



A MATTER OF SECURITY?

A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Underlying Security
Discourse in the Danish Ghetto Plan

Seda Emine Agzigüzel

Human Rights
Bachelor Thesis
15 credits
Spring semester 2021
Supervisor: Johan Brännmark

Abstract

This study investigates the political discourse in the Danish government's 'Ghetto Plan' of 2018 in order to reveal a securitization dimension in relation to Danish ghettos and non-Western immigrants. There has not been conducted much academic research concerning the Danish ghetto initiatives, and studies on the 'Danish Ghetto Plan' of 2018 remain pretty absent. Most previous studies primarily concentrated on investigating the role of the Danish ghetto initiatives in relation to broader political discourses. By conducting a critical discourse analysis on the Danish 'Ghetto Plan' while adopting Huysmans' theoretical framework on the securitization of migration, this study reveals a securitizing dimension in which the Danish government has constructed the ghettos and non-Western immigrants as threats to the liberal norms and values of Danish society. Thus, this study attempts to provide an insight into how the Danish government is able to implement and justify discriminatory policies.

Keywords

Securitization; immigration; discrimination; integration; minorities; ghettos; Denmark

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Purpose and research question	3
1.2 Delimitations	4
1.3 Relevance to the field of human rights.....	4
1.4 Disposition of thesis	6
2. CONTEXTUAL BACKGROUND.....	7
2.1 Waves of immigration reaching Denmark	7
2.2 The concept of ‘integration’	8
2.3 ‘Non-Western’ immigrants and the incompatibility with ‘Danishness’	9
2.4 The changing political landscape	10
2.5 ‘The Ghetto Plan’	12
3. PREVIOUS RESEARCH	14
3.1 Securitization of migration.....	14
3.2 The Ghetto.....	17
4. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	21
4.1 Security and security studies	21
4.2 Huysmans’ securitization of migration	22
5. METHODOLOGY	25
5.1 Single-case study.....	25
5.2 Critical Discourse Analysis	26
5.3 Analytical tools	27
5.3.1 Fairclough’s three-dimensional model.....	27
5.4 Selection of material.....	30
5.5 Limitations	31
6. ANALYSIS	32
6.1 Text dimension.....	32
6.2 Discursive practice dimension	36
6.3 Social practice dimension.....	38
7. CONCLUSION	40

7.1	Findings	40
7.2	Further research.....	41
8.	BIBLIOGRAPHY	42

1. INTRODUCTION

In contemporary Europe, new and challenging questions on immigration, integration, and social cohesion are dominating the political agendas of all European nation-states (Huysmans, 2000: 755; Jensen, 2016: 9). Since the mid-1980s, this questioning started to become dominant within national debates, following the successive waves of immigration that have taken place in the last couple of decades (2000: 755; 2016: 9). The migration and integration policies that were implemented across European nation-states in order to accommodate the great post-World War II migrations are widely considered as having been insufficient or even harmful (Joppke, 2007: 1). Consequently, a tendency towards ‘aggressive integrationism’ started to become visible among many European states, resulting in the introduction of more aggressive and restrictive means in relation to migration and integration (Triadafilopoulos, 2011: 861). According to some scholars, this tendency is based on the rising nationalism and xenophobia in Europe (Jordan, 2020). *“In this setting migration has been increasingly presented as a danger to public order, cultural identity, and domestic and labor market stability; it has been securitized.”* (Huysmans, 2000: 752).

This European tendency is also adopted and embraced by the Danish government¹ who, despite it once having one of the most liberal and tolerant immigration laws in the world (Mouritsen & Olsen, 2013: 691), have tightened up its immigration policies and enacted more restrictive integration strategies (Simonsen, 2016: 84-85). Additionally, the Danish government has claimed that ‘integration’ has failed (Regeringen, 2015), which has led to the scapegoating of immigrants, more specifically ‘non-Western’ immigrants² (Shih, 2017). In continuation of this, the Danish government has implemented stricter and more restrictive initiatives and assimilative laws (Salem, 2018) targeting specific residential areas or ‘ghettos’, as proclaimed by the government, which are characterized by constituting a large number of residents with non-Western origin, a low educational level, a high rate of unemployment, and a high rate of crime (TBST, 2020).

¹ Throughout this thesis, “Danish government” or “government” refers to the former Liberal-Conservative government who took office from 2015-2019.

² Throughout this thesis, “non-western immigrants” refers to immigrants and descendants who do not originate from one of the 28 EU-member countries, including Andorra, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Norway, San Marino, Switzerland, Vatican, Canada, USA, Australia, and New Zealand (Danmarks Statistik, n.d.)

Every year, since 2010, the Danish government releases a so-called ‘Ghetto List’³, which puts forward all residential areas that are designated as either ‘ghettos’ or ‘tough ghettos’ based on their fulfillment of the criteria’s on ethnicity, employment, income, criminality, and education (TBST, 2020). Since 2004, several strategies have been introduced in order to combat ghettos in Denmark. The latest ghetto initiative was introduced in 2018 and is today known as ‘The Ghetto Plan’⁴ as part of the Danish government’s “*One Denmark without Parallel Societies – No Ghettos in 2030*”⁵ initiative (Regeringen, 2018). As a result, non-Western immigrants and descendants living in these ghettos are deprived of having equal rights as people living outside these areas. Penalties for crimes are doubled, children from the age of one must spend at least 30 hours a week in childcare to receive mandatory training in ‘Danish values,’ and public housing in these areas will be limited to only 40 percent of total housing by 2030 (Regeringen, 2018: 11, 22, 25). The latter implies that public housing is now either being demolished, redeveloped, or rented to private companies (Versi, 2020), which puts residents at risk of being forcibly relocated (OHCHR, 2020).

Serious concerns of discrimination and stigmatization have been raised in relation to ‘The Ghetto Plan’ and the surrounding Danish political discourse based on ethnicity, national origin, race, and other protected grounds (OHCHR, 2020). This has given rise to a considerable amount of criticism from different scholars and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR, 2020). The OHCHR has criticized ‘The Ghetto Plan’ in the following way:

Denmark’s new “ghetto package” is hugely troubling & risks heightening racial discrimination against people of migrant origin – further “ghettoising” them. Coercive assimilation measures run risk of fuelling racial prejudice, xenophobia & intolerance (UN Tweet, 2018).

