citizens of member states and citizens from third countries. Categorization enables this differentiation of rights between people and creates a relation of power (Peoples, Vaughan-Williams, 2010, p.66), where EU emerge as an actor with given authority to categorize and differentiate between groups of people. In line with Foucauldian theory, power is an interaction understood as tactics, strategies and techniques to influence behaviour and enable or constrain political practice.

The second discourse to be found in the policy documents is the problematization and politicization of migration. Migration is rhetorically described as problematic, a challenge and concern for the member states and the EU. This political burden is said to be a problem for the EU as a global entity from an economic perspective, compromising EU's vitality and competitiveness on the global market. In this way, migration is made into a *transnational* problem, legitimating EU to take action and thus moving away from state-sovereignty. There is an apparent economic perspective in both the politicization and securitization of

migration. This is in line with EU as a global economic actor and its ambitions for a strong European market. Also European societies are said to be weakened by migration, thus threatening cultures and traditions of the community. This is a way of rhetorically defining migrants, or the 'other', as an external problem and making it into a political issue. While migration is portrayed as a problematic challenge, it is also seen as an economic *opportunity* for the constructed European community, an opportunity that could potentially solve issues of the labour market. *Legal* migrants are spoken of as an asset and labour opportunity for the European community, thus recreating a political unity with common interests. They are also recognized and described as victims of migration in form of criminal activity and exploitation. A human rights perspective is adopted and an expressed ambition to protect and ensure that *legal* migration is a safe activity, contradictory to the general rhetoric of migration as a concern and security threat. There is therefore a differentiation of migrants in the texts, expressing legal migration in positive terms, and irregular migrants as unwanted.

In the securitizing process, an issue is rhetorically transformed from politicized to securitized (Peoples, Vaughan-Williams, 2010, p.77). The analysis shows that migration is discursively securitized in EU policy documents. Large number of migrants entering Europe is said to result in a crisis for the EU. In other words, a potential future crisis caused by migration is formulated. With this rhetoric EU is motivating political measures for handling a potential state of emergency. Migration is also securitized by being linguistically connected to cross-border crimes and, less frequently, radicalisation. Connecting an issue with crime is a securitizing speech act. The crimes are said to be cross-border, thus threatening the *internal* security of EU. Securitization of migration contributes to constitute the political community of Europe, it creates unity and identity by instituting this external threat (Huysmans, 2006, p.47). By posing this threat to the constructed European community and its external borders, EU gains political trust and loyalty, and get the legitimacy to take political action. Through securitization EU institutions reproduce norms in Western society, a collective idea of migration as a threat. Migration is rhetorically outlined and defined as problematic and threatening to Western society. Foucault calls this a 'regime of truth', which is the formation of a context in which political phenomenon are understood and from this international politics and relations are organized (Peoples, Vaughan-Williams, 2010, p.65).

By securitizing migration EU is contributing to a discourse creating the idea of the migrant as an external threat, motivating political practices such as increased border control and surveillance. The rhetoric creates a 'regime of truth', a given reality, that structures international politics. The discourse that emerge in EU policy is a categorizing of people into groups and a differentiation between them. According to Foucault, thinking of a population as a category and applying biological features to a total population gives way to a type of governance and power relations. Through this, the population as a whole becomes the target of EU migration strategies. By trying to control and regulate who enters the community, there is an ambition to shift 'bad' elements of the population of EU, to 'good' (Peoples, Vaughan-Williams, 2010, p.67). For example, irregular migration is

considered a 'bad' element of the EU population, while legal migrants that can fill shortages in the labour market is considered to be of advantage for the community. By actively trying to lower irregular migration and increase the number of legal migration for labour purposes, EU institutions is seeking to change and normatively 'improve' the population as a whole. This is an exercise of power, with EU institutions seeking to strategically change the EU population. In accordance with post-structuralist theory and CDA's non-discursive dimension, language constitutes the social world. The securitizing speech acts and construction of a European community in EU policy is therefore constructing part of the social world and social relations. This can be seen in form of border control and surveillance, strict asylum rules and crisis management, which is actual political strategies as a response to migration as an issue of security.

6.1 Conclusion

As discussed in chapter two, critical discourse analysis has a normative element. The aim of CDA is to identify 'social wrongs' in society and produce knowledge that could contribute to right these wrongs or mitigate them (Fairclough, 2010, p.7-8). With my analysis I arrive at the conclusion that the rhetoric in EU policy is a discursive exercise of power, expressed by categorizing people, differentiate between them and creating 'regimes of truth' that organizes political practices in a certain way. This creates unequal relations and exclusion. I take the normative position that this is a social wrong. By uncovering these unequal relations and make securitization in EU policy visible, my purpose is to contribute to knowledge and societal change. By producing knowledge of the securitization of migration, the construction of external EU borders and the rhetorical categorization and exclusion of people, the ultimate aim of this thesis is to foster more egalitarian discourses.

