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Abstract
The securitisation of migration is a topic that has been researched in depth, especially in relation to events such as 9/11 or the so-called Migrant Crisis. These events connect migration to traditional security threats, such as terrorism and transnational crime. However, migration has also (traditionally) occurred for economic reasons. Between 9/11 and the Migrant Crisis, a major event happened in the field of economics: the 2008 Financial Crisis. This event is yet to be discussed in relation to the securitisation of migration. The United Kingdom (UK) was one of the European countries that experienced a large flow of immigrants after the 2004 A10 EU accession, which continued throughout the Financial Crisis.¹ It is also one of the countries in which there was a clear and ongoing anti-migrant rhetoric present in the media.

This dissertation will examine the securitising discourse on immigrants, in the UK, from the 2004 EU accession to 2007, and from the 2008 Financial Crisis to 2012. These discourses will be compared to uncover how the Financial Crisis changed the securitisation of migration. A special focus will be on the economic, societal and traditional security sectors and how the Financial Crisis shifted the focus between these sectors. Within the broader framework of securitisation theory, it has been chosen to analyse the diagnostic frame present in four British newspapers and political actors. This examines what is presented as a security threat, and to whom. A quantitative textual analysis has been made of the 1,715 media articles and editorials to create visual representations of the use of certain securitising language and to which sector of security the data refers. Furthermore, one expert interview with Chris Huhne, former Liberal Democrat MP, was conducted to add a more nuanced and anecdotal account to the research.

The dissertation will show that the 2008 Financial Crisis caused a greater focus on the economic sector as a security challenge, in relation to migration. This is especially the case when economic growth, and low-skilled and young British workers’ jobs are threatened. However, it will also show that some of the newspapers’ and political actors’ discourse contains conflicting research, and data on migrant numbers. It will also give an indication of how complex the topic is to research, due to its highly political nature, and because of the use of (overexaggerated and fear-mongering) anti-immigrant rhetoric for personal political gain. Furthermore, the different categories of migrants, and the economic, societal and traditional sectors of security, tend to get rolled up into one large general issue surrounding immigration, the economy, and societal and national security. Throughout the research period, migration is

¹ Although this fact is contested by certain actors discussed in this dissertation.
viewed as a threat; following the 2004 EU accession the discourse is at its most general, describing ‘migrants’ as a threat to ‘British jobs and society’. However, after the 2008 Financial Crisis, the discourse becomes more nuanced and specific, describing more precisely who or what is potentially under threat. It is also recognised that the issues surrounding migration may be a symptom of a larger problem within the wider political system and its immigration policies.
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Introduction (I)

Migration is a phenomenon that has occurred among living beings since the dawn of time. Originally these living beings migrated to survive. Since the modern age people have also migrated for economic reasons. Neo-liberal free market theory suggests that when there is demand for work, the supply (workers) will follow (Mises, 1985:238). The opposite is also true; when there is no demand, the workers will move further afield to where they are needed, can earn money and raise their living standards. According to Foucault, this concept of free market and migration encourages economic individuals to think and act in their own self-interest (Foucault, 2008: 292 and Nguyen, 2017: 5). If all individuals lived up to their full potential in this manner, their ‘rivalry’ would satisfy the collective interest and raise the living- and economic standards of everyone (Dardot and Laval 2013: 47).

However, this short description of neoliberalism and migration does not take non-economic arguments or subjective human emotions into account. Security, like migration, is also as old as humankind and is related to the (inter)subjective experiences of humans (Wolfers, 1952: 485). The Copenhagen School, and authors such as Barry Buzan, Jaap de Wilde and Ole Waever introduced the concept of ‘securitisation’ in the 1980’s (Buzan, 1983 and Buzan et al., 1998). In a nutshell, securitisation describes a process of a (securitising) actor identifying an existential threat to a referent object and suggesting the use of extraordinary measures to combat that threat (Buzan et al., 1998: 23). Because the process is political, in theory, anything could be proclaimed a threat. For the process of securitisation to succeed, the securitising actor and his claim must be perceived as legitimate by its audience (Buzan et al., 1998: 32).

In relation to migration, securitisation has been a ‘hot topic’ in the academic world since the end of the 1980s (Huysmans, 2000 :755, Peoples and Vaughan-Williams, 2010: 135 and Wohlfeld, 2014:61). Much focus has been placed on traditional security threats migrants may pose, such as terrorism and transnational crime, especially following the events of 9/11 (Bigo and Tsoukala, 2008 and Karyotis, 2007: 1). However, migration can also be related to diverse societal and economic threats, which has not been researched as much by the academic world. Related to the economic and societal sectors, securitising actors have developed anti-migrant rhetoric over the past ten years, which included the 2008 global Financial Crisis and events precipitated by it.
Linking together these concepts and issues, the following research question can be formulated: ‘How did the 2008 Financial Crisis change the securitisation of migration, in the United Kingdom?’

I.1 Context
Pre-dating the 2008 Financial Crisis, other major events occurred in Europe, in relation to migration. The European Union (EU)’s free movement of goods, capital, services and labour made migration easier. The single market was created in 1993 to enhance all member states’ economic growth and living standards (Europa, 2018 and LawTeacher, 2013). The idea is that, due to enhanced mobility, the people with certain skills go where their skills are needed. Therefore, labour productivity and financial output are raised everywhere.

In 1993, the EU counted twelve Member States. This number was raised to 15 in 1995, but in 2004 the EU allowed nine former Eastern Bloc countries and Cyprus to join, an enlargement of 66.7%. Despite the accession, the living standard and employability in the former Soviet countries still lagged a long way behind the North-West European countries such as the UK, Germany, The Netherlands and France (White, 2017: 19). The EU recognised that this difference and the newly enlarged Union may lead to a large explosion of migration. Hence, they allowed the older member states to impose limits on migrant numbers. The UK, under the Labour government at the time, needed migrant labour to fill shortages, and were one of the only countries not to impose migrant restrictions (Happold (Gu), 2003). This led, for example, to a large exodus of Poles to the UK looking for a brighter future, as there were not many other options for host countries. In turn, this could have led to larger dissatisfaction among the UK’s native population as they felt that they were disproportionately impacted by the new accession.

However, neo-liberal economic theory suggests that temporary migration is good for both economies. In this case, Polish immigrants would boost the economy of the UK before returning home with their wages and improving the economy there. Nevertheless, a wide variety of questions and fears can arise among the population, media and politicians when the situation is not this black and white. For instance: ‘What happens when the immigrants are here to stay?’; ‘What if immigrants are a threat to our customs and traditions, way of life, living standard, wages and employability?’; ‘What if the flow of migrants is ‘too high’ and pressures are placed on public services, schools and hospitals and segregation occurs?’; and

---

2 Also known as the A10 accession.
‘What do the immigrants have to do with the economic crisis and subsequent recession?’ This dissertation will show that these questions appeared in the discourse on migration throughout the research period and played a role in the process of securitisation.

I.2 Approach
The research period spans the four years before the 2008 Financial Crisis, from the beginning of 2004 and the A10 EU accession, and the four years following the crisis up to the end of 2012. In this first period, the initial discourse on migrants will be examined, as portrayed by political actors in manifestos, speeches, interviews, and by articles and editorials from four newspapers. Then, the discourse in the year of the Financial Crisis and the years following will be displayed. Both a qualitative diagnostic frame analysis and a quantitative textual analysis will be utilised. The qualitative diagnostic frame analysis will focus on ‘what’ is deemed a security threat and ‘to whom’, and the textual analysis will focus on numbers of keywords used and which security sector the discourse relates to. Consequently, the ‘old’ discourse will be compared to the ‘new’ discourse and the effect of the Financial Crisis will be laid bare.

It should be said, that this research period also contains an evolution in governmental leadership. In 2004, the Labour party under Tony Blair was still in office and they had a largely open policy toward migration, as they deemed it a necessity for filling labour gaps. In 2005, Labour won the election, and Gordon Brown took over as Prime Minister (PM) in 2007. In this period, immigration was a hot topic. Due to the political nature of securitisation, it was partially utilised as an instrument for the election campaigns in both 2005 and 2010. 2010 saw a defining moment, as Labour lost its 16-year seat of power and a first-time coalition was formed between the leading Conservatives and the Liberal Democrats, with David Cameron as PM. As immigration and the Financial Crisis was such a hot topic at the time, the 2010 election results indicated the level of public dissatisfaction with how the Labour party had handled the immigration wave since 2004 and the Financial Crisis.

The dissatisfaction was manifested especially in two of the four media sources covered in this dissertation, The Daily Mail and The Daily Telegraph. These are two of the most-read newspapers in the UK and they were both reporting anti-migrant, pro-migrant and combined stances with supporting conflictual research results on an almost-daily basis. Therefore, it must have been difficult for their readers to understand the situation. Furthermore, these two
newspapers especially showed a tendency to mix up different categories of migrants, but used the same arguments across the categories. This can also only have increased confusion and turned migration into a perhaps more complex issue than it was.

1.3 Lay-out
This dissertation aims to make the confusing situation understandable and uncover the general discourses. It will begin with a literature review on the topics of securitisation, the securitisation of migration, and economic recession theory and migration. Then, the data and methods used to conduct the research will be displayed in the methodology. The first chapter will contain a qualitative diagnostic frame analysis of the political party manifestos and speeches during the two periods around the 2008 Financial Crisis. The second chapter will display a quantitative textual analysis of the numerous media sources, to make the following chapter more comprehensible. The third chapter will contain the qualitative diagnostic frame analysis and dig deeper into the content of the media sources. The fourth and final chapter will contain an individual interview with a former prominent MP, to include a more-nuanced and anecdotal account of the situation. Finally, the full answer to the main research question ‘How did the 2008 Financial Crisis change the securitisation of migration, in the United Kingdom?’, will be given in the conclusion.

3 Like refugees, asylum seekers, illegal immigrants, economic immigrants, Poles and other Eastern Europeans, EU migrants, Non-EU migrants etc.
Literature Review (LR)

LR.1 Introduction

After the Cold War, migration began to be seen as a security issue and since then approaches towards migrants have been constantly changing (Huysmans, 2000:755, Peoples and Vaughan-Williams, 2010: 135 and Wohlfeld, 2014:61). The concept of securitisation can assist in our understanding of these phenomena. This chapter is divided into sections; it displays the key concepts and what has already been written on: (1) the securitisation of migration and the general concept of securitisation, (2) crucial moments in the securitisation of migration: 9/11 and the Migrant Crisis, (3) the connection between economic recession, populism and migration.

However, this chapter will also highlight where there are gaps in the existing literature. For instance, a large amount of the second and third sections is largely based on the content of one book on ‘the Securitisation of Migration to the EU’ (Lazaridis and Wadia, 2015). In turn, this book is mostly limited to the utilisation of anti-migrant rhetoric by far-right politicians, and the security implications for migrants. Despite it being recognised that there may be direct ties between rising unemployment and rising anti-immigrant discourse (in times of financial hardship) (Travis (Gu), 2012 and Warrell (FT), 2012), little research has been done into this phenomenon. This is especially surprising, considering a large part of migration is motivated by economic reasons, and because Europe experienced one of the worst Financial Crises in a century in 2008 (Miliband (Lab), 2010). The crisis was (shortly) preceded by 9/11, the EU enlargement of 2004, the London bombings of 2007 and was followed by the Arab Spring and consequential Migrant Crisis.

Perhaps these other events are seen to be more relevant to the securitisation of migration, because they follow on from much of the pre-existing traditional, political and societal discourse. Since 9/11, terrorism had received so much attention, that the discourse was perhaps biased and other newly occurring issues relating to migrants were left unseen. However, economic migration is not a new phenomenon. Therefore, it is notable that little has been written on the topic, especially in relation to the major-impact event of 2008. It is possible that the finance issues were so large that they were not immediately related to migration by the academic world. This dissertation will however strive to fill this gap, as politicians and the media, in the United Kingdom, did talk about the Financial Crisis in relation to migration in large volume.
LR.2 The Securitisation of Migration

Jef Huysman states that migration began to be securitised in Europe at the end of the 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s (Huysmans, 2000: 755). This view is shared by Columba Peoples and Nick Vaughan-Williams in their book on Critical Security Studies (Peoples and Vaughan-Williams, 2010: 135). Monika Wohlfeld also mentions that the securitisation of migration started at the end of the Cold War (Wohlfeld, 2014: 61). The Cold War is therefore seen to be a turning point in the construction of migration as a security issue. The end of the Cold War meant a shift in the entire field of security studies. Traditional ‘realist’ state-centric views, were replaced with broader ideas that security can entail more than just military issues, as is written in the work of Huysmans and Vicki Squire (Huysmans and Squire, 2012: 1) and Peoples and Vaughan-Williams (Peoples and Vaughan-Williams, 2010: 18). The Copenhagen School defines this broadening of the security agenda into a division of sectors, namely: military (traditional), environmental, economic, societal and political (Buzan et al., 1998: 7-8).

‘Securitisation’ is a complicated notion in itself. Thierry Balzacq, one of the leading scholars in this field, defines securitisation as the success of a securitising actor in adding an object or ideal to the security agenda. It does not necessarily depend on the existence of a real threat (Balzacq, 2010: 3). In the past, this was seen to be achieved through ‘speech acts’, as written in the work of Ole Waever (Balzacq, 2010: 1; Buzan et al., 1998: 31-3; Waever 1989: 42 and Waever, 1995: 55). Nowadays however, it is seen to be achieved through more than just the discursive labelling of something as a security threat. Didier Bigo, for instance, claims that the effect of the discursive, or non-discursive, act also has to be examined, alongside the ideational, physical, technical, historical and material conditions of possibility (of security practices) (Balzacq et al, 2010: 2 and Bigo, 2006). Peoples and Vaughan-Williams add that security is a ‘derivative concept’, meaning that the notion of security is derived from the way each individual sees the world and how we think politics works (Peoples and Vaughan-Williams, 2010: 22). Lazaridis and Tsagkroni say that securitisation happens when political leaders ‘utilise the rhetoric of threat pushing’. This means that an issue that was previously a topic of ‘normal politics’ is moved into the realm of security (Lazaridis and Tsagkroni, 2015: 211). A general discourse in the field of Critical Security Studies is that security is a social construct. Balzacq and the co-authors of Security Practices even say that ‘security’ is often used as a slogan, implying that the aim of securitising an issue is a promotional stunt towards furthering a personal agenda. ‘It is a peculiar method through which a dominant group justifies and imposes a political program by assessing who needs to be protected and who can
be sacrificed, who can be designated as an object of fear, control, coercion.’ (Balzacq et al, 2010:2). A final summarising notion regarding securitisation in general, can be added following the thoughts of Bigo: In principal, anyone can securitise something, but the authority of a specific actor to its audience is crucial. ‘In order to declare something as insecure, and to be believed, credentials are needed’ (Bigo, 2008: 128). Therefore, securitisation depends on the securitising actor, its audience and the issue that is being securitised.

In addition, Hass writes that the media can have a large impact on the process of securitisation. It can play a fundamental role in describing or promoting something as a threat, labelling certain security issues, or even calling for extraordinary measures regardless of the implications to human rights (Hass, 2009: 83). Furthermore, Hass explains that the media has three potential roles in the process of securitisation: (1) The media can be used to voice the securitising actor’s concerns and thus can have an important role in how the message is conveyed, whether extraordinary measures are deemed necessary to counter the threat, and thus, whether there is a case of successful securitisation; (2) The media can itself be a securitising actor and introduce a ‘speech act’; (3) The media should serve as a watchdog in the process of securitisation. This is something that is often neglected, but in effect, the media has the power to judge whether the extraordinary measures are necessary, proportional and whether there is no abuse of power on the side of the securitising actor (Hass, 2009: 84).

Williams adds that the securitising potential of the media does not depend on the ‘speech act’ alone but that they can have a large communicative action impact through the publication of visual images (Williams, 2003: 512). The choice of which images to publish, alongside the choice of which information, could also have implications for the securitising process. The balance between the media and policy-makers is therefore a key element in the process of securitisation in the modern age.