The United Nations Human Rights Council’s special rapporteurs have further criticized the ‘The Ghetto Plan’ for targeting ethnic, religious, and racial minorities and stated that it is a clear violation of the right to equality before the law, the right to equal treatment before tribunals, the right to racial equality in the enjoyment of cultural rights and the right to enjoy all human rights without discrimination on any grounds (OHCHR, 2020). Moreover, the Danish government has

³ ”Ghettolisten (in Danish)

⁴ ”Ghettoplanen” (in Danish)

⁵ ”Ét Danmark uden Parallelsamfund. Ingen ghettoer i 2030” (original title in Danish)

been criticized, by the French-American sociologist Loïc Wacquant, for using the term ghetto to define deprived residential areas and ‘The Ghetto List’ for stigmatizing (Omar, 2013). He further argues that, for the past two decades, a ‘panic discourse’ linked to a fear of Islam has dominated the Danish government and that the controversy about ghettos has been used to create a discourse that spread fear within the population (Omar, 2013).

How are governments justifying the implementation of policies and laws that are openly contesting both their national laws and international human rights laws? By linking topics of immigration and integration to a matter of security, governments are legitimizing the implementation of extraordinary measures (Banai & Kreide, 2017: 906). In this case, the Danish government’s political discourse on ghettos and non-Western immigrants, as being a threat to the Danish nation and its norms and values, triggers political measures to deal with it and thereby justify the implementation of extraordinary measures. The interesting question here is whether a security dimension can be revealed in ‘The Ghetto Plan’ concerning ghettos and non-Western immigrants. As it will be demonstrated under section three, research on this area remains absent within existing research.

1.1 Purpose and research question

In light of the publication of the Danish government’s ‘The Ghetto Plan’ of 2018⁶, this thesis seeks to reveal a securitization dimension in the Danish government’s political discourse on ghettos and non-Western immigrants by critically analyzing the government’s white paper “*One Denmark without Parallel Societies – No ghettos in 2030*” (Regeringen, 2018). This thesis leads by a dual research aim. First, this study will intend to identify the discourses constructed in the government’s white paper. Second, based on the identified discourses, this study will seek to reveal a securitization dimension in ‘The Ghetto Plan’. The following research questions guide this thesis:

RQ1: What discourses does ‘The Ghetto Plan’ of 2018 engage?

RQ2: Do these discourses reveal a securitizing dimension in ‘The Ghetto Plan’ of 2018?

⁶ Throughout this thesis, ‘The Ghetto Plan’ refers to the white paper “*One Denmark without Parallel Societies – No ghettos in 2030*” (Regeringen, 2018), released in March 2018 by the former Liberal-Conservative government who took office from 2015-2019.

1.2 Delimitations

This thesis will delimit its scope to only focus on investigating ‘The Ghetto Plan’ published in March 2018 by the former Liberal-Conservative government of Denmark who took office from 2015-2019. Previous initiatives and strategies introduced in relation to Danish ghettos will not be included. Conducting a critical discourse analysis within the field of integration and immigration can lead to many different discourses depending on the text producer and the context in which the discourse is situated. Therefore, this thesis will only include a focused analysis of the political discourses surrounding Danish ghettos identified in ‘The Ghetto Plan’ of 2018. Moreover, the determined scope will not include investigations in the forms of interviews or surveys to obtain a deeper understanding of the people’s experiences at target in ‘The Ghetto Plan’. Thus, analysis of any practical event is excluded from the scope of the thesis, as it requires adopting different methods and materials.

1.3 Relevance to the field of human rights

Minority groups can be found within the national territory of all States and are characterized by constituting their own identity in relation to nationality, ethnicity, linguistics, and religion (OHCHR, 2010: 2). Under the provisions of human rights instruments, each State has a responsibility and duty to comply with its obligation to protect the rights of all persons under their jurisdiction (OHCHR, 2010: 4). Therefore, the question of how a State treats, deals, and addresses the minority members of its population, is indeed one that falls within the field of human rights. In this setting, the OHCHR has based on the experiences of minority groups around the world as well as the contents of several human rights instruments identified major concerns in relation to the promotion and protection of the identity of minorities, equality, and non-discrimination (OHCHR, 2010: 8). People who belong to a minority group are more likely to experience discrimination, marginalization, stigmatization, and the deprivation of their rights and freedoms. Denmark’s integration system has an increasing assimilationist structure (Mouritsen et al. 2009: 7), and the strategy behind ‘The Ghetto Plan’ is an example of forced assimilation (UN Tweet, 2018), which hinders minorities in Denmark to enjoy the right to promotion and protection of their identity.

Non-discrimination and equality before the law serve as fundamental principles within international human rights law. These principles involve the recognition, enjoyment, and exercise of all rights and freedoms by all persons on an equal basis by prohibiting and preventing all forms of discrimination, including distinction, exclusion, restriction, and preference (OHCHR, 2010: 8). As the liberal democracy of Denmark has adopted the European tendency and moved towards a more aggressive and restrictive immigration and integration policy, minorities have experienced the curtailment of their most fundamental human rights and freedoms. ‘The Ghetto Plan’ is an example of this due to its discriminatory and unequal practice where rights and freedoms are granted to people based on the place they are residing. This means that people can live in different parts of the same city and be entitled to different rights and freedoms depending on the area they live in (Regeringen, 2018). With the introduction of ‘The Ghetto Plan’, it has been clear that the Danish government aims at limiting their liberal and democratic approach towards non-Western immigrants and particularly them living in ghettos. However, this aim is pursued even though discrimination and equal treatment are prohibited under the Danish constitution, Danish law, and international human rights conventions. Additionally, Denmark’s responsibilities under international human rights conventions have and are still taking place in the Danish Parliament’s political debates. Some politicians, mainly from the Danish People’s Party, are encouraging the withdrawal from international human rights conventions (Andersen, 2019). By doing so, the Danish government will be able to implement even harsher and restrictive policies and laws in relation to immigration and integration.

A ‘way’ to bypass conventional political processes in order to legitimize and justify the implementation of policies and laws, which are openly contesting national law and international human rights law, are through the application of securitization (Buzan et al., 1998: 23-24). By discursively constructing ghettos and non-Western immigrants as existential security threats, the Danish government wants to bypass the Danish constitution, Danish law, and international human rights law and legitimize the implementation of ‘The Ghetto Plan’ initiative. This is where international human rights law plays an important and crucial role in order to protect human rights in times of securitization and prevent states from *“taken advantage of the ‘metaphysical punch’ and the ‘disciplinary power’ that the ‘security’ concept has to discursively transform non-security issues into security threats and to legitimize the implementation of extraordinary measures”* (Meyer, 2012: 2).

