The Refugee as an Agent of Securitization in Europe following the Refugee Crisis of 2015

Master Thesis in Global Studies - Roskilde University

By;Asmus Sebastian Kobbernagel, Student nr. 54800

Supervisor; Michael Frederich Kluth, Email; kluth@ruc.dk
Department of Social Sciences and Buisness
 Fall Semester 2019
Characters: 162.723

Date of delivery: 03.09.19

Abstract

Following the declaration, the European (EU) refugee crisis in 2015, a rise in populist driven politics has been documented throughout EU and its member states, with the arrival of refugees framed as an existential threat to the political and social hegemony. The field of Securitization has often been used to critically study the development of policy from the discourse, on multiple levels. Scholars on of the field have with the securitization framework identified a dominant threat image associating the refugee with crime, violence, and instability. However, not much effort has gone into investigation of the refugee as an agent capable of influencing security discourse, despite it being theoretically feasible. This thesis utilizes a multiple-case design and discursive analysis to investigate five cases of refugee public performances after the arrival in the EU, with the securitization framework. The lacking acknowledgment of refugee as a securitization agent prove a gap in securitization literature when the discourse analysis of the individual cases, documents the necessary conditions for securitization practices. The comparison of trends and practices of the cases, identify a general narrative concerning the protection of the collective refugee group, against the discriminatory and dehumanizing rhetoric and xenophobic practices of EU populist movements. Here, proving the existence of a particular strand of discourse generated by the refugee group in the EU in need for further investigation.

Danish summary

Den Europæiske (EU) flygtninge krise fra 2015, har ført til at flygtninge gruppen er blevet identificeret som en eksistentiel trussel mod EU regionens sociale of politiske hegemoni, gennem populistisk drevet retorik og politisk praksis. Sikkerhedsstudier har i deres kritiske undersøgelser af denne udvikling identificeret flygtninge gruppens trussels billede som et produkt i sikkerhedsliggørelses processen. Der er dog meget få inden for sikkerhedsstudier, der har vurderet flygtningene i stand til at påvirke den globale sikkerheds diskurs. Specialet her benytter et multi-case design til at studere fem cases af flygtninge aktive i den offentlige debat, ved hjælp af sikkerheds studiets teoretiske ramme. Gennem kritisk diskurs analyse af de individuelle cases, identificere specialet flygtningene som agenter der opfylder kravende for sikkerhedsliggørelse, med muligheden for at påvirke den globale sikkerheds diskurs. Den komparative analyse af casene leder til identificeringen af en bredere diskurs fra flygtningenes perspektiv, hvor legitimeringen af diskriminerende og fremmedhadsk retorik og politik er identificeret so en eksistentiel trussel for flygtningene i EU. Specialets undersøgelse leder til af en overordnet diskursiv praksis blandt flygtningene i EU som er værd videre undersøgelser.

Acronyms

- EU- Europe
- CPHS – Copenhagen School of Securitization
- UNHCR – United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
- HRW – Human Rights Watch
- IR – International Relations
- MCD – Multiple Case Design
- CDA – Critical Discourse Analysis
- IFRC - International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Moon

Table of Content

Introduction

The Introduction chapter accounts for the problem field, the European refugee crisis, the threat image put forward by international agencies in this sphere, and a review of associated securitization studies. A critical review of the literature documents a gap in this field, from which we formulate the research question and the focus of the master thesis.

Problem area

Since the 1980s, political construction of migration has increasingly been associated with destabilization, and as a significant threat to both the political and social hegemony to the country of arrival (Huysmans 2000; 2006). The European (EU) refugee crisis has, according to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) global report of 2018, seen more than 6.4 million refugees in the EU, 3.6 million of which originated in Syria (UNHCR 2019). The development of the most recent EU refugee crisis has increased the existing anti-refugee rhetoric in the global public discourse surrounding the refuge group. Despite a steady drop in refugees coming to the EU from 2018 to 2019, populist and far-right radical leaders among the EU member states have continuously emphasized the issue of mass migration, creating a culture of insecurity and fear to sway public opinion in favor of their agenda (e.g. Human Rights Watch 2018; Stokes 2016; ABC News 2015). Here, presenting the refugee as an existential threat to the EU's social and political stability. Other discursive strands characterize refugees as a group in need of humanitarian aid (e.g. Henley 2018; Saunders 2017; UNHCR 2019), an idea which can easily become mainstream through today's easy access to mass-media and communicative technology. The political practice of connecting 'the refugee' as a social group to criminal and terrorist activity is not an isolated case. The broader politicization in which migrants and refugees are constructed as a security threat can be perceived through the theoretical lens of securitization. A process of dramatic use of discourse to sway the mainstream, which can lead to the justification of extreme measures and even the use of deathly force, in the name of security (Balzacq 2011; Buzan, et al. 1998). The field of securitization has engaged the securitization of refugees and migrants through both a traditionally state-centered focus for then later to adopt a more sociological approach. Here, documenting a dominating threat image surrounding the refugee, influencing their social standing and interactions in the EU, a construction of discourse which security scholars have connected to specific agencies of both international and local nature. Securitization scholars have primarily adopted a critical focus upon investigating these political and social agencies initiating this security discourse and the consequences it has for the refugees both physically, socially and politically(e.g. Biehl 2009; Gerard

and Pickering 2014; Ilgit and Klotz 2018; Moreno-Lax 2018; Léonard 2010). This leaves us with a well-documented and well-studied threat image of the refugee group and the so-called EU refugee crisis. Despite securitization scholars, limited acknowledgment of the referent as a subject (Balzacq 2011, 53), the field of securitization seemingly neglects to acknowledge the agency of the refugee, as capable of influencing the global security discourse. This thesis postulate that the lacking investigation of the refugee groups practices upon arrival to the EU, suggest a gap in the securitization literature. By acknowledging the refugee group as capable of communicating socially constructed reality to others, one could acknowledge their limited agency. The lacking investigation into the refugee groups practices suggest that not al is known of the complex securitization discourse of refugees following the 2015 crisis. To better understand the development of the crisis and how the securitizing discourse and threat image affects the refugee, and thus the development of the EU refugee crisis, the field of securitization must apply itself to their perspective. To neglect the refugee perspective is to maintain ignorance of how the global securitization discourse affects this group and how they may affect further development of the event (Saunders 2017).

The EU Refugee Crisis

The EU has seen a steady increase in migration and asylum seekers, focused from 2015-2016 approximately 1.02 million refugees and migrants arrived at the EU borders. This being the highest number of refugees registered since the Second World War, a state of emergency was declared by the EU security council (United Nations 2015; BBC NEWS 2018; UNHCR 2019). This has created an air of urgency around immigration, despite a steady drop of refugee arrivals at EU borders since 2015. Italy who in 2018 received approximately 22,435 migrants and refugees, in contrast to the 119,369 in 2017, was recently criticized for turning away refugee ships and generally delaying arrivals (Human Rights Watch 2018; UNHCR 2019). The refugee crisis has been suggested as a cause for political disruption within member states like Germany and mentioned as a factor in the British referendum campaign for Brexit (Stokes 2016; Walker 2016). Populist extremist parties have campaigned for segregation, closed borders, deportation, and even the use of violence onto the death of refugees and migrants coming from the South and the Middle East to EU. The refugee has thus been associated with crime, terror, and disruption to political and social hegemony in the EU (e.g. Martin Beck 2017; BBC NEWS 2018; ABC News 2015). International and local humanitarian agencies like the UNHCR and Human Rights Watch (HRW) have criticized EU member states like Hungary, Italy, and Switzerland, for introducing xenophobic and anti-refugee oriented politics in the name of security (Mohammed 2018; UNHCR 2019).

The steady growth of international migration to the EU already since the 1980s is a phenomenon which has transferred into political, public, and academic debates in the form of securitization and insecurity. There is, however, a broad consensus that the increase of political agencies, such as the European Council and its member states, attempts at securitizing migration and refugees come from the recent influx of refugees to the EU. A development which have led populist driven agencies to employ extreme measures to meet this assumed threat. The critical discussion in the current literature on securitization of refugees and migrants argues that representatives from both social and political agencies move to securitize migration from the Middle East and Southern countries, setting a negative tone in the global security discourse surrounding refugees. The increase in right-wing extremism and identity politics of a neo-nationalist nature supports this postulate (e.g. Ilgit and Klotz 2018; Moreno-Lax 2018; Župarić-Iljić and Valenta 2018).

Literature Review

This section of the chapter will review the literature on the securitization framework and of the securitization of migrants in EU, in order to provide much needed clarity reading of the evolution and limitations of the existing framework used to study the development of this diverse discourse.

This includes an introduction and background of the original framework of securitization, and attempt to asses the literature and academic practices surrounding the securitization of migrants and refugees in EU, which have emerged as extensions of the Copenhagen School of thought introduced by Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver and Jaap Wilde in 1998. The purpose is to evaluate existing practices within the field of study and will end on a discussion on said literatures in an attempt to isolate a research question for further study.

The Copenhagen School of Securitization

Securitization is a theoretical framework that describes the practice of an extreme form of politicization created by dramatized 'speech acts', where an issue is presented as an existential threat, legitimizing the use of extreme measures. Securitization as a theoretical framework for the academic analysis of threat, fear, and state stems from Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver and Jaap Wilde's development of The Copenhagen School (CPHS) of thought (1998). As a theory newly emerged after the Cold War, it sets out to look at security from a militaristic and political perspective without diminishing these aspects (Buzan and Hansen 2009 & Wæver 2004). The theoretical framework initially builds upon a constructivist perspective of nation-state relations between political or public

representatives as 'speech actors', the population as an 'audience', and successful security in the form of discourse change toward a particular phenomenon or group.

The theory describes the 'securitization' process where an issue is presented by an actor (such as a state representative) as an existential threat to a 'referent object' (what is threatened) requiring immediateaction outside the normal political procedures (Buzan et al.1998, 20ff). This framework has been contested, not least in the context of migration and refugees, and evolved to include sociopolitical dynamics of many different sectors. In his book (2011), Thierry Balzacq presents the securitization framework derived from the contesting literature. Here Balzacq has identified what he calls the Philosophical and Sociological Approaches to Securitization. These branches describe the essence of the academic tendencies that have emerged from the CPHS, as well as the following contesting literature. Drawing on a variety of International Relations (IR) literature – constructivism, poststructuralism, critical theory— it is clear that students of securitization aim to explicate the structures and processes that constitute security problems. Securitization theory elaborates the insight that no issue is necessarily a menace. Something becomes a security problem through discursive politics. However, within securitization theory, there are various ways to characterize this insight. While the philosophical and the sociological approach to securitization may not be wholly exclusive of one another, Balzacq does seem to differentiate between the two, which gives this chapter a working distinction when revising the literature of securitization of migrants and refugees. Referencing Wæver (1995), Balzacq presents what he calls the philosophical approach to security: as working in a poststructuralist tradition, in which the conditions of the possibility of threats are inherent to uttering the word 'security'. In short, security is a speech act to which uttering the word 'security', is the act(Balzacq 2011). Within the securitization literature concerning migration and refugees, those with a Sociological lens talk about securitization primarily in terms of practices, context, and power relations that characterize the construction of threat images. The argument is that while discursive practices are essential in explaining how some security problems originate, many develop with little if any discursive design. When the framework is applied to the topic of migration and refugees, we see a general tendency towards what Balzacq calls the sociological approach, where securitization does not only occur through discursive designs (e.g. Huysmans 2006; Bigo 2002; Feischmidt, Pries, and Cantat 2019).

The Sociological approach

The following section of this chapter will review the literature applying the securitization framework to the topic of migrants and refugees. The authors of the CPHS, Buzan, Wæver, and

Wilde (1998), describes this sector as being one of relationships, where the referent object is defined as large scale collective identities that can function independent of the state (Buzan et al. 1998, 7, 24). The more contemporary sociological approaches seem to emerge as a critique to the narrow focus of CPHS on discursive acts and linguistic analysis, claiming that it is limited not to include the 'performative acts' of security, those who go beyond mere linguistic language. The approach emerging from the securitization of migrants and refugees, also include the practices of securitization in a broader context of society, such as border control, data surveillance and risk assessment among others (Bigo 2002). This approach is appropriately referred to as the Paris School is inspired by the post-modernists Michel Foucault and Pierre Bourdieu (Peoples and Vaughan-Williams 2014). D. Bigo (2002) outlines a new framework based on risk society and political cooperation to politicize the mobility of people. This is an attempt to discover why the negative discourse, framing migrants, and refugee's relation to terrorism, crime, and unemployment continue, despite the existence of alternative discourse. Bigo argues that the securitization of migrants is a result of the government being perceived as a body for the polity. This practice is supposedly anchored in the fear that politicians will lose their power if the mobility of people is not controlled. Bigo (2002) looks at the topic of securitization from both an ideological and discursive perspective, stressing the vital role that institutions, media, and experts play in the processes of securitization. The difference in his work from the CPHS is that instead of looking at the audience as always in a receptive mode, he constructs the idea that security is gained on the cost of insecurity. The security actor is in this instance provoking a reaction of unease from the audience, creating a symbolic threat that may not reflect reality, but whom the audience needs the speaker's protection. Securitization of migrants, by speech actors both in and out of the political arena as a transversal political technology, is used as a mode of governmentality by diverse institutions to play and/or increase the unease among their audience and affirm their role as the governing power, thus creating a Risk Society (Ibid. 65). The framework of the risk society presents the negative label surrounding migrants as a discourse almost institutionalized within different dimensions of society (such as security, border, military, environment, religion, employment, real-estate) seeping into everyday considerations and concerns. This framework emphasize the study of political and bureaucratic interplay on a dialectic basis, is essential to understand the articulation of knowledge and power relations that are taking place through the securitization of immigration (Bigo 2002; van Munster 2009).

Migrants and refugees have been associated with significant challenges to both social and political cohesion for recipient states and have been politicized and labeled as threats to regional and national security. This is not a new phenomenon; scholars have researched the securitization of migrants since 1998, as to how and why, it emerges, affect society and refugee life, population and policy-making (Huysmans 2006). Jeff Huysmans (2000) argues that the increase in migration flows from the South and East to Western EU states, combined with the issues following a transit to a global economy, rise of poverty, worsening of urban living standards and the growth racist and xenophobic parties and multiculturalism, have entailed a shift in the discourse surrounding migrants. This shift is according to him the 'securitization of migrants,' a process where migrants have been perceived as a security issue and a threat to public order, cultural identity, and the stability of the labor market (Huysmans 2000). Huysmans describes the insecurity of an existential threat with an almost Hobbesian view regarding the selfish nature of humans, where human life is a constant war, all against all, driven by the fear of death, or the death of the political autonomy that protects a societal structure (Huysmans 2006, 52). Here it becomes the goal of the securitization theory to interpret the complex social and political structures that lead to the securitization of a group of people, with the measurement of political rhetoric and contextual analysis.

