The creation of a crisis

A discourse analysis of the securitization of migration within the Council of the European Union
Abstract

This research aims to examine the securitization of migration in the Council of the European union by answering the question “Why did a securitization of migration wave in 2015 occur in the political debate within the Council of the European union?”. The research focuses on the Justice and Home Affairs Council (JHA) and the Foreign Affairs Council (FAC). This is done by a discourse analysis of relevant Council documents, whereas the securitization theory is used as an explanatory tool. The results of the study show that a securitization of migration occurred due to the discourse 1) connecting migration to terrorism, 2) producing the image of a crisis taking place, 3) mobilizing institutions to act upon these notions, and 4) overlooking migrants’ security through power relation mechanisms detected in the discourse.
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1. Introduction

The European Union (EU) was created as an initiative with the purpose of working towards peace in Europe through trade. The EU has since its emergence increased its capacities and the cooperation between the member countries has intensified. Today, the EU is a unique organisation with the most extensive supranational cooperation in the world. (European Union 2018 [1]) The institutions have developed over time through various treaties and regulations. Since the EU’s emergence, these institutions have strengthened their role, but are nevertheless under constant development due to new challenges that emerge.

A well-known example of a current challenge that the EU institutions and member states faces is the so called “migration crisis” which put pressure on the institutions and member states in 2015 as the migration flows through the Mediterranean Sea increased drastically. This resulted in an increase in asylum applications which in 2015 was doubled compared to the year before, and thereby reached 1.3 million asylum applications. The migrants were exposed to inhumane conditions during their journey across the Mediterranean Sea towards Europe due to lack of alternative legal routes. This led to many cases where migrants were dependent on human traffickers in order to cross the Mediterranean Sea in life threatening circumstances. A great amount of fatalities was reported and many of these cases were due to migrants drowning. (Poptcheva 2015)

Meanwhile, a greater pressure was put on the member states to handle the asylum applications. Many member states took on drastic measures to decrease the asylum applications in both their own state, as well as in Europe. This was for example done by using treaties and regulations to their advantage, leading to a greater pressure being concentrated on a few member states - which in turn lead to an even greater risk for the migrants’ lives due to constrained legal options. (Poptcheva 2015)

1.1. Research problem

It is noted that, despite the life-threatening conditions that the migrants escape from, many EU member states took on drastic measures in order to stop the migration. Such reactions are not a new phenomenon. The EU member states have faced different migration waves throughout the years, and the act of actively excluding migrants is a pattern that can be seen in several different cases through different times. A common trait for these instances is the portrayal of migrants as a threat in different ways. This process is known as *securitization* and has been studied
thoroughly over the years. The concept has been applied to many cases and topics, whereas migration is one of them. The different studies have provided important insights of the mechanisms behind different securitization processes and the cases that have been studied have been provided with relevant explanations from a securitization perspective. The concept of securitization is under constant development, making it applicable on current situations. It can therefore be used to provide important explanations to why the events, related to the migration wave of 2015, unfolded the way they did; a topic which to this day is of great relevance in order to understand why the EU member states reacted the way they did on the migration wave. This research will therefore examine how the securitization of migration in the EU has unfolded.

From a scientific point of view, it is an interesting topic to study since it creates a greater knowledge about the securitization of migration within a supranational organization. By investigating this, a base will be laid regarding the interpretation of the migration discourse on EU level.

The topic of migration and the EU is relevant when looking beyond the scientific aspect as well, since this is something that greatly affects the lives of migrants as well as the EU member states. It is therefore utterly important to comprehend the discourse on a deeper level in order to read between the lines of the political arena and deconstruct the arguments.

1.2. Aim and research questions
The aim of this research is to create an understanding of the securitization of migration that occurred within the EU during 2015. More specifically, focus will be on the Council of the European Union. The research will therefore look into the processes behind the securitization of migration with the aim of explaining the case through the existing theoretical framework. It will be done in order to create a deeper understanding of the processes of securitizing migration by examining the discourse which securitized migration in 2015. This will be done by answering the following question:

- Why did a securitization of the migration wave in 2015 occur in the political debate within the Council of the European Union?

Moreover, the following sub-questions will be used as a guideline throughout the research:
1.3 Demarcation
In order to limit the study, the main focus of this research will be on the migration wave around the year of 2015 and the securitization of migration among the Council of the European Union. More specifically, the focus within the Council of the European Union will lay on the Justice and Home Affairs Council and the Foreign Affairs Council. As has been touched upon in the earlier section, the migration flows to EU countries increased during 2015, and so did the asylum applications. A shift was seen in the political arena as the member states started mobilizing and political actions were initiated. This shift is marked by the year 2015 and is therefore a natural choice to focus on when investigating the securitization of migration.

The choice of focusing on the Council of the European Union is rooted in several different factors. With its role as legislator, and in some cases even as an agenda-setter and implementer, it is interesting to know how the securitization of migration is set within the Council. While the Council of the European Union is far from being the only actor within the EU that manages migration matters, they nevertheless possess an important role in making decisions on the migration policies. The Council of the European Union thus composes an important element in shaping the EU policies in terms of migration, but is despite this often deprived of the spotlight as a research object when it comes to securitization of migration. It is therefore of great importance to dig deeper into the securitization process within the Council of the European Union specifically. In order to demarcate the study even further, the Justice and Home Affairs Council and the Foreign Affairs Council were chosen to focus on within the Council of the European Union, as these are the constellations are the most relevant when looking into migration.
2. Theoretical framework

In this section, a review of the existing literature based on earlier studies on the topic of securitization of migration in the EU will be given. This will be followed by a detailed description of the theory chosen for this study, being the concept of securitization - with focus on securitization of migration.

2.1. Literature review

A considerable amount of literature has been produced on the topic of security and the field has evolved thoroughly over the years. Within the studies of security, a shift occurred during the 1980s in defining security, where the concept came to include a broader set of matters compared to the traditional definition, which was locked on ascribing security matters to the military sector and the nation-state. This new, broader definition of security is known as the Copenhagen school. Among the first to lay the ground for this new era in security studies were Barry Buzan, Ole Weaver and Jaap De Wilde with their book ‘Security: A new Framework for Analysis’ where different aspects of society are seen with the security glasses and a definition of securitization was provided.