1.4 Disposition of thesis

The structure of the thesis consists of seven sections. Chapter 2 provides an overview of the contextual background in which ‘The Ghetto Plan’ is situated. Chapter 3 provides an insight into previous studies on the securitization of migration and ghetto studies. Chapter 4 introduces the theoretical framework of the thesis. Chapter 5 presents the methodological approach and the selected material. Chapter 6 presents the critical discourse analysis of ‘The Ghetto Plan’. Chapter 7 provides the conclusion for the analysis and recommendations for future research.

2. CONTEXTUAL BACKGROUND

This section will provide a contextual background of several events that have led to the introduction of ‘The Ghetto Plan. Context plays a crucial and significant role within critical discourse analysis and when conducting a single-case study. This will be elaborated further in chapter five concerning the methodology. Moreover, ‘The Ghetto Plan’ will be presented at the end of this section.

2.1 Waves of immigration reaching Denmark

In Denmark, the phenomenon of immigration has been around for a relatively long time but consisted mainly of moderate and limited immigration flows from other Nordic and Western countries (Nannestad, 2004: 757; Vitus et al., 2009: 2). However, this began to change during the 1960s as Denmark was facing a relatively high level of unemployment due to a net emigration of Danish citizens, mainly to Canada and Australia (Nannestad, 2004: 757). As a result, an influx of immigrants, mainly from Turkey, the former Yugoslavia, and Pakistan, came to Denmark as so-called ‘guest workers’⁷ in order to relieve the industrial labor shortages in certain sectors of the economy (Nannestad, 2004: 757; Vitus et al., 2009: 2; European Commission, n.d.). The term guest worker was based on the general assumption that most immigrants would, after a while, return to their home countries. At this time, no issues were raised in relation to the implications of immigrants on the social policy or the welfare state, and few integration measures were introduced in order to address the challenges of immigrants concerning their cultural and religious needs and the securing of their integration into the Danish society. To a large extent, immigrants were included on equal footing with Danish citizens within the public welfare state institutions (Brochmann & Hagelund, 2011: 15). However, this image changed drastically during the 1970s, resulting from a combination of the growing number of immigrants, the international economic downturn, and the increased focus on immigrants’ poor living conditions (Brochmann & Hagelund, 2011: 16). The subject of immigration began to appear as a significant public concern (Huysmans, 2000: 754). Consequently, new political claims emerged demanding policies to control immigration and “(...) *to counter the seeming emergence of migrants as a new social problem*” (Brochmann & Hagelund, 2011: 16). Thus, the Danish government began to introduce

⁷ *Gæstarbejdere (in Danish)*

new restrictions on entry into the country for foreign migrants, and in 1973 it attempted to put a full stop to immigration from non-Western countries (Vitus et al., 2009: 2; Brochmann & Hagelund, 2011: 16). This resulted in a shift from a more permissive immigration policy to a more control-oriented and restrictive policy. The motivation behind this shift was based on changes in the labor market and a desire to protect the social and economic rights of the domestic workforce (Huysmans, 2000: 754). Despite the efforts of the Danish government, new immigrants continued to arrive in Denmark, primarily due to family reunifications and asylum (Vitus et al., 2009: 2; Brochmann & Hagelund, 2011: 16; European Commission, n.d.). Moreover, during the 1980s and the 1990s, significant groups of refugees arrived from the Middle East, Sri Lanka, Bosnia, Somalia, Afghanistan, Iraq, and Chile, which has also influenced the increasing number of immigrants in Denmark (Vitus et al., 2009: 2; Jensen et al., 2010: 2; European Commission, n.d.).

2.2 The concept of ‘integration’

As the numbers of immigrants and refugees continued to increase, Denmark began to perceive them as economic burdens exploiting the Danish welfare state. This perception was based on the high level of unemployment among immigrants and that this level was considerably higher than that among native Danes (Mouritsen et al., 2014: 9). The issues on immigration and integration had become very salient within the political sphere (Mouritsen & Olsen, 2013: 694), and the concept of ‘integration’ dominated public and political discourses (Rytter & Pedersen, 2014: 2310). This has resulted in the formation of high expectations to immigrants demanding them to ‘integrate’ themselves into “(...) *vaguely defined Danish norms and standards*” (Rytter & Pedersen, 2014: 2310). In this setting, the term ‘integration’ actually meant ‘assimilation’ (Rytter & Pedersen, 2014: 2310). The former Social Democratic government introduced, in 1998, the first-ever ‘integration law’ with the purpose of contributing to the participation of newly arrived foreigners on an equal basis with other citizens “(...) *in the political, economic, work-related, social, religious and cultural life of society; to induce economic self-reliance and to provide the individual foreigner [with] an understanding of the fundamental values and norms of the Danish society*” (Mouritsen & Olsen, 2013: 694-695). The law entailed a three-year integration program, which was obligatory in order to obtain permanent residency, and only those who possessed a permanent residency were eligible to apply for family reunification. With the emergence of the new integration law, the liberal law of 1983 was eventually overturned through gradual reforms

since 1999. The focus moved from liberalism based on equal rights and opportunities to a demand for immigrants to become self-supporting, learn Danish values, and engage in the Danish society (Mouritsen & Olsen, 2013: 695).