With a number of securitization scholars shift to a more sociological lens, speech act theory have being contested and developed to also include factors such as gender, emotions, visual symbolism, and performative acts as a method of communication. The concepts of the speech act theory evolve as scholars include said factors, and adopt theoretical end methodological practices from other disciplines. Scholars with a sociological approach have gone beyond the CPHS general speech act theories, limited view on discursive practices as the only form of speech acts (e.g. L. Hansen 2011; Williams 2003; Vuori 2010; McDonald 2008; Kearns 2017). Here securitization is not only constructed through linguistic discourse but also visual performances by "speech" actors. J. Vuori (2010) argues that when researching a securitization phenomenon, one should focus on not only the act of speaking, but also the use of visuals, images, and symbols. This point is built from the argument that any form of political communication has been increasingly embedded within televisual media. We here see the speech act framework consist of a deeper understanding of media structures and institutions of contemporary political communication in order to analyze the process of securitization. Here it is understood that also images can be seen as communicative securitization acts, while not ignoring the written and spoken discourse ((Vuori 2010; Williams 2003); L. Hansen 2011). McDonald (2008), argue that the lacking acceptance of visual representation in the initial

framework came from the CPHS's understanding that only state representatives and political actors could perform speech acts. Where language may diverge, images and symbols are accepted as empirical referent and can transcend to represent collective meanings and values (Olesen 2016). Often stressed alongside the acceptance of visual, performative acts is the topic of gender (Lene Hansen 2000; Kearns 2017). Hansen (2000), in her article on the case of honor killings of a Pakistani woman, criticizes the CPHS framework for not taking into account the effect of securitization on the ability of the "victims" to perform discursive action. She does so by referencing American philosopher and scholar Judith Butler, criticizing the CPHS authors for not taking into account the concept of the human body and gender. Her argument is that gender is a dimension in which the CPHS has failed to account for. In her preliminary case of Pakistani honor killings, Hansen presents the securitization framework on a more subjective or individualist practice. By introducing the bodily enactment of discourse, she concludes that dominant and political-legal-religious discourse determines what is right and wrong behavior for a woman, and determines the practices punishment. Thus the practices of discourse also affect the social practices and the construction of subjective identity (Lene Hansen 2000, 304f). Hansen illustrates a broader social context to textual or verbal discourse when they are accompanied by physical threats, thus exceeding the speech act. In other words, Hansen argues that securitization practices cannot be said to be confined to the textual or bureaucratic level. Securitization is here not only a speech act but also becomes embedded in the production of subjectivities. Hansen constructs a concept of 'Security as silence'; those considered illegitimate get their agency within the discourse removed in fear of repercussions (Ibid.). Hansen here demonstrates a body of securitization literature focused more on the individual micro-level analysis and discourse, or the effect discourse has on the individual, a trend that has been cultivated by many other scholars (e.g. Gerard and Pickering 2014; Salter and Mutlu 2012; Fattah and Fierke 2009). Within security studies, concepts like fear, trauma, and insecurity have become an increased research focus, with the application of psychoanalytical and psychological methods to the speech act theory (Van Rythoven 2015; Fattah and Fierke 2009). This practice builds on the notion that to analyze securitization practices effectively speech act theory must also take into account the collective emotions of the audience as they are the ones to facilitate succes(Van Rythoven 2015). Here, identifying the audience's collective emotions with speech act theory performs the function of a judgment on the securitization practices. Political psychology to speech act theory represents a framework that views securitization as a psychological process where subjectivity and space take precedence over discourse (Kinnvall and Nesbitt-Larking

2009). A sentiment supported by Salter and Mutlu (2011) who emphasize the inclusion of psychoanalytical context when analyzing governmental security measures. Thus both arguing for more analysis towards what the extraordinary security measures have on the emotional attachment the public or audience, have towards the involved object being securitized (Salter and Mutlu 2012, 182).

Discussion

A diverse range of contested theories are included in this field. Many of the debates, however, seem to emphasize the conceptual understanding of the securitization concept itself, and in what context it is most effectively applied (Balzacq 2011). Komen among them is the critical lens applied to the practice of securitization whether by state or non-state actors and the effect this securitizing process has on the subject of securitization. Effects like physical, mental, or political isolation, and the de-legitimization of legal rights for the refugee or migrant. In identifying this consensus in the securitization literature concerning refugees and migrants in the EU, it is, however, curious that little to no research into the refugee perspective has been done. According to Hansen (2000), the individual belonging to a securitized group, when performing a speech act, successful or not, becomes a representative of the collective. This may not be intentional, but the reaction to their speech act will affect future attempts, from the securitized collective, to change the public discourse, in other words performing successful securitization. Adverse or forceful reactions to former speech acts may prevent others from taking action (Hansen 2000, 287). Refugees can be seen as a marginalized group who has been the subject of securitization, and public discourse is painting their presence in the EU as an existential threat (Huysmans 2000). Thus following Hansen's (2000) concept 'Security as silence,' it may not be surprising that the literature concerning the securitization of refugees and migrants, to the best of my knowledge, has not considered these groups as potential speech actors. Being the object of the global securitization discourse may affect how well the refugee can perform speech acts themselves. The securitization literature does not seem to detect any attempts from the refugees and migrants in the EU, to change the negative discourse surrounding them. However, is this because they do not "react" or are they silenced by the securitization process? As is pointed out by Balzacq (2011), a public official has a higher chance of securitizing an issue than many other security actors, due to two factors. First is that they have access to mass media outlets. Second is the linguistic competency that enables the speaker's legitimacy, trust, and confidence. Two elements essential to managing an audience (Balzacq 2011, 26). However, as acknowledged by many scholars, we are in the time of mobility and

communication. In assuming that non-western refugees have the capability of becoming a speech actor, how then will the theoretical framework be applied? The study of securitized migrants and refugees in EU have, to the best of my knowledge, not considered refugees to have their independent agency and a voice in the debate (e.g. Huysmans 2006; Boswell 2007; Biehl 2009). With the concept' Security as Silence', Hansen (2000) criticizes the CPHS for not including a sociological gender dimension. She argues that the social constructions left by securitization practices affect the securitized individual's ability to participate in the debate and change the discourse to their advantage. In doing so, Hansen (2000) stumbles upon the same question as presented here. However, she does not realize that the CPHS framework does not seem to perceive the agency of the so-called "threat". In other words, Hansen tries to include gender into the theory to elaborate on the effects of securitization practices. She is, however, missing the fact that the CPHS does not account for the Speech Acts performed by the "threat," or how their intervention in the debate may affect future discourse, be it political, public or academic. Authors like Alison Gerard and Sharon Pickering (2014), Margit Feischmidt and Ildikó Zakariás (2019), touches upon the effects the securitization process have in the individual refugee and how they live their lives. Huysmans (2000) argues that the negative discourse following refugees is what challenges integration to recipient society, but none of the literature covered in this chapter has reflected upon the refugees as agents within the discourse, despite it being theoretically possible. This thesis will, through a contextual discourse analysis of possible Speech Act practices from non-western refugees in the EU area, investigate what is called the EU refugee crisis. The hope is to get a clearer understanding of the refugee perspective and agency in the global security discourse, and hopefully clear the way for further development of the Securitization framework so that it also acknowledges the agency of the phenomenon being securitized.

Research Focus

The field of the securitization is a commonly employed framework for the critical investigation of political securitization practices at both an international and a local level. Studies of securitization and de-securitization practices within the EU have identified refugees as an existential threat, or a group in need of humanitarian aid (e.g. Ilgit and Klotz 2018; Moreno-Lax 2018; Župarić-Iljić and Valenta 2018). However, despite constituting multiple schools of thought and diverse practices, little if any research has been done focusing on the refugee's contribution to this global discourse by the field of securitization, despite it being theoretically feasible.

From this a research question can be identified; *What can the existing securitization framework reveal about the non-western refugees in Europe in the context of the crisis when the securitized refugee takes up the global discourse in defense of his/her collective group?*

The question above outlines the focus of the master thesis. It frames the observation that the field of security applied to the study of the refugee, does not acknowledge that the refugee group also possess agency. The refugees are a marginalized group in context to the EU refugee crisis, objectified into threat images by far right agencies. However they also find themselves in an environment where televisual media and communicative technology is easily accessed. These resources enabling far reaching communicative action, and the sense of urgency and pressure created by the crisis situation, could mean that the refugee is in the ideal position for perform securitization. Populist movements in the EU have constructed a threat image, including both refugees and migrants. As an entity subjected to massive politicization, multiple definitions of the refugee group exist both within academia and political agencies. The refugee is, however, a group distinct from others, such as the economic migrant. This master thesis adopts the broad definition of the Refugee Convention of 1951, to which a refugee is an individual that;

> "… *owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it*"
>
> (UNHCR 1951, 19)

Building on the constructivist notion that the discursive and social reality is where policy is made and reproduced, the lacking investigation into the refugee's public practices of securitization can be seen as an indicator of an incomplete understanding of the global securitization discourse.

Refugees practicing terrorism contribute to the threat image in the global securitization discourse. The act of terrorism can be seen as performative with a political objective communicated to an audience, and with a referent object like the protection of ideology. There is therefore an argument for it being an act of securitization. While acknowledging this, the thesis suggests that terrorism, as a paradoxical example of securitization, is a line of inquiry deserving of its own research. A study into the refugee's public practices of securitization, where their agency is acknowledged, will allow this master thesis to add its observations to the complex web of relations that constitutes the current global securitization discourse. Acknowledgement of the refuges agency in securitization practices, will lead to additional knowledge about the global securitization discourse from a new perspective. One could even argue that the addition of the refugee perspective will lead to a more full perspective of the crisis.

Work questions

In the context of the securitization framework and the academic debate covered in this literature review, four work questions are formulated. The work questions will serve to guide the research, maintaining its coherence, while at the same time providing the reader with a deeper inside into the content of this thesis.

- How does one determine whether there are refugees practicing securitization in EU?

When investigating refugees performances, be it talks, textual documents, or televisual images, one of the tasks must be to determine whether they fall under securitization practices. This work question will serve to identify potential security performances from the refugee, to see if they have the necessary conditions for securitization, such as an existential threat, and a referent object. Outlining a framework for identifying the refugees practicing securitization will allow for more selective data gathering, a necessity for answering the research question and a specific practice seemingly not considered by earlier security students.

- Who are the agents that constitute the refugee's security discourse in the EU?

The ability of the securitization agent to connect with an audience is, according to Balzacq (2011), what determines its effectiveness for changing a discourse. However, one cannot assume that all

securitizing acts are an intentional strategy, or that the speech act has just one intended audience. Also, a securitizing act made to a local audience may consequently reach a global audience, or 'go viral'. The study must determine the relationship between security agent(s), potential audience(s), and other agents confirming or contradicting the objective of the individual securitization performance. This work question will hold the thesis to explore this potentially complex web of power relations constituting the individual refugee's act of securitization, so to better determine both the possible objective and, and its possible recipient effect.

- What resources are available for refugees when performing speech acts?

The resources available to the speech actors, be they social, cultural, political, or even emotional, are factors which may determine the refugee's ability to reach an audience. Interestingly these resources may not come from the speech actor themselves. Other agencies may lend resources and credibility to a speech actor if they see it as advantages to their own goals. This work question will explore the different resources that non-western refugees possess and whether resources made available to the speech actor by other agencies affect the original intent.

- Are there any similarities to securitization practices from the refugee perspective?

This work question allows for a comparative study of multiple securitization practices by non-western refugees in the EU, determining possible trends and differences. The research will thus explore whether there is a collective effort for the refugees performing securitization and attempt to formulate a general narrative, which can enhance our understanding of the EU refugee crisis.

Securitization Theory

This chapter draws out a premise for the securitization framework that is primarily based upon the work of Balzacq (2011), and his empirically based analysis of security studies, in relation to the original CPHS framework (Buzan et al. 1998). On account of the academic debate presented in the literature review, many notable developments to individual concepts of the securitization framework have been presented by various scholars of security. Arguments from the academic debate of the field will, to varying degrees, work as supplements to the deliberation and understanding of the framework. Thus, a theoretical premise fitted for the study of the refugee as a securitization agent is drawn out with a fundamental focus in Balzacq's sociological approach. By studying refugees as securitization agents instead of the object (threat) of a securitization process, the thesis will attempt to test the application of the theoretical framework from a different perspective. This chapter will present the theoretical concepts of the sociological approach to securitization theory, and rules for data gathering, as they are applied in the thesis.

Positioning of the framework

Buzan et al. (1998) present the Copenhagen School (CPHS) of securitization as a multisectoral framework to understand security. A product of the post-Cold War period, the CPHS presents the argument that the study of threats and the securitization of those threats should include the study of nonmilitary threats as well as military. The CPHS presents an early widening of the field of security, where the central core does not revolve around the use of force and violence, security studies shifted to focus on the logic behind said security, its processes, and what sets it apart from that which is merely political. The conceptualization of security is considered by the CPHS to be a particular set of policies applied to a broader range of issues. Here security means something more specific than a threat or issue (Buzan et al. 1998, 3-5). The CPHS places security in international relations, thus putting it in a context where the word itself loses its everyday meaning and become something new, with its distinctive agenda. What makes an international security issue is here derived from what Buzan et al. (1998) phrases as the military and political sectors. Here security becomes an issue of survival, where a problem presents itself as an existential threat to a designated referent object. The nature of an existential threat thus justifies the use of extraordinary measures, like that of legitimizing the use of deadly force towards illegitimate refugees traveling from the Middle East to Europe. With outset in a state-centered approach, the CPHS argue that the invocation of the word security is what allows the governing body to mobilize and use

extraordinary power outside that of "normal" policy. Thus, a state of emergency is declared, and measures are employed to stop the development of the existential threat.

The CPHS understand referent objects to be that of large scale collective identities such as seen in nations or religious groups when security is engaged in the social sector. While collective identities are interchangeable from both external and internal developments, this does not mean that the collective does not intend to survive through any means necessary. In the case of migration, the introduction of change is seen as invasive to the hegemony of said collective, motivating security action from conservative parties. Here the change to the social construction of a given recipient society means that the collective will no longer exist, thus inspiring security action (Ibid. 23-25).

Balzacq (2011) argues in his empirical study of the field of security that an event becomes a security issue through discursive politics. Building upon this notion, Balzacq documents the development of the study of security. It is primarily with the development of the sociological approach that one can establish a functional framework to the study of refugees on the micro-level of analysis. The social theories to the field of security have allowed for the inclusion of non-verbal practices of security as well as emphasizing other conceptual aspects of the original CPHS framework, previously not included as strict criteria for securitization analysis. The sociological approach, discount the notion that security is a conventional procedure, whose success is dependent on the prevalence of specific facilitating conditions. That is however not to say that the sociological, or non-linguistic, approach completely negates all the features of the philosophical, linguistic, view as is seen in the CPHS speech act theory. Balzacq (2011) has developed the view that securitization should be understood as a pragmatic, sociological, practice, as opposed to universal pragmatics, as found in the speech act. Rather than focusing on the magical power of the word, a student of security should look to the configuration of the many and varied circumstances influencing the process of securitization (Ibid. 18, 25).

It is through the study of relations between social configurations, such as that between actor, audience, and the context, that this thesis will explore the position of the non-western refugees in Europe. Here refugees become agents of securitization, in a global security discourse that has otherwise portrayed the same group as the existential threat. Security, as a concept, can however be defined in many different ways, depending upon the researcher's approach and focus of study. The CPHS understands securitization as an intersubjective process to which Balzacq criticizes this

approach for overlooking the temporal constraints and the sense of urgency central to the constitution of the security field.