Over the years, the securitization theory has been elaborated by researchers such as Thierry Balzacq who identified securitization as an ideal type, and whose definition is one among those being used in this study. Securitization has also been applied to many different fields - migration being one of them. While Buzan, again, being among the first to make this connection, there have been other important names within the subject of migration and securitization. One of them is Jef Huysmans who has produced many contributions to the field, and whose work has contributed immensely to the theoretical framework of this study. Another significant contributor is Maggie Ibrahim whose connection to securitization of migration and racism adds an often forgotten dimension to the study. The work of Balzacq, Huysman and Ibrahim will lay the foundation of the theoretical framework of this study and will be further elaborated in the upcoming section.

2.2. Securitization theory

The topic of securitization of migration has been on the agenda long before the migration wave of 2015. The concept has been applied to different waves of migration in several different
places. This means that the theory has been well developed and that there is much literature to choose from on the topic.

The securitization of migration derives from the general concept of securitization, which simply means turning a topic on the political agenda into a matter of security. The concept of securitization is, according to Balzacq et al., an ideal type which captures the essentials of different theories and generalizes the characteristics of a phenomenon. (Balzacq 2015, p. 103-104) He defines the ideal type of securitization as the following:

“• Threats are social facts whose status depends on an intersubjective commitment between an audience and a securitizing actor

• Securitizing moves and context are co-dependent

• The drivers of securitizing moves are knowledge claims about an existential threat to a referent object

• Power relations among stakeholders structure both the processes and outcomes of securitizing moves

• Securitizing moves are engraved in social mechanisms (persuasion, propaganda, learning, socialization, practices, etc.)

• Securitization instantiates policy changes – for example, ‘deontic powers’ (rights, obligations, derogations exceptional or otherwise, etc.)

• Securitization ascribes responsibility”

(Balzacq 2015, p. 106)

Historically, the term ‘security’ has only been applied to the military sector in terms of arms control, nuclear deterrence, and military alliances where the main focus has been the nation state. After the Cold War, a shift in what was considered security occurred. In the 1990s, a wider range of policy issues, such as migration and environment, were included in the security term. While the military aspects of security did not fully disappear, it was evident that a shift had taken place. Even though academia had touched upon this subject even before this period,
the concept of securitization was now further established in the public and political arena. (Jef Huysmans 2006, p. 15-18)

Due to increased globalization of both world markets and their production modes, the securitization has taken on a more individual-oriented shift. While the earlier security focus rather saw individuals as citizens of a nation-state in first hand, the end of the Cold War marked a shift where the focus instead would be on individuals as persons. This has many times been described with the term ‘human security’ which aims to highlight threats towards populations beyond the borders of the nation-state. (Maggie Ibrahim 2005, p. 168)

By looking at the history of security it can hence be concluded that security and insecurity are social and political constructions which are produced and reproduced. Securitization emerges as a reaction to perceived threats by institutions and political actors. It can be seen as a discursive process where the language being used to describe a certain event can have a mobilizing effect on national security agencies and the public’s idea about the security state. Political issues can thus both be defined in positive and negative terms, and this in turn will determine whether or not it is turned into a security issue. (Huysmans 2006, p. 6-8)

What is defined as a threat is therefore dependent on “whether the threat is real or perceived” and “how much political priority it deserves” (Huysman 2006, p. 2-3). This creates a hierarchy of which security issues are to be prioritized and thus also a competition between security definitions. A prime example of such a case is the contesting views on migration as a threat to national security contra a threat to the human security. (Huysmans 2006, p. 2-3) When it comes to the framing of security it is further on important to note that the language used in the securitizing discourses has the capacity of transforming the public’s perception of an issue. This in turn is dependent on “a framework of meanings that security language implies” (Huysman 2006, p.25). It is therefore important to have the policy areas in mind when looking at the changed meanings of security issues. (Huysmans 2006, p. 22-25)

2.3. Securitization of migration
Migration has thus become a topic on the security agenda and is being portrayed as a threat to the domestic security, the domestic welfare state, and the nation’s culture. (Huysmans 2000,
One general pattern that can be found here is that the response to migration as a security issue is seen as an inevitable response to migration. When migration becomes a matter of security, a security policy is implemented in order to restore the public order and domestic stability which is said to be diminished because of migrants. By looking at the securitization of migration from this perspective, it is assumed that the implementation of security policy is a reaction to the securitization of migration which portrays the migrants as a threat. (Huysman 2000, p. 757)

Another way to look at it is to see the securitization of migration as a social force which is enforced by both expectations and the mobilization of institutions. Since some institutions are created in order to work with security matters and directly represent security policy, a consequence of this can be the securitization of migration. An example of such institutions can be the Ministry of Home Affairs and the police. These institutions can of course trigger the view of migrants as a threat to domestic security, but another way in which the securitization of migration can be expressed is from the human rights aspect which lays focus on the security of the migrant. In this case, asylum is seen as a human right and needs to be handled within the framework of the human rights policy. (Huysman 2000, p. 757)

What the securitization of migration further does is to determine the criteria of membership to the political community. It simply determines the belonging of the community by creating a group of “others” who compose a existential threat and are excluded from the national identity. This in turn creates a community which either supports or challenges the prevailing political authority on the basis of that existing “threat”. This process can be exemplified by looking at the conservative discourse which sees multiculturalism as a threat to the home culture and a myth is created which reinforces the idea that exclusion of migrants will lead to a stronger homogenous society. This process is however not only practiced by the far-right movements, but rather includes several actors such as the media, national governments, grass root movements, and the European community. (Huysman 2000, p. 758)

The securitization of migration is therefore “a structural effect of a multiplicity of practices” (Huysman 2000, p. 758).
Another important aspect to add when looking at the securitization of migration is its connection to racism, which is still present in our society on a structural level today. The concept ‘new racism’ adds a dimension to the concept of racism. Here it is not only (the non-existent) biological differences which are the base of the ideology. Instead, emphasis is also laid on cultural differences and the false assumption where some cultures are seen as inferior to others. This new shape which racism has taken has many dimensions, but in this context it is based on the assumption that the own culture has shared values which is said to be under threat because of migration, thus creating a fear of the “others”. This in turn can lead to discrimination of groups that do not belong to the majority. By focusing on cultural differences, the ‘new racism’ has adapted racism to the modern society in order to make it seem legitimate. (Ibrahim 2005, p. 165)

This can be described as an exercise of power relations and knowledge through discourse, which the laws and policies are an outcome of. This discourse is related to racist presumptions where cultural differences are seen as a threat, which international organizations, politicians, academics, and journalist reproduce through discourse. (Ibrahim 2005, p.164)

With the case of migration, there are several different trends when it comes to racist tendencies in the securitization of migration. As the term ‘human security’ has been established and a more individualistic approach is taken when analysing security, migration has become a security issue. This has however not been the case in order to highlight the risks that the migrants face, such as war and hunger, it has been the case because migrants are seen as a risk to the receiving countries. Here, a conflict is seen in how the migrant should be securitized - whose ‘human security’ is of greater importance? Is it the citizen of the receiving nation-state or the migrant whose life is at risk? The definition of which matter should be securitized is an example of power mechanism which is reproduced through discourse. This can lead to legitimization of racist fears, which are based on a fear of clashes between identity groups and a fear of how migration will transform the national identity. These fears are in turn based on racial prejudice. (Ibrahim 2005, p. 168-173)
3. Method and material

In this section an explanation of the method being used will be given. This will be followed by an overview of the materials that lays the ground for this study.