The migration-security nexus entails more than just the traditional, militaristic, state-centric aspect of security studies and includes many of the Copenhagen School’s sectors. Huysmans and Squire mention that the security-side is often approached as a ‘value that has to be achieved’ (Huysmans and Squire, 2012: 3). Wohlfeld adds that the focus in the migration-security nexus tends to be on various aspects related to national security, such as the (promotion and protection of) the wellbeing of the nation’s citizens (Wohlfeld, 2014: 68). This security is also extended to ‘legal residents’ of the territory on paper, however, as Wohlford mentions (with regard to ethnic minority groups within the population): ‘the other’, with different customs, languages and values, can often bring out suspicion and hatred in the
nation’s ‘indigenous’ citizens (Wohlfeld, 2014: 68). Peoples and Vaughan-Williams say that migration became associated with threats to cultural order, European public order and domestic labour markets (Peoples and Vaughan-Williams, 2012: 134). Since 9/11, this was also extended to transnational global terrorism and transnational crime (Peoples and Vaughan-Williams, 2012: 134). This transnational crime, among others, includes drugs and human trafficking. Lazaridis and Wadia highlight the importance of this as it can directly affect, both the indigenous citizens and the migrant populations negatively (Lazaridis and Wadia, 2015: 2). It is implied that the indigenous citizens could be confronted with higher levels of crime and societal disorder, and the migrant populations could become the victims of human trafficking or serve as drug mules. Furthermore, they could become the scapegoats for civil dissatisfaction because of the higher levels of crime.

As mentioned above, the securitisation of migration does not only contain security threats in the traditional, militaristic sense, but it also contains threats to economic security and social security. Huysmans adds that migration is seen to be one of the main factors weakening national tradition and societal homogeneity. This, as one may assume, is not only the work of a few right-wing political parties, but is also employed by ‘national governments, grass roots, European transnational police networks, the media, etc.’ (Huysmans, 2000: 758). Tal Dingott Alkopher and Emmanuelle Blanc reinforce this point. They state that the elites in European parliaments’ discourse has traditionally stressed ‘the adverse impact of immigration on jobs, public order, cultural norms, and national social harmony, often suggesting a threat to the host society’s interests, values, and lifestyle (Alkopher and Blanc, 2017: 524).

Another side of the migration-security nexus that has recently been the topic of discussion, is the (in)security of migrants themselves, besides that of the people supposedly threatened by the migrants. According to Lazaridis and Wadia, when migration is treated as a threat to security, the insecurity of migrant populations is increased (Lazaridis and Wadia, 2015: 2). When dichotomies such as ‘newcomers’ and ‘natives’ arise, the distinction created, and the practises that follow from it, increase the insecurity of migrants (Lazaridis and Wadia, 2015: 2). A key point is the paradox in Western governments regarding the control of migration for security purposes and the facilitation of mobility to improve the economy; governments are trying to keep mobility open enough to improve their economy but are controlling it through securitising measures. This leads to economic migrants, among other types of migrants, potentially being viewed as the cause of social instability or even as terrorists (Lazaridis and Wadia, 2015: 2).
LR.3 Crucial Moments in the Securitisation of Migration

As discussed, the securitisation of migration began after the Cold War. This point is reinforced in the works of Huysmans (Huysmans, 2000:755), Peoples and Vaughan-Williams (Peoples and Vaughan-Williams, 2010: 135) and Wohlfeld (Wohlfeld, 2014:61). Many of them, however, also mention that there was a significant surge in the further securitisation of migration after the events of 9/11. Huysmans mentions that moves towards the securitisation of migration have intensified and that the dynamics surrounding them have become further entrenched since 9/11 (Peoples and Vaughan-William, 2010: 137). Peoples and Vaughan-Williams add that security practices have taken on racist tendencies, as a result of the new fears surrounding migration. The focus of security threats in relation to migration has often been pointed towards Muslim communities since 9/11, but also since the London and Madrid bombings of the 2000s (Peoples and Vaughan-William, 2010: 137). Zahra McDonald presents an extra nuance to this. She explains that certain governments actively tried to ‘engender a sense of inclusion and partnership between state-led operations and Muslim communities’, to counter the perceived increasingly racist tendencies of security practises. By doing so, the opposite has happened, and, in effect, the entire Muslim population has become profiled in relation to political affiliation, ethnicity, religion, geographical location and socialites (Zahra McDonald, 2015: 119).

LR.3.1 Crucial Moment: 9/11

Georgios Karyotis is one of several authors to have focussed entire works on European migration policy after 9/11. He writes that immigrants have increasingly been seen as a potential threat to societal and state security since then, and that they are associated with terrorism and criminal activities (Karyotis, 2007: 1). This view is, for instance, also reflected in the book of Didier Bigo and Anastassia Tsoukala, on ‘Terror, insecurity and liberty: illiberal practices of liberal regimes after 9/11’ (Bigo and Tsoukala, 2008). Although the idea of protecting national security has been accepted widely by European governments after 9/11, Lazaridis and Wadia mention that it has especially been a constant aspect of far-right campaigning and policies (Lazaridis and Wadia, 2015: 4). The far-right parties are also more likely to call for a halt to immigration and for the restriction of citizenship and nationality rights to migrants, in the name of protecting ‘native’ Europeans’ national security (Lazaridis and Wadia, 2015: 4). For some, 9/11 is therefore (indirectly) used as a means of promoting migrants as a source of insecurity.
Christina Boswell, however, refutes the idea that there was a further securitisation of migration after 9/11 in Europe. She suggests that it would not do to assume that 9/11 was a catalysing moment which led to an increase in securitising processes (Squire, 2015: 19). She also writes that there is little evidence to support the linkage of irregular migrants to terrorism. (Boswell, 2007: 590).

Boswell only examined the linkage of migration to terrorism, and not the other possible security threats migration can bring. In this aspect, Vicki Squire took Boswell’s ideas and developed them further. She argues that there is not an absence of securitisation, as Boswell suggests, but rather that securitisation is an ‘absent presence’ in the current European context (Squire, 2015: 20). This entails two aspects. First, migration is so vastly associated with various problems that migration is broadly accepted as a threat, in the European context, and therefore securitisation is ‘conditioning the very assumptions under which migration policy and practise is developed’ (Squire, 2015: 23). Second, Squire suggests that assuming migration is a threat, becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. Often, the practises and policies that are trying to deal with ‘the threats of migration’ fail, and this leads to those policies and practises actually producing the problems associated with migration as a threat (Squire, 2015: 23-24).

Flynn and Olad view the issue of 9/11 being a catalysing moment in the securitisation of migration from a different perspective. They conducted research into the surveillance of Somali communities living in Britain in the post 9/11-world. In this research, they pose the question of whether life for young Somalis - who come from families that had been living in the UK for decades - would have been vastly different if 9/11 had not happened, or whether the already-existing integration and immigration policies of the United Kingdom had predetermined their fate in UK society (Lazaridis and Wadia, 2015: 9). By posing this question, they hope to demonstrate that securitisation is not just linked to the threat of terrorism and that the arguments for securitisation pre-existed 9/11 (Flynn and Olad, 2015: 142/146). Authors like these demonstrate that the linkage of the securitisation of migration to terrorism, is perhaps something that has been overdone in academic literature, which has led to a distortion of the general picture.

**LR.3.2 Crucial Moment: The Migrant Crisis**
The ‘Migrant Crisis’ – first named politically in 2014, but which has roots pre-dating the Arab Spring that began in 2010 (Horvat, 2015) - can also be seen as a key event in the securitisation of migration. Alkopher and Blanc write that there has been an interesting dynamic in the Schengen Zone, following the crisis: certain member states, such as Germany, have made
moves of de-securitisation to welcome refugees, and others, such as the Czech-Republic and Hungary, have made moves to close the borders to refugees to protect ‘the national interest and citizens’ (Alkopher and Blanc, 2017: 524/526). This rupture between EU-countries has potentially unleashed new security threats to Europe by driving a wedge into a Union that was initially created to prevent another World War. For instance, 2014 saw a sudden 50% increase in the number of far-right MEPs (Lazaridis and Wadia, 2015: 3). This could have unforeseen implications for the future. In the past few years since the Migrant Crisis, scholars such as Nazli Avdan (Avdan, 2014 and Avdan and Gelpi, 2017) have written about the migration-security nexus in relation to terrorist violence. However, there seems to be a general lack of literature, in the years following 9/11 and the Migrant Crisis, on the migration-security nexus in relation to the other kinds of security threats that have come into consideration, thanks to securitisation theory.

LR.4 Economic Recession, Populism and Migration

The 2008 global Financial Crisis can also be seen as one of the major impact events in Europe of the last ten years, as it has often been named one of the worst recessions in history (Eichengreen, 2014: 1; Huhne (Personal Interview), 2018; Miliband (Lab), 2010; and Young, 2014: 64). In the UK, for instance, the crisis in the economic sector had far-reaching consequences in, among others, the political sector. The way political parties proposed to resolve the crisis, partially with measures to deal with migration, was highly influential in the 2010 general election (Boxell (FT), 2009b). Furthermore, fingers were pointed towards migrants when scapegoats for the recession were being sought. This led to increased fears regarding ‘others’ and the protection of national identity. For migrants themselves, this has led to increased insecurity. Not only do they suffer disproportionately directly from the effects of the Financial Crisis, but the associated political and social instability also impacts them the hardest (Lazaridis and Wadia, 2015: 3). However, the crisis is missing from the literature on the securitisation of migration. This is especially notable, as a large part of migration is economically motivated, but there has been little written in relation to the economic security sector and migration.

Unsurprisingly, much of the literature written on the socio-political effect of the crisis stems from researchers in the Southern-European, Mediterranean countries that were most affected by the crisis (and also lie on the prime refugee routes). Gabriella Lazaridis writes that the framing of migration as a security issue began before the crisis but was further
exacerbated by it. She explains that there was a change in dynamic between state, citizen and migrant because of increasing migrant mobilizations, intolerance and the reactivation of nationalist reflexes, which led to further anti-immigrant views. According to Lazaridis, there ‘seemed’ to be a direct link between immigration and unemployment, and extreme-right electoral performance. Both these aspects led to increased anti-immigrant thinking among individuals (Lazaridis, 2015: 179). Eva Anduiza and Guillem Rico support this, explaining that large-scale economic crises ‘clearly provide the conditions for feelings of dissatisfaction and perceived unresponsiveness of the political elites’ (Anduiza and Rico, 2016:4). They link this to the rise of populism in saying that populist attitudes can be either created (in)directly through economic crisis, or that populist attitudes are fuelled by economic crisis (Anduiza and Rico, 2016:4). Lazaridis and Wadia further portray populists’ methods and explain that far-right parties frame migration as a security issue by using themes of national, cultural, economic and internal security (Lazaridis and Wadia, 2015:4). In the field of economic security – one of populists’ most important sectors for anti-migrant argumentation - migrants are portrayed as ‘job thieves’ in a difficult job market. This rhetoric is especially effective among Europe’s lesser- or unskilled workers, who are the first hit by the flexible job markets and experience high rates of unemployment (Lazaridis and Wadia, 2015: 4). Furthermore, ‘migrants do not deserve to use the welfare state that is on the decline’ (Lazaridis and Wadia, 2015: 4). In the field of cultural insecurity, populists are able to influence those who have not profited from the globalising world, and who have been living in sheltered parts of society with specific knowledge, views and traditions that are constantly been challenged by today’s globalised world (Lazaridis and Wadia, 2015: 4). Migrants also bring potential challenges to these people, as they may have different religions and cultures (Lazaridis and Wadia, 2015: 4). The far right can exploit these challenges and fears, utilising strong feelings of xenophobia in their immigration ideologies. This is something that is gaining popular appeal among voters (Lazaridis and Wadia, 2015: 9). A common theme in all these authors’ work is that anti-immigrant rhetoric is used by populist parties to gain popular support; they are securitising migration.

Some scholars in North-Western Europe have conducted research on the effect of economic crisis on migration, such as Gijs Beets and Frans Willekens (Beets and Willekens, 2009), commissioned by the European Commission. In their research, they deduce that migration theory, historical reports, scholarly literature and official organisations all point to migration to developed economies being on the decline following an economic crisis (Beets and Willekens, 2009: 4, 7, 9). It is also the case that a few people who had previously
migrated to a developed economy are likely to return to their country of origin following a crisis. However, the cost of the initial migration is often so high for them, that most migrants remain (Beets and Willekens, 2009: 9). In the UK, immigration from Poland was at its lowest point since the EU accession in the summer of 2008 and was down 36 per cent since the previous year (Beets and Willekens, 2009: 9). Patrick Taran, president of the Global Migration Policy Associates also gave a speech on the effect of economic crisis on migration in 2009 (Taran, 2009). Taran says that migrants easily become scapegoats for xenophobic sentiments and discrimination, in times of economic turmoil (Taran, 2009: 2). Furthermore, migrants are often ‘the last to be hired and the first to be fired’ and statistically make up a disproportionate part of the people rendered unemployed following a financial crisis (Taran, 2009: 2). Even with these facts, showing how new migrants are unlikely to come following a crisis and that prior migrants are the worst affected by a crisis, many countries are adding migrant quotas, protecting their social security benefits and actively calling for hostile political migrant-excluding discourse (Taran, 2009: 2). This makes an interesting paradoxical situation, and one that is counter-productive for economic recovery following a recession.

The literature in general, in North-Western Europe, seems to forget the further securitisation of migration as a security threat following the Financial Crisis, even though there are direct ties between economic recession and the rise of anti-immigrant views and populism, despite the decline in migration. Furthermore, as mentioned, a large part of migration is economically-motivated, which also raises the question how so little research has been conducted into the securitisation of migration in the economic sector of security.

Lazaridis and Wadia have edited a book on the topic and state that the rise of far-right MEPs is thanks to their common utilisation of themes of (in)security and immigration, especially since the 2008 economic crisis and following budget-slashing austerity programmes in Europe (Lazaridis and Wadia, 2015: 3). However, this is a statement and view only discovered in the book by Gabrielle Lazaridis and Wadia. Furthermore, this book focuses on far-right populists as securitising actors, even though they mostly do not make up the majority of a government and cannot be seen as the sole securitising actor. The book also generally tends to focus on security threats created for migrants following the securitisation of migration, rather than which security threats are implied for the original population. In general, non-traditional security threats, such as threats to cultural identity and economic security, are perceived and portrayed in the media and (especially) populist party policies. These threats seem to be generally forgotten in the academic literature, when there are issues like terrorism and transnational crime to be discussed.
Methodology (M)

M.1 Introduction

As the literature review suggests, there is a lack of research into the topic of the further securitisation of migration, following the 2008 Financial Crisis. Although certain academics have touched upon the security implications for citizens of migrant origin, first-generation migrants and refugees following the crisis, little work has been done on the other, more general side of the securitising actor. This is especially the case for securitising actors who are not members of far-right populist parties.

This dissertation will answer the question: **How did the 2008 Financial Crisis change the securitisation of migration, in the United Kingdom?** To assist in answering the main research question, two additional research topics have been formulated:

1. What was the discourse on migrants in relation to security prior to 2008, starting from the EU accession period in 2004?
2. Are more economic arguments being used in relation to migrants, or is the focus (still) on terrorism and transnational crime?

M.2 Hypotheses

Based on the literature and the gaps found in it, various hypotheses have been formulated that the researcher predicts will be part of the outcomes of the research questions:

1. *The 2008 Financial Crisis did result in the changing of the construction of migration as a security threat in the United Kingdom.* This is because migrants are often pointed to as scapegoats in times of political or economic turmoil, even though migration is usually on the decline following a recession, according to migration theory.
2. *The securitising discourse around migration might cause a shift towards the economic sector as a challenge to the state’* Where the challenges previously may have lain in the traditional or societal security sectors, it is deemed that the 2008 Financial Crisis may have led to a new focus on migration challenges in the economic sector.
3. *There may be conflicting findings in the discourse on migration.* Due to the political nature of securitisation, it is possible that different actors may have opposing or conflicting views. Political parties and the media may also use the discourse on migration to further their own (political) agenda.
M.3 Research Design
The questions shall be answered using both a qualitative and quantitative research approach and all research will be conducted with securitisation theory as the main perspective. The socio-political consequences of the 2008 Financial Crisis, as a major impact event, will be central in viewing the further construction of migration as a security threat. Furthermore, it will be important to keep the relevant different sectors of security that can be threatened in mind: economic security, societal security and traditional security. The concepts of austerity and social/cultural challenges surrounding migration are expected to be a key factor.