Balzacq defines securitization as;

"an articulated assemblage of practices whereby heuristic artefacts (metaphors, policy tools, image repertoires, analogies, stereotypes, emotions, etc.) are contextually mobilized by a securitizing actor, who works to prompt an audience to build a coherent network of implications (feelings, sensations, thoughts, and intuitions), about the critical vulnerability of a referent object, that concurs with the securitizing actor's reasons for choices and actions, by investing the referent subject with such an aura of unprecedented threatening complexion that a customized policy must be undertaken immediately to block its development." (Balzacq 2011, 4).

This adaptation of the sociological approach to the study of security does not deny the discursive nature that security can take, but deny that the concept of security is reducible to a conventional procedure, which is functional whatever the context. Rather security is understood as a strategic and pragmatic process which occurs within and as part of the configuration of circumstances in different social fields. Thus aspects like context, the psycho-cultural disposition of the audience, and the power that both security actor and recipient audience(s) brings to the interaction, influence the nature and effects of security. Security operates on a level of persuasion where the security actors utilize tools like metaphors, emotions, and stereotypical gestures to reach their goals. This creates a frame for social pragmatics, where the focus is not merely on the colorful use of language, but also the fundamental principles underlying communicative action, such as culture, context, and power of the speaker and the listener (Ibid. 2).

Acts and Agency

A critical deliberation of the original speech act theory presented by the CPHS in 1998 is expected to lead to a more in-depth explanation of the securitizing agencies role and limitations.

Following the postulate that language is performative, one may argue that by uttering the word security, an action is taking place and the circumstances around the actor change. One modifies the context through the enunciation of utterances. Attaining the intended change of circumstances is, therefore, dependent upon the facilitating conditions. This implies that speech acts are achieved under perceived rules, and if these are followed, the context alters accordingly, and a formerly secure place becomes insecure. It can be said that the concept of security, allows for the activation

of new context. In other words, the security utterances under a speech act operate as instructions for both the construction and interpretation of a given situation. Words create their own condition of receptiveness by modifying or building a context fitting the speaker's objective, or experience if there is no objective. As such, one must point out that the word security may not always reflect objective reality. The speech act is an agency in itself to the extent that it conveys a self-referential practice instantiated by a discourse on existential threats empowering political elites to sometimes, take extraordinary policy measures to alleviate insecurity. Thus the CPHS argue that decisive for security is what language constructs as a consequence of the speech act. In other words, what is happening in reality outside a given discourse, like the urgency of a real threat, is not of any relevance to the study of securitization (Balzacq 2011, 11-12). Later scholars have emphasized a more comprehensive definition of the speech act concept than that initially presented by the CPHS, which have focused more on the textual representations of discursive security speech acts. Here arguing that the discursive actions may not be "speech" acts in only a linguistic sense. Preferably speech acts can also be constituted as a type of performative action of discourse, like the visual manifestation of meaning through pictures, as well as by linguistic means. An action performed by the securitization agent who is both constructing and constituted by discourse (e.g., Balzacq, 2005; Huysmans 2006; Hansen, 2000: 306; McDonald, 2008: 564; Bigo, 2002; Williams, 2003). Balzacq (2011) starts his argument by emphasizing that one must distinguish between external "brute" threats, threats not depending on language, and those who do as described by the CPHS. One should, however, not overemphasize the distinction; the brute threats still affect the discourse as a contextual element.

Balzacq understands security as a multifaceted phenomenon, influenced by circumstance on many different levels. As such, a concept like security is vulnerable to the modeling of context. In other words, the context is what selects or activates the properties of a concept, while at the same time maintains or cancels out other understandings of the same word. Thus far Balzacq agrees with the CPHS, that security means something different depending on the context. However, he takes it a step further to argue that an instance of securitization can be seen as a historical process. Historical context constitute the process of securitization, therefore, impacting on the immediate interaction between the audience and securitizing agent. This involves acts with reinforcing consequences to the security agenda as well as aversive acts to the same, happening concurrently to one another. This argument emphasizes the apparent complexity behind the causation of securitization, while at the same time illustrating the many elements a security agent must navigate to succeed in

transforming the discourse. One single speech actor may fail if they alone are not able to make a significant enough impression on the process. When studying an instance of securitization, one should, therefore, note that the individual' act' may not give a holistic picture of the persuasive force taking up the particular discourse the researcher is analyzing. Thus studying the construction of a security problem should also factor in that all other successful and abortive attempts at modifying the discourse are relevant to experience the phenomenon to the fullest (Balzacq 2011, 12).

While maintaining a more realist perspective, not compatible to the one of this thesis, P. Williams (2003) presents a decent argument in his criticism towards the CPHS methodological focus that has consequences for how we are to conceptualize the speech act theory. Williams argues that political communication is increasingly embedded into televisual media (Williams 2003, 524), a sentiment which is also applicable to the speech acts of any securitization agent in our day and age, be they individuals or institutional. In other words, Williams questions the speech acts capability to explain social behavior when limited to only include linguistic rhetoric. By limiting the concept only to portray linguistic action, the researcher stands with an equally limited tool for understanding political communication as well as social communication. In a contemporary society increasingly driven by electronic media and televisual images, this is especially true (Ibid. 525). Speech acts of securitization may therefore not only be understood as an exclusively linguistic action, when also images of terror attacks or refugees drowning while crossing the ocean, is used as communicative tools for manipulating the global security discourse.

Security practices are complex strings of creative and performative arguments intended to recall or direct the attention of the audience to some person, idea, object, or event that they deem threatening. In other words, security is a symbol that even though it is presented in a naturalized frame is also corresponding with, and shaped by current information and the influence of other speakers objective (Balzacq 2011, 11). The mobilizations of a security argument thus require an assessment of suitability to the state of affairs. The so-called manifest of a security discourse can be seen as a blueprint for the state of affairs presented from the perspective of the securitizing agent. Whereas the securitizing actor may rely on the audience to flesh out some of the details regarding the state of affairs themselves, the researcher should still put some emphasis on the nature of the performative security act. The formulation or format of the security argument has to resonate with the audience's experience for them to be able to interpret and understand it. Thus, the configuration of security as a concept is depending upon the combination of textual meaning, what can be learned about the

concept through language, and cultural meaning, knowledge gained through previous interactions and the current situation (Ibid. 13). Here is also the argument of Aglaya Snetkov (2017), that a researcher studying securitization will often find that there are more than one discursive strands and strategies at play at the same time. The point is that there may not be just one referent object to one speech act (Snetkov 2017, 2). Following the premise of the research question, some may assume that if the refugee takes up the discourse, he or she will do so in an attempt of de-securitize their collective group, or to securitize threats to refugees as a group. It has, however, already been determined that the speech actor does not necessarily have the intention behind their action for it to change the securitization discourse effectively (Hansen 2000). The thesis will in its research of refugees taking up the securitization discourse, of necessity have to analyze possible referent objects. One cannot in advance assume that a case where a refugee performs acts of securitization will do so with the intent of de-securitizing their collective. As such analysis must also include the identification and availability of the referent objects in question, as these may propose more than one securitization move at a time (Snetkov 2017, 4).

The CPHS securitization framework argues that any actor may securitize any referent object at any given time. However, it is clear that the effect of the speech act is determined by both social positions of the speech actor, their relationship to a given audience, and the structure of speech acts themselves. The security agent may gain a stronger relationship with the audience through the use of televisual images and mass media (Williams 2003). However, one cannot ignore the possibility that the media platform used to facilitate the speech act does not have their agendas when assisting a securitization agent. Following this argument, it is beneficial for the researcher to gain a deeper understanding of the media platforms, structures and institutions at play within the particular case of each speech act if one wishes a deeper understanding of the securitization process. Therefore, images, visuals, and symbols shall all be included within the definition of what is deemed a speech act. Images often convey meaning and intent, and as argued by Lene Hansen (2011), the researcher has to take note of what she calls the 'visuality of securitization.' Hansen argues that there is a constant interaction between visual and spoken discourse, and these should be examined on equal footing when it comes to analyzing securitization speech acts. As such it can be determined that when it comes to collecting data, we are not limited only by textual or spoken attempts of speech acts, but also visuals and even active physical, performative demonstrations, can be seen as a securitization act. Consequently, the thesis will go beyond from referring to the linguistic and textual performances by the agent in question in its future use of the concept' speech acts'. In

addition, more performative actions drawn from a variety of contextual, symbolic, and institutional resources for its effectiveness (Williams 2003, 526), must be acknowledged factors to the concept of the speech act. It is argued that distinguishing between the otherwise performative, and the not performative speech acts within the securitization discourse is impossible (Huysmans 2006 & Aradau 2001**).**

Audience and success

Balzacq has criticized the CPHS approach for being too formal on the basis that it will not match with any real-life cases, as it does not take all of the aspects going into affecting general discourse into account (Balzacq 2005, 176). Securitization should therefore not be seen as a speech acts are successful to the extent that the securitization agent follows a predetermined ruleset. Rather securitization is a pragmatic strategy which allows said actor to influence the mindset of the audiences that is adherent to the referent object. Success is therefore not to be measured purely in the changes to the conception of an object into a threat and call for arms, but rather the more general change of audience opinion or unease (Ibid. 172). It should be understood that the act of securitization is measured not purely in instances of failure or success. What can be drawn from Balzacq's theoretical inquiry is that the researcher also has to acknowledge that failed attempts or lesser changes to the discourse also can affect. It is, however, not the effects of securitization in itself that is important. Equal emphasis should be put on the process of practicing securitization from which we can gain additional knowledge about a given situation.

It can be argued that the success of the securitization process is dependent upon the actor's ability to identify with the feelings, needs and interests of the audiences (Balzacq 2011, 9, 2005, 172). The securitizing agent has to tune their communication to the audience to fit their experiences, should they wish to impose their intentions. This requires that the agent(s) argument employs terms that resonate with the audiences' language or terms of reference. It is through the use of speeches, gestures, tonality image attitude, and ideas that the actor(s) will attempt to identify their goals with that of the audience. To utilize the speech act, or performative security, to greatest effect, the actor may proceed to do so from maps of the audience based on their stereotypical beliefs and experiences they assume the audience to hold (Ibid. 9). Here it can be argued that refugees from the Middle East often have been identified as the "other," the strange, or the threat to social and political hegemony, (like the collective identity of a westernized society) (Huysman 2006). Given the recipient EU states may not be their targeted audience if one is intended; the successful performative action of the refugee to influence the security discourse is dependent on their ability to

identify with said audience. As such, identifying with any Western social collectives notion of identity may be a daunting task given the refugees disposition in the current discourse.

It should be noted that as well as in the choice of platform, like media outlet for the speech act, the securitization actor does not necessarily stand-alone, but can as an intersubjective process invite other agencies, with similar goals, to their cause. Such tactics will add to the lone agent or agency by adding external partner's resources to their own and possibly claim legitimacy to their position. Securitizing agencies are sensitive to support of both formal and informal format. Whereas moral support often supports formal backing, these two forms of support are still of different natures, and are often unevenly distributed depending on the audience is constructed of formal institutions or the public. A securitizing agent may appeal for moral support from an audience that has a direct causal connection with their desired goals, like the use of violence to rid them of an existential threat. While moral support may be necessary, it is the formal support often in the form of legal and bureaucratically powerful institutions that enable policy change (Balzacq 2011, 9). The refugee in the EU may not share many of the same goals with a recipient of western society that they can appeal to, but by drawing on the formal as well as moral support from a humanitarian agency like the UNHCR, the refugee gains resources and legitimacy otherwise not disclosed to them as a minority group in western society. For securitization to be a success, there is a requirement for a direct causal connection between the desired goals of the audience, and the outcome wished by the securitizing agency. This is important as the audiences do not have the same power over a given securitization actor as they may have over them. Although the securitization agency may act without audience support, they do often have to draw their support to for example change policy or regain legitimacy over their actions (Ibid. 9).

Audience can, thus, be seen as more central to securitization and should not be presumed as eminently receptive or event intentional. For an issue to be proclaimed an instance of securitization, an empowered audience must, therefore, agree with the claims of a securitizing actor. In other words, an audience may not be easily persuaded and can enable the securitizing actor to adopt new measures when tackling the threat (Ibid. 9). While the clarification of what determines whether a speech act is successful is an essential aspect of the analysis, the uncovering of the strategy, resources and audience(s) is just as crucial to answering the research question. The aim of this thesis is not to analyze the effect of a securitization speech act, but rather focus on uncovering

securitization strategies performed by refugees in EU, to gain an understanding of the current refugee security crisis from a new perspective.

Practices and the *dispositif*

One of the significant differences in the framework described here, and that of the CPHS is the understanding that securitization is a process constituted by multiple factors happening concurrently or in short reference to one another on many different fields. According to Balzacq (2011), there is a need to look to the system of relations that constitutes securitization. Securitization consists of practices which instantiate intersubjective understanding. These practices are according to Balzacq, primarily enacted through policy tools. Where discourse and ideology become increasingly hard to separate, and where the differences between actor and audience in security seem blurred, it can be argued that a study of the nature and focus of the policy tools employed in securitization would be the better research focus. This is, however, not to say that one should study the mere technical functions of these tools. "*Instead, because operating tools activates a specific dispositif, they can be regarded as basic elements contributing to the emergence of a security field and in the routinization of practices (i.e., habitus).*" (Balzacq 2011, 15)

Drawing from Foucoult (1980), Balzacq presents the concept *dispositif*, when describing the space of relations in which different elements like laws, administrative rules, discourse, scientific statements and moral, among many other factors from different social fields, meet. A security practice, or a policy tool, is, in other words, social devices through which the securitizing agent(s) view the threat. It is through this threat image that the public action is configured to address the security issue at hand. These tools do not necessarily have to be directly part of the discourse but are still factors that subtly but decisively influence the nature of securitization processes and its outcome (Balzacq 2011, 16). One may argue that a focus on the *dispositif* as part of the tools employed by security agencies, is inept as an analytical concept when it comes to the individual or organized acts of securitization efforts from refugees. If one assumes that refugees from the Middle East in the EU are in fact, not political entities it can be argued that these have to operate from the 'ground level and up' to change policies. The existing of intricate policy tools described by Balzacq (2011) could be said to be different or consisting of less complicated relations. However, as a researcher moving into a field with a framework that, to the best of our knowledge, has not been employed thusly before, one cannot assume that knowledge of the *dispositif* is not applicable to the study. Balzacq's adopted concept of the *dispositif*, may prove to be a valuable tool when engaging

the empirical data of refugees in the EU taking up the global security discourse. Furthermore, this elaborate description of securitizations constitution as consisting of different practices and their intersubjective interactions with habitus from different fields may still help us to understand the complex securitization process.