2.3 ‘Non-Western’ immigrants and the incompatibility with ‘Danishness’

The so-called non-Western immigrants have been the main target group within Denmark’s immigration and integration discourse (Jensen et al., 2010: 5-6, 31; Mouritsen et al., 2014: 8). As of January 1, 2020, 8.8 percent of Denmark’s 5.8 million population are non-Western immigrants and descendants of immigrants, where the largest group is of Turkish descent and followed by Syrians and Iraqis (Jensen et al., 2010; 2; Danmarks Statistik, 2020). Since the mid-1990s, immigration and integration of non-Western immigrants and their descendants have experienced a high level of politicization due to the widespread perception as being difficult to integrate into Danish society (Mouritsen et al., 2014: 5, 8). It is believed that the cultural and religious differences between non-Western immigrants and Danes are a significant challenge (Mouritsen et al., 2014: 2, 31) and that especially Muslim values are incompatible with liberal Danish values and norms (Jensen et al., 2010: 2). Danish values are perceived as being both universal and liberal and are rooted within their cultural and historical heritage. The assumption is that it will be difficult for non-Western immigrants to access this heritage unless they have been living in Denmark for a long time (Mouritsen et al., 2014: 8). Non-Western immigrants are also viewed as unwilling to integrate into the ‘modern’ Danish democracy and society (Jensen et al., 2010: 2). This is perceived as a great cultural barrier for successful integration within the labor market (Mouritsen et al., 2014: 8). The challenges and concerns raised in relation to the diversity and incompatibility of non-Western immigrants and Danes can, according to the Danish politicians, be summed up in three central themes: 1) *unemployment*; 2) *parallel societies (ghettoization)*; and 3) *radicalization/extremism* (Jensen et al., 2010: 2). First, the percentage of non-Western immigrants on social security is frequently emphasized as being out of proportion with the rest of the population, which is seen as a threat to the Danish welfare model’s long-term viability (Jensen et al., 2010: 2). Second, it is frequently stressed that a situation in which Muslims live in their secluded communities, proclaimed as ‘parallel societies’ by the Danish government, isolated from the rest of the Danish society must be prevented. It is often asserted that Denmark is on the verge of such a situation if no action is taken immediately. The politicians fear that parallel societies will become hostile and

indifferent to one another, the implementation of Sharia law outside of Danish law and that the stability of the Danish society will deteriorate (Jensen et al., 2010: 2). Third, radicalization within Muslim communities has been a growing concern for politicians. Within the debate concerning the hazards of multiculturalism and parallel societies, tolerance has not been shown towards what is perceived as the problematic beliefs and practices of minorities, leading to acts of terrorism in the worst-case scenarios. The democratic mindset of Muslims is frequently articulated as a major concern. However, the concept of tolerance is coming back to the political agenda in order to prevent radicalization, the symbolic exclusion of immigrant youth, and to counteract anti-Semitism in larger urban areas (Jensen et al., 2010: 2-3). Danish political debates have dominantly been concerned with the need to protect these liberal Danish values and principles by limiting and controlling the number of new immigrants and implementing heavy-handed measures to shape and socialize those already here (Mouritsen et al., 2014: 8). Today, it is exceptional to experience that national and more settled religious minorities in Denmark raise claims themselves demanding symbolic respect, special or equal rights, and recognition (Jensen et al., 2010: 6).

2.4 The changing political landscape

The events on September 11 and the way it was framed and responded to by the former Bush Administration have indeed affected and continue to affect politics and security relations on both a global scale and on national levels. On the national level, it has resulted in the implementation of many new policies and laws, as well as changes in perception of nationality, identity, belonging, and day-to-day relations between majorities and minorities around the world. In the European context, a continuous phase of 'securitization' has entailed a common impact on many nation-states. Based on the aim of protecting and securing the nation-state, its institutions, and citizens from religiously motivated terrorism, European nation-states began to enact far-reaching and pre-emptive policies and legislation (Rytter & Pedersen, 2014: 2305). Muslim populations living in Western European countries are to a large extent perceived as potential internal enemies and experience being subjected to suspicion, control, and surveillance. This means that political debates concerning Muslim immigrants have taken on a new security dimension (Rytter & Pedersen, 2014: 2303-2304).

Following the events of September 11, their implications and consequences have also marked a turning point in relation to understand and conceptualize ethnic and religious minorities in

Denmark (Rytter & Pedersen, 2014: 2306), which has resulted in the implementation of new laws and regulations (Rytter & Pedersen, 2014: 2304). The Danish national election in 2001 has to a great extent been influenced by the events of 9/11, which took place two months before the election. The issues of immigration and integration were topping the Danish political agenda more than ever before, and all political parties responded strongly in order to maintain and secure the support of their voters. (Rytter & Pedersen, 2014: 2306). This led to a ‘competition’ between the political parties as to who could be the most anti-immigrant. The competition was ‘won’ by the Danish People’s Party⁸ who, after the 2001 election, became the third-largest party and the new Liberal-Conservative⁹ government’s stable parliamentary support (Mouritsen & Olsen, 2013: 692; Rytter & Pedersen, 2014: 2306).

From 2001 to 2011, this government, formed by the Liberals¹⁰, the Conservative People’s Party¹¹, and Danish People’s Party, enjoyed an absolute majority in parliament, which is marked as an exceptional event in the recent history of the Danish parliament (Rytter & Pedersen, 2014: 2306). In continuation of the Social Democrats’¹² defeat and the emergence of a new path of right-of-center politics, the 2001 election is generally perceived as “*the system change*” (Rytter & Pedersen, 2014: 2306). The following years offered further the introduction of far-reaching anti-terror legislation, strict laws on family reunification (Rytter & Pedersen, 2014: 2306), and tougher political discourses on immigrants focusing mainly on their negative impact on social cohesion in Danish society (Jensen et al., 2010: 3, 14). These new initiatives are aimed at reducing the number of immigrants and family reunifications by making it more demanding and challenging to obtain permanent residence and citizenship (Jensen et al., 2010: 3, 14). In other words, restrictions applied to all immigration forms, and if immigrants wanted to stay in Denmark, they were expected to adopt Danish values (Mouritsen & Olsen, 2013: 692). As it became harder to enter into Denmark, the regulation, surveillance, and control of Muslim immigrants living in Denmark became more intense (Rytter & Pedersen, 2014: 2307). Thus, by using the term ‘integration’, the Danish government really meant assimilation. This was associated with a securitized political agenda of national cohesion (Mouritsen et al., 2014: 14).