M.3.1 Case Selection
The United Kingdom has been chosen as a case study due to the literature available in the researcher’s language, the size of the case, and due to the clear reduction of (economic) migration following the crisis, but the continuation of anti-immigrant, securitising language in the media. The country also experienced the largest single flow of immigrants it had ever seen, following the 2004 EU accession (Marangozov, 2008). Furthermore, the findings on the United Kingdom could be relevant to other (European) countries that experienced a similar flow of migrants and impact of the Financial Crisis in their recent history, such as Germany, France, Greece and Italy.

M.3.2 Data
M.3.2.1 Political Sources
Political speeches and party manifestos made in the four years since the 2004 EU accession, through the 2008 Financial Crisis - and up to the end of 2012, in the four years following - regarding migration as a security threat and the Financial Crisis, will be collected online from the three main political parties in the UK. These are the Conservative Party, Labour Party and Liberal Democrats.

The speeches will be found using the British Political Speech archive (British Political Speech, 2018) and the announcements page of the UK government (UK government, 2018). The keyword ‘Migration’, ‘Immigration’ and ‘Migrant’ shall be searched individually. All relevant results from 2004-2012 of the Labour, Conservative and Liberal Democrat Parties shall be saved for later analysis.

M.3.2.2 Media Sources
Four key media sources of the UK, namely The Daily Mail, The Daily Telegraph, The Financial Times, and The Guardian will be searched in relation to the changing of the framing of migration as a security threat in the post-2008 Financial Crisis-world. The creation of a personal newspaper archive will be a key step towards answering the research question.
For the Daily Telegraph and The Daily Mail, the archives will be accessed via the online Nexis, using the search term ‘Migrant OR Migration OR Immigration’. For each source the 1000 most-relevant articles from the beginning of 2004 up to the end of 2012 shall be saved for analysis. This vast resource base shall be narrowed down to remove certain irrelevant articles and duplicates. The Financial Times’ archive shall be accessed with the search term ‘Migrant OR Migration OR Immigration’ and all articles relevant to the UK shall be saved from the beginning of 2004 to the end of 2012. The Guardian’s archive shall be accessed differently, as they have an existing catalogue of all their articles on ‘Migrant OR Migration OR Immigration’ under the heading ‘migration’ in their news topics overview. Each article from the beginning of 2004 up to the end of 2012 shall be saved. The following table displays the number of viable sources from each newspaper used for this research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Number Of Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Daily Mail</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Daily Telegraph</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Financial Times</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Guardian</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total)</td>
<td>1,715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 - Articles Contributed per Newspaper

Even though looking at printed media alone will not give the full spectrum of published news, it will be sufficient as the widest-read sources have been chosen alongside sources from various affiliations on the political spectrum. The following table shows the average daily circulation of each newspaper per year in the research period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2,485,210</td>
<td>914,981</td>
<td>383,157</td>
<td>422,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,409,121</td>
<td>920,745</td>
<td>376,816</td>
<td>422,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2,389,011</td>
<td>917,943</td>
<td>394,913</td>
<td>441,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2,354,028</td>
<td>911,454</td>
<td>384,070</td>
<td>439,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2,313,908</td>
<td>890,086</td>
<td>378,394</td>
<td>452,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2,200,398</td>
<td>783,210</td>
<td>358,844</td>
<td>426,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2,120,347</td>
<td>691,128</td>
<td>302,285</td>
<td>390,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2,136,568</td>
<td>651,184</td>
<td>279,308</td>
<td>383,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,945,496</td>
<td>578,774</td>
<td>215,988</td>
<td>316,493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 - Average Newspaper Circulation as of January of each year (Source: Audit Bureau of Circulations)

The next figure shows the demographic division of readers from the largest British newspapers. This data was collected in the same year as the Financial Crisis, 2008, and can assist in viewing which published discourse may be received by the most influential audience. Reading Figure 1, the Financial Times has the youngest and most ‘upmarket’ readership, followed closely by the Guardian. The Daily Telegraph is still largely upmarket but read by the oldest audience. Finally, The Daily Mail is clearly read more by older middle-class
people. Table 2 above shows that these two latter newspapers had the largest circulation by far, and Table 1 shows that they also published the largest volume on immigration. Therefore, the impact of the Mail’s and Telegraph’s discourse was probably much larger than the Financial Times’ and the Guardian’s. Furthermore, it should be noted that The Daily Mail and The Daily Telegraph (and their readers) strongly back the Conservative Party (Daily Mail Comment, 2010 and TES (DT), 2010a). This claim stems from the 2010 general election, but both media sources have a long Conservative history. For the Guardian and Financial Times this is more divided. The Guardian traditionally endorses the party which is most likely to beat the Conservative party in a general election. It backed the Liberal Democrats through 2010 but shifted to Labour in 2015, following the Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition (Sweney (Gu), 2015). The Financial Times endorsed the Conservatives in the 2010 general election but gave praise to both the Labour and Liberal Democrat parties (Reuters Staff, 2010).

Figure 1 - Readership of Newspapers by Age and Social Class (Source: NMA September 2008) (Hilton et al., 2010)

M.3.3 Methods

M.3.3.1 Qualitative Diagnostic Frame Analysis

A qualitative discourse analysis will be made comparing the views on migration as a security threat, from before and after the 2008 Financial Crisis. This will be done using framing theory. The narratives on migration from the different sources shall be constructed, describing the three different types of linguistic frames: diagnostic (what is the threat and who is threatened by it), prognostic (what should be done about it) and motivational (how urgent should something be done) (Snow and Benford, 1988: 199 and Benford and Snow, 2000:...
615). This theory was coined by David Snow and Robert Benford, and has previously been used by, among others, Myrium Dunn Cavelty and Scott Watson in their respective studies on framing in the US Cyber-Terror debate and on ‘Framing’ the Copenhagen School (Dunn Cavelty, 2008 and Watson, 2012). The latter partially inspired this research as it focussed on integrating different strands of securitisation theory.

The focus in this research shall be on the diagnostic frame in the sources and whether and how they changed following the 2008 Financial Crisis. The diagnostic frame is particularly relevant to securitisation theory and this research, as it describes potential threats and the threatened. In other words, uncovering the diagnostic frame will assist to construct the narrative on who or what migrants may (or may not) threaten. Both the 1st and 3rd chapters will include visual tables with key diagnostic frame findings at the end of each section. This will enable the researcher to easily compare the diagnostic frames from before and after the Financial Crisis and to see what role it played in the construction of migration as a security threat. Furthermore, the discourses of the political parties will be compared to each other and to what was conveyed by the media. It will be interesting to see whether the media follows policy or vice-versa. Considering The Daily Mail and the Daily Telegraph have a clear Conservative political affiliation, The Guardian a clear anti-Conservative affiliation, and The Financial Times being linked to all three parties discussed in this research, it may not be easy to discern whether the media follow policy or vice-versa.

**M.3.3.2 Quantitative Textual Analysis**

The media archive will also be analysed using quantitative textual analysis. This will help to visualise the volume and division of articles. A list of all articles will be constructed in Microsoft Excel and codes will be applied to each one. Each article will be assessed on which security sector it fits into. Furthermore, the language which is used to refer to potential threats shall be examined. Graphs shall be constructed on the division of articles before and after 2008. This will assist further in examining any potential discourse change following the 2008 Financial Crisis.

**M.3.3.3 Expert Interview**

Finally, an interview will be conducted with a former prominent member of the least-covered political party in the media and therefore this research: Liberal Democrat. This is to add further nuance to the research and cover voices less-heard, as they also played a role in shaping the discourse. Furthermore, it proved exceedingly difficult to acquire expert interviews with the political elite. The researcher contacted ten (former) MPs each from the three largest parties in the UK, but only managed to interview one of the 30 candidates. This
interview will serve in a supporting role, rather than being the primary focus of the research, as it will be conducted 10 years after the 2008 Financial Crisis. It is possible that the inability to acquire interviews indicates that the media may be more influential in shaping the discourse on migrants, than the political parties. However, it could also be because the political actors have different issues to focus on in the present.

M.4 Research Rationale
This research will form a niche angle into an already-existing large body of research on the securitisation of migration. The construction of migration as a security threat in Europe is a topic that has been frequently discussed, but not in relation to the 2008 Financial Crisis. The events of 9/11, the London and Madrid bombings of the 2000s and the ‘Migrant Crisis’ that started in 2014, are often seen as some of the only drivers regarding the construction of migration as a security threat, in the last 20 years. These events mostly link the threats of terrorism and transnational crime to migration. This research strives to deduce whether the 2008 Financial Crisis also played a major part and what other security threats have been linked to migration because of it.

This specific research design has been chosen because it will enable the researcher to get an extensive picture of the process of securitisation of migration in the United Kingdom. With this design, the researcher can examine different sources as securitising actors, or enablers of the securitising process. Furthermore, the combination of using political party publications, news sources and an individual interview will contribute to discovering the entire framing of migration. Finally, using securitisation theory enables the researcher to view all potential security threats that migrants may be perceived to bring.

M.5 Ethics
The researcher acknowledges that she will engage with the proper Ethics Application Procedure of Glasgow University when conducting interviews. She will go to lengths, with the supervisors, to ensure the correct application of ethics throughout the entire period of research.

M.6 Limitations
The researcher acknowledges the fact that looking at the chosen data sources alone does not provide the entire picture of migration that is presented to the population. It has been chosen
to only examine the discourses of the three major political parties in the UK, even though there may have been other influential opinions, because of the need to limit the data pool. Two liberal-leaning and two conservative-leaning newspapers have been chosen, as this still provides a diverse range of opinions, despite needing to limit the data pool. For instance, television, social media and radio sources have been ignored, because the research needed to be limited, because the printed news sources serve as a good general platform for displaying the discourse and because of accessibility issues. Social media was also not as important for reading or discussing news in 2008, as it is now.
Chapter 1: The Political Discourse

1.1 Introduction

This chapter serves as an exposition and discourse analysis of the political secondary data, consisting of 9 party manifestos and 44 political speeches, that were collected to answer the research question on how the 2008 Financial Crisis changed the securitisation of migration, in the United Kingdom. Both sections will provide a chronological walkthrough of the discourse around migration and security. To assist this, use of diagnostic frames has been made. The comparison of the two time periods will be found in the conclusion, to show how the Financial Crisis affected the securitisation of migration. In certain cases, the prognostic frames (or: proposed solutions to the security threats related to migration) have also been analysed. This is because it adds extra clarity to the diagnostic frame. Furthermore, sometimes the diagnostic frame is not mentioned explicitly and therefore the ‘threats’ and ‘threatened’ must be interpreted from the prognostic frame.

The political data originates from between the 1st of January 2004 and the 31st of December 2012. More significantly, everything was published in the four years between the 2004 A10 EU accession, and the 2008 Financial Crisis and in the four years following. These two events are both somewhat determining for the securitisation of migration, as will become clear throughout this dissertation.

The political parties examined are the three largest in the UK, namely: Conservative (Con), Labour (Lab) and the Liberal Democrats (LiD). Each speech found stems from an individual member of these parties and was given in the name of their party. As mentioned, the Labour party was the party in government at the beginning of the research period, until the 2010 general election on the 6th May, where after the Conservatives and the Liberal Democrats formed a coalition. Migration was one of the largest items on the political agenda in the years leading up to this election, and in the years following. The fact that there was a change in government leadership perhaps suggests that it was also an important matter for the public. As explained in the literature review, securitisation cannot take place without a securitising actor and an audience. This interplay will be examined throughout the dissertation.

With visual representations of the key findings in tables 3 to 6.
1.2 Party Manifestos

According to the Oxford Dictionary, a manifesto is ‘a public declaration of policy and aims, especially one issued before an election by a political party or candidate (Oxford Living Dictionaries, 2018).’ Manifestos are typically written to ‘interrupt the status quo’ but reflect outcomes that can realistically be met and that are truly desired (Ludema and Johnson, 2018). Therefore, manifestos can contain controversial language designed to gain the most support for the political party’s policies and aims. One can also assume that, as manifestos are published in the run up to an election, they may contain (hyperbolic) statements that parties think the public wants to read, to gain the most votes. Therefore, the statements should be viewed critically, as is the case with most political discourse.

The publication of the researched party manifestos correlated with the years of general elections. Manifestos valid to this research period were published in 2001, 2005 and 2010. It will be especially interesting to view any changes made between 2005 and 2010, as the Financial Crisis lies in between, and potentially had an impact on the securitisation of migration.

1.2.1 2004-2007

In 2001, for both Labour and Conservative, migration did not feature in their manifestos. The Liberal Democrats (Lib. Dems.) do mention migration. Their focus is on the illegitimate labelling of immigrants as a problem for British society (Liberal Democrats, 2001: 33). Therefore, migrants are not named as a threat to British society, but almost vice-versa. The Lib. Dems. highlight both humanitarian and practical reasons for treating immigrants more fairly and decently, as they fill skills gaps in British jobs and contribute positively to British society (Liberal Democrats, 2001: 33). They do, however, promise to support local services properly in dealing with asylum seekers and discourage illegal immigrants (Liberal Democrats, 2001: 33/34). These points on skills gaps, supporting local services and preventing illegal immigration were recognised early on, and are key themes that will remain relevant throughout the research.

Each party manifesto from 2005 is significantly more detailed, regarding migration, than the 2001 version. One could rank them in order of most-severe to least-severe views around migration with Conservative first, then Labour and finally the Lib. Dems. The Conservatives highlight that the (at that time) current immigration system is ‘out-of-control’ (Conservative, 2005: 1). Furthermore, they mention that migrants can spread deadly diseases and put pressure on the National Health Service (NHS). They call for improved management
and control of immigration, so that immigration can continue benefitting ‘old and new Britons’ (Conservative, 2005: 19). They mention the increased (traditional security sector) threats of terrorism and human trafficking as consequences of an immigration system that is out of control (Conservative, 2005: 1/16). The Labour manifesto focusses more equally on the effects of an outdated asylum and immigration system on the parts of both the immigrant and British society. Besides mentioning traditional security threats to Britain like terrorism, there is a focus on the potential ‘attack on our way of life’ (societal sector of security) and on ‘illegal working and fraudulent use of public services’ (economic sector) (Labour, 2005: 52/53). Furthermore, the Labour party highlights explicitly that the Conservatives pose a threat to the matter of immigration as they wish to impose large cuts to border controls and implement ‘fantasy island’ asylum policies (Labour, 2005: 54). In contrast, the Conservatives only mention that ‘this government has lost effective control of our borders’ (Conservative, 2005: 19). With this kind of language, they are merely implying that Labour is at fault and part of the diagnostic frame. Like the Lib. Dems., Labour focusses strongly on the rights and wellbeing of immigrants and asylum seekers. The Lib. Dems., however are the most eloquent in this matter and again highlight the importance of ‘fair and effective policies over the distinct issues of asylum and immigration’ (Liberal Democrats, 2005: Foreword). They highlight being proud of a multi-racial and multi-ethnic Britain but do name asylum and immigration as ‘issues’. After the 2004 EU accession and inflow of economic migrants from Eastern Europe, all three parties broach the topic of economic migration and Labour and Conservative both suggest introducing an ‘(Australian-style) points-based system’ to limit the number of economic migrants and ‘give priority to the skills Britain needs’ (Labour, 2005: 52 and Conservative, 2005: 19). They both fail to mention that this is referring to non-EU migrants as EU migrants cannot be limited under the (unrestricted) free movement of workers of the EU. The Lib. Dems., in liberal tradition, take a more liberal approach to the matter and ‘support a liberal economic approach to trade, investment and migration in the national interest (Liberal Democrats, 2005: 10-11). However, in other words, they also support a points-based system, as they wish to ‘consult with business and the public services to agree numbers of work permits for economic migration to make sure that Britain continues to prosper’ (Liberal Democrats, 2005: 10-11). The Lib. Dems. are unique in avoiding pointing the finger at the other parties in relation to migration. The diagnostic frames, as described above, can be summarised in the following table:

---

5 These kinds of remarks are not uncommon in manifestos, as one of the key aims of such a document is to convince voters that your party is better than another.
The 2010 party manifestos are founded in their 2005 counterparts. However, all three parties are more explicit in the aspects of British society which must be protected. Labour places a strong focus on protecting the British economy and the values of British citizenship and encourages proper integration (Labour, 2010: 5:6). They highlight the pressure that all kinds of immigration can place on housing and public services, families, local institutions and society in general and want to implement ‘firm and fair rules’ to deal with immigration (Labour, 2010: 0:5/5:6). Furthermore, they recognise the ‘growing threat’ of crime, illegal immigration and terrorism (Labour, 2010: 5:5). This sentence is potentially ambiguous. One could interpret these issues as all being linked to migration in some form, or only illegal immigration. The Conservatives carry a similar message to Labour in relation to integration and the protection of core British values (Conservative, 2010: 21). However, they are more explicit in their management of economic migration. They stress that migration can enhance British economic growth but want to reduce net migration to the level of the 1990s and do not want to ‘attract people to do jobs that can be carried out by British citizens given the right training and support’ (Conservative, 2010: 21). Like Labour, they wish to further the Australian-style points-based admittance system, but also wish to extend a similar bond-system for international students (Conservative, 2010: 21). From a ‘national security’ perspective, the Conservatives say that the border is too easily penetrated by extremists,

---

6 The net migration rate is the difference between the number of immigrants (people coming into an area) and the number of emigrants (people leaving an area) throughout the year (Liu, 1975)
serous criminals and others. For instance, those who traffic people, weapons or drugs (Conservative, 2010: 57). Interestingly, like Labour, they call for improvements to be made to counter this, in the same sentence as ‘improving immigration controls’ (Conservative, 2010: 57). This could imply the linkage of migration to these issues, but it is not linked explicitly. The Lib. Dems. continue with the same themes as their previous manifestos and stress the importance of a ‘firm and fair immigration system that promotes integration’ (Liberal Democrats, 2010: 75). In contrast to Labour and Conservative they highlight the need to ensure that ‘taxpayers’ money’ is spent better in equipping the country for future threats, such as mass migration (Liberal Democrats, 2010: 64). Furthermore, they are more explicit in their treatment of refugees and asylum seekers and the threats they face, not only the ones they can potentially bring (Liberal Democrats, 2010: 76). This is also reflected in the other parties’ manifestos, but is only mentioned briefly.