While it is acknowledged that this definition may not be perfect (Balzacq 2011, 16), further knowledge into the characteristics of the policy tools most often be employed in instances of securitization can be derived from it. Knowledge of these security practices and their characteristics will reflect some of the actions that the agent(s) means the audience to take. First is that each securitization tool has to define features that align it with other similar tools. However, tools design traits, or how the tool is constructed to react, is what makes each tool distinguishable. Secondly, each securitization tool is a method to configure the actions of one kind or the other. Each has its procedures, skill requirements, and mechanisms for delivering this action. One can think of these constructions as institutions, which are guided by a routinized set of rules and procedures for controlling the interaction between individual and organization. As such it the Securitization tool is what shape social relations, by defining who is involved, what their role is, and how they relate to one another. This can, in other words, be understood as if securitization tools are part of what is communicated in the interaction between securitizing agent and audience, but here described on a more institutional level.

It should be noted that despite Balzacq's (2011) focus on the sociological approach, he here uses an analogy with an institutional or state-centered perspective to illustrate his theory. Following that, Balzacq (2011) outlines this part of his theory as if successful securitization is a foregone conclusion, and as if it is inherently an intentional act. As documented earlier in this chapter, this is not necessarily the case (Balzacq 2011, 25). We can, therefore, assume that in his attempt to illustrate the practices constituting securitization his almost state-centered focus, is just that, an illustration. Excluding refugees from employing securitization tools, with the argument that they do not pose institutionalized political tools would, therefore, be presumptuous. Third, tools for securitization reconfigure the audience(s) actions to address the security issue at hand. Fourth and last is that these tools embody specific images of the threat and how one is to react to it. Knowledge of these four traits will reveal the policy preference of the security agency, and in what directions their actions may go. Important to note is that these tools, as explained earlier, are designed to a given situation, whereas the same tool may not be equally effective in every instance. Their

effectiveness can be limited or even indirect, but the function of the instrument still has a strong influence over the process of securitization. There is not talk about a technical tool with a clear solution to a security issue, but its effectiveness is still dependent upon the ability of the technical aspects to link their objectives with the issues or threats at hand.

One should not forget that while the selection and effects may be dependent upon political factors rather than technical, they also hold significant symbolic elements in their employment. The securitization tools, like most political tools or practices, are designed with symbolic attributes to broadcast what the actor(s) to securitization is thinking, and presumably their intentions to preserve themselves and the referent object in question (Ibid. 16–17). From this description, Balzacq (2011) presents two broad definitions of tools that are most often used in instances of securitization for the purpose of empirical analysis, namely regulatory tools and capacity tools. Regulatory tools are the practice that seeks to normalize the behavior of the targeted individuals — in other words, legitimizing the use of extreme practices to reduce the threat, or prohibiting other types of political activity that can transform into an issue. Capacity tools, on the other hand, can be described as the instrument which enables the agent(s) in question to organize their knowledge, training, and resources to make decisions and carry out activities with the highest likelihood of success. Specifically, this tool allows for imposing external discipline upon individuals or groups to carry out actions to attain the security agent(s) objective. Thus, capacity tools are often objected to heavy regulation and forced to adopt protocols to minimize the potential for them to exploit a given populous. As a result, these kinds of tools are often changing in their design traits (Ibid. 17).

Sub-conclusion

The adaptation of the sociological approach to security studies allows us to understand securitization as a pragmatic practice formed and reconstructed by contextual circumstances from many different fields. The circumstances leading to securitization are varied, and Balzacq himself argues that it is presumptuous of the researcher to suggest that we can grasp all the factors comprehensively (Balzacq 2011, 18). By narrowing down the circumstances leading securitization to be based on three core assumptions, the centrality of the audience, the co-dependency of agency and context, and the *dispositif* as structuring forces of practices formulating a threat image, Balzacq makes security analysis comprehensible. Performative actions of security, like that of the speech act, are understood by Balzacq (2011) as situated actions mediated by the agent's habitus, meaning

the dispositions that inform the agent's perceptions and behavior. Performatives thus have to be analyzed as the result of power games and within the social field of context. The performative actions of a security agent are here analyzed in contrast to the results of power games between audience and actor in a given social context, as well as between the results of power games and habitus. The discourse of securitization thus distinctly manifests itself as temporally constructed engagements by actors of different structural environments. These structures are changed and reproduced through the interplay of factors like habit, judgment, and imagination, in response to changes in the temporal situations. The recipient audience to a securitization act is by both the philosophical and sociological approach seen as essential to the study of securitization and the success of the said process. Where the CPHS, and by proxy the linguistic approach, places the audience in a receptive mode, Balzacq presents the argument that the audience is not a product of the speech act. Instead, the audience is an emerging category which must be empirically examined before it is considered a level of analysis.

The sociological approach allows the study of security to consider new potential knowledge to the securitization framework that was not available to the more classical philosophical approach alone. It is argued that securitization does not necessarily have to be of a discursive nature. The performance of securitization does not have to be intentional. Likewise, security problems can, through the sociological approach, be both designed or they can emerge out of the different practices, whose initial aim, if one is there at all, was not to articulate an existential threat image. Action or performance within the social field is not necessarily committed with a premeditated design, but a product of the intersubjective understandings through the habitus from different competing social fields. There is, in other words, an understanding that securitization can happen performativity, while not being an intentional action in and of itself. Balzacq (2011) here amplifies the idea that that the threat images are social facts, which acquire a degree of objectivity in the relationship between the actor(s), the audience(s) in the given context. Desired or unintended, to analyze the actions of securitization discursively is to account for their capacity to bring about change.

Method

This chapter will present the logic behind the research, as well as present the methods for collecting and engaging the empirical data, so as to best answer the research question.

Research Design

As illustrated in the literature review, a rise in migration from the South and Middle Eastern countries to the West has steadily been rising, but in 2015 it reached a crisis level on a global scale (United Nations 2015).

In the context of the EU refugee crisis, leaving millions of refugees displaced and arriving at EU borders, instances of panic has ensured. Multiple strands of discourse defending or damming the refugee as an existential threat to the safety of the political, social, and economic hegemony of the western societies have been documented (Huysmans 2006). Much literature concerning the securitization of refugees present studies of these discourses and their effects on the displaced. However lacking study is the refugee as a self-aware entity able to affect the same discourse of insecurity, for better or for worse. This has left us with the research question; *"What can the existing securitization framework reveal about the non-western refugees in Europe in the context of the crisis when the securitized refugee takes up the global discourses in defense of his/her collective group?"*. The research question is concerned with what additional knowledge can be discovered about the refugee crisis if the existing securitization framework is applied differently, introducing the refugee as a possible securitization agent.

A review of the securitization literature as well as a brief review of the public debate on refugees has identified branches of discourse connecting this group to acts of terrorism, insecurity, and identified them as strangers to Western society, while other branches of literature claim refugees as a group in need of humanitarian aid. Indeed much of the researches of refugees from a securitization standpoint are critical reviews of the manipulative discourse applied to the recipient western societies by far-right political entities (e.g. Ilgit and Klotz 2018; Moreno-Lax 2018; Župarić-Iljić and Valenta 2018). This leaves us with a well-documented and well-studied threat image of the refugee group. To sufficiently answer the research question, it is clear that the refugee group becomes the subject of research. It could be postulated that the refugee, belonging to a displaced group finding themselves in an environment which associates them with a threat image, is surrounded by critical tensions, possibly endangering their existence. The refugee coming to the EU is at the same time in a space where free speech is valued very highly, and where advanced

communicative technology is readily available to most. It is also feasible that their social position, in EU is effected by the notion of crisis. Following this line of logic, the refugee is in the ideal position for the practice of securitization. Identifying the threat images produced by refugees in the EU may very well give insight into the continued development of the crisis and possibly this group's response to being labeled as a threat. As such, the aim of inquiry is to identify and make sense of the threat images put forth by the refugee. To better understand this development, there is a need for a more in-depth empirical study of the refugee's performative public actions, to see whether these qualify as securitization practices. Knowing who performs securitization does however not tell us what makes an existential threat to the refugees, and neither does it necessarily tell us who, why or what is threatened (Balzacq 2011, 31).

A case study of refugee's public performatives would allow us to determine whether these acts fit the necessary conditions for securitization. There are significant constraints to what can be called securitization, like the formulation of an existential threat, a referent object in need of protection, as well as an empowered audience with a casual claim to the agenda of the securitizing refugee. As such, many cases of refugees doing public performative actions will not qualify for this study. Following the notion that an instance of performative securitization does not have to be intentional (Ibid. 9f), we argue that cases of refugees unconsciously or consciously, challenging or confirming to the general threat image of their subject group can also be relevant. Public performatives from refugees are placed into the critical environment of the EU refugee crisis. The inclusion of public performatives challenging or confirming the global security discourses threat image is furthermore supported by Hansen's (2000) notion of the marginalized minorities' automatic representativeness for their collective group (Hansen 2000, 287). Given the complex social and cultural interactionism characterizing the securitization process, the isolation of a case of refugees performing securitization would allow us to identify the technical distinctions of the given act and its possible multitude of variable interests. We mention the multitude of interests since one single case of performative securitization may have multiple agendas (referent objects and securitizing moves) developed in context to a given event (Snetkov 2017, 260f). This leaves the possibility of high diversity in securitizing agendas despite refugees in the EU sharing some socio-cultural conditions. Important to note is that one single case study may not give a clear picture of the refugee perspective in context to the crisis. Indeed the theoretical framework argues that securitizations successful change to audience opinion is a result of multiple performative acts from different securitizing agencies with the same primary agenda (Balzacq 2011, 12). As such, a single case

design would not be sufficient to explore the refugee perspective in the securitization debate following the current crisis. To understand the refugee perspective and who/what they feel are threatened, and by whom, there is an incentive to study multiple cases. The Multiple-case Design (MCD) will allow us to explore the similarities and differences in practice and possible objectives of the refugees. The careful selection and comparison of these cases may provide a clearer picture of refugee driven strands of discourse. Identifying these strands of discourse, and the securitizing tools applied here may point towards future developments of the crisis. While the MCD may provide a more robust set of findings, we also acknowledge that the cases are set in different contexts and that the acts may be driven by different experiences (Yin 2003; Campbell and Ahrens 1998).

It should be noted that this study, while possibly providing new knowledge to the global security discourse surrounding the refugee crisis, does not mean that it is generalizable to the extent that the findings represent all refugees in the EU. Thus, when referring to the refugee perspective, the thesis only refers to the subject group of the research. Before the data can be analytically engaged the levels that constitute the analysis has to be specified. Balzacqs (2011) framework emphasizes the agent, the act itself, and the context related to the specific case of securitization. Employing the constituent levels to the analysis, will allow us to develop a methodology that includes the vocabulary of our theoretical framework. However, the master thesis attempt to gain new knowledge of the EU refugee crisis will focus on the agent and their performative acts. While the employment of MCD provides a reasonable structure for the analysis and systematic handling of the empirical data, it does not give us a set method for engaging said data.

The sociological approach considers context and performative acts to the study of securitization. Here securitization is understood as a pragmatic process, drawing on the symbolic interactive use of language and the sociological features as described by the concept of the *dispositif* (Balzacq 2011, 20). When talking of performatives, one can, therefore, assume that they are actions bringing about a particular effect. The securitizing agent(s) and the audience(s) are engaged in a responsive activity within an ongoing dynamic situation affected by the notion of crisis. Engaging in securitization studies from this perspective leaves the research objective to focus on unraveling the processes where a securitization actor tries to convince an audience to agree with a given interpretation of an event as a threat image. In other words, the compelling power of an agency to cause an audience to agree is in essence a discursive action, even if this action is not linguistic in nature (Ibid.). There is

thus a need to investigate the persuasive arguments and competencies from the securitization agent(s). A task that leys firmly in the objective of discursive analysis. Confirming discourse as part of what this study considers performatives acts, is that agents dealing with defined questions of security operate agnostically. It is through the manipulation of knowledge that such discourses shape social relations and builds their content to an audience. As a vehicle for ideas about a threat image, a securitization discourse targets and creates an instance of communicative action (Huckin 2002, 5; Janks 1997, 333f). Discourse is here understood as the socio-cultural resources to construct meaning about the world, and communicate this understanding to others. Discourse analysis of the refugee securitization practices will make meaning of the emergence and development of the threat image. Critical discourse analysis (CDA), is the method that similar to the securitization framework employed by this thesis, focus on a dialog as an event emerging from the contextual power struggles between speaker and listener, agent and audience. Thus, also include context and non-linguistic based procedures of communication (Balzacq 2011, 41). Employing this method for analyzing the data will allow for a deeper understanding of the social practices associated with the development of the refugees existential threat, leaving better conditions for comparison.

Multiple-case design

The instrumental use of MCD is applied to gain insight into the notion of refugees as a securitizing agent. This research draws on the empirical framework from Balzacq (2011), in combination with Rebecca Campbell and Courtney E. Ahrens (1998) application of qualitative MCD. The application of the case study allows for an in-depth investigation into the refugees in the EU, taking up the securitization discourse within the real-life context of the refugee crisis. The application of a MCD is useful to study where the boundaries between the phenomenon and context are far from clear (Balzacq 2011, 33; Campbell and Ahrens 1998, 541). The case study involves the collection of in-debt observations of a limited number of cases, allowing us to identify technical distinctions on fewer subjects with multiple variables. This point is underscored by the fact that each case has temporal and spatial differences affecting their acts of securitization. The case study will provide observations of a diverse data set, making it possible to capture multiple perspectives in a real-world context. Drawing on multiple points of inquiry, furthermore makes it possible to address the reliability and validity of our findings (Campbell and Ahrens 1998, 542). From the presentation of the theoretical framework, the contextually dependent agent, the empowered audience, and the intersubjective relations of communication across different fields as tools for engaging the discourse, has been emphasized as points of analysis. Balzacq (2011) argue that his framework

allows for a combination of the standard defined IR units and levels of analysis, into three constituent levels; the Acts, the Agent, and the Context (Balzacq 2011, 35). While these constituent levels may only apply to the case of securitization, one must recognize that they do seem to conform to the more standard IR practices, such as the Individual, sub-system level, and international level of analysis (Buzan et al. 1998, 5–7). Balzacq has tried to formulate a framework for handling data which validates his theory in correlation to the general IR practices. This research acknowledges that the constituent levels of analysis put forward here may indeed reflect a workable adaptation of IR practices to the theory.

The first level; concentrates on the actors and the relations that structure the studied phenomenon when scrutinized.

This level constitutes not only the securitizing actor but also those who contribute or resist the construction of a securitization issue, directly or indirectly. This naturally includes the performing security agent, but also the empowered audience, and the 'functional actors'; intermediate agencies directly interacting with the issue e.g. public media agencies or international agency like the UNHCR. This level focuses on the relationship and power positions between said actors. Consideration to these agencies profiles, provide understanding for what guides their behavior in their interaction (Balzacq 2011, 35–36).

The second level; of analysis focuses on the act itself.

This level concerns the performative acts of securitization, discursive or non-discursive, that constitute the securitization process and the construction of the threat image. In other words, the public performative action which start the discussion of methods and policies for handling the threat. This rather broad level is by Balzacq explained to have four sides. First is the 'action type,' which points to the use of grammatical and syntactical rules governing the performative language used by the actor. Secondly comes the strategy constituting the act. The researcher has to consider the heuristic artifacts that will resonate with a given audience. Is the actor employing metaphors, analogies, emotions, stereotypes, or the like to mobilize a specific response from the audience, and what resources are used to reach the audience? Thirdly, this analysis level also investigates the constellations of practices and tools, described by the *dispositif* concept. Fourthly, is that the analysis on this level also has to consider the general policy or intended objective put forward by the act (Ibid. 36).