3.1. Research method

The research design that is going to be used in this essay is the model of an explanatory, theory consuming case study. An explanatory study aims to answer questions regarding why something is the way it is (Esaiasson et. al. 2017, p. 37). Meanwhile, a theory consuming study refers to the use of a theoretical framework to explain a case. This means that the case will be in the centre of the study while the theory is the tool used to look at it, instead of being in the centre. The theory is thus simply used to explain why an event unfolded the way it did. (Esaiasson et. al. 2017, p. 42) In this study we will therefore put the case of the Council of the European Union and the migration in 2015 in the centre of the study in order to explain it with help from our theoretical framework - which is securitization theory.

The research method that will be used in this study is discourse analysis, which is a technique used in qualitative research. Its aim is to analyse the meaning and ideas that are being communicated through a text and through speech. (Göran Bergström & Kristina Boréus 2012, p. 16-17) In some cases a broader definition is used to describe discourse as being more than text and language. Within semiotics, all human communications which produce a meaning are seen as a ‘text’. This can thus include images and movies aside from the written text. (Bergström & Boréus 2012, p. 21) Even if the discourse analysis in this study will focus on the written texts, it is nevertheless important to have this broad definition in mind.

The functions of a text is understood when putting the use of language in a social system, as it is a part of the human social practices. The use of a text can be seen from two sides. On one hand, the language being used is an expression of thoughts and ideas or of the perception of the surroundings. On the other hand, language is used in social relations with others, for example in order to express an opinion or to inform. Seen from this perspective, it is not only used to express something - it is intended to lead to action. A discourse is therefore the use of language as a social practice, and the discourse analysis is thereby aimed to understand the social context and the practices in which the words are used in. (Bergström & Boréus 2012, p. 21-23) The social context which is to be understood in this study is the Council of the European Union, or
more specifically the JHA and FAC, and the practices which are to be understood in this study is the securitization of migration.

A common object analysed within the social sciences is power relations, which are communicated through discourse. According to Steven Lukes, power relations have three dimensions: 1) Power is visible and is typically expressed through decisions taken within political contexts, or 2) power can be exercised by not putting something on the agenda, and 3) hidden power exercise, being power over the thought, which takes another level of analysis as the content needs to be analysed through what is actually expressed. (Bergström & Boréus 2012, p.18-19) These dimensions are important to have in mind when looking at the discourse analysis of this study.

There are several approaches to make a discourse analysis, and the one that will be used in this study is the argument analysis. Here the arguments of the actor are in focus. These are put in a context in order to understand what the argument is and the reasons behind it. The content of the text and the implications of it is also of great importance when doing an argumentation analysis. (Bergström & Boréus 2012, p. 24)

A discourse analysis is of great relevance for this study since it will provide an important tool to create an understanding of the securitization of migration within the Council of the European Union. Since the securitization occurs due to expression of ideas, and language is used as a tool to securitize matters, it is suitable to use a argumentation analysis to see which arguments are presented in order to securitize migration and thus mobilize the institutions into taking political action. As the securitization occurs on so many levels and is a continuous process, the discourse analysis can be used to trace this process and disclose it. Despite the broad definition of discourse, this study will limit itself to written text due to practical reasons and thus focus on finding the securitizing words and implications within the documents being analysed without looking further into non-verbal communication.
3.2. Material
The material being used for analysis are documents derived from the Council of the European Union’s collection of meeting documents retrieved from the website consilium.europa.eu. Here, meeting documents from the JHA and the FAC related to the migration wave in 2015 are used. Statements and documents from Donald Tusk and the European Council have also been used in cases where they related to JHA and FAC. The documents include statements, meeting conclusions, background briefings, invitation letters, which will be carefully read and reviewed in order to grasp the securitization elements that are being expressed. Other material that is used in the study is seen in the theory section where the work of Jef Huysman, Thierry Balzacq and Maggie Ibrahim are used to give an insight of the concept of securitization. When the institutions and frameworks of the EU related to this study will be explained an important source is Jonas Tallberg’s book “EU:s politiska system” as well as the EU’s website. Along with this, the scientific articles being listed have been used which have been retrieved through the library search engine of the Linnaeus University - Onesearch. When searching for material, whether it has been through Onesearch or through the EU sites, the main keywords being used to find the material have been ‘securitization’, ‘migration’, ‘Council of European Union’, ‘Justice and Home Affairs’, ‘Foreign Affairs Council’, and ‘Schengen’.

Some important aspects have been in consideration when choosing the material for this study in order to ensure that the sources are valid for this context. One aspect has, of course, been the relevance of the sources - as they need to provide with relevant information for the aim of the study. This has been ensured by always having the demarcation in mind when carefully sorting out irrelevant information.

Another aspect that has been in consideration when looking into sources is that the sources always should be characterized by the principles of authenticity, independence, contemporaneity, and non-tendency (Esaiasson et. al. 2017, p. 288). The authenticity of the sources has been ensured by only retrieving the information from well known providers such as the EU and Onesearch, which guarantee that the information has been peer-reviewed and is not false. The principle of the independence of the sources is ensured by mainly using primary sources, such as the EU documents, as well as having a critical approach to the content through the discourse analysis as well as by using complementary sources. The use of complementary sources has also reduced the risk of tendentious sources as the same information has been
confirmed through other sources as well. The only risk of tendentiousness is the extensive use of sources derived from the EU. This is however done when explaining general information of the functions of the institutions, as well as for the discourse analysis - which is of necessity for this study. The material used for this study has thus been carefully chosen in order to ensure the scientific validity of the results in this study.
4. The European Union’s framework for migration

There are several different rules, regulations, and frameworks which regulate the EU’s asylum policies and make up the framework for migration. In order to understand the context and the relevant actors for this research, the following section will provide a brief explanation of the different frameworks and their relation to migration. Moreover, a brief explanation will be given on the role of the Council of the European Union and the constellations in which it operates in within the migration framework.