⁸ *Dansk Folke Parti* (original Danish name)

⁹ *VK-regeringen* (original Danish name)

¹⁰ *Venstre* (original Danish name)

¹¹ *Det Konservative Folkeparti* (original Danish name)

¹² *Socialdemokratiet* (original Danish name)

2.5 ‘The Ghetto Plan’

Danish ghettos are today a hot political topic, which has made its appearance within Danish politics in recent years (Simonsen, 2016: 83-85). From 2012 until now, it is possible to find a statement concerning ghettos from all Danish political parties on the Parliament’s webpage (Simonsen, 2016: 83). The former Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen¹³ had already addressed the issue of ghettos in his New Year’s speech in 2004, where he stressed that the formation of immigrant ghettos is a result of many years of failed foreign policy (Fogh Rasmussen, 2004; Simonsen, 2016: 85). However, its prominent entrance into the Danish political agenda happened in 2010 with the former Prime Minister Lars Løkke Rasmussen’s¹⁴ opening speech to the Parliament where he used the term ghetto instead of the formerly denoted ‘socially vulnerable housing area’ (Simonsen, 2016: 85). In his speech, Løkke Rasmussen emphasized the importance of taking strong action in order to combat the ghettos and announced that a strategy would be realized which will both focus on “(...) ‘the walls’ and ‘the people living behind the walls’” (Simonsen, 2016: 85). The former Liberal-Conservative government published in October 2010 its first ‘ghetto strategy’ under the initiative called “*Return of the Ghetto to Society. Taking Action against Parallel Societies in Denmark*”¹⁵ (Regeringen, 2010; Simonsen, 2016: 86). Although few central actors criticized the strategy for its use of the term ghetto to describe specific residential areas, a general agreement among political parties was reached in relation to both the rhetoric used on the issue and the understanding of the issue as a lack of integration (Simonsen, 2016: 86).

The latest ghetto strategy was published in March 2018 in a white paper called “*One Denmark without parallel societies – No ghettos in 2030*” (Regeringen, 2018) to combat ghettos for once and all in order to build a coherent Denmark (Regeringen, 2018: 4). In the white paper, the government states that the strong population growth of citizens of non-Western origin has provided a breeding ground for parallel societies, where Danish values and norms are not the primary ones. Furthermore, it argues that 28,000 families with non-Western backgrounds live in isolation from the rest of the Danish society, both physically and mentally, in so-called parallel societies (Regeringen, 2018: 7).

¹³ Prime Minister from 2001-2009 representing the Liberal Party (In Danish: Venstre)

¹⁴ Prime Minister from 2009-2011 and 2015-2019 representing the Liberal Party (In Danish: Venstre)

¹⁵ *Ghettoen tilbage til samfundet. Et opgør med parallelsamfund i Danmark* (original Danish title)

The government's ghetto strategy of 2018 consist of 22 initiatives and centers around four focus areas:

1. Physical demolition and reconstruction of vulnerable residential areas
 2. More firm control of who can live in vulnerable residential areas
 3. Strengthened police response and severer punishment must fight crime and create more security
 4. A good start in life for all children and young people
- (Regeringen, 2018: 9)

According to the Danish government, a ghetto is characterized as a physical cohesive public residential area constituting at least 1,000 residents who meet at least two of the following three criteria (Regeringen, 2018: 11):

- The amount of residents convicted for violations of the Criminal Code, the Firearms Act, or the Euphoriants Act exceeds 2.7 percent of the total amount of residents.
- The proportion of residents aged between 18 and 64 years with no relation to the labor market or the education system exceeds 40 percent.
- The proportion of immigrants and descendants from non-Western countries exceeds 50 percent.

OR:

- The proportion of immigrants and descendants from non-Western countries exceeds 60 percent.

3. PREVIOUS RESEARCH

There has not been conducted much academic research concerning the Danish ghetto initiatives and strategies (Seemann, 2020: 3). Within already existing studies, the central focus has been on investigating the role of the Danish ghetto initiatives in relation to broader political discourses concerning ethnicity, multiculturalism, and immigration (Seeman, 2020: 3). Some authors have examined the sufficient grounds for justification, the consistency, and the effectiveness of these initiatives and strategies (Seeman, 2020: 4), as well as the increasing political opposition against the Danish ghetto initiatives (Seeman, 2020: 4). A considerable amount of literature on ghetto studies exists within the field of urban sociology, where several scholars examine the deeper understanding of its physical meaning in order to define the ghetto in a way that distinguishes it from other types of urban spatial separation (Simonsen, 2016: 86). Within the constantly growing field of immigration studies, the main focus has been on the ‘securitization’ of immigration (Messina, 2014: 530). A considerable body of authors has, within the ongoing debate in policy research, attempted to explain the appearance of a European tendency moving towards more restrictive and aggressive policies in relation to immigration and integration (Jordan, 2020: 16). The leading focus has been on explaining this tendency based on the rising xenophobia and nationalism in Europe (Jordan, 2020: 16), whereas other scholars have examined this move based on theoretical frameworks of liberalism and universalism (Jordan, 2020: 16).

Nevertheless, a review of the current scholarly work exposes a gap in the existing literature in relation to the absence of a focused analysis on ‘The Ghetto Plan’ from 2018 aimed at revealing a discursive securitization dimension on Danish ghettos. This paper will attempt to contribute to the existing literature in this area by investigating whether it is possible to reveal a securitization dimension in ‘The Ghetto Plan’ of 2018. This chapter will try to cover recent relevant scholarly work by covering two central topics: 1) securitization of migration; and (2) the ghetto.

3.1 Securitization of migration

Many countries have, within the last decade, experienced a growing number of immigrants within their borders, which has resulted in increasing fear of terrorism, national security and identity, and other threats to internal safety (Farny, 2016). The construction of a climate of fear and accumulation of danger can also be viewed as a governmental tool that can direct and control the

actions and attitudes of citizens towards immigrants (Farny, 2016: 3). According to Ceyhan and Tsoukala, securitization of migration can be defined as a symbolic process treated by symbolic politics and involves a transformation of the logic of control and the scrutinization of people entering and living inside the territory (Ceyhan & Tsoukala, 2002: 23; Farny, 2016).

Maggie Ibrahim stresses that migration has turned into a synonym for risk to the liberal world and that this discourse normalizes the view of migrants as a threat to the social body, resulting in the creation of new exclusionary immigration legislation (Ibrahim, 2005: 163-164). Thus, Ibrahim and other scholars (Huysmans, 2000; Togral, 2011) have focused on the role of racism within the process of the securitization of migration, where exclusion of certain people and groups is based on cultural differences rather than on biological ones. Ibrahim explains that it can be examined as a “*discourse through which relations of power are exercised*” (Ibrahim, 2005: 164) and further argues that the securitization of migration discourse is re-actualizing the most modern form of racism, namely “*new racism*”, which she defines as “*exclusion based on cultural difference*” and outlines that this leads to a “*social breakdown*” (Ibrahim, 2005: 164).