The third level; is the consideration of context.

The production of a threat image, or a strand of discourse, happens through the work of specific contexts. As such, when looking upon a specific securitization discourse, it becomes essential to note how it is both historically and socially situated. For the research to properly investigate, a particular discourse of securitization one, therefore, has to consider the class structure, and political formation surrounding the securitization process — all factors which will explain the agents relationships. Proximate context includes the setting, occasion, or genre of the interaction between the agents. These could be meetings, interview, campaigns, or conferences. The distal context, however, talks of the sociocultural environment that the performative act is fixed in. The distal context refers to social class, the ethnic composition of the actors as well as the regional and cultural environment (Ibid. 36–37).

The research question of this thesis place the focus of the research with the second level of analysis. The study of the refugees' performative acts of securitization and the pragmatics and functional aspects leaves a premise that allows us to determine how these actors see the world. The strength of the MCD allowing for both in-depth analysis, and the comparison of the different narratives told by the refugees, provide a workable frame for discovering how they interact with one another and the world. This clear proposition, drawn from the framework allows for a more in-depth focus of the research and possibly the discovery of new knowledge to the global security discourse and EU refugee crisis (Campbell and Ahrens 1998). Despite not being able to engage the data equally from all three levels of analysis, the different profiles, as well as context, will not be completely ignored, as these may increase out understand the different action types, and what they mean to the study of security from a refugee perspective. An investigation into the power relations on the first level of analysis, and the context constituting these relations is also where we drag the analysis up from the individual acts to a higher level of analysis.

Critical Discourse Analysis

To understand their constitution and structure each case of performative securitization has to be analyzed before any deeper meaning can be drawn out by comparative analysis. The thesis employs the method of CDA to analyze each case and draw out the meaning of the pragmatics governing the securitization threat image. Here, drawing from the framework presented by Balzacq (2011), in combination with the guidelines from Hilary Janks work (1997). Janks provides an additional

vocabulary and strategy for analysis not fully disclosed by 'Balzacq's empirically-based discussion of method-application to the field of security.

Building on 'Fairclough's (1989) model of CDA, Janks argue that discourse consist of three interrelated dimensions. 1) dimension concerns the object of analysis, or the verbal, visual, or in other ways performative actions of discourse. 2) dimension concerns the process by which discourse is produced by the securitizing agent and received by a reader (audience). Thus describing the format from which the discourse objective is designed and processed, e.g. writing and reading, speaking and listening, designing and viewed. 3) dimension concerns socio-historical conditions governing the process of producing securitization discourse. Also known as the contextual conditions from which the agents, habitus and socially constructed world originate. CDA proposes a method for engaging close reading of a 'text' in conjunction with the three dimensions of discourse (Huckin 2002, 4; Janks 1997, 329). Here the concept of 'texts' refers to both linguistic as well as other manifestations of discourse e.g. graphic images, speeches, and symbols. Discourse practices are here understood as structures of meaning, manifesting as text (e.g. Balzacq 2011, 39; Huckin 2002, 10; Janks 1997, 329f). The CDA aims to establish meaning of the texts shaped by a distinct context. Thus, allowing the researcher to capture a distinct social development and give a description of the practices that construct and reproduce something like a threat image. When applying this method, one must therefore also note the temporal and special conditions of each text, as these will determine the experiences the actor(s) produce discourse in (Balzacq 2011, 41).

Reading Position

We engage the data through multiple readings and analyze from a word-sentence-level to interpretation- and social-level of analysis. Janks (1997) emphasis the notion that the analysis starts from the moment a text is first engaged. Here the researcher should always attempt to dislodge own biases and prerequisites in the first peripheral reading (Huckin 2002, 5; Janks 1997, 331). At this stage, we have already formulated a comprehensive framework and knowledge of the context surrounding refugees. As such an unbiased reading may be impossible. However, going into the analysis, there is value in what immediate observations can be made from the first glance of the individual case. While it might be impossible for us to put our self in the 'actor's position, documentation of our immediate observations may prove important to further study.

Analysis of the Securitization Act

Further reading will be where the text is engaged directly, and their practices divided into different themes named by the securitization framework. This part of the analysis concerns the examination

Asmus S. Kobbernagel
Supervisor: Michael F. Kluth

Roskilde University
Master Thesis – Global Studies

03-09.19
Characters: 162.723

of the refugees specific strings of statements and utterances in the act of securitization. A close textual analysis will reveal the internal coherence of the text, allowing us to inquire into the refugees securitization moves (Balzacq 2011, 43). One must study the utterances and visual symbolism in the given text to understand what the securitization agent wants to achieve. It is here the heuristic artifacts, such as metaphors, modalities, emotions, analogies, and the 'actor's classification of developments from the context is identified. A study of the refugee's use of such tools and communicate their experiences to an audience will reflect the refugee's understanding of the world, and current crisis. Is the refugee, assertive, making a declaration, or expressing personal-narrative? The application of these questions to the textual analysis will provide insight into the objective of the securitizing refugee. Janks (1997) provide functional grammatical terms to the textual analysis;

- Lexicalization; linguistic devices used to manipulate readers through the use of words or phrases that assume the truth of their own statements.

- Patterns of transitivity: refers to the patterns of relations between agent and subject in a sentence, reflecting power relations in the discursive interaction.

- Active and passive voice; the inclusion of discursive differences, register shifts, and multiple voices.

- Nominalization: The omission of information, e.g. rather than confirming the truth of an event the agent refers to the result. An example could be the conscious omission of information should it invalidate the position or objective of the agent.

- Choices of mood: the attitude of the sentence or text, e.g. declarative, indicative, or expressive.

- Choices of modality or polarity: phrases like certainty, willingness, obligation, and necessity, to convey the 'agent's attitude towards the world and facilitate various forms of manipulation of the narrative.

- Thematic structure of text; the conceptions of statements between informing, subjection, and predicate, and to frame and, or, insert content into the given context.

- Information focus; what the agent share with the audience

- Cohesion devices; how sentences and stamens are linked.

(Huckin 2002, 7–10; Janks 1997, 335)

Note here that texts are hybrids, often containing multiple strands of discourse (Janks 1997, 335). Depending on which of these prove more useful in answering the research question, that grammatical term may take priority.

Interpretation of processes and relations

The interpretation of meaning in relation to the patterns of transitivity (Ibid. 332, 335). Here the format of the different texts should be considered and what type of interaction the text generates with other agencies, or texts. For a fuller comprehension of the possible securitization discourse produced by the refugees in the EU, the analysis cannot focus on only one text. The intertextual relations of discursive texts and how these relate and reproduce meaning, is what constitute the greater refugee narrative in global securitization discourse. In the comparison of different practices and understandings of what is securitized, new facets to the issue may appear. Here it is essential to remember that one text can hold multiple discursive strands, as the agent may present multiple existential threats and referent objects (Janks 1997, 340; Snetkov 2017, 260). As such, our analysis may not reflect others studying the same texts, should they not engage it with the same questions and framework.Both Janks (1997) and Balzacq (2011) emphasize this interconnectedness, and that earlier texts may affect the production of new texts. Recurring patterns of linguistic characterization happening in these intertextual relationships will produce a general narrative (storyline) that can be studied. The securitizing agent may draw on the general narrative's different discursive categories, to give meaning to the issue that concerns them. We must acknowledge the generative power of intertextual relationships in discourse. When verified, such narratives gain a certain momentum by contributing to cognitive routinization. The reader (audience) may encounter a known phrase or category that previous acts of securitization have already given meaning to, thus not processing it again in the new context (Balzacq 2011, 49; Janks 1997, 339f). Studying the intertextual relations of the cases will help map the variations of securitization practices and possibly identify a greater narrative.

Data

The MCD and the CDA both offer a frame for what data can be gathered. This allows us to demonstrate the combined concerns and limitations of both methods. Some would argue that this still leaves a fragmented guide for replication of the research. The thesis circumvents this argument by presenting the general criteria for the data selection in research design. This qualitative study identifies its case samples from refugees in the EU performing securitization. The research focus demands that we collect data from public demonstrations of securitization practices by refugees.

The theoretical framework and the definition of refugees present specific facilitating conditions for what qualifies as a case. The refugee is an individual who has fled their country of origin due to persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, or membership of a particular social group or political opinion (UNHCR 1951). These are the conditions identifying the subject group of this research. However, we acknowledge that other academic or political fields may disagree. For public discourse performances, to be considered an act of securitization, this act must identify an existential threat, and a referent object(s) and an empowered audience. It is important to note that the cases presented in this thesis are not necessarily examples of successful securitization, as this is not relevant to answer the research question.

Data Collection

From the research question, it is noted that the research concerns the refugee's public securitization discourse, in the context of the refugee crisis.

Janks (1998) recommend the collection of diverse textual representations of discourse, to gain better insight into the intertextual conditions of the data set (Balzacq 2011, 41; Janks 1997, 339). This diversity and their many, possibly contradicting, strands of discourse will provide us with conditions for a deeper understanding of the general narrative. Thus, we find cases of securitization practices manifested in multiple different textual forms, such as articles, books, speeches, videos, pictures. The frame for what data is relevant for this study can be considered broad. However, a broad definition for the obscure research into refugees performing securitization may be preferable. Both Janks (1998) and Balzacq (2011) argue that the inclusion of multiple texts, how they interrelate in the context of an event, provide validity to the critical study of the general narrative. To prevent data overload, decisiveness for when to stop data collecting is crucial. To meet this challenge, it is concluded that the research should avoid cases that are repetitive in their textual form. At the point of repetition suspension, in both format and qualitative findings, the data collection process can be done with little risk of missing relevant information (Balzacq 2011, 42).

Consideration to the historical context is here included in the study of the intertextual. This also constitutes earlier securitization performances within the same line of discourse. The relationship between the different texts led to a light application of the snowball method in data collection with varying degrees of success. The snowball method proved more successful when applied to some media platforms than others. Instagram, and TEDx share links and references to agents sharing the same sociocultural background. Likewise is the case of Nujeen Mustafa, human rights activist, and

Syrian refugee, referenced Malala Yousafzai, Nobel Peace prize winner, and refugee from Pakistan. From the research question, it is clear that this thesis operates from the temporal and spatial limitations of the EU refugee crisis. Thus this study will not include cases of refugees outside the territorial conditions of the EU. Similarly, are all the cases of texts shared after the declaration of the 2015 crisis until today (United Nations 2015). While securitization practices performed by refugees in the United States of America may also represent a new perspective to the global securitization discourse surrounding refugees, these are not the focus of this study. The intersexualization of texts and the securitizing refugee's sensitivity to socio-historical context, furthermore, argues for a chronological consideration to the analysis.

The cases

- The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Moon (IFRC); "*Talk with migrants not about them*" YouTube video, the 14.12.16

- Nujeen Mustafa; "*I am Not A Number*" TEDxTalk video London, UK the 12.05.17.

- Ali Muhammed Shareef; "*The Fleeing; 22 stories of how it is like to be a refugee in Denmark*" Book, Copenhagen Denmark, by *Ungdomsbureaut*, 2017.

- Yusra Mardini;" *I am Yusra. I am refugee and I am proud to stand for peace*" UNHCR website article, published in 11.01.17

- Sedra Al-Yousef; "*Temporary Humanbeing,*" The University Post, newspaper article, published in 01.07.19

Deliberation on the choice of cases can be found in the Analysis.

Sub Conclusion

The methods selected for answering the research question prove complimentary for comparative analysis of multiple cases of securitization. CDA and MCD complement each other in their explorative focus and the similar inclusion of real-world context. While no specific methodological tradition seems to exist, this combination also represents an often-used practice for qualitatively driven securitization studies (Balzacq 2011).

This master thesis investigates a complex phenomenon that is refugees as agents within the securitization discourse. The CDA approach, on the study of multiple cases allows for a reliable and easily replicated framework for the in-debt analysis each case. Similarly is the MCD's guide for comparative analysis, and the intertextual relationships among texts in CDA, complementary, and

capable of providing a field guide for discovering the greater narrative of the subject group (Balzacq 2011, 32f; Campbell and Ahrens 1998, 542). The use of multiple codes or terms from both approaches may assist to obtain a higher level of objectivity to the analysis of cases both individually and comparatively. By allowing for the convergence of multiple interpretations to the cases, this combination of methods may also provide multiple perspectives to the real-world context (Campbell and Ahrens 1998, 543). The cases may prove too complex to easily categorize for further comprehension. Repetition in our method of analysis to multiple cases will meet this challenge and enhance the external validity of our findings. The thesis, therefore, puts effort into the detailed description of our observations while acknowledging that we will not be able to account for all the variables constituting the refugees full contribution to the global securitization discourse.

Analysis

With Multiple-case designs, this chapter starts by analyzing each case as individual texts, in chronological order, to illustrate potential intertextual relationships between each case for the comparative analysis. In the first reading, specific statements have been isolated according to the analytical themes, derived from the Securitization framework (audience, agents, referent object, existential threats). Further study will reveal new and more specific subthemes and trends during the textual analysis. With a focus on the act, resources, and tools for securitization are revealed. Also, the relationships between the agents in each case are analyzed to their specific context.

IFRC

Talk with migrants not about them: YouTube video, the 14th of December 2016.

The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Society (IFRC) published a 2 min long video, produced by the Norwegian Red Cross affiliate (2016) during an awareness campaign called Crumbling Myths. The video "*Talking with Refugees*" was shared on the media platform YouTube and featured 8 young refugees and migrants in Norway, reading up social media posts on migration to Norway, in negative tones (IFRC 2016). This case was chosen and transcribed in Norwegian (Appendice 1), as it directly engages the negative security discourse of refugees and migration immediately after the crisis. An interesting observation is that the case represents multiple possible securitizing agencies.

Textual analyses

The video films each narrator individually so that the viewer gets the impression that it is only them and the camera, in what is presumably a classroom. Subtitles in English role in the bottom of the video while slow piano music plays in the background throughout.

The video starts with a close up of a young girl, approximately 6-7 years old, in profile, with only her face and part of the shoulders visible. Haltingly the young girl reads up a short statement without looking into the camera. The statement is in Norwegian and translates to "*I hope the whole bunch goes home again.*" After finishing her reading the camera shifts showing her face hair and shoulders. The girl finishes by looking into the camera, pausing for a couple of seconds, for then to look hesitatingly into the camera as if she just then understands what she has read (Appendice 1, 00:00-00:17). The camera shifts to a close up of a young man. He speaks loud and clear while reading a similar statement, with slow pronunciation as if afraid of making mistakes (Ibid. 00:17-00:23). Abruptly the video shifts to the 3rd narrator, another young girl seemingly the same age as the first. She takes over the reading mid-sentence. Also, she is careful to pronounce every word

correctly. When done, the girl pauses and looks into the screen while her mouth visibly tightens and her brows wrinkles into a frown of confusion. Under the silent pause, the subtitles freeze with some of the last words being "*criminals*" and "*foreign*" (Ibid. 00:23-00:30). These hostile phrases convey a notion of threat to the refugee and migrant and their existence in Norway. Interesting to note is the combination of verbal and written text, where our transcription of the narrators, show some discrepancy in timing between the verbal statements and end the English subtitles. This construction of the visual and textual is a potential tool to emphasize the notion of threat and confirm refugees and migrants as the referent subject of this case.