4.1. The Dublin Regulation

The Dublin Regulation (DR) was first introduced in 1997 and has since been reformed twice; in 2003 (Dublin II) and in 2013 (Dublin III). The DR was created as a regional EU asylum legislation where the first country of arrival is the one responsible for the asylum application. This thereby stops asylum seekers from applying in multiple EU-countries as well as it stops member states from avoiding responsibility. The migrant is thus returned to the state where the first asylum application was submitted. This system has not been entirely unproblematic. Some of the issues faced are the different reception conditions, the state’s processing ability, and the different access to social rights for the migrants. (Jean-Paul Brekke, Grete Brochmann 2015, p. 2)

This has been a problem due to the disproportionate burden being laid on the countries at the border of the EU, leading to the halted enforcement of the DR by states at the EU borders, such as Greece and Italy. This, in turn, has led to Northern European countries, such as Sweden and Germany receiving most of the asylum applications. (Teresa Cicero & Jorge Tavares da Silva 2016, p. 10-11)

The current version of the DR - the Dublin III, was adopted in 2013 and was aimed to increase the protection of the asylum applicant as well as improving the efficiency of the system. Nevertheless, an evaluation in 2015 revealed further defaults in the DR III in relation to the migration flows, leading to suggestions on further developing the DR in order to match the European Agenda on Migration. The Dublin IV is now under further development, aiming to fulfil the procedure from 2017 to 2020. (European Union [4])
4.2. The Schengen Agreement
The Schengen Agreement was established in 1985 as an intergovernmental initiative between France, Germany, Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands. (Stephen Castles, Hein de Haas & Mark J. Miller 2014, p. 232) This was initially a way of creating a free movement for citizens who want to work or visit another country within the Schengen Area - an initiative seen as the birth of a common European migration and integration policy. Eventually, the Schengen Agreement was soon incorporated into the EU legislation as the Treaty of Amsterdam was signed in 1997. Now, the goal was to expand the free movement by enabling EU citizens to cross borders without the need of showing formal documents, as well as it was a way of increase the control of the external borders and controlling the illegal immigration within the EU. (Cicero & Tavares da Silva 2016, p. 8)

One initiative that was taken as a part of increasing the external control of the borders was the establishment of FRONTEX (European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union) in 2004. This was an attempt of uniting the member-states by shifting the focus from internal immigration to immigration from non-member states. The external border control of the EU was thus intensified, while still emphasising national sovereignty. This is why the member states still have the main responsibility of their own borders as FRONTEX mainly assists with coordination and other assistance. The authority of FRONTEX has in some cases been expanded to cross the borders of the EU in order to take actions to prevent migration. Such examples are the HERA-operations as well as the Liaison Officers whose main task is to make risk analyses of immigration trends in non-member states. (Cicero & Tavares 2016, p. 10)

The Schengen Agreement along with FRONTEX were thus one of the main actors during the migration wave in 2015 used as a means of controlling the migration flows. As has been seen, the Schengen Agreement has been undermined as a result of EU member states attempting to control the migration inflows. This was for example done by setting up internal border controls, and in some cases such as in Hungary even building fences and walls. This in turn eroded the idea of shared responsibilities and solidarity. (Cicero & Tavares 2016, p. 12)
4.3. The Council of the European Union
The Council of the European Union is, along with the European Parliament, the legislative institutions regarding asylum matters. Its role was stipulated in the Rome Treaty 1957, and it’s not to be seen as a permanent council with a consistent set of members. It is composed of different constellations depending on which matter is discussed, where each member state has one representative. The representatives are usually the member states’ minister responsible for the topic under current discussion. The ministers in the Council are however only one fraction of the whole work group. There are several committees and work groups who assist the ministers and negotiate matters in advance, meaning that the decisions are usually already concluded when they reach the ministers. The most important organ aside from the Council is the Coreper, which prepares the meetings for each constellation and where most decisions are made. The work is lead by the presidency, whose tasks are to administer and coordinate the work, decide which matters are to be initiated, mediate in decisions, and to represent the Council of the European Union internally and externally. (Jonas Tallberg 2013)

The role of the Council of the European Union varies depending on the constellation taking place. Putting it simply, the Council has the responsibility of both coordinating and legislating, as well as implementing in some cases. As a legislator, the Council has a shared responsibility with the European Parliament - a shift which was made to democratize the EU and give the EU a greater supranational status. However, the Council still has a stronger position regarding some matters where the Parliament only serves as a counsellor. Aside from this, the Council has a prominent role in determining the EU:s budget. As a coordinator, the Council operates in two ways: 1) by deciding which actions are to be taken regarding the EU:s foreign policy and security policy, and 2) by coordinating the member states’ policies on several national matters. The coordination is made based on guidelines that the European Commission suggests. The responsibility to implement is also shared with the European Commission and he member states and the European Council. The role of the Council of the European Union is mainly to create non-binding guidelines which aim to carry through with existing goals. This, along with delegating instructions to the European Commission and following up on their work is the political aspect of the Council’s implementation process. The other, administrative, aspect is to review the Commission’s administrative implementation of the policies. (Tallberg 2013)
4.3.1. Justice and Home Affairs Council (JHA)
One of the constellations which the Council of the European Union meets in, is the Justice and Home Affairs Council - which consists of the Justice and Home Affairs ministers of each member state. Their work aims to “develop cooperation and common policies on various cross-border issues, with the aim of building an EU-wide area of freedom, security and justice”. (European Union 2018 [2])

Thereby, the judicial ministers work on cooperation in matters regarding civil and criminal law, and that the home affairs ministers work on cooperation regarding migration, border management, and police cooperation. Additionally, the Justice and Home Affairs Council is responsible for civil protection. When meeting every three months, the constellation of ministers aims to adopt legislation along with the European Parliament in terms of internal security and external border protection. (European Union 2018 [2])

4.3.2. Foreign Affairs Council (FAC)
The Foreign Affairs Council is another constellation within the Council of the European Union whose job is to decide on the EU’s actions in foreign affairs. This includes foreign policy, security, defence, trade, development, and humanitarian aid. The ministers in this constellation are usually the member states’ foreign ministers. However, in some cases the defence ministers, development ministers, and trade ministers are included depending on the agenda. The meetings of the FAC are hosted once a month and are chaired by the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, which in turn is assisted by the European External Action Service (EEAS). (European Union 2018 [3])
5. Analysing the securitization of migration

In the following section, the securitization of migration will be presented and analysed. The findings are divided according to their main characteristics. This is done for a clearer overview, but the topics are nevertheless intertwined and merge into each other. Moreover, the statements which are analysed are viewed through the lens of the securitization theory presented earlier in the research.