According to Huysmans, the idea of *cultural homogeneity as a stabilizing factor*” (Huysmans, 2000: 753) is supported by EU policies and that “*the protection and transformation of cultural identity is one of the key issues through which the politics of belonging and the question of migration are connected*” (Huysmans, 2000: 762). Thus, the politics of belonging should be integrated into the political construction of migration as being a security threat. In this context, the approach adopted reflects a wider contemporary European political viewpoint and attitude towards immigrants as disrupting and threatening European cultural homogeneity. Consequently, this will lead to the risk of exclusive policies, and immigrants will face a challenge to become a part of the European cultural homogeneity. This point of view is supported by Ibrahim, who emphasizes that “*cultural pluralism will lead to interethnic conflict which will dissolve the unity of the state*” (Ibrahim, 2005: 166). She states that this assumption has been used for decades by right-wing governments as a method to limit immigration but is now adopted and upheld by liberal governments as well. (Ibrahim, 2005: 166). Moreover, she argues that this phenomenon of exclusion is taking a global form and that other states are responding to migrants in a similar repressive manner as Canada (Ibrahim, 2005:183-184).

In the Danish context, the impact and implication of the events of 9/11 have been studied, by Rytter and Pedersen, in relation to how it has motivated a security/integration response and governed immigrants and their descendants in Denmark, primarily Muslims, and how different pre-emptive measures have portrayed Muslim as the usual suspect within the public and political discourse (Rytter & Pedersen, 2014:2303-2304). The authors discuss how this has changed the relationship between the majorities and minorities in Denmark and examine how this change has been created by recent national and international events (Rytter & Pedersen, 2014: 2304). Moreover, they point out that the security/integration response is processed through securitization, which they define, based on the idea of Laustsen and Wæver (2000), as “(...) *the process where something (a referent object) is deemed threatened and security actions are taken in its defence*”, and this ongoing process is a common effect in many European states (Rytter and Pedersen, 2014: 2305). They further argue that, after 2001, the emergence of a nationalist discourse became dominating within Danish political debate, and the central concern was to control and tighten the legislation on family reunification from non-European countries with the aim of protecting the Danish nation and values (Rytter & Pedersen, 2014: 2307). Similar to Ibrahim, Togral, and Rytter and Pedersen are also emphasizing the cultural dimension of securitization and the significant risk of immigrants being perceived as threats (Rytter & Pedersen, 2014: 2311). They depart from the understanding of Ibrahim and Togral by adopting the term “*cultural anxiety*” (Grillo, 2003: 158) in order to explain this phenomenon within the Danish public and political discourse. The fear of losing national sovereignty, history, territory, values, and identity is motivating cultural anxiety (Rytter and Pedersen, 2014: 2311). However, they indicate that this reconstruction of Muslim immigrants, as potential internal enemies, can result in an “(...) *erosion of the mutual trust, reciprocity and solidarity on which the welfare society rests*” (Rytter & Pedersen, 2014: 2309). An important point emphasized by Rytter and Pedersen is that new security issues will inevitably arise from any process of securitization, which they refer to as the “*spiral of alienation*”. Therefore, the entire fabric of Danish society is affected by the current security/integration response and not just Muslim minorities (Rytter & Pedersen, 2014: 2315).

Similar to Rytter and Pedersen, Mouritsen et al. argue that immigration, particularly Muslim, is perceived as a potential threat to Danish society and its fundamental values (Mouritsen et al. 2009: 7). Drawing on the argument from Ceyhan and Tsoukala, Mouritsen agrees on the point that this phenomenon can be interpreted as part of a broader Western European one (Mouritsen et al. 2009:

160). The authors have focused on and examined the Danish integration system and argue that the system has an increasing assimilationist structure (Mouritsen et al. 2009: 7). Since the year 2000, the integration of immigrants has been monitored by a think tank, implemented by the Danish Minister of Integration, in relation to “(...) *education, labour market, welfare, discrimination, everyday contact between native Danes and immigrants, political participation, and indeed immigrants’ commitment to fundamental Danish values (including ‘crime level’)*” (Mouritsen et al. 2009: 7). Therefore, immigrants are required to demonstrate a high level of willingness to integrate into Danish society and adopt Danish values. However, Denmark has a quite well-developed registration of immigrants and their descendants, which means that even if immigrants fulfill the requirements and successfully integrate into the Danish society, they will always be regarded as immigrants and descendants (Mouritsen et al. 2009: 7). Indeed, this creates major concerns regarding whether it is possible for immigrants to completely integrate into Danish society, despite their successful fulfillment of the requirements.

3.2 The Ghetto

Studies on ghettos can be traced back to the beginning of the twentieth century and have a long tradition within the field of urban sociology (Simonsen, 2016: 86). In recent years, academic interest has increased within the subject, compared to previous time (Simonsen, 2016: 86). The analytical focus within urban sociology has been occupied with studying the materiality of the ghetto, meaning the space and its inhabitants (Simonsen, 2016:86). Several scholars have been engaged in a conceptual exercise in which they attempt to define the ghetto and differentiate it from other types of urban spatial separation (Simonsen, 2016: 86). The main reason underlying the necessity for such distinction is because “(...) *there are different dynamics at work, different conditions for the ghetto’s re-integration into society, and, in turn, different policy recommendations to be made when targeting these different forms of segregation*” (Simonsen, 2016: 86).

Peter Marcuse distinguishes between three forms of spatial separation: “*the classic ghetto, the new outcast ghetto, and immigrant or cultural enclaves*” (Simonsen, 2016: 86). He differentiates between the segregation of the ghetto and the enclave by stating that the ghetto is involuntary while the enclave is voluntary. The members of the outcast ghetto experience a complete exclusion from mainstream society and the economy, which distinguishes them from the classic ghetto where the

inhabitants still serve the economy, and therefore, are not entirely excluded from the larger society (Simonsen, 2016: 86).