The 4th to 6th narrator performs similar readings, always their story seems to end with a closeup, conveying facial expressions of sadness, confusion, or passivity. During the 8th narration, by a teenage boy in a denim jacket and styled hair, a visual of the Facebook post he is reading appears above his left shoulder. It reads "*Hope the whole bunch goes home again*" with a posting time of 3 min it already shows two "*likes*" indicating approval from two other citizens (Ibid. 01:29-01:40).

To the subject of integration, this combination of text, read by the narrators with an immigration background, and symbolism conveys a pattern of transitivity between subject and agent. Acknowledging each of the narrators as agents, such an intimate relationship to the referent may appeal to audience sympathy and ethics. To fully emphasize this notion, the often observed pause when the narrators stop to look into the camera, seems to be an indication of conscious thematic choice of mood. Utilizing the emotional display of these young refugees and migrants as a heuristic artifact this security performance calls for moral support in an attempt to sway audience opinion by calling on their empathy to protect them and the collective they represent. Factors such as piano music in the background seem to emphasize this observation. The choice of narrator, possibly conveying a sense of innocence and the fact that they read in Norwegian, indicates an attempt to identify with a Norwegian audience.

However, as stated above the agents in this case of securitization is in question. While the narrators undoubtedly are refugees and migrants in the EU, they do not seem in control of their reading or how the video is constructed. Are they then really the securitizing actor? The narrator could represent self-interests, indicating an individual level, the producing agency communicates their performance to the regional EU sub-unit that is Norway's population. The IFRC, on the other hand, is one of the largest international humanitarian networks, with social inclusion and peace as a primary goal (IFRC 2019), has the resources to communicate this performance to an even wider audience, such as the general EU population or western society in general. There is an argument for

the IFRC lending formal support and legitimacy to this performance, and the opportunity to reach a wider audience. They may use the refugee performances to create a connection to the audience and use of emotions, that they cannot wield themselves. However, one must acknowledge that the introduction of a new agency and a wider audience may change the original objective of the narrators should they possess one. An example of this is confirmed by our observation of the irregular translations and placement of the subtitles.

The video ends with black text on a white screen "*Language can stop Integration … Or it can start it … Talk with migrants – not about them*" (Appendice 1 01:40-01:50), and at last with the IFRC sign, and link to their website, while piano music fades away. From here, the objective seems to be protecting the narrators and their collective, from xenophobia and discriminatory behavior. This message and IFRC's potential to spread it to an international audience cannot be said to be outside the narrator's' interests. However, it is the IFRC who controls the narrative despite not being the narrator.

With the additional agency of the IFRC, to the original Norwegian Red Cross video, a shift in both audience and possibly the original objective takes place. This case represents the use of visuals and text to convey the securitization of xenophobic discourse of the arriving migrants and refugees to Norway, and through IFRC presentation and translation, the EU member states. It is questionable whether this is a case of conscious securitization from the refugee perspective. We do see refugees, perhaps unconsciously performing a public presentation of text, although it is produced and conveyed by other powerful bureaucratic agencies (Balzacq 2011, 9). One could argue that the refugee performance here does not become securitization before it is taken up by the Red Cross and the IFRC. As such, it is representative of the refugee oriented securitization, making it credible for the comparative analysis.

Nujeen Mustafa

"*I am Not A Number*" TEDxTalk video London, UK the 12the of May 2017.

Nujeen Mustafa is a twenty-year-old female Kurdish, Syrian refugee from Aleppo, turned author, and human rights advocate for international agencies like the UNHCR. Born with cerebral palsy, a nerve disease that makes her unable to walk, she was unable to attend school until her arrival in Germany, EU in 2015 (TEDx Talks 2017).

Textual analyses

Nujeen Mustafa appears in her wheelchair in the center of a stage, in front of a live audience. To forgo potential misinterpretations the video provides English subtitles. Mustafa starts her speech,

creating an audible response of laughter from the audience in front of her. Following this statement, she sighs and becomes notably less animated in her movements. Here she introduces what she calls an unpleasant fact (Appendice 2, 00:47). Thus Mustafa shifts the mood of her speech from expressive to declarative, introducing the audience to the fear she has felt, as a refugee. Starting the speech from her own story as a refugee Mustafa uses the shift in mood to engage the audience, first by drawing them in with the use of the heuristic artifact, humor, for then to introduce an unpleasant fact.

In conveying her story as a refugee, she tells of danger and threat to her vulnerable existence, a notion emphasized by her confinement to a wheelchair (Ibid, 04:01-04:05). The picture of her as a young disabled child in Syria covering the screen seem a visual aid to the same effect (Ibid. 01:36-01:46). However, considering the full speech, one could argue that the message is not to stop Syrian conflict or that refugees should have free access to the EU. Of more significance is Mustafa's verbal deliberation on her apparent dislike for the term refugee as she argues that it has become a synonym for a plague spreading through the EU. Refugees are to her opinion not accepted as human beings by the recipient societies but mere numbers on the news (Ibid, 00:56-01:11). By presenting her experiences and use of a determiner like "*You*" and "*We*," Mustafa consciously puts herself in a representative position for the collective refugee group (Hansen, 2000). As such, Mustafa seems to say that she as a Syrian refugee in EU, has been addressed as a disease, a nightmare, and a number, not a human being (Appendice 2, 05:53). This statement presents her and by extension, the refugee collective as the referent subject in need of protection. To lend credibility to this claim, we will refer to the fact that Mustafa, is considered a Syrian rights activist, prized for sharing her story as a disabled refugee in EU (Syrian Rights Activist Honored 2019).

"*... What am I going to say to England? Hey, I love Charles Dickens*" (Appendice 2, 00:21-00:28). References to Western authors, Disney princesses, and TV shows serve to identify Mustafa with a general Western audience, and particularly with the local audience present during her speech. This statement and the spatial and temporal conditions of the original performance and responding audience make a case for England citizens to be the intended audience. However, the case we analyze is a video put forward by the media TEDxTalks, removing the performance from the original contextual environment of interaction. TEDx makes their format and credibility available to individual activists and communities around the world (TEDx Talks 2017), as such Mustafa has found a platform with the ability to reach both local and a broader international audience. The video is produced by the local affiliation TEDxExeter in their Hope campaign, inspiring a better world.

As such, we see a new but maybe not different objective to Mustafa's securitization act. The additional reach provided here, and her earlier references to the EU and country of residents, German, indicates an audience of international proportions. One could argue that the purpose of telling her back story Mustafa establish herself as a victim of circumstance rather than malice, playing on the audience sympathy for her and by extension, the whole refugee group. The case's existential threat comes after the arrival to the EU, and the lacking acceptance as well as, the fearful and dehumanizing rhetoric performed by media, the recipient society, and state officials from EU. Mustafa points out her fear of being isolated upon arrival in EU and Germany, where she has gained asylum (Appendice 2, 02:49-02:59). This point is underlined by her claim that as a refugee, she is considered to be unfamiliar, strange and even dangerous to both state officials, and citizens of Germany and the EU (Ibid. 04:48-04:54, 06:11-06:13), a tendency that clashes with her desire to be considered human and welcomed by the recipient society (Ibid. 06:32-06:38).

"*Why is she telling us this depressing story? Well, I hope that all of you will leave here today with these few things in mind. First: I am not a number. A human.*" (Ibid. 05:38-05:53). This statement suggests a conscious shift in theme of the speech. From humanizing herself and by extension, all refugees in EU, and gaining empathy, to imploring the audience to act and adopt policies that protect them against the further dehumanizing threat image. An act which in the current discourse may indeed be considered extraordinary measures of securitization from what is normal practices.

This case represents multiple agencies despite the solitude appearance of Mustafa on her stage. As the securitizing agent, she presents the vulnerable referent subject, for which she is also one, communicating the existential threat of discriminatory and dehumanizing powerful agents such as German and EU officials and the rhetoric reproduced in EU societies. The securitization as an action is here performed through an international media, lending it credibility and some formal support.

After her finishing statement, the video frame turns to the audience, who rise to applaud (Ibid. 06:35-07:10). The video ending on an angle showing the dark profiles of the audience and Mustafa highlighted on stage behind them. This manipulation of the visuals under the speech function as tools for manipulating the viewer of the video. Considering the place of the original performance, the inclusion of audience reaction to the video shows what is presumably EU citizens positively responding to the speech. This observation suggests that also the recorded audience, loos some of their agency alongside Mustafa, during TEDx administration.

Ali Muhammed Shareef

Danish book; "*The Fleeing; 22 stories of how it is like to be a refugee in Denmark*" Published in 2017 by Ungdomsbureaut in Copenhagen.

The primary goal of this group is to make the current generation of youths, the most socially conscious in Danish history. The project was initiated by the observation of young refugees arriving in Denmark, and the question of what happens to the youth demographic when personal safety and security is ripped away (Hesseldahl et al. 2017). The authors of each story are young refugees between 16 and 30 years of age, from Eritrea, Iran, Irak, Afghanistan, Syria, Zanzibar, The Dominican Republic or Egypt, and have all been given aliases so that these stories cannot be used against them or their families. This case is of Ali M. Shareef, a young refugee from Southeast Asia who at the time of publication had been in Denmark for 3 years. The quotes used in this case analysis are translated from Danish.

Textual analyses

Shareef's story starts with the title "*When it's no longer possible to be quiet*" (Shareef 2017, 107). On the first page is a picture of a handwritten poem about a beautiful brown-eyed girl, telling that their sorrows will fade one day. The text is a 4 page short story told from Shareef's perspective. He starts his story by introducing himself as a well-educated student with of political science, who got politically active after observing his country moving towards religious fundamentalism. He writes; "*... you need to speak up. And if I didn't do it who would?*" (ibid.). Here he uses a choice of modality conveying what he sees as obligation or necessity, and a declarative mood to engage the reader in his position. Following this, he tells o fellow students being kidnaped tortured and killed by secret services, events that led him to flee his country and hide for three years around the world. Firmly placing himself in a vulnerable position.

Upon discovering Denmark and arrival, he expresses his general optimism and "*hope*" for a better future as they seem to share many of his ideals. He presents his beliefs in progressive idea's and a life away from the oppression that he had experienced in his country. The reader will note that the introduction presents a primary objective to it's of this book. Here giving voice to the individual story and provide insight into the refugee situation in Denmark since the crisis. Here they implore the reader to engage the stories despite being scare as "*we*" as EU Citizens, are privileged and should be proud that other people outside EU wants the same rights and opportunities as "*us*" (Hesseldahl et al. 2017, 11). The Danish, or more particularly the EU citizen, is presented as the primary audience. One could, therefore, argue that presenting the values he shares with Denmark is

an attempt to identify with said audience. This observation is confirmed by his voluntary arrival at the Danish refugee camp, Sandholmlejren, despite being warned by Danish citizens he meets on the street not to go when asking for directions. His presentation of academic credentials and values, as well as his willingness to follow Danish refugee law, could be seen as a strategy to confirm his credibility and moral. At the same time, he establishes himself as belonging to a higher level in the sociocultural hierarchy in Denmark, then the current refugee discourse suggests.

Upon arrival at the refugee camp, Shareef's information focus shifts slightly to focus on the diverse group of individuals he met there and how they; *"... stayed together, because we all just want to be accepted."* (Shareef 2017, 108). This lexicalizing statement places him and the refugee group as having a strong relation effectively claiming that he belongs to this group. He indicates their common vulnerability and their need for protection, while also expressing his disappointment in the refugees who themselves practiced discrimination towards Danes and other asylum seekers. He shifts the mood of the text again from expressing "*being stuck*" to indicate optimism after gaining 5 years residence and starting integration. This conscious shift in mood continues in the next thematic section of the text. He describes the cultural barriers and the homogeneous way in which Danish media and society describe the refugee group; "*It is way to easy to put people in boxes and give them labels*" (Ibid. 10-111), as an existential threat towards the freedom of the refugee as well as the values that he identified with Denmark and EU. In his finishing statement, he appeals the audience to cherish diversity and freedom, claiming that with the practice of intolerance and feelings of superiority, this freedom of diversity will not survive.

The case represents a referent objective which is not necessarily a socially constructed group, but rather the value of freedom and cultural, religious diversity. This case indicates a different relationship with the audience, compared to many of the other refugee stories in the book who share their experience and world view, in that he motivates the adoption of inclusive policies.

Yusra Mardini

UNHCR website Article, by Yusra Mardini;" *I am Yusra. I am refugee and I am proud to stand for peace*" published in 11.01.17 (Mardini 2017b).

Mardini is a young female refugee, when she was 16 she fled the Syrian war with her sister for then to gain asylum in Berlin, Germany. She gained public attention after getting picked to compete in the 2016 Olympics on the Refugee Team where she won Gold in swimming. She is known for swimming beside the boat going from Turkey to Greece, after an engine failure. She has since

become a UNHCR refugee activist, an author and is now training for the 2020 Olympics (Mardini 2017b; 2017a).

Textual analyses

This text is an article published on UNHCR Web page, composed as a letter directly from Yusra Mardini to the reader, confirming that this is a conscious action of discourse. The text starts by identifying Mardini with the collective of 22 million other refugees forced to flee war and violence; "*... my name is refugee*". Interesting to this statement is her lexicalization of "*… that is what they call me,*" thus indicating to the reader that she and refugees are not responsible for this name. Following the introduction is a visual image of Mardini holding a speech on behalf of the2016 refugee Olympic team to the members of the IOC in Rio (Appendice 3, 1). Mardini stands behind a podium with the Olympic rings on it, with her teammate. She is addressing a blurred audience. The three individuals sitting behind her are lighted and slightly raised above the rest of the audience, indicating authority over the interaction. These powerful individuals look towards Mardini and her teammate while clapping displaying emotions of happiness, and from the one woman empathy as well. This visual strategy recognises Mardini as a refugee and Olympic athlete, strengthening her social position and lends formal credibility to her text. In her expressive description of the struggles, she uses words like "*humiliation*" and "*cry*" to associate the refugee experience with vulnerability and insecurity, possibly appealing to the audience's sympathy and morals. Hereto, follows an image of Mardini in the pool looking straight up into the camera. The use of visual symbolism indicates a strategic thematic change reminding the reader of her accomplishments of an athlete and strengthening her sociocultural position in the interaction with the intended audience.

"*We struggle on with our lives. We fight to study, to work, to learn a new language, to integrate. All too often the barriers are too high, the odds stacked against us*." (Ibid. 2). Here the text has placed the refugee in a vulnerable position while the quote above illustrates a change in focus and theme, indicating an ongoing struggle after coming to EU. From here, we identify the refugee as the referent subject, while also noting that the dangers of war and violence are not the existential threat that Mardini's text refers. A shift in mood from expressive to declarative confirms this observation; "That's *our struggle. But this isn't just our fight, it's yours too.*" Mardini has at this point identified the referent as a vulnerable group garnering audience sympathy, using symbolism to confirm her position both as a referent and powerful speech actor (Ibid. 4).