5.1. Connecting migration to terrorism

There have been several trends of securitization of migration seen in the meeting documents of the JHA and the FAC. One interesting finding is that migration and terrorism were often handled on the same meetings. This can be partially be explained by the fact that they both fall under the same authority and that this simply is the reason they were on the agenda simultaneously. Nevertheless, a connection existed between these two subjects in how they were problematized, and which solutions were provided. The fact that terrorism was seen as a problem emerging from the outside was withstanding.

The solutions presented regarding tackling terrorism are similar to the solutions presented on handling migration. One solution appearing often when looking at the documents is the need to strengthen the external border control. (Council of the European Union Meeting n°3415: Background) This is an example of connecting migration and terrorism, as Schengen and border control are frequently mentioned when discussing counter-terrorism measures. For example, one solution that was presented to the issue of terrorism was the Schengen Information System (SIS) in which everyone who passes the Schengen borders is to be documented, both the inflow and the outflow. (Council of the European Union Meeting n°3376: Background) Another clear example is the suggestion of using PNR (Passenger Name Record) for tackling terrorism, where it is argued that: “The Council and the European Council have regularly highlighted the urgency of finalising this directive, in light of the growing threat posed by foreign fighters.” (Council of the European Union Meeting n°3415: Background). According to this notion, it could be argued that it is implied that the terrorists are coming from the outside and are not spoken of as if they are from within the EU.
On tackling terrorism it is also mentioned that there is a need of “making full use of the existing Schengen framework to reinforce and modernise external borders' control” (Council of the European Union Meeting n°3376: Background) This also implies that the threat is coming from the outside and contributes to the image of a terrorist being the equivalent to a migrant and not someone from within, thus creating an “us and them”.

Here it is evident that the notion of terrorism as a foreign phenomenon is prevalent as being a threat to the domestic security and is used to legitimize both the use of the SIS and the PNR by mobilising the institutions through this portrayal of migrants in the discourse. The solutions presented can also be seen as an example of actors reinforcing the idea of exclusion as a measure necessary for a stronger society free from terrorism. The discursive process and the language used has a securitizing effect through its implications when describing the issue, which often is producing the image of terrorists being from the outside. This can also be referred to the idea of whether a threat is present being dependent on the political priority. The domestic terrorists are for example not portrayed and prioritized in the same way, thus the ‘foreign fighters’ are securitized. The policies suggested are thereby a reaction to a perceived threat which has been identified in the securitization processes, the threat being the migrant.

The undertones which imprint the discussion regarding terrorism are at times targeting migrants. This is for example seen in Donald Tusk’s press statement made after the terror attack in Paris:

“As well as threats to peace outside, the European Union faces enemies within. Only five weeks ago, terrorists killed 17 people in France.

We will co-operate together to face this threat, not with emotion or over-reaction, but with calm and determination. We have agreed on new priorities in the fight against terrorism. What is needed most is agreement on the exchange of passenger records within the European Union. We need this soon.” (Council of the European Union 57/15)

Here, despite talking about enemies from within, the solutions presented, being the exchange of passenger records within the EU, are similar to the ones presented to constrain migration and
target persons in movement. The image of a threat being present is given, and by saying that the exchange of passenger records is needed the most to tackle terrorism creates the idea of urgency to mobilise by controlling the movements. An indirect connection is thereby made between migration and terrorism by exercising power relations to which the policies become an outcome of, due to the securitization processes. While measures on preventing radicalisation from within are mentioned in other documents, the words used to address the public can be considered to reproduce the idea of migrants as a threat - which also relates to the idea of which matter deserves political priority. It is thereby evident that the securitizing moves and the context in which they operate in are co-dependent, as terrorism is once again used to legitimize the measures taken to control the borders - a simplified solution to a complex matter.

“*The attacks were an assault on the European values of freedom, democracy, human rights and the rule of law.*“ (Council of the European Union 14382/15)

The statement above also refers to the terror attack in Paris, and it is evident that the language used indirectly creates a sense of identity in terms of speaking of ‘European values’ as guarding the freedom, democracy, human rights and rule of law. Here it is implied that there are shared values that represent European identity and culture - thus implying that the opposite is not considered to be a ‘European value’. Hence, the membership of the European political community is determined by these values and the ‘others’ are constructed. This can indirectly be seen as a way of targeting migrants by securitizing terrorism in terms of a foreign phenomenon, and indirectly targeting migrants by stating that the internal identity and culture in terms of values are threatened.

5.2. Producing the image of a crisis
One common finding in terms of describing migration and the situation at the European borders is that this is done by producing the image of a crisis taking place. This is evident in the discussions on the external borders, citizenship and identity.

One topic that often appeared on the agenda was the external borders, where the situation is described as critical and securitizing language has been used when talking about the amount of
migrants. The migration to EU has been described as having “taken unprecedented proportions”. It is often described as a “challenge” and as a “dramatic situation” at Europe’s external borders. (Council of the European Union Meeting n°3415: Background)

When calling upon the JHA, the president of the European Council, used a securitizing language when describing the migratory flows. The migrants have been spoken of as a big group and he has at times given the image of a crisis taking place, disrupting and threatening the Schengen system internally, having to be solved by external border control. The image of a crisis and a threat occurring has the aim of mobilizing politically, which is seen in statements such as the following: “If we are to avoid the worst we must speed up our actions” (Council of the European Union 775/15) or “The clock is ticking. We are under pressure. We need to act fast. As a Union.” (Council of the European Union 814/15) The crisis rhetoric has been prevailing throughout the discourse. The word crisis has been used explicitly when describing the migratory flows, and not only indirectly (Council of European Union Meeting n°3433: Background).