A summary of the second time-period’s diagnostic frames can be found in table 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008-2012 Manifestos</th>
<th>What Must be Protected?</th>
<th>From What/Whom?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>• British economy</td>
<td>• Pressure of immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Values of British citizenship</td>
<td>• Growing threat of crime, illegal immigration and terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• (British) housing, public services, families, local institutions and society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>• Core British values</td>
<td>• Migrants in jobs that British citizens could do given the right training and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• British economic growth</td>
<td>• (foreign) extremists, and serious criminals (in i.e. people/drugs/weapons trafficking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The border</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Democrats</td>
<td>• Firm and fair immigration system that promotes integration</td>
<td>• Future threats like mass migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Refugees and asylum seekers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Political Speeches

15 of the speeches found were made before 2008 and 29 were made in and after 2008. This significant difference is partially due to the increased accessibility to the government’s online database since the Conservative and Liberal Democrat coalition of 2010.
1.3.1 2004-2007

In the speeches made before 2008, the discourse starts early, in 2004, with ‘Immigration is chaotic and out of control’ (Howard (Con), 2004). All parties share this diagnostic frame, but some are more explicit or vocal in their wording than others. Within this diagnostic frame, (British) ‘people’ ‘feel that their tolerance and fairness is being abused’ and ‘they have increasing concerns about the impact of immigration on public services’ (Howard (Con), 2004). The proposed solutions, or prognostic frames of 2004 and 2005 consist of calls for a ‘government that gets a grip on this shambles’ (Howard (Con), 2004), a ‘reform of the systems to make them fairer and faster’ and to ‘respect people’s genuine religious and cultural identities at community level’ (Kennedy (LiD), 2004). These quotations come from opposition party speeches in the run up to the 2005 election. Labour, in government, focusses more, on the one hand, on the human rights of refugees and on the other, on the abuse of the immigration system by some asylum seekers (Lord Falconer (Lab), 2004). In Labour’s victory speech in 2005, however, Tony Blair expresses the tolerance of the British population but recognises that there ‘are real problems in our immigration and asylum system’ and that there must be a ‘radical programme of legislation to focus on these priorities’ (Blair (Lab), 2005).

This ‘radical programme’ was perhaps already visible in 2006, when all parties became more concrete in their diagnostic and prognostic frames. The main issues, or diagnostics, mentioned were: raised immigration, ‘the doctrine of race-based exclusivity of the British National Party’, Romanians and Bulgarians that don’t take British Citizenship seriously, a divided society, the ‘British way of life’ that is threatened by globalisation, identity fraud linked to ‘modern migration’ and terrorist threats that foreign nationals may pose (Blair (Lab), 2006; Brown (Lab), 2006a; Brown (Lab), 2006b; Lord Goldsmith (Lab), 2006 and Cameron (Con), 2006). It is clear that the discourse shifted from a general stance on immigration and asylum policy, to one that focusses more on the threats to societal security and traditional security. It may be important to mention, however, that these speeches were made following the London Bombing’s on 7th July 2005. This could have had a special impact on the discourse.

2007 saw a renewed focus on the protection of ‘national identity, what it is to be British and what we value about the British way of life’ (Brown (Lab), 2007a). It is important to say, that all parties stress the importance of doing this in a non-racist way and focus on the better integration of ethnic communities and migrants. The prognostic frame is, for instance, that migrants should learn English and be taught about ‘our’ culture and history (Brown
Alongside the societal aspect, there was also more focus on tackling migrant crime in 2007, such as (identity) fraud, trade of illicit goods, terrorism and illegal immigration (Brown (Lab), 2007b and Cameron (Con), 2007a). David Cameron, the Conservative opposition leader, was the first and only one since 2004/2005 to mention a more economic diagnostic framing of migration as a (security) issue. In 2007, he highlighted that migration had been a huge benefit but that it can put a lot of pressure on public services, hospitals, housing and schools, if left unregulated (Cameron (Con), 2007b).

A summary of the speeches’ diagnostic frames from this first period can be found in table 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2004-2007 Speeches</th>
<th>What Must be Protected?</th>
<th>From What/Whom?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human rights of refugees</td>
<td>Abuse of the immigration system by some asylum seekers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The tolerance of the British population</td>
<td>Problems in our immigration and asylum system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Britishness/What it is to be British/National identity</td>
<td>Raised immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(What we value about) the British way of life</td>
<td>The doctrine of race-based exclusivity of the British National Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The better integration of ethnic communities and migrants</td>
<td>Romanians and Bulgarians that don’t take British Citizenship seriously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A divided society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Terrorist threats that foreign nationals may pose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Migrant crime: (identity) fraud, trade of illicit goods, terrorism and illegal immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>The tolerance and fairness of British people</td>
<td>Chaotic and out of control immigration/unregulated migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public services, hospitals housing and schools</td>
<td>Terrorist threats that foreign nationals may pose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Democrats</td>
<td>Respect of people’s genuine religious and cultural identities</td>
<td>Migrant crime: (identity) fraud, trade of illicit goods, terrorism and illegal immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The better integration of ethnic communities and migrants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 - Key Findings in Speeches’ Diagnostic Frame 2004-2007

1.3.2 2008-2014

The discourse continued vastly the same as the previous years in 2008 and 2009. Diagnostically, ‘our communities’ were the referent object that needed protection (Smith
Although, out of context, this is a societal aspect of security that needs to be protected, the prognostic arguments are both societal and economic. Jacqui Smith, the Home Secretary, argues that the communities need to be protected by only welcoming those who are prepared to ‘play by our rules, pay their way and learn our language’ (Smith (Lab), 2008). The Australian-style Points Based System is introduced as a measure to ensure that only people who can contribute something to the UK, may come and stay. Gordon Brown, the leader of Labour, continues this discourse and stresses that ‘nobody should get to take more out of the system than they are willing to put in’ (Brown (Lab), 2008). He recognises again, that migrants can contribute positively to British society and the economy, but that only those who are willing to contribute should be let in (Brown (Lab), 2008). The citizenship test, English language and charging migrants for public services, are all prognostic measures that should be introduced to discourage ‘unfair’ immigrant behaviour (Brown (Lab), 2008). In 2009, he also adds that the points-based system will help in protecting the borders against terrorism and illegal immigration (Brown (Lab), 2009). With this, he uses an economic prognostic frame for a traditional/militaristic diagnostic frame. This is potentially a first clear instance of the mixing of threats and measures across the different sectors of security. In 2009, David Cameron’s Conservative leader’s speech continues the societal discourse. However, he adds that ‘Britishness’ and the national identity should be protected from the pressures of mass immigration through limits on immigration and proper leadership (Cameron (Con), 2009). This addition regarding leadership is unsurprising coming from the political opposition in the run-up to an election.

The economy gained a key position in the 2010 speeches. Ed Miliband, as leader of the Labour opposition, mentions that we saw ‘the worst financial crisis in a generation’ and that he had met a man whose ‘mate’s wages had been driven down by the consequences of migration’ (Miliband (Lab), 2010). Although these two diagnostic frame elements are not directly connected, they are referred to in the same section of the speech. They are also mentioned within the broader framework of the consequences of globalisation. David Cameron, as Prime Minister, stressed that the economy is the diagnostic frame which must be protected from the constant entering of more and more people into the country while millions live a life on welfare (Cameron (Con), 2010d). The economic aspects of migration are highlighted further in the foreign secretary’s speech on illegal immigration, in which he discusses the issue of people coming to Britain and not leaving when they should, and of students coming who turn out not to be students (Hague (Con), 2010). Here, again the sectors of security are becoming merged in relation to migration as a security threat. It remained a
vital aspect on the political agenda all throughout 2010 and a new prognostic frame is suggested to deal with the issue: a cap on immigration. The Conservative government stressed that it wished to put a limit on the number of immigrants, as immigration was too high (Cameron (Con), 2010a). David Cameron recognised that restricting migration in this way could be counterproductive for economic growth, as it limited businesses in finding the best people for their jobs (Cameron (Con), 2010c). However, in his final speech of 2010, he makes an important statement that economic growth - although it is a means to an end – is not the only aim for a society. The quality of life needs to be protected through protecting public services and encouraging social cohesion (Cameron (Con), 2010b). Here, it is implied that public wellbeing can only be improved if immigration is limited. Even though the country is experiencing an economic downturn following the Financial Crisis, the focus is still on dealing with the migration situation.

The discourse in 2011 continued mostly on these points from 2010. The economy, social cohesion, welfare, living standards and public services were all key elements of the speeches and played a large role in the diagnostic frames (Cameron (Con), 2011b; Cameron (Con), 2011c; Cameron (Con), 2011d; Miliband (Lab), 2011 and Neville-Jones (Con), 2011). The Financial Crisis was also mentioned as a catalyst of the country’s problems, in combination with bad immigration policy (Miliband (Lab), 2011). However, there were some new introductions to the discourse too. The concepts of liberty, and a liberal country, were introduced, as referent objects that needed to be protected against extremists, anti-liberals and terrorists (Cameron (Con), 2011a; Cameron (Con), 2011c and Clegg (LiD), 2011). These are aspects that are partially linked to immigration. Terrorists are seen to be a sub-group of immigrants and a threat to our liberty, values and common identity (Neville-Jones (Con), 2011). Furthermore, the more general issues of societal segregation, partially due to immigration, is seen to be a threat to ‘our liberal country’ as it can lead to radicalisation and/or increased racial tensions (Cameron (Con), 2011c). Far-right extremism is connected to this issue and is a new threat to social cohesion in relation to immigration from the other side. It is implied that these extremists are using the fuel of the public’s heightened fear of migrants in relation to their economic and societal security, and that they are spreading hate for their own political agenda (Cameron (Con), 2011d). The government’s prognostics for dealing with all these threats is to control immigration, improve British people’s employability, ‘promote integration of and participation in our society of minority groups and new migrants’, find a ‘perfect symmetry in our response to crime and violent extremism’ and ‘confront hateful views and practices regardless of who expresses them (Cameron (Con), 2011b; Clegg (LiD),
2011 and Neville-Jones (Con), 2011). A final important element of the discourse is the renewed focus on reforms to student immigration and tackling abuse of the system (Alexander (LiD), 2011).

Only a few speeches were made in relation to migration in 2012. There were more calls for improvement of the immigration system and finding an immigration system that works for all, and ending illegal immigration (Miliband (Lab), 2012). Besides this, there was a specific focus on improving the British workforce’s employability and work ethos (Browne (LiD), 2012 and Duncan Smith (Con), 2012). Jeremy Browne of the Foreign Office said that we ‘should not be surprised that some people in our labour market are struggling to compete with immigrants from Europe’ and that the answer is ‘not to pull up the drawbridge and pretend that we can isolate ourselves from the outside world. The answer is to raise our game’ (Browne (LiD), 2012). Iain Duncan Smith adds that we need ‘internal and external cultural change’ rather than political and technocratic welfare reform (Duncan Smith (Con), 2012). Therefore, while it is recognised that migrants play a part in the problems around the economy, they are not the sole perpetrator. Vince Cable, the business secretary, even adds that ‘the UK’s own migration controls are a barrier to trade’, and its economic growth (Cable (LiD), 2012).

A summary of the second time-period’s diagnostic frames can be found in table 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008-2012 Speeches</th>
<th>What Must be Protected?</th>
<th>From What/Whom?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labour</strong></td>
<td>• Our communities</td>
<td>• Those who aren’t prepared to play by our rules, pay their way and learn our language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fair use of ‘the system’</td>
<td>• ‘unfair’ immigrant behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• British society and economy</td>
<td>• Terrorism and illegal immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Our wages</td>
<td>• The worst financial crisis in a generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Living standards</td>
<td>• Bad immigration policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conservative</strong></td>
<td>• Britishness/the national identity/common identity/values</td>
<td>• Pressures of mass immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The economy</td>
<td>• Improper leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Economic growth</td>
<td>• The constant entering of more people into the country while millions live on welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Finding the best people for jobs</td>
<td>• Immigration too high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The quality of life</td>
<td>• People coming to Britain and not leaving when they should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public services</td>
<td>• Immigrant students who turned out not to be students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Social cohesion</td>
<td>• (Far-right/Islamic)extremism, terrorism and more instability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Welfare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Our liberal country/liberalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Having looked at the political manifestos and speeches separately, the key points, in relation to the political discourse, are summarised in this short section. The political discourse in relation to migration as a security issue follows an interesting path from the beginning of 2004 to the end of 2012. Certain elements are mentioned throughout, like ‘fairness’, protecting the human rights of ‘real’ immigrants, regaining control of the immigration system and preventing illegal immigration.

However, following the 2004 EU accession, the more-focussed discourse does not begin until 2005 and 2006. In the speeches, there is especially a focus on protecting the societal sector of security and protecting national identity, values and communities. In the manifestos, unsurprisingly due to their broad nature, the range of security sectors is larger, and there is more attention to the traditional/militaristic sector of security and the economic sector, with the first suggestions of the Australian-style Points-Based System. The traditional sector of security becomes more highlighted towards the end of the period 2004-2007, with focus on preventing terrorism and other migrant crime. There is a general lack of focus on the economic sector of security in the speeches, besides the mention of the pressure unchecked migration can place on public services, hospitals and schools.

In the year 2008-2012, both in the manifestos and speeches, few new arguments or aspects are introduced. All sources seem to become more specific in their diagnostic frames regarding the type of threats or issues that migrants can pose and what they threaten. These generally remain in the sectors of societal and traditional security, but there are also more references to economic security. Interestingly, ‘economic growth’ is introduced as a key element of the diagnostic frame. Furthermore, the sectors of security are becoming more mixed. For instance, ‘our society’ is a societal element that needs to be protected, but this is to be done partially through economic measures.
A concluding remark is that, towards the end of the research period, the political discourse seems to become more nuanced regarding migrants. Where initially migrants were seen to be the ‘threat’ (especially in the economic sector), it began to be recognised that migrants are more a symptom of a problem, and that government focus should be on encouraging the employability of the British population. Furthermore, the political actors do not often refer directly to migrants in relation to the Financial Crisis. The Financial Crisis tends to get rolled up into a general discussion on the economy and the migration issue.
Chapter 2: The Quantitative Textual Media Analysis

2.1 Introduction

This chapter will assist in answering the research question on how the 2008 Financial Crisis changed the securitisation of migration, in the United Kingdom, through a quantitative (textual) analysis of the media sources. This is to create visual representations for, and to add clarity to, the following chapter containing the qualitative media diagnostic frame analysis. Furthermore, the overall discourse on migrants in this vast media database will be juxtaposed with the different sectors of security and the use of securitising language. A comparison of the discourses prior to- and following the 2008 Financial Crisis will be made to uncover the effect of the Financial Crisis on the securitisation of migration.