Mardini indicates that the audiences neglect gave "*the other voices space to grow*", legitimizing the xenophobic behavior that made the refugee a synonym for greed, danger, and crime (Ibid. 4). By

declaring that "*they*" spread "*lies*" about refugees and created "*fear*", Mardini identifies the real existential threat. The silent dehumanization of refugees into statistics and the normalization of refugee deaths allowed radical populist opinions to construct the refugee threat image, resulting in "*barriers*" for integration. Her use of lexicalization by declaring that "*you,*" the audience, are aware of refugees struggle to integrate but forgot their sympathy for them after their arrival in EU, she places part of the responsibility with them. When describing her opposition to the threat, another shift in modality from expressive to declarative, and a shift in tone from passive to active voice occurs. Interesting is that she now seems to direct the text towards the refugees; *"There is no shame in being a refugee if we remember who we are."* Where she before seemed to refer to the EU citizen observing the refugee, she now addresses the referent subject, calling them to action.

In Mardini's last statement, she calls for "*all of us*" to take a stand for peace, decency, and dignity on behalf of the referent subject. The observation of two audiences, the extreme action she hopes to mobilize with this securitization act, is therefore also twofold. Given that Mardini now resides in Berlin, and her use of declarative differences like "you" and "we" we confirm that the EU citizen, are also an intended audience. From the EU citizen, the necessity of, and responsibility to acknowledge the refugee's humanity and speak up against injustice treatment. An action that similar to previous cases are outside normal practice. From her finishing statement, it is clear that she also wishes the refugees to do as she, standing up and taking on the term "refugee" to give it a new positive association. She identifies to both audiences effectively by referring to the fact that she, was just like the EU citizen, and that the refugees still are; "*… doctors, engineers, lawyers, teachers, students we were back at home. We are still the mothers and fathers, brothers and sisters."* Thus, identifying with western society and stating that it was violence and war, which made them different, from the EU citizens (Ibid. 5).

By acknowledging the refugee's agency, Mardini creates a space of interaction between two factions. This case is a clear example of a securitization act appealing to audiences to take drastic action against an existential threat. Her relation to the two is, however, very different. The same factors have, however, placed her in a position of authority in the refugee group, constituting both the referent subject and other audience. Here, creating a strong position for the securitization of discriminatory behavior with both groups.

Sedra Al-Yousef

Newspaper article; "*Temporary Humanbeing,*" featuring interview with Sedra Al-Yousef, a 21-year-old Syrian refugee in Denmark since 2014, and a medical student at Copenhagen University.

The article is published in Copenhagen University's prize-winning free paper The University Post, in June 2019. The paper is physically published 6 times a year, with a continuously updating media web page, in both Danish and English. The target group is students and employees of Copenhagen University, while they encourage all to read it (Uniavisen 2019).

Textual analysis

The June publication of this paper features a headshot of Yousef, covering the whole front page. She is here presented in a white scarf, looking into the camera with a slight smile. The papers logo is shown in the upper left corner and the title of the article shown in the pink and white (Bjerre 2019). This text has two correlating voices, to which quotes from Yousef sticks out as actively engaging. The voice of the author and journalist takes on a passive quality, filling us in with context from Yousef's social position and background and the current political developments leading to the production of this text. Going to the article on page three, another picture is shown, this time a full frontal, with white hijab and her hands folded in front of her, smiling to the camera. These visuals with the all-white outfit and approachable body language communicate a sense of innocence and willingness to interact with the reader.

The text starts in a storyteller fashion, for then to shift to a quote describing her reaction upon getting her acceptance letter to the school of medicine." *I cried of joy."* (Appendice 4, 2). The position of this statement of happiness and gratitude, right after she is identified as a refugee, indicating a conscious effort to present Yousef in an amenable light to the Danish reader, considering the current rhetoric associating the refugee with fortune hunters and criminals.

"*From outside this looks like a success story*" (Ibid.) this following statement and the subsequent thematic shift, from expressive to informative of her strong connection to her fellow students and life in Denmark, frames the position of the text as critical to the claim of success. This observation tells the audience that the objective is not to present a fairytale story with a happy ending while motivating further reading.

On the right side of this statement in the article, is a text box confirming our observation by indicating the presence of an existential threat; "*It is stressful, that I do not know whether or not I will be sent home. In Syria, we lived in constant fear for the future. I thought that was over when I came to Denmark*" (Ibid.). She here expresses the fear that her future and the opportunities given

her, can be taken away at every moment, leaving her unable to plan her future further than the next semester. With another strategic thematic shift, the text inserts the contextual developments of the far-rightwing paradigm shift in integration policy. Up to the 2019 election, integration was a hot topic of debate, to which the sitting government made a shift in their policy focus from integration towards deportation of refugees, in coalition with known populist and extremist political parties. Considering that the date of publication is four days before the Danish election, it is reasonable to assume that the objective of this article is meant as a critical opposition to this political coalition.

After expressing her fears Yousef, argue that going home to rebuild her country, an argument put forward by the political coalition, would be as throwing her support behind the Assad regime, who have secured control and reasonable stability of part of Syria since the development of the war. Here, stating that it was her family's political demonstrations against Assad's regime, and their fight for democracy and free speech that forced them to flee in the first place. Thus, associating the paradigm shift, with the supporting Assad, and going against Denmark's fundamental democratic values. In an attempt to strategically confirm this association, the text presents her life before and after the war. Here, establishing Yousef's connection to the same democratic values identified with Danish society. Here informing us of her family's upper-middle-class status as medical professionals, with private schooling, playing sports, and her mother's work for the UN, and her father's political activism. All things which were taken away by the war; "*It is not easy seeing my father, a respected dentist in Ibid, now sitting disheartened in the refugee camp in South Jutland…*" (Ibid. 7). Following her statement of loss is a declaration that Yousef wont not give up, but utilize the opportunities of free education, get on with her life and help people. The texts conscious shift in voices, and thematic focus and moods has so far placed Yousef in an almost protagonist position. A notion which no doubt is strategic to the effect of strengthening her social position in a society where the paradigm shift indicates a rise in populist and nationalist ideas. "*I do not see myself as a victim. I am proud to be a refugee. It is part of my identity*" (Ibid. 5) this statement in a highlighted orange text box on the side of the main text, serves to confirm this observation, while it also indicates her as representative to the marginalized refugee group. She claims that the politicians labeling her a "*temporary refugee*", objectifies and dehumanize her as a refugee. Yousef here communicates an existential threat to her existence and future safety, as an individual. Thus, confirming the conditions for being a securitizing agent.

What is interesting about this case is that Yousef despite providing a referent subject, and an existential threat, does not seem to be the agent in control of the textual cohesion and strategic, manipulative structure we have identified. It can be argued that The University Post is the one to place Yousef in a strong position for securitization practices. Where the post's objective seems to be presenting a critical opposition to the current political climate, Yousef, calls the audience to action, by claiming her right to be counted a human being.

Comparative analysis

This second part of the chapter compares the different practices and trends of securitization, to discover standard practices and possibly document a general securitization narrative from the refugee perspective. Each case fits the necessary conditions for an act of securitization performed by a refugee in context to the EU crisis. What is important to note before the comparative analysis is fully engaged is that the purpose of this thesis is not to identify particular causal claims for this phenomenon, but utilize the existing securitization framework, investigating the refugee perspective in the hope that our findings can add additional knowledge to the development of the EU refugee crisis.

Agents

As the cases in this thesis, all are identified as refugees, similarities in the agent's sociocultural position can be observed. However, to strengthen the validity of this research, the cases were selected as they represent different textual manifestations of discourse. In the case of Mustafa and Mardini, we see two agent profiles who have gained public notoriety on behalf of their refugee experience and personal accomplishments. Both are young woman, who fled the war in Syria, and activists who for various reasons have been recognized by international agencies like the UNHCR and HRW, which arguably gives them a notion of authority or formal credibility in their performances. This notion of formal credibility may shine through in their action with the refugee group and the recipient EU societies. Thus, indicating a stronger sociocultural position with the refugee collective, possibly leading to a stronger position in their interaction with EU society, compared to other agents from this marginalized group.

Comparatively, Mardini and Yousef present two well-educated refugees claiming a willingness to integrate, who despite having gone through some of the same harrowing experiences, arguably does not have the same social standing in EU as Mardini. While identifying themselves as well educated and willing to integrate, all four profiles already here oppose the global threat image of the refugee.

However, one must address the differences between them and their social profiles as this may affect their relationship with both audience and referent subjects — relationships which describe their ability to communicate meaning to them. All the cases in this study have utilized the assistance of a secondary agency lending their securitization performance varying degrees of formal support. Where the case of IFRC, and in lesser part Yousef, are not the dominating agency in control of the textual manifestation of the securitizing act, none of the cases stand without formal support. The differences in the formal agency and the refugees' relationship with them, arguably determine credibility in the eyes of the EU citizen. Mardini and Mustafa have been given public profiles as activists of refugee rights for the UNHCR, while Yousef and Shareef, have been selected to share their experience with a media agency in support of this formal agencies interest at that time. It could be postulated that the stronger the relationship to a formal agency, the more credible is given to the refugee profile. Likewise is the actors lending credibility to the formal agencies when engaging topics like the EU crisis, integration, and discrimination, as they lend their intimate experience with these topics and their representativeness for the marginalized group. One must conclude that there is a mutually beneficial relationship between these agents, to when agreeable objectives coincide, the securitizing argument of a specific event or phenomenon grows stronger. Where they diverge in interests, such social constructions may instead reduce or weaken the objective of the speaker, as well as their formal agency.

Audiences

Another interesting observation from the case study is the similarity in choice of audiences. Where four out of five cases represents a conscious act of securitization, the analysis has identified an EU audience, in all of them. Where Yousef, Shareef, and to some degree Mustafa, all engage a localized population of a member states Denmark, England and Germany, Mardini and the IFRC address the regional EU. Here consideration to the spatial conditions of the securitization performance must be considered. Yousef, Shareef, and Mustafa perform their security act through a media platform directed towards a local audience. In the IFRC case, we identify the original production of the video to the Norwegian Red Cross, for then to be shared by the international IFRC agency, sharing it with a broader audience. Similarly, has the media TEDx published the video of Mustaf's speech, thus widening the reach of the performance through the agency's international qualities. The performance standing out is Mardini, who through her text on the global UNHCR webpage engaged both EU society and the refugee collective. However, one could argue that Shareef, in his case for protecting the rights of freedom and diversity, also addresses the refugee

group, when mentioning that they also have been known for practicing discriminatory behavior. Thus multiple audiences are addressed by the individual case. However, the general trend seems to be initiating a dialog with the EU's population and recipient societies.

Practices

Except for the IFRC, a constant in the practice of securitization is presenting the refugee agents story, placing them in a position of vulnerability. An observation supported by their shared sociocultural position and the historical context of the crisis. By telling of their traumatic experiences and their accomplishments be they academic, social, or athletic, the agents identify with the ideology of the EU audience and strengthen their representative position for the refugee collective. All cases illustrate refugee experience, onto which they communicate both their identity and credibility, in an attempt to humanize their collective and identify with the audience. How they choose to utilize this position differs slightly, while there is a general use of the emotion as a tactic, when appealing to the audience's empathy and moral support. Where Mustafa utilizes humor as a tool for interacting with her audience when presenting what she calls unpleasant facts, Yousef, Mardini, and Shareef call upon the audience's sense of responsibility. They are here associating their objective with the leading ideologies of the dominating audience. With the possible exception of Shareef, we have observed the manipulation of the visual and placement of text as a method for illustrating points and position in the securitization performances. Going back to the notion of credibility and the cooperation with formal agencies, we see the media platforms use of visuals and symbolism as a capacity tool to organize the information focus as well as strengthening the objective and security agents identity through symbolism.

General narrative

The cases here share the same referent subject that is the refugee collective. Here Shareef, and the 8 narrators in the IFRC case, arguably only gain this when the formal agency produce and share their performance. Shareef arguably presents the concept of freedom and the acceptance of cultural diversity as his referent object. The existential threat presented by all cases is the dehumanization of refugees, through discriminatory rhetoric and xenophobic practices. Here we consider the temporal and spatial limitations to data gathering and the identified threat image surrounding refugees in western society, as the general cause for this trend. It is interesting to consider the similarities in practices for refugees performing securitization. Of note are the general strategy to play on the emotions and the lexicalizing way the latter cases present the moral responsibility of the EU audience. The similarities and casual accepters of truth in their statements suggest a general

discourse which has gained momentum since the start of the crisis in 2015. Here it seems that the discriminating rhetoric and dehumanization of the refugee has become common knowledge among our securitization actors. Thus the common objective, for the audiences to adopt practices which accept the refugees as human beings, rather than objects, and interact with them instead of generating harsh discriminating rhetoric. This common objective can be seen as the plea for action outside normal policy practices, given the current political climate, here illustrate a general narrative, or storyline, from the refugee perspective. There is a question of whether or not this is an act of securitization or de-securitization. As the objective of the securitizing refugee seems to be moving their collective out of the security discourse and the refugee threat image, the cases indeed qualify as de-securitization. However, every single case here, present a notable existential threat. It is our understanding that this position depends upon the interpretation of the theory. Thus, we argue that the existence of an existential threat and the motivation for extraordinary measures to protect the referent subject, suggests that this is a practice of securitization, while we suggest that this may not be the practice of other scholars.

Conclusion

This section presents the thesis' concluding remarks and the arguments and reflections based on the value of these findings.