7   References

7.1   Primary material

European Commission, 2011/0743. *COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS-The Global Approach to Migration and Mobility.*
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52011DC0743&from=EN Retrieved: 2016-04-23

European Commission, 2014/096. *REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS-Report on the implementation of the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility.*
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52014DC0096&rid=2 Retrieved: 2016-04-23

European Commission, 2013. *Commission report calls for forward-looking policies on migration.*
http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-552_en.htm Retrieved: 2016-04-23

European Commission, 2014/0154. *COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS-An open and secure Europe: making it happen.*
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52014DC0154&rid=15 Retrieved: 2016-04-23

European Commssion, 2013/0869. *COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND THE COUNCIL-on the work of the Task Force Mediteranean.*
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52013DC0869&rid=18 Retrieved: 2016-04-22

European Commission, 2014/0165. *COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT-Accompanying the document Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council 5th Annual Report on Immigration and Asylum (2013).* http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52014SC0165&rid=3 Retrieved: 2016-04-23

European Commission, 2011/1353. *COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS-The Global Approach to Migration and Mobility.* https://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/sites/antitrafficking/files/communication_from_the_commission_1.pdf Retrieved: 2016-04-23

European Commission, 2011/226. *The European Commission's response to the migratory flows from North Africa.* http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-11-226_en.htm?locale=EN Retrieved: 2016-04-23

European Economic and Social Committee, 2011/743. *Opinion of the European Economic and Social Committee on the 'Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions — The global approach to migration and mobility'.* http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52012AE1057&rid=26 Retrieved: 2016-04-22

European Commission, 2013/0292. *COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS-Maximising the Development Impact of Migration The EU contribution for the UN High-level Dialogue and next steps towards broadening the development-migration nexus.* http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52013DC0292&rid=19 Retrieved: 2016-04-23

European Commission, 2015/6026. The European Union's cooperation with Africa on migration. http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-15-6026_en.htm Retrieved: 2016-04-22

7.2   Secondary material

Baele, S.J. & Sterck, O.C. 2015, "Diagnosing the Securitisation of Immigration at the EU Level: A New Method for Stronger Empirical Claims", *Political Studies,* vol. 63, no. 5, pp. 1120-1139.

Balzacq, T. 2011, *Securitization Theory: How Security Problems Emerge and Dissolve,* 1st edn, Routledge, London.

Benhabib, S. 2004, *The rights of others : aliens, residents, and citizens,* Cambridge ; New York : Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Bergström, G., Boréus, K. 2012. *Textens Mening och Makt – metodbok I samhällsvetenskaplig text- och diskursanalys.* 3rd ed. Studentlitteratur: Lund.

Blomfield, Michael., Morehouse, Christal 2011, "Irregular Migration in Europe", *Migration Policy Institute,* .

Boswell, C. 2003, *European migration policies in flux : changing patterns of inclusion and exclusion,* London : Royal institute of international affairs, European programme : Blackwell, 2003.

Bretherton, C.V., John 2006, *The European Union As a Global Actor,* 2nd edn, Taylor & Francis, London.

Buzan, B. 2007, *People, states & fear : an agenda for international security studies in the post-cold war era,* Colchester, UK : ECPR Press, cop. 2007; 2. ed., with a new introduction by the author.

Collyer, M. 2012, "Migrants as strategic actors in the European Union's Global Approach to Migration and Mobility", *Global Networks,* vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 505-524.

European Commission, 2015/4544. *Towards a Comprehensive European Migration Policy: 20 years of EU Action.* Press Release Database. http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-15-4544_en.htm Retrieved: 2016-04-27

European Commission (1), 2016. *About us.* Migration and Home Affairs. http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/who-we-are/about-us/index_en.htm Retrieved: 2016-04-25

European Commission (2), 2016. *Global Approach to Migration and Mobility.* Migration and Home Affairs. http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/international-affairs/global-approach-to-migration/index_en.htm Retrieved: 2016-03-29

European Commission (3), 2015. *Glossary.* EU Immigration Portal. http://ec.europa.eu/immigration/glossary_en#glosR Retrieved: 2016-05-03

European Parliament, 1999. *TAMPERE EUROPEAN COUNCIL 15 AND 16 OCTOBER 1999-PRESIDENCY CONCLUSIONS.* http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/tam_en.htm#a Retrieved: 2016-04-27

European Parliament, 2008. *DIRECTIVE 2008/115/EC OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 16 December 2008-on common standards and procedures in Member States for returning illegally staying third-country nationals.* Official Journal of the European Union. http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-

content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32008L0115&from=EN Retrieved:
2016-04-16

Fairclough, N. 2010, *Critical discourse analysis : the critical study of language,*
Harlow : Longman, 2010; 2. ed.

Hampshire, J. 2016, "Speaking with one voice? The European Union's global
approach to migration and mobility and the limits of international migration
cooperation", *Journal of Ethnic & Migration Studies,* vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 571-
586.

Huysmans, J. 2006, *The politics of insecurity. [Electronic Resource] : fear,
migration and asylum in the EU,* Hoboken : Taylor & Francis Ltd, 2006.

Huysmans, J. 2000, "The European Union and the Securitization of Migration",
Journal of Common Market Studies, vol. 38, no. 5, pp. 751.

Kaunert, C., Kamil. 2013, *The EU as a Global Security Actor,* 1st edn, Palgrave
Macmillan, England.

Kaya, A. 2009, *Islam, migration and integration. [Electronic Resource] : the age
of securitization,* New York : Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Koser, K. 2005, *Irregular migration, state security and human security*, Global
Commission o9n International Migration.

Koser, K. 2007, *International migration. [Electronic Resource] : a very short
introduction,* Oxford : Oxford University Press, UK, 2007.

Peoples, C. & Vaughan-Williams, N. 2010, *Critical security studies : an
introduction,* London : Routledge, 2010.

UNESCO, 2016. *Migrant/Migration.* International Migration.
http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-
sciences/themes/international-migration/glossary/migrant/ Retrieved: 2016-
04-20

United Nations, 2006. *The Rights of Non-citizens.* United Nations Publication,
New York and Geneva.
http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/noncitizensen.pdf Retrieved:
2016-04-27)