Another dividing line to present a particular definition of the ghetto is introduced by Loïc Wacquant, who contends that “(...) *the ghetto constitutes an autonomous centre with its own institutions: it is inhabited by a racially homogeneous group that is deemed undesirable, and state inaction serves to maintain the deprivation of the area*” (Simonsen, 2016: 87). He compares this form of spatialized marginality to another form of, which he refers to as “*ethnic cluster*” and emphasizes on the importance in distinguishing between this form of spatialized marginality and the one of the ghetto (Simonsen, 2016: 87-88). In contrast to the ghetto, the ethnic cluster is primarily based on class rather than race and is inhabited by a racially heterogeneous group (2016: 87). Through processes of cultural learning and social and spatial mobility, the ethnic cluster can serve as a springboard for assimilation, contrary to the ghetto, which constructs both material and symbolic isolation and thus composes a clear obstacle to integration (Simonsen, 2016: 87). Based on his studies in France and the United States, Wacquant concludes that France and the rest of Europe do not have ghettos but only ethnic clusters and that the phenomenon of the ghetto is exclusive for black segregation in the United States (Simonsen, 2016: 87). This demonstrates why he strongly emphasizes the importance of distinguishing between the ghetto and the ethnic cluster. Similarly, Marcuse argues that the outcast ghetto is reserved for the American context because only the black patterns satisfy his definition of it (Simonsen, 2016: 87).

In the Danish context, Larsen (2011) is, by using Wacquant’s conceptualization of the ghetto, questioning the sociological relevance of using the term “*ghetto*” in order to describe specific residential areas in Denmark (Larsen, 2011: 47). Within his research, Larsen applies Wacquant’s model on socio-spatial seclusion to examine the specific characteristics of the controversial Danish residential areas today and the extent to which these coincide with the American ghettos, as Wacquant defines them (Larsen, 2011: 47). He concludes, “*the problem with the ghetto term, as a social diagnosis of these areas, it is wrong*”¹⁶ (Larsen, 2011: 63), which confirms the studies of Wacquant. Moreover, Larsen stresses that “*the term ‘ghetto’ is highly problematic as a starting point for policy development, and at the same time it contributes to legitimize the general widespread demonization of the non-profit housing sector and, in particular, the neglected housing*

¹⁶ “Men problemet ved ghettobegrebet er, at det som social diagnose af disse områder er forkert” (original sentence).

areas and their residents”¹⁷ (Larsen, 2011: 63). Instead of using the term ghetto, Larsen proposes the term ‘deprived residential area’, which defines social housing areas with a high number of resource-poor residents (Larsen, 2011: 63).

Marcuse, Wacquant, and Larsen are studying within three different contexts, i.e., America, Europe, and Denmark. However, Simonsen (2016) draws on a common understanding that all of them share and describes it with the following words from Marcuse “(...) *ultimately a spatial concept (...) an empirically determined physical, quantifiable, experiential object*” (Marcuse, 2007 cited in Simonsen, 2016: 87). Based on this, they started to question the definition of the ghetto and which processes within it exist in order to produce and sustain it. However, according to Simonsen, “*such questions neglect to probe the broader (symbolic) function (not just the social functionings) of the ghetto*” (Simonsen, 2016: 87).

Simonsen departs from the tradition of urban sociologists by offering a discourse analytical perspective in order to inquire the meaning and consequence of the concept of the ghetto in political discourse (Simonsen, 2016: 83, 87). He adopts the discourse analytical framework of Laclau and Mouffe and studies the “(...) *symbolic existence and positions in a wider web of meaning*” (Simonsen, 2016: 86) in contrast to the research of urban sociologist who studies the ghetto in relation to space and its inhabitants (Simonsen, 2016: 86). The idea behind adopting a discourse analytical approach enables the author to move the focus from the ghetto as “(...) *a substance to its discursive boundary, asking what meanings and ideas hinder its integration into the rest of society*” (Simonsen, 2016: 87). Based on this, Simonsen examines the role of the ghetto in Danish political discourse by analyzing the whitepaper outlining the former liberal-conservative government’s ghetto strategy (Simonsen, 2016: 83). He argues that the ghetto can be perceived as an antagonistic identity that emerges from the discourse on Danish identity, meaning that the confirmation of a Danish identity is dependent on the discursive construction of the ghetto against the society (Simonsen, 2016: 83-84). Simonsen states that a nationalist discourse and the process of “*othering*” are dominant within the Danish ghetto strategy. He further points out that this ghetto-society nexus results in a struggle between two identities that already had problems fusing

¹⁷ “Således er ghettobegrebet stærkt problematisk som udgangspunkt for politikudvikling, og samtidig medvirker begrebet til at legitimere den udbredte demonisering af den almennyttige boligsektor generelt og i særdeleshed de forsømte boligområder og deres beboere” (original sentence).

(Simonsen, 2016: 83-84) and that “*The Ghetto Plan thus unites Danish society against the common threat that the ghetto represents, and (in stark contrast to the strategy’s stated goal) this implies the impossibility of the ghetto’s integration into Denmark*” (Simonsen, 2016: 84). This leads Simonsen to the conclusion that such strong emphasis on cohesion and internal integration constructing Danish identity, will necessarily point out the ghetto as “*(...) an enemy to be destroyed*” (Simonsen, 2016: 97).

Simonsen has, in contrast to Marcuse, Wacquant, and Larsen, taken a quite non-traditional approach to study and analyze the ghetto. Instead of dealing with the ghetto as an essence and studying it based on materiality, Simonsen has employed a framework based on the understanding that identities are not *'things'* which are but meanings which continuously become” (Simonsen, 2016: 96). Her current work on the Danish ghetto strategy contributes to the contemporary societal debate on integration, concluding that “*(...) Danish national identity needs the ghetto as a negation that allows Danishness to appear as a fixed and full identity*” (Simonsen, 2016: 84).

The objective of this chapter is to review existing scholarly work within the topics of securitization of migration and studies on the ghetto. This chapter has made it clear that the Danish government’s ghetto strategies have not been subjected to much scholarly review, and less work has been done specifically on the Danish government’s ‘Ghetto Plan’ from 2018.

4. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This section will present the theoretical framework of this thesis. First, an overview will be presented of the concept of security and the field of security studies, which is important in order to understand the fundamentals of the securitization theory. Second, Huysmans' theoretical framework on the securitization of migration will be presented. His framework will be adopted in order to analyze 'The Ghetto Plan'.

4.1 Security and security studies

The idea and concept of security entail several meanings, which have changed over time. Back in the Antiquity, security was understood as the psychological condition of a subject, and during the early modern times, the focused change into a state's protection of basic rights, goods, persons, and public order. Today, the concept of security and security threats are, to a high degree, formed and informed by élites, the media, science, and politics (Banai & Kreidi, 2017: 905). The terms 'security' and 'security issue' have, within the academic field of international relations, a relatively different meaning than the common understanding of it in everyday language (Buzan et al., 1998: 21).