As a marginalized group in the EU, driven from their country of origin and with a dispersed social network, it is logical to infer that the refugees inhabit a reduced sociocultural position, when interacting with an EU citizen. This, suggest that the refugee possess little agency in the EU, when it comes to the change the development of policy. By firstly accepting this often neglected premise, this master thesis has documented five cases of securitization practices from the refugee perspective in the EU. Here it must be mentioned that none of the refugee agents identified in this study was without formal support from an external agency. However, where our first case indicates the refugee as primarily a powerful tool for the humanitarian agency IFRC, the remaining four cases depict the refugee actively taking up securitization discourse. It is arguable that the existence of a second, and possibly more influential formal agency like the media group TEDx, and the instance of the UNHCR controlling the presentation of the securitization performance weakens the refugee's original objective and reduces their agency. From the findings, it is reasonable to assume that acceptance of formal support from external agents is a necessary condition for the refugee to perform securitization, with any chance of successfully influencing discourse and initiate policy changes in the EU. While this condition may concur with the idea that refugees lack consequential agency, the above textual analysis of the individual cases has proved that despite influencing the message, the refugee is the primary agent in these interactions. Here the agents meet in a mutually beneficial cooperative relationship. In a scenario where the formal agencies such as the UNHCR gain credibility on the topic of refugees, the agents gain credibility and legitimacy when calling for a change in social and political practices. The thesis has identified cases of the refugee addressing both their own collective group, regional units like Denmark and Norway, as well as the general EU recipient society in their securitization performances. The same support from formal agencies also allows the refugees with the resources to address a wider audience outside their immediate cultural and geographical arena. Here we confirm the existence of multiple audiences to each case. Where the original performance may be meant for a local audience, such as speech performed in London, the more resourceful agencies distribution of the performance to a broader EU audience may influence the message, and the refugees' ability to identify with this new audience. With regards to the research question, the thesis does not focus on the cases of successful securitization. A significant finding of the analysis was that, when attempting to create a stronger relation to their

audience, the refugee identified with a westernized democratic ideology. This trend can be observed across all cases in one form or another, arguably making the transfer from a local to an international audience easier. Typical for the cases with dominant refugee actors is that they uniformly consciously identify themselves as belonging to the 'refugee collective'. By communicating refugee experiences, they utilize the sense of vulnerability to indicate a note of urgency to their objective, to invoke feelings of sympathy as a resource to influence the audience. Some actors strengthen their interaction through the use of humor or positive reflections of the recipient society and its political ideals, to which the audience belongs. The objectives of these cases are the protection of the collective refugee group, which they represent. They argue that the refugee existence is threatened by discriminatory rhetoric and xenophobic practices on a social and political level in the EU. The similarities in referent object and identification of an existential threat are overt and arguably supported by previous works of securitization scholars, identifying the threat image, as presented in the introduction. The similarities between the cases could be identified as a weak point in the argument, on the basis that they do not reflect the diverse refugee perspective in securitization. If one considers the weaknesses of the snowball method, the discovery of the next case depending on the references of the former may not have led to a diverse sample of data. As such, the value and generalizability of these findings may be limited. However, to ensure the validity of the findings, the cases presented here are diverse in the sense that they represent five different textual representations of securitizing discourse. To further strengthen the academic quality of this paper, we refer to the theoretical frameworks notion; assuming one has discovered all the intricate relations and complex contextual factors of the securitization process would be hubris on our part. However, the repetitiveness in the five cases may be an indicator of a strong reproductive quality to this particular discursive strand.

To sum up, it is clear that the refugee can be considered a securitizing agent, although formal support from external agents seems to be the driving factor for these performances. By sharing their own experiences, the actors utilized their collective's vulnerability to emphasize the need for protection from discriminatory rhetoric, xenophobia, and policy in the EU. Here they identify with the audience by claiming ideological similarities and strengthen their social position as a securitizing agent in the EU. This thesis does not represent the full refugee perspective in securitization discourse. However, the analysis presents a string of discourse present in the global securitization discourse, which to the best of our knowledge has not previously been considered. Here suggesting the existence of a higher, humanitarian oriented, refugee narrative within the

securitization discourse. It is, however, doubtful as to whether this study has provided new or additional knowledge to the field of security, or the development of the EU refugee crisis. A stalwart student could argue that these findings indicate the future development of more active engagement in the political and public sphere from the refugee group as their social and political standing develops over time. Looking at our case study, we see indications of this discourse gaining considerable momentum, presupposing the coming of more active refugee agents, a postulation supported by the observation of the continually developing refugee agency. We hope this thesis documentation of the refugee as a securitization agent will be the stepping stone for further research into the refugee perspective, both within the field of securitization and beyond.

Bibliography

ABC News. 2015. *Anti-Immigrant Protests Grow as Refugees Flood Europe | ABC News*.
    https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Bb0OYWY6V5g&fbclid=IwAR2s33B765Lbh7TFKJfJ
    -IT5SzRAr43XQLHvP7g6RIMMMJMrJHWRhFTra6w&app=desktop.

Balzacq, Thierry. 2005. "The Three Faces of Securitization: Political Agency, Audience and
    Context." *European Journal of International Relations* 11 (2): 171–201.
    https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066105052960.

———. 2011. *Securitization Theory, How Security Problems Emerge and Dissolve*. PRIO New
    Security Studies. London: Routledge.

Balzacq, Thierry, and Stefano Guzzini. 2015. "Introduction: 'What Kind of Theory – If Any – Is
    Securitization?'" *International Relations* 29 (1): 97–102.
    https://doi.org/10.1177/0047117814526606a.

BBC NEWS. 2018. "Migration to Europe in Charts." *BBC News*, September 11, 2018, sec. Europe.
    https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-44660699.

Biehl, Kristen. 2009. "Migration 'Securitization' and Its Everyday Implications: An Examination of
    Turkish Asylum Policy and Practice." http://cadmus.eui.eu//handle/1814/11761.

Bigo, D. 2002. "Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease."
    Alternatives 27 (1): 63–92. https://doi.org/10.1177/03043754020270S105.

Bjerre, Signe. 2019. "»Jeg Tør Ikke Tænke Længere End Mit Nuværende Semester«." *Uniavisen*,
    May 28, 2019. https://uniavisen.dk/jeg-toer-ikke-taenke-laengere-end-mit-nuvaerende-
    semester/.

Black, Richard. 2001. "Fifty Years of Refugee Studies: From Theory to Policy." *International
    Migration Review* 35 (1): 57–78. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2001.tb00004.x.

Boswell, Christina. 2007. "Migration Control in Europe After 9/11: Explaining the Absence of
    Securitization*." *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 45 (3): 589–610.
    https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2007.00722.x.

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

Buzan, Barry, Ole Wæver, and Jaap De Wilde. 1998. *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*.
    Lynne Rienner Publishers. https://www.google.com/books?hl=da&lr=&id=j4BGr-
    Elsp8C&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&dq=Buzan+BG,+W%C3%A6ver+O+and+Jaap+Wilde+de+(199

8)+Security:+A+New+Framework+for+Analysis&ots=bOmgw-

Yv0c&sig=Wv5a9yaof4Q1ezK5TsdNep-PjTg.

Campbell, Rebecca, and Courtney Ahrens. 1998. "Innovative Community Services for Rape

Victims: An Application of Multiple Case Study Methodology." *American Journal of*

Community Psychology 26 (4): 537–571. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022140921921.

Fairclough, Norman. 1992. *Discourse and Social Change*. Vol. 10. Polity press Cambridge.

Fattah, Khaled, and K. M. Fierke. 2009. "A Clash of Emotions: The Politics of Humiliation and

Political Violence in the Middle East." *European Journal of International Relations* 15 (1):

67–93. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066108100053.

Gerard, Alison, and Sharon Pickering. 2014. "Gender, Securitization and Transit: Refugee Women

and the Journey to the EU." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 27 (3): 338–59.

https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fet019.

Hansen, L. 2011. "Theorizing the Image for Security Studies: Visual Securitization and the

Muhammad Cartoon Crisis." *European Journal Of International Relations* 17 (1): 51–74.

https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066110388593.

Hansen, Lene. 2000. "The Little Mermaid's Silent Security Dilemma and the Absence of Gender in

the Copenhagen School." *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* 29 (2): 285–306.

https://doi.org/10.1177/03058298000290020501.

Henley, Jon. 2018. "What Is the Current State of the Migration Crisis in Europe?" *The Guardian*,

November 21, 2018, sec. World news.

https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/jun/15/what-current-scale-migration-crisis-

europe-future-outlook.

Hesseldahl, Olav, Martin Fehr Therkildsen, Sara Ridder, and Ungdomsbureauet. 2017. *De flygtede,*

22 personlige fortællinger om at være ung flygtning i Danmark. 1. udgave. De-serien. Kbh.:

Ungdomsbureauet.

Huckin, Thomas. 2002. "Critical Discourse Analysis and the Discourse of Condescension." In

Discourse Studies in Composition, by Ellen L. Barton and Gail Stygall, 155:176. Hampton,

Unites States of America: Hampton Press (NJ).

Human Rights Watch. 2018. "World Report 2018: Rights Trends in European Union." Human

Rights Watch. December 18, 2018. https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2019/country-

chapters/european-union.

Huysmans, Jef. 2000. "The European Union and the Securitization of Migration." *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 38 (5): 751–77. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5965.00263.

———. 2006. *The Politics of Insecurity: Fear, Migration and Asylum in the EU*. Routledge. https://www.google.com/books?hl=da&lr=&id=9y9DaS2VL_oC&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=Hu ysmans+J+(2006)+The+politics+of+insecurity+:+fear,+migration+and+asylum+in+the+EU. +New+York&ots=1b_T2Jp3Ke&sig=6Ibp0O7a1_H4p_OIn-AmXZI9Kk8.

IFRC. 2016. *Talk with Migrants, Not about Them*. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ET0CbiDdLwQ.

———. 2019. "What We Do - IFRC." 2019. https://www.ifrc.org/en/what-we-do/.

Ilgit, Asli, and Audie Klotz. 2018. "Refugee Rights or Refugees as Threats? Germany's New Asylum Policy." *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 20 (3): 613–31. https://doi.org/10.1177/1369148118778958.

"Instagram." n.d. Instagram. Accessed August 25, 2019. https://instagram.com/.

Janks, Hilary. 1997. "Critical Discourse Analysis as a Research Tool." *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 18 (3): 329–342. https://doi.org/10.1080/0159630970180302.

Kearns, Matthew. 2017. "Gender, Visuality and Violence: Visual Securitization and the 2001 War in Afghanistan." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 19 (4): 491–505. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616742.2017.1371623.

Kinnvall, Catarina, and Paul Nesbitt-Larking. 2009. "Security, Subjectivity and Space in Postcolonial Europe: Muslims in the Diaspora." *European Security* 18 (3): 305–325. https://doi.org/10.1080/09662831003758107.

Klotz, Audie, and Cecelia Lynch. 2007. *Strategies for Research in Constructivist International Relations*. International Relations in a Constructed World. M E Sharpe Inc.

Léonard, Sarah. 2010. "EU Border Security and Migration into the European Union: FRONTEX and Securitisation through Practices." *European Security* 19 (2): 231–254. https://doi.org/10.1080/09662839.2010.526937.

Mardini, Yusra. 2017a. "Yusra Mardini: Home." May 2017.

———. 2017b. "I Am Yusra. I Am a Refugee and I'm Proud to Stand for Peace." UNHCR. November 1, 2017. https://www.unhcr.org/news/latest/2017/1/58760b294/yusra-refugee-im-proud-for�-peace.html.

Martin Beck. 2017. "Securitization of Refugees in Europe." E-International Relations. September 17, 2017. https://www.e-ir.info/2017/09/18/securitization-of-refugees-in-europe/.

McDonald, Matt. 2008. "Securitization and the Construction of Security." *European Journal of International Relations* 14 (4): 563–87. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066108097553.

Mohammed, Elmaazi. 2018. "'Blatantly Xenophobic' and 'Shameful' Anti-Refugee Laws Are Passed by New Hungarian Government, Says UN." *OpenDemocracy*, April 7, 2018. https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/can-europe-make-it/blatantly-xenophobic-and-shameful-anti-refugee-laws-are-passed-by/?fbclid=IwAR3soAbfF8MQ_Rpzy_v1-t7HhG9VcxS322wJp3UdMq3cuNI1EQMJglyDkh4.

Moreno-Lax, Violeta. 2018. "The EU Humanitarian Border and the Securitization of Human Rights: The 'Rescue-Through-Interdiction/Rescue-Without-Protection' Paradigm." *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 56 (1): 119–40. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcms.12651.

Mustafa, Nujeen. 2016. *Nujeen, i kørestol og på flugt fra krigen i Syrien*. Stockholm: HarperCollins Nordic.

Olesen, Thomas. 2016. "Politicizing Cultural Sociology: The Power of/in Global Injustice Symbols." *International Sociology* 31 (3): 324–340. https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580916629613.

Peoples, Columba, and Nick Vaughan-Williams. 2014. *Critical Security Studies: An Introduction*. Routledge.

Salter, Mark B., and Can E. Mutlu. 2012. "Psychoanalytic Theory and Border Security." *European Journal of Social Theory* 15 (2): 179–195. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368431011423594.

Saunders, Natasha. 2017. *International Political Theory and the Refugee Problem*. 1st ed. New Yourk: Routledge: the Taylor and Francis Group.

Shareef, Ali Muhammed. 2017. "Når Det Ikke Er Muligt At Tige Stille." In *De flygtede, 22 personlige fortællinger om at være ung flygtning i Danmark*, by Olav Hesseldahl, Martin Fehr Therkildsen, and Sara Ridder, 1. udgave, 106–11. De-serien. Kbh.: Ungdomsbureauet.

Snetkov, Aglaya. 2017. "Theories, Methods and Practices – a Longitudinal Spatial Analysis of the (de)Securitization of the Insurgency Threat in Russia." *Security Dialogue* 48 (3): 259–275. https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010617701676.

Stokes, Bruce. 2016. "The Immigration Crisis Is Tearing Europe Apart." *Foreign Policy* (blog). July 22, 2016. https://foreignpolicy.com/2016/07/22/the-immigration-crisis-is-tearing-europe-apart/.

"Syrian Rights Activist Honored." 2019. *Human Rights Watch* (blog). February 7, 2019. https://www.hrw.org/news/2019/02/07/syrian-rights-activist-honored.

TEDx Talks. 2017. *I Am Not a Number: A Refugee's Tale | Nujeen Mustafa | TEDxExeter*. London, UK: First Sight Media. https://tedxexeter.com/category/type/video/.

UNHCR. 1951. "Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees." In *UNHCR*. https://www.unhcr.org/protection/basic/3b66c2aa10/convention-protocol-relating-status-refugees.html.

———. 2019a. "UNHCR: The Global Report 2018." 19. UNHCR Global Report. 1211 Geneva 2, Switzerland: UNHCR. https://www.unhcr.org/the-global-report.html.

———. 2019b. "Europe Situation." UNHCR. July 21, 2019. https://www.unhcr.org/europe-emergency.html.

Uniavisen. 2019. "Om Uniavisen - Københavns Universitets kritiske avis." Infromation Media Website. Uniavisen. 2019. https://uniavisen.dk/om-uniavisen/.

United Nations. 2015. "Refugees." December 14, 2015. https://www.un.org/en/sections/issues-depth/refugees/.

Van Rythoven, Eric. 2015. "Learning to Feel, Learning to Fear? Emotions, Imaginaries, and Limits in the Politics of Securitization." *Security Dialogue* 46 (5): 458–475. https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010615574766.

Vuori, Juha A. 2010. "A Timely Prophet? The Doomsday Clock as a Visualization of Securitization Moves with a Global Referent Object." *Security Dialogue* 41 (3): 255–277. https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010610370225.

Walker, Peter. 2016. "EU Immigration Debate Upset More than Half of Voters, Report Finds." *The Guardian*, July 27, 2016, sec. Politics. https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2016/jul/27/more-than-half-of-voters-disliked-tone-of-eu-immigration-debate-report-finds.

Williams, Michael C. 2003. "Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics." *International Studies Quarterly* 47 (4): 511–31. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.0020-8833.2003.00277.x.

Yin, Robert K. 2003. *Case Study Research, Design and Methods*. 3. ed. Applied Social Research Methods Series 5. Thousand Oaks, Calif: SAGE Publications.

"YouTube." n.d. Accessed August 25, 2019. https://www.youtube.com/.

Župarić-Iljić, D., and M. Valenta. 2018. "Opportunistic Humanitarianism and Securitization Discomfort along the Balkan Corridor: The Croatian Experience." In *Refugee Protection*

and Civil Society in Europe, by Margit Feischmidt and Ludger Pries. Springer International Publishing.