2.2 The Media Database within the Five Sectors of Security

The discourse on migration to the UK was centred on 3 of the 5 security sectors: traditional, economic and societal. The two circle diagrams below show the percental division of where the articles in the database fit into the security sectors. It is possible (and occurs often) that one article is does not solely fit into one sector, but in two or three. In this case, the article in question was placed in all the sectors it describes. It is also not always the case that securitising language was used in relation to migration, but that the topic of the article fit into one or more of the sectors. The use of securitising language will be analysed further on.
Looking at this sectoral division, the economic section accounted for 46% of the migration discourse prior to the Financial Crisis and this was raised to 58% after it. Where traditional security elements, such as illegal migrants, migrant-related crime and terrorism, took up 27% of the discourse prior to the Crisis, this diminished to 17% following it. The societal sector kept its importance at 22-23% of the discourse throughout.

This ranking correlates with what was discussed in the articles, and what will be displayed in further detail in the next chapter. The economic implications of migration, such as unemployment, raised taxes and pension-security, was deemed most important to protect and was often the first element of the diagnostic frame. Following this, the societal implications, such as social cohesion and certain pressures on public services were found important. The decline in the traditional sector is proven well in the previous and next chapter. Before the Crisis, most actors were still focussed on the threats of bogus asylum seekers and terrorists, but this vastly made way for economic issues following the Crisis. It is unsurprising that more articles were focussed on the economic sector following the Crisis, due to the rising unemployment level and the fears surrounding it.

2.3 The Use of Securitising Language in the Media Database

The following figure displays the development of the use of securitising language in relation to migration throughout the research period. A ranking has been made in the legend, from most serious securitising language, to least serious. The most serious and explicit securitising language referred to migration as a ‘threat’ or a ‘danger’ and the least referred to it as having an ‘impact’ or ‘negative’ impact on the UK. Again, it is possible that one article contained one to four of these categorisations of language, or none.

Unsurprisingly, as there were never any extreme measures put in place to deal with migration, it was rarely referred to as a threat or danger. The use of the other three types of language all
seem to follow a similar pattern. It starts in 2004, declines a little in 2005, rises steeply through 2007 and then declines again, with a small peak in 2010. This is interesting, as the use of language does not seem to correlate with the Financial Crisis. In 2004 there was an initial panic, due to the EU accession, which receded in 2005 because the migration rate was not as high as initially predicted. However, the effect on the economy and society probably only began to be seen in 2006 and 2007, hence the sharp rise in securitising language. Perhaps, following the Financial Crisis, the Financial Crisis itself was seen to be more of a threat to the UK than migration and that is why there was a decline in securitising language. Even though migration was often described as an aspect of the issues around the recession, it was never the main cause. This claim is also reflected in the political discourse where they view unemployment, migration and societal cohesion as the biggest issues Britain faces, but do not lump them together as one threat (Cameron (Con), 2010b; Labour, 2010; Conservative, 2010 and Miliband (Lab), 2010). The small rise in 2010 could be due to the increased number of immigrants coming back to the UK ‘despite the recession’ and potentially being able to get or hold onto jobs better than the British population, as is described in the following chapter.

An interesting development to take into consideration is the huge dip in the number of articles that do not use securitising language to describe migration, following the Financial Crisis. The fact that there was not as much securitising language used in the years directly following the crisis, does not necessarily mean that it was less of an issue, as this sharp decline would suggest. One potential explanation is that the newspapers were becoming more politically correct in their use of language, or that they were less explicit in the diagnostic frame, as many issues had been ongoing since 2004 already. In other words, the use of securitising language is unnecessary once a problem has already been established by a securitising actor. This could clarify why the discourse around migrants continued the same way, but the use of active securitising language was diminished.
Chapter 3: The Qualitative Media Frame Analysis

3.1 Introduction

This chapter will display the influence of the media within the broader question of how the 2008 Financial Crisis changed the securitisation of migration, in the United Kingdom. It requires a different approach to Chapter 1, which used the same analytical technique, due to the sheer quantity of media sources collected. It will begin with some more general findings in relation to the sources, based on the extensive framing analysis conducted by the researcher. Then, each newspaper’s discourse in the two time-periods will be examined to uncover the broadcasted diagnostic frames in relation to migration to the UK. This different approach compared to Chapter 1, focussing on the individual newspapers rather than analysing all sources within a certain category, will allow a deeper understanding of the whole discourse. A final comparison of the discourse prior to- and following the 2008 Financial Crisis will be made in the conclusion, which will assist in showing how the Financial Crisis changed the securitisation of migration, in the UK.

1,715 individual articles were gathered and assessed from between the 1st of January 2004 and the 31st of December 2012 on all topics in relation to migration to the UK. The contribution per newspaper is clear in Table 7 below. These are four major newspapers that spanned the most-mainstream sections of the political spectrum. The right-wing ‘middle-class’ Daily Mail (DM) is the most widely-read in the UK (See table 2 and figure 1, Methodology). The right-wing and more ‘upmarket’ Daily Telegraph (DT) followed closely in (older) readership. Both the liberal Guardian (Gu) and the liberal-economic Financial Times (FT) were not read as widely but had younger audiences. All articles collected related to migration in general, not just in relation to (in)security or the Financial Crisis. It is important to keep this, and the amounts of articles from each source, in mind when analysing the data, as the strength and reception of the source’s discourse is dependent on it. Furthermore, what will be discussed below is just a fraction of the database, but it covers what was argued by each source the most often and strongly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Number Of Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Daily Mail</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Daily Telegraph</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Financial Times</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Guardian</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total)</td>
<td>1,715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 - Re-cap Articles Contributed per Newspaper (Table 1)

A summary of which can be found in tables 8 and 9.
3.2 General Findings

The inherent nature of ‘securitisation’ implies that there is a security threat. When looking at the media sources, many articles did not use such strong language, but there was at least reference to ‘concerns’, ‘issues’ or ‘problems’. A visual representation of this use can be found in Figure 4 of the previous chapter.

While most articles use certain securitising language, the referent object and the security threat differ per newspaper. Because the majority that were published were somewhat anti-immigrant, especially from the right-wing newspapers, it is useful to begin with an economic pro-migration argument, that was published in the Guardian in 2004:

“Migration, economists argue, can help offset the impact of an ageing population by increasing the number of prime-aged workers. The benefits, however, are much more substantial if the migrant workers only stay in Britain for a temporary period before returning to their country of origin, since their fertility levels tend to converge with the low rates in the West and they, too, eventually become part of the ageing population (Denny and Elliot (Gu), 2004).”

This argument, in fact, highlights one of the key problems with migrants, as portrayed (especially) in the right-wing media throughout the research period: migrants are seen as ‘bad’ for the economy and fuel anti-immigrant sentiment if they are here to stay. In most of the articles, there is a recognition that migrants can be good for the economy, but that their numbers are becoming too high. Often, this economic issue is accompanied with the threats migrants may pose to social cohesion, public services and sometimes crime and terror statistics.

Interestingly, an important trend in all sources, is that the number of immigrants estimated to come to the UK was constantly changing. This co-existed with articles on explosive migrant birth-rates, in comparison to that of British natives. Although the immigration rate was on the rise, for the right-wing newspapers, the estimated numbers were increased and broadcasted every week, usually based on research from the thinktank Migrant Watch. The more liberal newspapers posted an article on numbers roughly every quarter. Throughout the research period, it became clear that the government had no census on the number of illegal and regular migrants in the country, and they began to admit that this was, in fact, a large part of the ‘issue’ of migration.

---

8 This is a self-proclaimed independent and non-political thinktank that’s research is frequently published as truth in the right-wing newspapers. However, critics say that it is in fact a right-wing pressure or lobby group (Pallister, 2007).
Another key finding, also unsurprising due to the political nature of securitisation, was the fact that migration was used as a vessel for blackening the political reputation of other parties. The Daily Mail did not refrain from using extreme headlines such as ‘Dishonest’ Blair and Straw Accused Over Secret Plan for Multicultural UK’ (Walter (DM), 2009).

Furthermore, even after the Conservative and Liberal Democrat coalition came into power, both the Daily Mail and the Daily Telegraph, continued blaming the previous Labour government for ‘letting the migrant issue get so out of control’ (Whitehead (DT), 2009 and Chapman (DM), 2010). The Guardian was more focussed on displaying the stories more objectively, rather than pointing fingers, but it did react extensively to what was reported by the right-wing newspapers and proving that was ‘wrong’. The Financial Times was generally more focussed on the economic aspects, rather than politics.

In terms of article lay-outs and structures, it was far easier to read those of the Daily Telegraph and Daily Mail, than the Guardian’s and the Financial Times’. The right-wing newspapers have shorter articles and the diagnostic (and prognostic) frames are often easily discerned in the first few sentences. The more-liberal newspapers pride themselves in their attempts to be more objective and sometimes, due to an ironic or satirical writing-style, it is difficult to uncover the diagnostic frame until the end of the piece. It is unsurprising that the right-wing newspapers are read more widely, as they have shorter and more understandable pieces and use a lot of repetition, both in volume of articles and in their arguments.

In terms of content however, this is problematic. Even though the Guardian and Financial Times cover more positions, or utilise complicated economic theory, they are clearer as to which sector of security they are referring to and to what categorisation of migrants, i.e. EU migrants, Non-EU migrants, illegal migrants, refugees and asylum seekers. This cannot be said for the right-wing newspapers. They consistently report on different sectors of security and categories of migrants, while using the same arguments, as will become clear in the following sections. Due to the sheer volume of their publications, this must be highly confusing for their readers. The Financial Times supports this thesis in an article from 2005 and says that this tendency stems from policy makers who utilise ‘campaigns designed to mislead’ (Stephens (FT), 2005).

On a different note, the Financial Times is the only source to concretely refer to immigration as a ‘national security challenge’ (Edwards (FT), 2007). Perhaps this shows how the Financial Times is clearer and more concrete in their discourse. The other sources tend to be vaguer, while referring to security challenges, either because they are following
‘misleading’ policy makers, or perhaps out of political correctness. In other words, they may avoid being labelled as racist, by keeping their discourse on migrants vague.

Another noticeable point from the publications is the use of symbolism. There are many references to Enoch Powell’s 1968 ‘Rivers of Blood’ speech, which strongly criticised mass immigration,9 in relation to the current migrant situation. Furthermore, the Daily Mail uses very colourful language, like referring to the UK seeing a ‘collapse like the fall of Rome’, if nothing is done about the migrant situation (Greenhill (DM), 2006). The Financial Times even coins the concept of ‘new nationalism’ as a way of describing the government’s desire to prevent migration completely, instead of managing it strategically, and to the UK’s economic benefit (Taylor (FT), 2008b).

A final point to highlight, before looking into more detail at the framing of migration in the four newspapers, and the discourse prior to and post-2008, is another economic one. In 2006, the Financial Times wrote that the demand for migrant labour to Europe would endure if a major economic downturn was avoided (The Financial Times, 2006). What then, would the Financial Crisis mean for the UK’s demand and framing of migrants, especially as the immigration rate continued to rise? This is an issue that will be covered in the following sections.

3.3 2004-2007

3.3.1 The Daily Mail

Despite the 2004 EU accession not taking place until May, the Daily Mail reported a vast amount on the event and it predicted negative scenarios beforehand. It immediately published findings of ‘a leading thinktank’ (Migration Watch) that the claim by ministers that migrants ‘boost’ our economy by 2.5 billion pounds was false (Doughty (DM), 2004b). Although the ‘lying’ ministers here are part of the diagnostic frame, it was implied that migrants have zero or a negative impact on the British economy. This is a recurring theme in the reporting of the Daily Mail, except when they are publishing quotes of MPs or findings from certain research. In 2006, for instance, an Ernst & Young study was posted, explaining why ‘we’ needed Polish plumbers: they keep interest rates down and therefore boost the economy (Doughty (DM), 2006b). The next day, however, Migration Watch published its own study, explaining how migrants do not boost the economy, but rather cost the British taxpayer £200 million (Doughty (DM), 2006a).

---

9 But also contained racist undertones, according to certain critics (TES, 1968)
The ‘British taxpayer’ is part of the diagnostic frame throughout, as a referent object in relation to the migration threat. This is meant in an economic security sense, as their money is supporting refugees and asylum seekers, who are often ‘bogus’ and wrongfully claiming benefits (Doughty (DM), 2004a and Rawstorne and Pisa (DM), 2005).

The immigration system itself is often part of the diagnostic frame and a threat. Prime Minister Tony Blair admitted that ‘Britain had reached a “crunch point” on immigration’, even before the EU accession (Eastham (DM), 2004). This was, at the time, mostly a reference to migrants who cannot support themselves and are a burden to the taxpayer. However, moving forward, the ‘large influx of Eastern European migrants’ following the accession, meant that by mid-2006, Britain had passed a new ‘milestone’. Namely, a population of over 60 million people (TES (DM), 2006). Along with the fact that 80% of migrants ‘take more from the British economy than they contribute’ (Slack (DM), 2006), and push up the jobless rate, council tax and house prices (Shipman and Slack (DM), 2006 and Walker (DM), 2006), they also leave Britons fearing for their ‘way of life’ and identity (Slack and Hickley (DM), 2006 and Slack (DM), 2007a). Furthermore, migrants put pressure on public services like schools, due to, for instance, a lack of integration and language capabilities (Harris and Clark (DM), 2006 and Slack (DM), 2007c).

Despite the Daily Mail occasionally reporting on the importance of migrants for businesses (Paton (DM), 2005) and how migrants ‘work harder’, according to firms (Slack (DM), 2007d), the discourse is mostly that ‘British workers are priced out by waves of low-paid migrants’ (Slack (DM), 2007b). Furthermore, ‘foreign villains roam our streets’ (including terrorists) (Reid et al. (DM), 2006) and the migrant surge ‘led to disorder and crime’ (Doughty (DM), 2007). The above shows the diagnostic frame is generally that migrants, their high numbers, and the immigration system, provide economic, societal and traditional threats to British taxpayers, British workers and British cultural identity.

3.3.2 The Daily Telegraph

The Daily Telegraph covers many of the same issues and from similar positions as the Daily Mail. Therefore, the researcher has attempted to include different points to the ones above. The Daily Telegraph does generally include more nuances, evidence for arguments, less ‘blame’ language and more clarity in their categorisation of migrants. For instance, one of their first pieces on the topic included Tony Blair’s anxiety to separate asylum seekers from ‘immigrants’ in public categorisation. However, the Telegraph argues that the distinction is
false, due to many people, who claim to be seeking political refuge, actually being economic migrants seeking work (Johnston *(DT)*, 2004a).

The EU accession of 2004 is correlated with a ‘looming immigration crisis’ (TES *(DT)*, 2004). In this climate, the government is faced with fears about mass immigration, and separate concerns about terrorism (Johnston *(DT)*, 2004b). A YouGov poll even suggests that immigration is seen to be the most important issue facing the country, ahead of crime, the NHS and terrorism, as the country is ‘already too crowded’ (Johnston *(DT)*, 2004b).

Interestingly, this YouGov poll suggests that immigration is not connected to any of the other issues. However, the Telegraph’s reporting would at least suggest that the NHS is facing huge pressure due to the influx of Eastern European economic migrants, along with other public services such as schools, transport and housing (Watts *(DT)*, 2006b; Johnston *(DT)*, 2007a; Johnston *(DT)*, 2007c and TES *(DT)*, 2007b).