“Let there be no doubt: the future of Schengen is at stake and time is running out. Every week decisions are taken in Europe, which testify to how grave the situation is: reintroduction of border controls, or “technical barriers” at the borders. This is a clear demonstration that we need to regain the control of our external border. Clearly not as the only action but as the first and most important action; as a precondition for a European migration policy. “

(Council of the European Union 814/15)

...  

“Securing our borders also requires that our rules and laws are applied. The European Union will stick to its international obligations in terms of asylum rights, but it must be clear that without registration there will be no rights. If a migrant does not cooperate, there must be consequences. It is also clear that asylum seekers cannot decide where they will be granted asylum within the European Union. These are issues for the Commission and our Interior Ministers. They will need to turn these principles into operational reality now. Again, if we do not progress this Schengen will be at stake.”
In this statement, the situation at the external borders is portrayed as a crisis. By stating that “the future of Schengen is at stake” it is implied that the domestic stability of the EU is disrupted. In the statement, he further calls on action by expressing there is a need to “regain control” of the borders. This is implying that an inevitable response to the migration flows is necessary as the “control” is allegedly lost otherwise. In the statement, the power relations are also expressed in terms of whose human security is of priority. While the international asylum rights are recognised, it is stated that who is the rights holder is defined by the domestic, European, power holders and are second handedly to be claimed by the migrants themselves. The citizenships is thus excluding who does have the right to claim the rights that are referred to in the text. The securitization of migrants through the power dimension thereby prioritizes the image produced by the crisis rhetoric rather than the human security in terms of the security of the migrants. The crisis rhetoric could thereby be considered to be used as a means of legitimizing exclusion. Again, the migrants are portrayed as a disruption of the Schengen, domestic security and stability - and the discourse aims to mobilize institutions to act.

The power dimension on defining citizenship in terms of crisis rhetoric is detected in the discussions on security and terrorism as well, as the security of European citizens is under threat. The security of Europeans is described as being ensured by taking on external measures, which is seen in a suggestion to take on “measures to detect and disrupt suspect movements, in particular of foreign terrorist fighters” (Council of the European Union 57/15). This directly connects to the idea of human security and whose human security is prioritized due to power relations.

The concept of “new racism” can be connected to these measures as they are being described as a way of “safeguarding values” (Council of the European Union 57/15). While other factors...
such as promoting tolerance, non-discrimination, fundamental freedoms, international cooperation and the need to address crisis and conflict are mentioned - it is not specified who is included in this and the idea of the threat as something coming from the outside is prevalent. (Council of the European Union 57/15) The idea of citizenship as exclusive and the idea of different prioritization of the human security of European citizens contra migrants’ human security is thereby prevalent, as well as it is connected to the idea of crisis rhetoric used as a legitimization of the migration policies.

Other examples where the image of a crisis is produced, are for example to be seen in the statement regarding the situation in Greece and Italy. Here, the President of the European Council, Donald Tusk stated the following:

“*It is clear that the greatest tide of refugees and migrants is yet to come. Therefore we need to correct the policy of open doors and windows. Now the focus should be on the proper protection of our external borders and on external assistance to refugees and the countries in our neighbourhood.*” (Council of the European Union 675/15)

…

“*Leaders also agreed that the current chaos at our external borders must end. Proper management and control of our external borders is our common responsibility.*”

(Council of the European Union 675/15)

…

“*Tonight we have a common understanding that we cannot continue like we did before. Without changing the current paradigm the Schengen area will only exist in theory.*”

(Council of the European Union 675/15)

In this statement, the crisis rhetoric can be detected in the use of terms such as “*chaos*” when describing the situation at the European borders. The idea of migrants being a disruption to the domestic security is thereby once again reproduced, and the institutions are urged to act upon this by controlling the external borders. Here the use of the words “*proper protection of our*
external borders” implies that there is a need of “protection” at the borders, hence indirectly implying migrants being a threat. This can thereby also contribute to reproducing the idea that excluding migrants will lead to a stable situation. By stating that a change is needed or “the Schengen area will only exist in theory”, the image of a crisis is further produced by giving implications of a dystopic future awaiting due to migration and the “chaos” it allegedly brings to the borders. Thereby, it could be argued that the image of a crisis is indirectly used to legitimize the exclusion of migrants.

5.3. Mobilisation
Throughout the documents, it has been evident that the words aim to mobilise the institutions. This is seen in different examples such as in terms of establishing return policies, cooperating with different actors and establishing ‘hotspots’. The idea of a threat being present is prevailing throughout the discourse. Below, some examples of how the statements aim to mobilise are listed.

One solution provided is the return policy. It is for example stated that the member states need to “improve the return rate” (Council of the European Union 13880/15) Other mobilising solutions mentioned is the cooperation with third countries outside of Europe. The actors that are suggested to be cooperated with are countries of origin and transit. The examples of such cooperation is the Valletta Summit with African countries, and the cooperation with Turkey, Jordan, Lebanon and the Western Balkan countries. (Council of the European Union EUCO 22/15)

When talking about cooperation with the non-EU actors the matter of migration is clearly securitized. The discussions on cooperation with countries of origin, mainly focus on stemming the migration flows to the EU countries. Here, suggestions such as identifying “safe countries of origin”, “tackling the root causes of migration” and “reduce the incentives for illegal migration” are given. (Council of the European Union EUCO 22/15) It is thereby both explicitly and indirectly stated that the aim is to reduce migration by the proposed policies and cooperation. The cooperation can thus be seen as an act of mobilisation as several different actors are engaged in reducing the migration to EU, and the crisis rhetoric’s role in it is evident.
When talking about the Joint Action Plan with Turkey, or about the cooperation on the Western Balkans/Mediterranean route, or the Valletta Summit - where African Heads of State or Government participated, the words used to argue for the cooperation are “shared responsibility”, “mutual commitments”, and “delivery”. Using such words can imply as a call for mobilisation and action from the actors involved. The cooperation is argued to be done with “emphasis on the management of migratory flows and the fight against criminal networks”. (European Council EUCO 26/15) Here, it can be seen that a securitization of migration occurs by connecting it to criminal networks, which can be considered as another way of portraying migrants as a threat and thus legitimizing the actions. Other solutions presented are increased development aid, which in this case is done to remove the incentives for migrating to the EU, as it is explicitly stated in the documents. (Council of the European Union EUCO 22/15) By increasing development aid to remove incentives for migration, institutions are mobilized further by going beyond the institutions directly related to migration and borders, showing that the securitization has an impact beyond the institutions directly related to borders, security and migration. These suggestions can thereby be considered as arguments used to initiate the cooperation with the mentioned actors, which in turn is an outcome of the securitization rhetoric - as institutions become mobilised and urged to act.

In terms of security and defence, it is also suggested that there is a need for further cooperation with actors such as UN, NATO, OSCE, and the African Union (AU). (Council of the European Union EUCO 22/15) Even though this is not suggested to be done in terms of migration explicitly, it is argued to be done to be “empowering and enabling partners to prevent and manage crises, including through concrete projects of capacity building with a flexible geographic scope”. (Council of the European Union EUCO 22/15) It can be argued that involving organisations such as the NATO and OSCE can indirectly be considered as a securitizing move as these organizations explicit work with security matters. As migration is described as a crisis, it could hence be included here, particularly assuming the context in which the decisions are made in.

Another evident outcome of the securitizing moves is the establishment of a decision regarding assisting the transit countries, in particular Italy and Greece, due to the alleged “emergency
situation characterised by a sudden inflow of nationals of third countries”. The situation is described as a “crisis in the Mediterranean” and aims to mobilise institutions and member states by relocation mechanisms through FRONTEX, EASO and other agencies. This is described as an act of “internal solidarity and responsibility”. (Council of the European Union 12098/15)

Aside from the relocation, the decision was made to regulate the flows at the external borders and prevent “irregular migration” as well as to take on measures to “avoid secondary movement of relocated persons”. The situation in the transit countries are described as having “pressure on their migration and asylum systems” and words such as “emergency” and “crisis” are used frequently. The measures taken are described as “provisional”, a “temporary derogation” and an “emergency scheme”. (Council of the European Union 12098/15)

It is furthermore stated that the “National security and public order should be taken into consideration throughout the relocation procedure, until the transfer of the applicant is implemented”, which implies that the migrants allegedly are a risk to national security. (Council of the European Union 12098/15)

Here, the securitization of migration has resulted in measures being taken to constrain it. The rhetoric have described the situation as a crisis, and ascribed responsibility to institutions in order to mobilise them. It is explicitly stated that the measures are taken to keep migrants away from the EU. By giving the image of a crisis, the provisional measures are legitimized as being part of said emergency scheme needed to avoid destabilization. Having “national security and public order” in consideration when doing this implies that threats against national security and public order are present. The fact that institutions are mobilized due to the alleged “emergency” and are urged to take on the provisional measures can be seen as an implication of a state of emergency being declared where the regular regulations are overlooked. Doing this is an example of how the securitization is produced by the rhetoric, but also reproduced by the mobilization of institutions - showing that securitization occurs through practices as well.
When solutions are presented it is stated that there is a need to “implement immediately the necessary systematic and coordinated checks at external borders, including on individuals enjoying the right of free movement” (Council of the European Union 14382/15). Using the word ‘immediately’ can be seen as a way of giving the impression of a threat being present and that the situation is urgent. It can be seen as another example of a state of emergency indirectly being declared when the status quo of the Schengen is being challenged by the authorities.

Other examples of how the discourse securitizes and thus mobilizes institutions is when solutions presented include enhancing the mandate of FRONTEX in order to control the external borders and returns of migrants. (European Council EUCO 26/15) It is for example suggested to establish a common information strategy targeting the asylum seekers, migrants, smugglers and traffickers in order to be “reducing pull factors”. (Council of the European Union 13880/15) Here, it is expressed that there is a need to systemically register fingerprints at the borders and hotspots in the “Schengen Information System II”. It is furthermore suggested that these databases should be connected with the Interpol databases, and that a need of developing systems for rapid border interventions (RABIT) is expressed. (Council of the European Union 14382/15) Here it is seen that the securitisation ascribes responsibility and instantiates policy changes by enhancing mandates of security institutions to take on further security measures and introducing new technologies to do so.

It is evident that this is a way of describing the migrants as a security threat when Italy and Greece are urged to use the hotspots and the fingerprint system, Eurodac, to inform other states of the potential danger of individuals. This is for example seen in this statement:

“In full respect of the fundamental rights of the applicant, including the relevant rules on data protection, where a Member State has reasonable grounds for regarding an applicant as a danger to its national security or public order, it should inform the other Member States thereof” (Council of the European Union 12098/15)
The arguments used to mobilise institutions into using these systems are thus directly connected to the idea of migrants being a potential threat to domestic and national security, and public order. By referring to the fundamental rights of the applicants and the rules on data protection, the actions are legitimised as being done in accordance with the existing frameworks. A solution to the potential threat is here therefore to mobilise institutions to collect and share information about migrants to avoid the alleged dangers.

5.4. Migrants’ security
Although there was much talk about of migrants as a threat, it is an unfair image to give about the discourse. The migrants’ security was mentioned as well in terms of drowning accidents and asylum rights. It did, however, not make an imprint on the decisions being taken to the same extent as the securitization of migrants as a threat to the member states did. One example of a case where the drowning accidents were mentioned was in terms of the FRONTEX managed operation Triton, whose aim was to serve as a coast guard and monitor the waters, but also to conduct rescue operations when needed. Here, the primary goal was not to rescue, but it was done after all as a secondary mission. (Council of the European Union Meeting n°3376)

Since securitizing language aims to mobilise and is to be imprinted on the policies, it can be concluded that the human security of the migrants was not securitized to the same extent. This relates to the power aspect of securitization where it is seen as the “power relations among stakeholders structure both the process and outcomes of securitizing moves” (Balzacq 2015, p. 106) This means that the power relations have resulted in the securitization laying focus on other aspects than the migrants’ safety.

The human security of the migrants is at times mentioned in terms of drowning accidents, causing tragic deaths, and by urging for actors to act upon preventing that. This is exemplified by stressing the need to increase the EU presence at sea and the need to fight trafficking. While focusing on life saving, the discussion often subtly shifts towards focusing on ways of keeping migrants away from the EU by talking about reducing incentives for irregular migration, securing external borders and resettlement. (Council of the European Union Meeting n°3396: Background). It is thereby important to stress the lack of focus given to the rights of migrants. This is another example of exclusion through discourse which results in a prioritization of
whose rights are considered to be of greater importance based on power relations. The rights are thus not unconditional, which is captured in the following quote:

“As regards the concrete proposal on relocation, ministers stressed that on the basis of the principle of solidarity they were all ready to make an effort to help member states under a particular migratory pressure. Several delegations stressed the necessity to strike the right balance between solidarity and responsibility.”