The Telegraph’s main issues with immigration are economic. Despite articles following the EU accession, firstly, discussing the ‘anything-but-harmful’ effect Eastern European migrant workers have on Britain (Clark *(DT)*, 2005); secondly, the fact that migrants are ‘better’ workers (Alleyne *(DT)*, 2007); and thirdly, the suggestion that ’10 million migrants’ could help Briton’s ageing population and pension crisis (Conway *(DT)*, 2006), most articles are highly sceptical and often fearful towards migrants. It is stated that ‘migration needs to benefit all Britons’ (Howard *(DT)*, 2005). The current level and consequences of migration is bad for social cohesion, which in turn is easily exploited by far-right extremists (Rennie *(DT)*, 2005). Furthermore, the unchecked immigration is putting Britons out of work (Johnston *(DT)*, 2006b). The Telegraph is more precise in their explanation of this, as they explain that it is the low-skilled workers who are most effected by competition from migrant workers, as the top-10 migrant jobs are low-skilled (Green *(DT)*, 2006). Further still, migrants push up rent prices (Watts *(DT)*, 2006a), swamp council services (Johnston *(DT)*, 2006b), force Britons to take ‘less-secure’ jobs (Carter *(DT)*, 2007) and even ‘possibly’ push 100,000 young Britons into unemployment (Winnett *(DT)*, 2007).

Underlying these issues are other articles based on research by Migration Watch, that explain that the social costs of migrants are far higher than any benefits they may bring (Johnston *(DT)*, 2006a) and that migrants only contribute 4 pence to the British taxpayer’s pocket (Johnston *(DT)*, 2007b). Therefore, the economic benefit is marginal.

The diagnostic frame of the Daily Telegraph is more difficult to ascertain than the Daily Mail’s, perhaps due to more political correctness. However, it seems that migrants and their numbers economically threaten especially low-skilled and young British workers.
Furthermore, they place enormous ‘pressure’ on public services and threaten social, and even political cohesion.

3.3.3 The Guardian

The Guardian takes, unsurprisingly, a completely different stance toward migration than the two right-wing newspapers. It does not lay down ‘hard facts’ on immigrant flows or immigrant behaviour. Furthermore, it shows how political the issue is and how the real problems are either unknown, the government’s handling of the situation and/or the (right-wing) media coverage. It does, of course, report on the same events and publishes MPs opinions like those that appeared in the other two sources.

The Guardian acknowledges and debates both the pros and cons of immigration. Early 2004, an article appeared in which it was stated that there needs to be a change of mentality, so Britain could be progressive, but also have reservations about mass immigration (Goodhart (Gu), 2004). Mechanisms were needed to make sure that the ‘poor’ were not disproportionately of a different race than the majority; and that the symbolic aspects of British citizenship needed to be reinforced. These economic and societal aspects needed to be debated openly (Goodhart (Gu), 2004).

The criticism on government openness in relation to migration is a key theme seen throughout the Guardian’s publications. Firstly, it criticises the government for not analysing what the real problem is – low-skilled workers’ competition, technological change or racism - and therefore not being able to find fitting solutions (Denny and Elliot (Gu), 2004). Secondly, the use of ‘migration’ in speeches, lumped together with other issues like security and criminality, is counterproductive and seen to be unfair, as these issues become ‘conflated in the public’s mind’ (Ahmed and Mathiason (Gu), 2004 and Stubbs (Gu), 2006). Thirdly, the large fear around pressure on public services is unfounded, due to the scale of migration being unknown, even though fear is being spread among the population by tabloids (Crawley (Gu), 2004).

This fear-mongering by the media and thinktank Migration Watch is another aspect criticised by the Guardian. Six weeks after the EU accession, the Daily Mail was criticised for overestimating an upcoming tide of 1.6 million new migrants, as ‘that is the entire population of Estonia and more’ (Travis (Gu), 2004). Migration Watch was accused of being biased and publishing ‘inflammatory’ estimates about the levels and effects of migration, that got picked up by the right-wing media and caused a polarised debate on migration (Muir (Gu), 2004).
However, the Guardian also points out that the alarmist myths cannot be quashed without real statistics on migrants (Bunting (Gu), 2007). Finally, the media was also criticised for bundling too many separate issues together, like ‘migration and jobs’ and ‘migration and crime’ which influenced ‘poorer white families’ resentment and increased the possibility of extremism (White (Gu), 2007).

The Guardian did not just criticise broadcasters of information. It also acknowledged that Britain needs migrants to maintain its economic growth and affluence (Kettle (Gu), 2005). Furthermore, the proposed migration points-based system poses a threat to the UK’s economy that was ‘built on unskilled illegal labour’ (Lawrence (Gu), 2006). The newspaper even contains articles on the plights of migrants in the UK. For instance, in 2005, it was written that many new EU migrants had fallen into the squalid living and working situation of illegal migrants and that they were publicly associated with those who commit benefit fraud (Lawrence (Gu), 2005). However, the Guardian also contained some articles that acknowledged the increased population size and the effect it has on the home population, especially due to the rate of change. It is recognised that the ‘impact on labour and housing markets triggered tensions and threatened community cohesion’ and were exploited by the far right (Cruddas (Gu), 2007). Furthermore, the balance between migration being good for economic growth but having social costs like social cohesion and losing their cultural identities, is seen to be a real dilemma (Russell (Gu), 2007).

It is difficult to uncover the Guardian’s diagnostic frame toward migration as migrants are not particularly the issue in their opinion. The prognostic frame is perhaps more useful in this situation, as they suggest that the government should become more open and analyse the real problem and the media should not publish inflammatory articles that exacerbate public fear.

3.3.4 The Financial Times

The Financial Times is an interesting source for this research, as it also criticises many of the ‘mainstream’ views on migration but does not try to sweep them off the table, which the Guardian has a tendency towards. It also supports most of its claims with hard-line economic arguments or more pragmatic solutions. Finally, The Financial Times’ articles in relation to migration, often look beyond the UK, to the European and international level, and look more at historical situations. Therefore, the articles are not always useful to this research.
Besides giving similar criticism of the media to the Guardian, the Financial Times (FT) highlights where the real problems are in migration policy. Firstly, as mentioned, FT underlines the fact that what is generally said about immigration is part of a campaign ‘calculated to mislead’ (Stephens (FT), 2005). Immigration is lumped together with ‘our economy, our jobs, our culture, our security; it’s about crime’, and deliberate confusion is made between asylum and immigration (Stephens (FT), 2005). Secondly, FT recognises that net immigration has grown enormously and that something should be done. Non-control would lead to economic, social, political and demographic transformation, and it is implied that this is unwanted (Wolf (FT), 2005). However, FT suggests that a thought-through policy is necessary. ‘Bad economic arguments cannot be the basis for a good policy’ (Wolf (FT), 2005). This is especially the case as migration is not simply an economic matter. FT recognises that immigration generates economic costs as well as benefits (and not overly one or the other, as the other sources tend to do), but it also sees that large-scale immigration can put a strain on key infrastructure, like housing, hospitals and schools (Philpott (FT), 2005). However, argument needs to be based on ‘analysis, rather than angst’ (TES (FT), 2007a). A final suggestion of a real issue of migration, is related to the development of the migrant’s original countries. It is implied that it could be advantageous to the UK to improve the economy and living standards in their home countries, as this may reduce immigration numbers (Wagstyl (FT), 2006).

FT does generally portray arguments against things said by the right-wing newspapers. For instance, Eastern European migrants should be welcomed, because there is an effective labour shortage, as the British workforce does not seem willing to fill vacancies (Moules (FT), 2005). FT also shows that these labourers generally only stay a short while before returning home (Sriskandarajah (FT), 2007). Furthermore, the need for Polish plumbers has been highlighted as it is ‘one of Britain’s greatest area of skills shortage’ (Pimlott (FT), 2006). Shortages in skills are predicted to increase while more of Britain’s people go to university. Therefore, the government’s emphasis on managing migration could have negative consequences for the economy in future (Pimlott (FT), 2006). Among other parts of Britain’s nationals, FT says that shortages in skills are due to the ‘poor education system’ not producing people with the right skills and motivation (Frost (FT), 2006). FT also makes the case that migrant workers ‘have not taken jobs from unemployed Britons’, despite their effect on the economy being modest (Taylor (FT), 2006).

Interestingly, FT also has many stories involving the traditional and societal sectors of security. For instance, the opinion of John Reid, the home secretary, was published stating
that Britain was in the midst of ‘the most sustained period of severe threat since the end of World War II’ and it was implied that migration brought new threats of organised crime and terrorism (Adams (FT), 2006). Another article suggested that a more holistic answer is needed for ‘national security challenges’, of which immigration is one (Edwards (FT), 2007). Immigrants also brought concrete safety issues, according to a Cambridgeshire chief constable, because they have different cultures and customs and often do not speak good English. There had also been raised instances of drunk driving, knife crime and prostitution (Taylor (FT), 2007).

Societally, FT is unique in suggesting that the prevention of attacks like the 07/07 London bombings would be caused by better integration of Muslim minorities through better education and more jobs for immigrants (Munter (FT), 2006). A FT poll also showed that British citizens had become more hostile to migrants than any other major West European country (Daneshkhu and Parker (FT), 2007). This was mostly because white Britons felt their identity was under threat (Wagstyl (FT), 2007).

A final FT article that stood out because it contains its suggestion for the compromise in immigration policy: the society the immigrants come to should be able to maintain the qualities that make it attractive in the first place, and control the rate of migration. This can only be done through both controlling borders and underlining the host society’s core values. If it is not done like this, there can only be either complete freedom of movement or a completely isolated fortress (Wolf (FT), 2006).

Like the Guardian, FT’s frames are more difficult to discover, as it does not necessarily see migration as a problem. Furthermore, its focus moves beyond the UK and discusses migration as a more international issue, which is logical as it always involves two or more countries. For instance, it is unique in suggesting that efforts for dealing with the migration issue should be shifted to the migrants’ country of origin. FT spends a lot of time debunking myths spread by politicians and the right-wing newspapers but does recognise that there is both a cost and benefit to migration economically. It is more explicit in the societal and traditional threats that migrants can pose but does not generalise that ‘migrants as a whole’ are an issue.

A summary of all the key findings in the media sources’ diagnostic frames, in the first research period, can be found in table 8:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2004-2007 Newspapers</th>
<th>What Must be Protected?</th>
<th>From What/Whom?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Daily Mail</td>
<td>The Daily Telegraph</td>
<td>The Guardian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - Our economy  
- The British taxpayer  
- Our benefits  
- The jobless rate  
- Level of council tax  
- Level of house prices  
- Britons’ way of life and identity  
- Public services like schools  
- British workers priced-out by waves of low-paid migrants | - Lying ministers  
- Migrants (often in general)  
- Bogus refugees and asylum seekers  
- The (current) immigration system and rate of migration  
- Migrants who cannot support themselves  
- 80% of migrants who take more from the British economy than they contribute  
- Lack of migrant integration and language capabilities  
- Foreign villains roaming our streets (incl. terrorists) | - Britain’s progressiveness but freedom to have reservations about migration  
- The poor not being disproportionally of a different race than the majority  
- The symbolic aspects of British citizenship  
- The maintenance of Britain’s economic growth and affluence (with migrants)  
- The living and working conditions of economic migrants  
- The home population’s ability to adapt to migrants with the current rate of change  
- Community cohesion | - The economy  
- National security  
- The integration of (Muslim) minorities | - The lack of government openness in relation to migration:  
  - Not analysing the real problem  
  - Its use of ‘migration’ (unjustly) lumped together with other issues like security and criminality  
  - The unfounded fear around pressure on public services due to lack of information on the scale of migration  
- Fear-mongering by the (right-wing) media and Migration Watch:  
  - Leading to resentment among ‘poorer white families’ and possible extremism  
- The lack of real statistics on migration  
- The potential that migration will have more social costs than economic benefits | - The real problems in migration policy:  
  - The discourse on migrants is part of a campaign ‘calculated to mislead’  
  - Net immigration has grown enormously, and something |
Table 8 - Key findings in Newspapers’ Diagnostic Frame 2004-2007

<p>| British identity/the host society’s core values | should be done to control it, but a ‘thought-through’ policy is necessary |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borders</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shortages in (British) skills and motivation, and a lack of willingness to fill open vacancies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants bring new threats of organised crime and terrorism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants with different cultures and customs and who don’t speak English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 2008-2012

3.4.1 The Daily Mail

It is important to keep in mind that the discourse mostly continued the same way as in the period before. Therefore, it has been chosen to show articles that particularly reflect on the migrant wave following the 2004 EU accession, the 2008 Financial Crisis and pressures on public services and social cohesion.

Interestingly, the statistics on the wave of Eastern European migrants differ. Mid-2008, the number of Eastern European migrants arriving in Britain had fallen to its lowest point since 2004, due to our economy collapsing, ‘battered by the credit crunch’, and yet ‘immigration is changing the face of Britain’ (TES (DM), 2008a). Two months later, an article was published that the influx of ‘foreign workers’ had not been halted by the recession and that the numbers with British jobs had increased, while British people lost their jobs (Slack (DM), 2008a and Doughty (DM), 2010a). In 2009, however, it was reported that many migrants were returning home, but that thousands more were coming ‘as the recession bites’ (Doughty (DM), 2009). Not only were thousands of Eastern Europeans applying for UK benefits to ‘ride out’ the recession (Hickley (DM), 2009), nearly ‘1.6 Million jobs created since 1997 have gone to foreigners’ (Slack (DM), 2010b), migrants ‘are given 1 in 15 new council houses (Doyle (DM), 2010) and the ‘average earnings of many immigrants from outside Europe have overtaken those born in Britain (Doughty (DM), 2012b). The Daily Mail became more explicit in the fact that it was mostly young and low-skilled Britons, who were becoming unemployed due to these various categories of migrants (Slack (DM), 2008c).

There were also a few articles on how it was ‘lazy’ Britons’ fault that they were ‘on the dole’ due to lack of skills, motivation and incentives (Slack (DM), 2008d; Hickley (DM), 2008 and Doughty (DM), 2010b).

The pressure on public services was expressed more explicitly in this period. Britain’s ‘most senior black policeman’ stated that the surge in immigration was putting pressure on his
force and had led to a rise in crime (TES (DM), 2008c and Slack (DM), 2009). Maternity wards were also suffering and had to turn away expectant mothers due to the soaring demand from immigrants (Martin (DM), 2008). Furthermore, schools ‘at a breaking point’ were forced to add temporary classrooms due to immigrants, and other pupils were being held back by those who spoke little English (Delgado and Sandy (DM), 2010 and TES (DM), 2010b).

Social cohesion was a huge topic for the Daily Mail in this period. The ‘vast majority of Britons’ found that immigration was diluting their culture and leading to the ‘breakdown of society’, making Britain a more dangerous place to live (Slack (DM), 2008b). Community cohesion was seen to be the ‘biggest concern’ facing the population after the economy (Slack (DM), 2008e). Furthermore, Britain risked losing its national identity and ‘white Britons’ even risked becoming a minority by 2066, if immigration was not dramatically reduced (Slack (DM), 2010a and Shipman (DM), 2010). In his first published speech as Prime Minister, David Cameron’s words were paraphrased as: ‘Britain has been torn apart by the biggest influx of immigrants in history’ (Chapman (DM), 2011). Finally, in 2012, the results from the national headcount ‘provide the clearest picture yet’ of the impact of recent immigration (Doughty (DM), 2012a). 70% of the population rise was due to immigration and it had led to the crumbling of ‘traditional pillars of society’, such as the decline in number of Christians (Doughty (DM), 2012a).

The diagnostic frame of the Daily Mail remains much the same as previously, although it is more precise about which aspects of societal security are threatened and how. The role of the Financial Crisis will be displayed in the conclusion.

### 3.4.2 The Daily Telegraph

Again, the Daily Telegraph covers many of the same issues as the Daily Mail, but with slightly more nuances. In this period, there is a large focus on pressures on health, education and social services, and the negative impact on social cohesion. Differently to the Daily Mail, the Telegraph focuses more on the fact that migration is not just an economic matter, and it connects the traditional, economic and societal sectors of security more. There is also more focus on the debate around migration and crime.

In 2008, it reported that there is growing evidence that health, education and social services are coming under strain (Hope et al. (DT), 2008). This is exacerbated by the government’s inadequate data on the migrant numbers (Prince and Winnett (DT), 2008). The worry is often centred around the negative effect on educational standards (Kirkup (DT),
Interestingly, although not connected by the Telegraph, much reporting is also done on Briton’s being out of work because they lack motivation and ‘employability’, and not because of foreign competition (Hope (DT), 2008). However, in future, one can imagine that the lowering educational standards due to migration, could become connected to the lack of Britons’ employability. The Telegraph does add new a new nuance when it explains that especially rural communities are affected by a disproportionate migrant pressure on public services (Whitehead (DT), 2008). This is not only due to smaller councils’ having smaller budgets to deal with migrant numbers, but also due to more difficulties regarding integration.

Socially, the goal of improving integration and social cohesion continues as migrants are being taught about British customs and values, and for instance, being told ‘not to spit or touch’ (Kirkup (DT), 2008a). Social cohesion remains a key feature of many articles. However, a new point introduced is that mass immigration has led to a racial ‘cold war’ among rival ethnic communities (Carter (DT), 2008). This is especially the case during the economic downturn, as the incoming migrants are often better educated but are competing for the same fewer jobs as others in the communities (Winnett and Kirkup (DT), 2011).

Many articles discuss whether migrants have pushed Britons out of jobs and kept wages down during the Financial Crisis. However, it is impossible to uncover a specific discourse. It is reported that 500,000 Poles will not return to their country during the recession (Whitehead (DT), 2009a and Beckford (DT), 2009) and that the recession is ‘stemming the largest flow of migrants’ (Whitehead (DT), 2009b). However, others report that a lack of migrants is creating skill shortages and therefore stemming Britain’s economic recovery (Cramb (DT), 2009). Following the worst of the Crisis, the tone of the articles seemed angry as ‘nearly four out of five new jobs went to migrants over the past three months’ (Hope (DT), 2010) and it was claimed that foreign workers had benefitted more from the economic recovery than Britons, still vastly unemployed (Whitehead (DT), 2010). Two different researches were published two days in a row with conflicting results. The first proved how immigration had ‘little or no impact on the number of unemployed people in Britain (TES (DT), 2012) and the second proved that immigration had kept Britons out of jobs, especially during the economic downturn (Whitehead (DT), 2011).

The Telegraph includes several articles on the importance of not limiting the migration debate to an economic one or one of numbers. The governmental debate about restricting migration is seen to be bad, as it is solely focussed on numbers, while people are also concerned with migrants fitting in and contributing (O’Brien (DT), 2012). Furthermore, part of the problem is that the government talks mostly about migrants in economic terms, as it is
more results-focussed, and they do not consider the ‘social and cultural dimensions’ at the root of people’s concerns (TES (DT), 2010c).

On crime, a Chief Police Officer’s report claimed that the influx of immigrants from Eastern Europe had not caused more crime, but that any rise was proportional to a general rise in the population (Clout (DT), 2008). However, this view is not shared by most other articles. Rising immigration is said to have fuelled crime in communities (Hough (DT), 2010) and in 2011 Britain was reported to have been in the ‘grip of a foreign crime-wave’ (Whitehead (DT), 2011). All these elements associated with migrants are in turn, expected to lead to racial tensions and the rise of nationalist parties, to further exacerbate the issue and polarise the country (Riddell (DT), 2010).

The Telegraph’s discourse remains the same as before, but includes newer statistics and lessons learned. However, it is difficult to find one true diagnostic frame on migrants. They focus on the entire picture and are more explicit in how migration is a traditional, economic and societal security threat. Their arguments supporting this thesis, however, are quite conflictual.

3.4.3 The Guardian

The Guardian’s approach in this period is like that of the previous one. It spends a vast amount of time debating many issues presented in the right-wing newspapers and by politicians. It does not necessarily debunk their views completely but tries to include a larger picture and bring in more theoretical-sounding arguments.

On social cohesion, the Guardian posted an article that suggests that we are approaching it wrongly through a ‘political dictator media frenzy’ (Gould (Gu), 2008). Of course, migrants need to learn English, but social cohesion needs to include ‘respect for the diversity of people’ rather than a tendency towards unifying them (Gould (Gu), 2008). Furthermore, in the light of the 40th anniversary of Enoch Powell’s river of blood speech, the topic of damaged community cohesion was approached. The article found that, even after large-scale Eastern European immigration, the economic, cultural and social contribution of migrants is positive to community cohesion (Pillai (Gu), 2008). It also asked a critical question of whether there may be other factors that influenced poor community cohesion, something mostly forgotten in other sources (Pillai (Gu), 2008).

On crime, the Guardian acknowledges that migration has led to ‘new demands’ made on the police service (Dodd (Gu), 2008). However, talks of a large-scale crime wave by
migrants were overexaggerated (Dodd (Gu), 2008). The same can be said about the impact of migrants on public services and our quality of life. One article poses the question of whether these raised ‘pressures on public services’ would be approached in the same way if the rising population had been caused by an explosive British birth-rate (Finch (Gu), 2010). A different article suggests that the birth-rate is even more important for rising population numbers than the rate of immigration, and ironically asks whether Britain should impose a ‘Chinese-style one child per family policy’, if the country is really becoming overcrowded (Travis (Gu), 2010a).

On the economy, and during the recession, it is explained how the argument that ‘foreign workers are taking our jobs’ is extremely short-sighted (Meredith (Gu), 2010). There is a shortage of skilled workers in Britain (Meredith (Gu), 2010), and the Guardian publishes that migration is on the decline because of the recession (Travis (Gu), 2009 and Travis (Gu), 2010c). This could lead to businesses moving their companies abroad to fill their skills gaps, which would be counter-productive for economic recovery (Press Association (Gu), 2010). Furthermore, migrants are needed due to Britain’s falling fertility rate and ageing population (Dorling (Gu), 2009). Economic theory also suggests that people’s concerns about migrants stealing their jobs are unjust, as ‘immigrants don’t bother going to places where there is no work to do; ergo, they fill vacancies that are otherwise hard to fill’ (Hanley (Gu), 2011). The opposing argument is the government’s and right wing’s diversion from the truth that ‘the working class always gets diddled’ (in times of scarcity) (Hanley (Gu), 2011) and it is politicians’ responsibility to challenge the myths about immigration (Summers (Gu), 2009).

Following the Financial Crisis, the arguments become a bit vaguer. Polish net migration to the UK went up again (Travis (Gu), 2010 and Pidd (Gu), 2011) and it was reported that immigration to Britain had had little or no impact on overall levels of unemployment during the recession (Travis (Gu), 2010b). The following day, however, the Guardian published an article that linked non-EU immigration to unemployment in depressed economic times (Travis (Gu), 2012).

Therefore, it is difficult to uncover the diagnostic frame. Economically, migrants may or may not pose a threat to British unemployment in times of recession, depending on the type of migrant. Societally and traditionally, the opinions spread by the Daily Mail and Daily Telegraph are seen to be overexaggerated and lacking the critical questions that the Guardian poses.
3.4.4 The Financial Times

In this period, the Financial Times (FT) focusses mostly on the economic sector of security, which is unsurprising for an economy-focussed newspaper, in times of financial hardship. It publishes stories displaying different points of view and highlights why migrants are neither inherently bad nor good for the economy and Britain’s situation.

A first interesting point made, focussed on the notion of ‘benefit tourists’, debunks the myth that migrants take more out of the economy than they put in (Boxell (FT), 2010a and Boxell and Fray (FT), 2010). This is supported by proof from 2009 that ‘Czechs, Poles and other Eastern European immigrants’ have paid their way (in taxes) (Timmins (FT), 2009). FT proves that the wave of immigrants has not been a burden on the fiscal system but does raise the question of how much the country as a whole has gained; it implies that it is not a substantial amount (Boxell (FT), 2010a and Boxell and Fray (FT), 2010).

It is recognised that economic migrants are necessary, as food producers were facing labour shortages, due to migrants returning home because of the recession (Taylor (FT), 2008e). Coupled to the fact British workers are not willing, or lack the skills, to do certain jobs, it will have wider implications for society as a whole if food production decreases (Taylor (FT), 2008c; Taylor (FT), 2008e and Bounds (FT), 2010). This dip in the number of migrants is also seen to have negative implications for other industries (Guthrie (FT), 2008 and Groom (FT), 2009). However, the migrants that stayed have proven better at retaining their jobs than the British population (Briscoe and Groom (FT), 2009). Despite claims that migrant workers significantly reduced employment or wages being declared false, FT expects that this issue will cause migrants to become scape-goats for unemployment, as the recession progresses (Taylor (FT), 2009).

Even though there are good ‘economic as well as cultural argument for immigration’, such as the amount of successful British businesses created by migrants or the amount of jobs held by migrants in the public sector (Brittan (FT), 2008), the UK has an especially hostile view towards immigration, compared to other developed countries (Taylor (FT), 2008d; Boxell (FT), 2010b and Blitz (FT), 2010). Coupled with statistics published such as ‘white Britons no longer make up the majority in London’ (Cohen (FT), 2012), FT acknowledges the public’s fears of migration. However, they especially blame ministers themselves for turning the political debate on migration into something so defensive (TES (FT), 2008b).

FT is positive about the decline of migrant workers in the recession for various reasons. Firstly, councils were struggling with the rising tide of migrant workers which would
have led to higher taxation or shrinking services, and which in turn could lead to social unrest (Taylor (FT), 2008a). Secondly, unemployment was expected to rise during the recession, but due to migrants leaving, the effect is slightly lower (TES (FT), 2009). This is good for the British population. However, some sectors with high proportions of migrant labour, like construction, were expected to be affected very negatively (Taylor and Gemson (FT), 2008 and TES (FT), 2009). Thirdly, the rise of migrants after the Crisis was positive according to FT, as it was a sign that the economy was recovering (Boxell (FT), 2009a). However, this raised new fears about the impact of east European migrants on youth unemployment, as there were four times as many of them living in the UK in 2009 than in 2004 (Boxell (FT), 2009c). Furthermore, the number of foreign-born workers filling low-skill jobs had more than doubled in nine years, despite high unemployment during the recession (Garcia (FT), 2011).

Further still, FT publishes research that claims that the immigration of non-EU workers ‘may’ have led to the displacement of 160,000 jobs for British-born employees (Warrell (FT), 2012). However, it debunks myths that immigrant children have a negative effect on British schools. According to FT, schools with non-English speakers did perform worse, but when taking other factors like poverty into account, the effect of the lack of English was declared minimal (Cook (FT), 2012).

Like the Guardian, FT’s diagnostic frame on migrants is hard to ascertain. It views economic migrants as important for certain sectors but does report positively on the decrease of migrants during the recession, as they are implied to threaten low-skill and youth jobs.

A summary of the key findings in the diagnostic frames from all media sources in the second research period can be found in table 9:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008-2012 Newspapers</th>
<th>What Must be Protected?</th>
<th>From What/Whom?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The Daily Mail        | • The collapsed economy battered by the credit crunch  
                         • The face of Britain  
                         • British people who lost their jobs (despite foreign workers increasingly with jobs)  
                         • Council houses  
                         • The wage levels  
                         • Public services, including police  
                         • Maternity wards  
                         • Schools  
                         • Social cohesion/British culture/national | • Immigration/immigrants  
                         • Eastern Europeans applying for UK benefits to ride out the recession  
                         • A rise in immigrant crime  
                         • Migrant children who speak little English  
                         • The breakdown of British society, making Britain a more dangerous place to live  
                         • The risk of white Britons becoming a minority by 2066  
                         • The biggest influx of immigrants in history |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>The Daily Telegraph</strong></th>
<th><strong>The Daily Telegraph</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Health, education (standards) and social services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social cohesion and integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rural communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• British customs and values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Britain’s economic recovery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communities’ crime figures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The government’s inadequate data on migrant numbers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The government’s focus on numbers in the migration debate and their incapability of looking beyond the economic aspects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Britons’ lack of work motivation and employability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Smaller council budgets to deal with immigrants and improve integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mass immigration (leading to tensions between ethnic communities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 500,000 Poles not returning home during the recession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Skills shortages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Foreign workers that may or may not have benefitted more from the economic recovery than Britons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Foreign crime wave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>The Guardian</strong></th>
<th><strong>The Guardian</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Social cohesion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Respect for the diversity of people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The working class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The ‘political dictator media frenzy’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Myths about immigration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shortage of skilled workers in Britain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Businesses potentially moving their companies abroad because of the skills gap and recession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Britain’s falling fertility rate and ageing population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non-EU immigrants causing unemployment in depressed times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>The Financial Times</strong></th>
<th><strong>The Financial Times</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Food producers facing labour shortages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The entire society (if food production decreases)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Councils (avoiding higher taxation or shrinking services)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some sectors of the labour market which had a high proportion of migrant workers before the recession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Youth unemployment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 160,000 British-born employees that may have been displaced from their jobs by migrants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Myth that migrants take more out of the economy than they put in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Myth that immigrant children have a negative effect on British schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Migrants returning home because of the recession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• British workers without the necessary skills and motivation for certain jobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Migrants becoming scapegoats for unemployment as the recession progresses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The UK’s hostile view towards immigration/public fear of immigration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential social unrest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 9 - Key findings in Newspapers’ Diagnostic Frame 2008-2012*
Chapter 4: Interview

This chapter will serve in a more-nuanced and anecdotal role to answering the research question ‘How did the 2008 Financial Crisis change the securitisation of migration, in the United Kingdom?’ Due to difficulties in obtaining eligible interviewees, the vast amount of secondary data available and the word-limit, it has been chosen to only include one expert interview. However, this interview was conducted with an important member of parliament for the least-covered party in the research so far: Liberal Democrat. The interview with Chris Huhne, which was conducted on 17th April 2018, offers some additional context and deeper explanation as to how the Financial Crisis changed the (already-existing) perception of migration as a security threat.

Chris Huhne was a member of parliament for Liberal Democrat from 2005 to 2013. He holds a first-class degree in Philosophy, Politics and Economy and was the Lib. Dem. Home Affairs Spokesperson from 2007 to 2010. Therefore, he is an ideal expert for this research, as he was actively involved in shaping the political discourse (on migration) around the time of the Financial Crisis and has an educational background in economics. Furthermore, he was either mentioned or quoted in 17 of the 1,715 media sources analysed, so in around 1% of the articles. This section will compare Mr. Huhne’s opinions on migration to the content of the previous two chapters containing the further political discourse and what was portrayed by the media. It should be mentioned that Mr. Huhne was a journalist for the Guardian, following his parliamentary career. Therefore, much of what he says correlates with views published in the Guardian (and to some extent the Financial Times).

4.1 Why Should Societies be Concerned with Migration?

On the question of why societies should be concerned with migration, Mr. Huhne explained that all societies have become concerned with migration since transportation became relatively easy and cheap, and where there are substantial gaps in living standards between immigrants’ countries of origin and their countries of destination. However, it need only become an economic concern when the scale of migration is so high that the country of destination is unable to absorb the inflow and adapt easily. Politically, it need not be an issue unless the scale of migration discomforts people within the receiving society. This discomfort can be both objective and subjective. Mr. Huhne gave the example of Southampton builders being adversely impacted by the large inflow of Polish builders following the EU accession of 2004, due to their pay rate going down. These kind of issues leads to objective discomfort in the short-term. The subjective discomfort is caused by particularly populist politician’s use of
immigration as a way of stigmatising an outside group, regardless of whether there is an actual objective problem. These politicians have a way of pulling citizens together who have a more authoritarian nature, as has been seen historically in, for example, Germany in the 1920s and 1930s, but is also seen in the more current discourse of UKIP and the British National Party.

Mr. Huhne’s statement on the concerns around migration correlates well with what has been previously covered in the research. All political parties argued, especially 2 to 3 years after the EU accession, that the scale of migration was becoming too high, regardless of the data on the migrant inflow being insufficient. This argument was then used, by especially the Conservative Party and the more widely-read conservative newspapers to play on the subjective discomfort of the population. Taking the anecdotal objective cases into account, such as the one described above of Southampton builders, where the inflow of migrants led to declining salaries or even rising unemployment later, it is unsurprising that migration began to be seen as a rising threat to economic and societal security.