(Council of the European Union 9951/15)

This can also be connected to the idea of citizenship and exclusion, as the migrants’ rights are overlooked while the rights of European citizens are emphasized. It is for example seen as the words “solidarity and responsibility” are contrasted, where solidarity can be seen as a voluntary act of selflessness towards the migrants, while the protection of the own citizens is seen as a responsibility. The securitization of migration thereby shows different prioritization of issues, where migrants’ security is a second priority and the security of the own citizens can be seen as used to legitimize actions.

Another interesting finding regarding legitimizing the return and readmission policies in the discussions of the human security of migrants, is seen when the policies are claimed to be beneficial for migrants as well. This is exemplified in the following quote:

“Effective return, readmission and reintegration policies for those not qualifying for protection are an essential part of combating illegal migration and will help discourage people from risking their lives.” (European Council EUCO 22/15)

Here, it is seen that the return, readmission and reintegration policy is legitimimized by being framed as a way of containing the deaths at the Mediterranean. It furthermore shifts the responsibility to the migrant by stating that the measures taken will “discourage people from risking their lives” (European Council EUCO 22/15), thereby reproducing the legitimacy of
the measures taken on this matter through power exercising. The power relations are detected in terms of defining the responsibilities, rights and obligations of the different actors - which is evidently done here.

Other examples when the rights of the migrants were mentioned but were treated as a second priority is seen when mentioning the migrant’s rights when talking about relocation. Here, it was stated that the best interest of the child, not separating families, and informing the migrants about the relocation process in a language they understand was of importance. Moreover, family reunification when relocating, as well health issues, and paying attention to cultural, social and family ties in the Member States were also mentioned. It is expressed that vulnerable groups should be a priority and that the migrants should enjoy the protection rights while being relocated. This is however not expressed on unconditional terms as it is seen as a temporary measure because the aim is to discourage them from staying in the EU. (Council of the European Union 12098/15)

The following statement further demonstrates that the migrant’s rights are not unconditional:

“On the one hand, this threshold would have to ensure, to the maximum extent possible, that all applicants in clear need of international protection would be in a position to fully and swiftly enjoy their protection rights in the Member State of relocation. On the other hand, it would have to prevent, to the maximum extent possible, applicants who are likely to receive a negative decision on their application from being relocated to another Member State, and therefore from prolonging unduly their stay in the Union”. (Council of the European Union 12098/15)

Connecting to the power aspect of a discourse analysis, and the dimensions of power relations, by looking at the several EU documents it is seen that power is being exercised through the discourse. It is seen on all three dimensions, both in the political contexts and actions being taken, but also by not putting several things on the agenda. This is seen as the human security of the migrants not being as prioritized or mentioned as often as the disruption of the internal
affairs. It is thereby evident that the safety of the migrants were not as securitized or prioritized as other matters in the discussions on migration.

6. Conclusion
Throughout the research, the question “Why did a securitization of the migration wave in 2015 occur in the political debate within the Council of the European Union?” was examined by a discourse analysis of the JHA and the FAC documents. Here, the arguments used to securitize migration were detected. The findings show that several trends were to be seen in the documents that could be explained through the theoretical framework of the research. The main trends found in terms of securitization of migration were divided into four headlines in when analysing. These show that there was 1) a connection made between migration and terrorism, 2) the idea of a crisis taking place was produced, 3) institutions were mobilized based on these assumptions, and 4) the human security of migrants was overlooked. These trends were, however, very intertwined and interconnected and showed some common characteristics while diverging in many details.

According to the findings it can therefore be concluded that within the connection between migration and terrorism, the main arguments to be found were that the solutions presented to combat terrorism were similar to the ones presented to constrain migration. Terrorism was portrayed as a phenomenon coming from the outside, and the foreign terrorist fighters were used to legitimize the actions which in fact will lead to constrained migration flows. Examples of such actions include protection of the external borders and using the SIS and the PNR. These measures were also claimed to be done to protect the domestic values and European citizens, who were portrayed as being under threat. Here, it was evident that the securitizing moves and the context under which they operate in are co-dependent as the image of terrorists as foreign fighters could be used to legitimize the migration policies. This connects to the idea of power relations being expressed in terms of which image gains political priority.

When analysing the discourse where the idea of a crisis taking place is produced, the main arguments detected were that the situation in different ways was described as a crisis, chaos, and that the migrants were portrayed as a disruption to internal affairs, the Schengen, and the future of EU. The arguments in terms of protecting values were used here as well. Moreover,
it was implied that the safety of the own, European, citizens was threatened, and the idea of prioritizing citizenship was used to exclude migrants. By producing the image of a crisis taking place, the securitization of migration that gained priority was related to the idea of migrants as a disruption of internal affairs rather than the idea of migrant’s security. This is also an expression of power relations, where the idea of a crisis taking place is used to legitimize the exclusion of migrants and clearly aims to mobilise institutions to do so by portraying the situation as urgent.

When looking into how the institutions were mobilised the findings show that several different measures were taken to mobilize institutions to constrain the migration flows. In some cases this was stated explicitly while in other cases it was reflected in the policies suggested and the arguments of those. Some examples of how institutions were mobilised is seen in the cooperation with transit countries, the increased development aid where the aim was to reduce incentives for migration, by urging countries to use the fingerprint system, hotspots, and to mobilise in order to fight against criminal networks. Moreover, the image of an urgent situation mobilized institutions such as FRONTEX; EASO and the use of fingerprint systems to warn of dangerous individuals. The securitization of migration thereby ascribed responsibility to institutions. Through the provisional measures taken, a state of emergency was indirectly declared where the regular regulations were overlooked, such as the status quo of the Schengen. It is thereby evident that the securitization of migration is produced by rhetoric which the institutions act upon. The securitization thereby becomes reproduced by mobilization and the securitization thus occurs through practices as well.

When examining the discussions on migrants’ security, the main findings show that the security of migrants was acknowledged but not securitized to the same extent. It was noted that the rights of the migrants were not unconditional and were not as prioritized as the rights of EU citizens. Thereby, citizenship was used as exclusion mechanism. Moreover, the own return and readmission policies were legitimized as beneficial for migrants as well. Thus, a competition between the prevailing security definitions was noted. Due to the expressed power relations migrants’ safety was not securitized to the same extent as the idea of a crisis taking place and threatening European citizens’ safety.
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