4.2 What is the Most Important Policy to Deal with Migration?
When asked what the most important policy would be to deal with migration and the consequences of it, Mr. Huhne stated that there are two things to be done: (1) Society should be made aware of short-term problems surrounding an inflow of immigrants and (2) a regional element should be added to national economic policy. The first measure refers to the fact that a lot of current anti-immigrant sentiment comes from communities where there are hardly any immigrants, partially due to the unattractiveness of those ‘colonies’. Mr. Huhne interprets their anti-immigrant sentiments as cries for help, as the people there feel that they are being left behind. These communities, in places like Sunderland and Hartlepool, therefore form a good target audience for populists trying to find support for their cause, and who blame the decline of communities on outsiders. The second measure, partially linked to the first, is that declining communities and the ‘feeling of being left behind’ should be targeted by adding a regional element to economic policy. People ‘get a lot of their sense of self-respect from the job and actually having work, and therefore being left behind in a place like Hastings or Hartlepool, with very little potential prospect of the job, even if your living standards are being supported by the benefit and tax system, is not really enough.’ Therefore, policies towards regional support should be rethought and foreign investments to these areas should be encouraged. Furthermore, people need to feel that they are contributing to rising prosperity, as it is also about self-esteem. Alongside this, Mr. Huhne suggested that policies on benefits
perhaps could be harder, i.e. people need to make a larger effort in searching for jobs, or risk losing their benefits.

These suggested policy measures also tie in to what was said in the political discourse and the newspapers. Rising British unemployment, following the Financial Crisis, was often linked to Britons’ unwillingness and inability to do certain jobs, but blamed on migrants. Furthermore, the more-liberal newspapers mostly warned that immigrants were not the cause of the recession and rising unemployment, and that measures suggested to limit them could be potentially damaging, as it could result in a decline in the amount of foreign investment. The statements made by Mr. Huhne above, underline the fact that perhaps the ‘real’ issue surrounding migrants was often forgotten due to immigrants being used to feed on subjective discomforts and certain anecdotal objective discomforts.

4.3 How did the Financial Crisis Change the Balance?
When asked whether and how the Financial Crisis changed the balance between the positive and negative consequences of migration, Mr. Huhne said that the real issue was people’s disillusionment with the political system. It was the worst financial downturn since The Great Depression, but the unemployment rate, surprisingly, did not suffer such a large effect as prognosed. This was due to people’s preparedness to take pay cuts so that jobs could be kept. However, this period of personal austerity followed decades of rising pay, so it was unsurprising that there was disillusionment with the political system and immigrants.

These words correlate well with the sheer volume of issues related to migration by the securitising actors. Migration was seen to be the number one priority, following the economy, in the years after the Crisis. However, the very focus on migrants and linkage of migrants to the economy perhaps meant that they were highly associated by the target audience. Furthermore, the government was suggesting new policies on a weekly basis to staunch the migration ‘issue’ and this was picked up on by the conservative newspapers. The reporting on public opinion towards migrants suggests that both the government’s and the conservative newspapers’ fixation on the migration issue was successful in raising anti-immigrant sentiment. This is partially because the government’s constantly-changing policies towards immigration were deemed ineffective which also meant a general disillusionment with the government’s capabilities. This disillusionment in the government is clearly felt in the more-liberal newspapers, as they often explain why certain policies on migrants will do more harm than good. Despite counter-arguments - or a bigger display of both pros and cons, based on political and economic theory, given for instance, by Mr. Huhne and the liberal newspapers -
the anti-immigrant sentiment continued throughout the research-period. The Financial Crisis played further on the subjective discomforts of the population, with the anecdotal objective discomforts, and a neglect to focus on certain issues that could have made a difference, as described by Mr. Huhne.
Conclusion

To summarise, this dissertation has striven to answer the research question ‘How did the 2008 Financial Crisis change the securitisation of migration, in the United Kingdom’. Within the broader framework of securitisation theory, a qualitative diagnostic frame analysis was made of 9 party manifestos and 44 political speeches of the Labour, Conservative and Liberal Democrat parties. Both a quantitative textual- and qualitative diagnostic frame analysis was made of 1,715 newspaper articles and editorials from The Daily Mail, The Daily Telegraph, The Guardian and the Financial Times. Finally, one expert interview was conducted with the economist Chris Huhne, former prominent MP of the Liberal Democrats, to add an extra nuance to the research.

Referring to the statement of Balzacq in the literature review, this research has demonstrated that ‘security’ as a slogan, in relation to migration, helped some actors to further a personal political agenda. Immigration, and the consequences of it, were viewed as key issues throughout the research by the examined actors. In other words, there was an element of securitisation occurring in relation to migration. The aim of this research, however, was not to ascertain whether securitisation of migration occurred, but how. More specifically, what influence did the 2008 Economic Crisis have on the changing discourse in the securitisation of migration? In this case, securitisation may be viewed as the (certain) dependent variable, and the economy and economic crisis the examined independent variable.

Prior to the Crisis, politicians mostly stated that migration was an important topic, alongside crime and terrorism. Following the Crisis, it was stated to be the most important issue after, and related to, the economy. The discourse was often especially heightened in the year leading up to the general elections. This research has also proven that the role of securitising actor is not just destined for politicians, but that the media can also be a securitising actor and is often more influential than politicians, due to the amount it publishes on the matter. Of course, much of the political discourse also reaches the audience through the media. Where Hass in the literature review stated that it is the media’s responsibility to act as a watchdog in the process of securitisation, one could say this role has been disregarded in this case, and that they even played a large part in pushing threats related to migrants. The media perhaps tried to warn the population on the dangers of migration, the raised migration rate and bad migration policies, but the methods used to achieve this goal arguably exacerbated the situation and furthered the securitisation process.
In general, it is difficult to ascertain the number of immigrants arriving in the UK and their impact on British society and economy, due to the lack of official data on the matter. This was one of the main issues surrounding migration that all parties mentioned throughout the research and led to disillusionment with the government(s) and their policy proposals. Furthermore, the lack of official data led to many smaller institutions, thinktanks and individuals doing their own research on the matter. This in turn, resulted in the publishing of highly conflicting research results, often just days after one another, and exacerbated the issue further.

Another common issue in the publishing of numbers, was the distortion of figures in relation to the impact of migrants on unemployment, lower wages, and birth and crime rates. The Daily Telegraph in 2008, for instance, explained that although the rise in immigration had led to a rise in crime, this was proportionate to the rise in population. However, as with many aspects, it is impossible to get to the real facts regarding migration and crime as the other newspapers (and the Daily Telegraph on other occasions) posted that migrants had caused a (disproportionate) rise in crime.

This constant manipulation and distortion of evidence makes this topic difficult to research. Furthermore, it made the issues highly politicised. This fact alone proves that there was an element of securitisation ongoing. Coupled with the fact that the categories of migrants were constantly confused in the most-read right-wing newspapers, and that the sectors of security were often confused, i.e. economic arguments were used for societal issues, the public perception of migration was shaped to include a whole range of confusing, and at times conflicting, issues. As discussed in the Financial Times, ‘what is generally said about immigration is part of a campaign calculated to mislead’. Fortunately, because this research was conducted following securitisation theory, it is not necessary to uncover the facts, but rather what was published by politicising actors. The following sections contain a summary of the diagnostic frames on migration from before and after the Financial Crisis. Visual representations of these points can be found in tables 10 to 12.

In the period prior to the Financial Crisis in 2004-2007, the discourse on migration was related to certain broad themes, in contrast to the more specific discourse in the following period. The research period began shortly before the 2004 A10 EU accession. This event was defining for the discourse on migration all throughout the research period.

At the beginning of this first period, both the Daily Mail and the Daily Telegraph (table 11) predicted that the number of migrants from A10 countries, mostly referred to as
‘Poles and other Eastern Europeans’, would be far higher than the country could handle. Coupled with the fact that all political parties recognised that the immigration system itself was ‘out of control’, this painted a dire picture of migrants. The right-wing newspapers portrayed migrants as posing economic, societal and traditional threats to British taxpayers, British (low-skilled) workers and British cultural identity. The threats they brought were: heightened risks of crime and terrorism; pressures on public services, such as schools, hospitals and the NHS; a heightened unemployment rate, council taxes and house prices, coupled with lower wages; and lessened societal cohesion due to lack of immigration. The pattern of intensity this discourse followed, however, was interesting. It was higher before the EU accession and then quietened until about two years after the accession, when the effect of it was perhaps clearer and the tide of migrants was ongoing.

This pattern of intensity in the discourse is similar in the political section (table 10). In the speeches, the discourse was focussed mostly on protecting the societal sector and national identity, values and communities. In the manifestos however, the range of the diagnostic frame is larger and covers the prevention of terrorism (following the 07/07 attacks) and other migrant crime. The focus on the economic sector is lower, but the rate of migration is recognised to put pressures on public services.

In the more-liberal newspapers (table 12), migration was not such a clear-cut issue. Therefore, there is less of a diagnostic frame focussed on migrants. In fact, the diagnosis is more that the government and (right-wing) media is the problem as it is not analysing the real issues and is spreading unnecessary fear. The Financial Times does recognise that there is both a cost and benefit to migration, and that migrants can pose threats to society, and in a traditional security sense. However, it never generalises that ‘migrants’ pose these threats.

In the period containing the Financial Crisis and the four subsequent years, 2008-2012, the discourse essentially continues the same as before, but more explicitly and with more focus on the economic sector. This shift was not only perceived in the qualitative analysis, but also in the percental changes perceived between Figure 2 and Figure 3 in Chapter 2.

In the political discourse, ‘economic growth’ is a key thing to be protected, besides ‘our society’ (table 10). There is less focus on the traditional/militaristic sector and the discourse becomes more nuanced. Especially towards the end of the period, it has become clear to politicians that migrants are not necessarily the problem, but a symptom of it. More efforts are made to increase the employability and motivation of British workers and to discourage the anti-immigrant discourse.
In the media, however, it has proven difficult for the politicians to convince the newspapers that (1) they (the politicians) are working hard to deal with the large migrant influx and improve Britons employability, especially during the crisis and (2) that migrants are not necessarily the largest problem. The Guardian and the Financial Times seem more sceptical toward migrants and the consequences of migration, despite the decline in the use of actual securitising language. However, as discussed, this decline is likely because most ‘threats’ have already been recognised by this time and therefore the language needs to be less explicit, or perhaps because there is now more known on the topic and therefore the publications are more nuanced and politically correct.

In this period, the economy is seen to be the biggest area needing protection, followed by community cohesion. The pressures on public services, hospitals and schools is something that is continually covered by all sources. The Daily Mail and Telegraph (table 11) published that migration is diluting British society, disregarding British values and customs, and will lead to tensions between ethnic groups, and that ‘whites’ will become the minority in future. Both newspapers most often reported that migrants were putting low-skilled and young Britons out of work (and council houses), especially during their rising unemployment following the Crisis. However, they do both acknowledge that British workers’ mentalities are part of the problem. This is something that was also seen to be a key feature of the actual problem during the individual interview with Chris Huhne and in the more-liberal newspapers.
|-------------------------------|----------|----------|
| **What Must be Protected?**   | • British low-skilled workers  
• British taxpayers  
• British cultural identity | • The economy  
• Low-skilled and young (jobless) Britons  
• Community cohesion  
• British society  
• British values and customs |
| **From What/Whom?**           | • Poles and other Eastern Europeans  
• Out of control immigration system  
• Traditional: risk of more crime and terrorism  
• Societal: pressures on public services, schools, hospitals, NHS, lessened societal cohesion  
• Economic: higher unemployment rate, higher council taxes, raised house prices, lower wages | • Traditional:  
• Societal: The pressures on public services, hospitals and schools. Raised tensions between ethnic groups and the potential that whites will become the minority in future  
• Economic: Migrants that are putting low-skilled and young Britons out of work and council houses. British workers’ (bad) mentalities and work-ethic |

Table 11 - Comparison Key Diagnostic Frame Findings Conservative Newspapers

The Guardian posted ambiguous articles on the effect of migrants on British jobs in time of recession. Eastern Europeans were not seen to influence unemployment, despite the reporting of the right-wing newspapers, but non-EU migrants were. A lot of the Guardian’s publishing was again focussed on discrediting arguments presented in the right-wing newspapers, and how suggested policies to deal with the migrant ‘issue’ were faulty. This is mirrored in the Financial Times’ discourse (table 12). However, FT is positive about the seeming decline in migrants following the Financial Crisis, due to their negative impact on low-skilled jobs and youth unemployment. An interesting point of conflict in this research, is that FT displays how the decrease in migrants could be damaging for certain industries like construction. One of the ‘objective discomfort’ examples Mr. Huhne gave was of the adverse effect migrants had on the construction industry. However, this is more likely to be in the period following the 2004 EU accession, rather than after the Financial Crisis, as the UK had come to rely upon this migrant labour in the period in between.

---

10 Which was later discredited across all newspapers.
In conclusion, in response to the question ‘How did the 2008 Financial Crisis change the securitisation of migration, in the United Kingdom?’, one can say that there was a substantially larger focus on the economic sector of security following the Crisis. Furthermore, migrants were at least recognised to have an adverse impact on low-skilled and youth unemployment, despite being needed in other areas. This argumentation did already exist before the crisis. However, the use of the ‘recession’ in the discourse did strengthen the case against migration.

The quantitative textual analysis and qualitative diagnostic frame analysis does suggest that the Financial Crisis perhaps did not have as large an impact as the EU accession of 2004. This is because all arguments made after the Crisis follow-on from arguments made in the previous period, and mostly relate to immigrants from the A10 countries. The arguments did become more explicit, heightened and more nuanced. However, this could be because of the ongoing growth in the migrant rate, more experience with the migrant issues and the Financial Crisis (or a combination of these things).

Looking at whether the media followed policy or vice-versa, it seems there was an interesting interplay. The media seemed to explode at the beginning of 2004 with fear-mongering messages on the overexaggerated number of migrants set to enter the UK following the accession. However, this died down until about 2006, during which the media more moderately followed policy-making. The so-called media ‘frenzy’ began again around
2006 and then continued throughout the research period, with an extra boost thanks to the Financial Crisis. Following the Financial Crisis, and in the run-up to the 2010 general election, it seemed that the policy-makers were following the media more. By that time, the media had been able to influence public opinion so vastly, that the political parties were left with no choice but to turn migration into such a hot political issue. This supports Vicky Squire’s thesis that the securitisation of migration becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. The practises and policies initially placed to deal with migration fail, but receive lots of media attention, which raises the pressure on quickly designing and implementing new policies, which also often fail. As Mr. Huhne added, this leads to disillusionment with both migrants and the political system.

The hypotheses posed in the methodology mostly proved to be true. Firstly, it is true that the 2008 Financial Crisis resulted in the changing of the construction of migration as a security threat in the United Kingdom. However, a caveat can now be added that this was predated by the larger-impact event of the 2004 EU accession. Both of these events were then used together in the securitisation of migration.

Secondly, the securitisation discourse around migration did cause a shift toward the economic sector as a challenge to the state. This is especially the case when ‘economic growth’ became something that needed to be protected. However, arguments were made both pro- and anti- migration in relation to the stimulation of economic growth and economic recovery. Furthermore, despite the raise in focus on the economic sector, it is not the case that economic arguments against migrants were first introduced following the Crisis.

Finally, there were conflictual findings in the discourse on migration. There was a large ambiguity in the numbers published on migrants arriving in the UK, and on their effect on British jobs, wages and unemployment. This is unsurprising between sources that come from different sides of the political spectrum, partially seeking to further their own political agenda and migrant rhetoric. However, multiple sources published articles that conflicted with other previous articles, sometimes within the same week. This must have been highly confusing for the public, spread fear and potentially hindered their ability to create an objective opinion on migrants.

The outcome of these hypotheses highlights the political nature of the securitisation (of migration). It shows that the discourse does not have to be led by ‘facts’. Instead, the discourse is influenced by a securitising actor, and its capability of convincing its audience
that extraordinary measures need to be taken to combat a ‘threat’. In this case, the economic security sector received a renewed focus in relation to the issue of migration.

Despite having such a large data pool, this research was still very limited in its scope. In future, it would be interesting to look more at the role of public opinion. It could be interesting to examine some of the opinion polls mentioned in the newspapers, in more depth. A potential complement to this dissertation could also involve a public survey of these findings among a wider audience. Another idea could be to look at different types of sources like radio and television broadcast or different, more ‘downmarket’ newspapers. Finally, it could be interesting to compare the discourse uncovered here to the one now. In his interview, Mr. Huhne hinted on the disillusionment felt with the government, partially caused by their handling of the migrant situation, which led to the Brexit referendum and the subsequent process of leaving the EU.
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