Within the conceptualization of security studies, questions have been raised in relation to the primacy of the military element and the state. This questioning has been prominent since the Cold War era, emerging from a dissatisfaction with the scope of security studies, where different kinds of actors and disciplines have attempted to provide answers for this questioning and challenge the intense narrowing view of the field. The origin of this dissatisfaction was triggered by the emergence of the themes of economy and environment, which started to dominate the agenda of international relations during the 1970s and 1980s. Subsequently, the arrival of concerns in relation to identity issues and transnational crime during the 1990s became the new stimulating factor for this lack of satisfaction. As a result, two views have become prominent within the debate of security studies, the 'wideners' and the 'traditionalists' perspective. Within the traditionalist view on security, crucial primacy is given to the phenomenon of war, where security issues are identified in relation to the use of military force. The wideners agree on the point that the element of military, war, force, and conflict are important for security studies. However, in contrast, they strongly argue that economic, environmental, and social issues are just as important. Therefore, the wideners'

approach to security takes a step further and moves the focus out from the military sector, whereas traditionalists insist on maintaining the field within the phenomenon of war. Identifying security issues is thus becoming more difficult for the wideners than for the traditionalists (Buzan et al., 1998: viii-5).

4.2 Huysmans' securitization of migration

A prominent scholar, who is engaged with developing theoretical frameworks within the field of security studies, is Jef Huysmans. His research is occupied with the question of how the distribution and administration of fear can turn issues into a matter of security, primarily in relation to migration, asylum, and refuge in the European Union. According to Huysmans, security policies and responses are the products of a continuing and gradual process, driven by past events (Huysmans, 2006), which is visible within the development of restrictive migration policies and the designation of migration as a security threat to national identity and welfare in Europe. Huysmans explains that this designation of migration, as an issue of security, is embedded in the politics of belonging in Western Europe (Huysmans, 2000: 751), which he defines as “(...) *the struggle over cultural, racial and socio-economic criteria for the distribution of rights and duties connected to membership of the national and European community*” (Huysmans, 2000: 771). Supporting securitization strategies, both directly or indirectly, makes it increasingly challenging for immigrants to integrate into and become a part of European societies (Huysmans, 2000: 753). Huysmans states that political integration and criteria membership are, through the identification of existential threats, preserved or transformed by security policies because it functions as a mediator for belonging. In other words, the political importance of danger discourses and the practices of security stems from their ability to stimulate people to form political communities and to either ground or challenge the political authority based on its reification of the dangers (Huysmans, 2000: 757). Huysmans argues that migration is considered one of the major factors that undermine and weakens national traditions and societal homogeneity. Further, he states that the conceptualization of migration is represented both as an internal and external danger that threatens the existence of the national community or western civilization (Huysmans, 2000: 758). The construction of this security discourse represents migrants as aliens who are dangerous to the reproduction of the social fabric and results in the exclusion of migrants from the normal fabric of society. Thus, the future of the political community is framed as a choice between either being for

migration or against it. However, Huysmans emphasizes that this choice is not free to make because the choice of being for migration is represented as a choice of being against the political community and the survival of it (Huysmans, 2000: 758).

According to Huysmans, securitization of migration in the context of European integration is comprised of three major central themes: 1) *internal security*; 2) *cultural identity*; and 3) *crisis of the welfare state* (Huysmans, 2006: 69).

First, within the theme on “*internal security*”, Huysmans explains that the European integration process is highly involved in the securitization of migration by turning its socio-economic project of the internal market into an internal security project. This securitization of the internal market is based on a widely accepted assumption that the public order and the rule of law will face challenges if internal border controls in the European Union were to be abolished, including the termination of facilitating transnational flows of goods, capital, services, and people. This way, a linkage is created between diminishing internal border controls and strengthening external border control with the expectation of improving facilities against terrorism, international crime, and immigrants (Huysmans, 2000: 758-760; 2016: 69-70). However, Huysmans states that to make an issue into a question of security, it is not enough only to create a linkage between internal and external border control. Instead, it requires that this linkage is constructed and framed in relation to a problem of internal security (Huysmans, 2000: 760; 2016: 70). Thus, the European Union and its member states have articulated this linkage through discourse, and by institutionalizing police and customs corporation, they have induced the production of a security continuum that connects border control, international crime, terrorism, and migration (Huysmans, 2000: 758-760; 2016: 69-70). Huysmans stresses that the subject of migration is moving away from the traditional human rights field and into the security area of terrorism and drug trafficking (Huysmans, 2000: 760; 2016: 71).

Second, within the theme on “*cultural identity*”, Huysmans explains that one of the main issues that connect the politics of belonging and the question of migration is the protection and transformation of cultural identity (Huysmans, 2000: 762; 2016: 73). He states that issues of nationalism, European identity, multiculturalism, xenophobia, and racism are all playing a central role within the political rendering of cultural identity. Yet, he defines the key element as being the “*cultural mixing*” that occurs as a result of the politicization of migration on the basis that

multicultural developments create a challenge to the desire for coinciding cultural and political boundaries. An important source for the mobilization of security rhetoric and institutions is the articulation of discourses in which migration is presented as a cultural threat to social and political integration. According to Huysmans, this presentation of migration as being a dangerous threat to integration has a strong securitizing effect (Huysmans, 2000: 762; 2016: 73).

Third, in the theme “*crisis of the welfare*”, Huysmans asserts that the politicization and governance of belonging in welfare states are highly dependent on access to social and economic rights. It is therefore important to distinguish between those who have a legitimate right to enjoy welfare provisions and those who have not. According to Huysmans, immigrants are increasingly being perceived as having no legitimate right to receive social assistance and welfare provisions. He states that scarcity results in the creation of a competition between immigrants and national citizens within the labor market and in relation to the distribution of social goods. This competition has resulted in a strong and increasing assertion of welfare chauvinism or privileging of national citizens in relation to the enjoyment of socio-economic rights. Huysmans states that immigrants are seen as illegitimate recipients of socio-economic rights and that migrants are coming to Europe based solely on the offering of welfare provisions (Huysmans, 2000: 767; 2016: 77).

5. METHODOLOGY

This section starts with an explanation about the choice of ‘The Ghetto Plan’ of 2018 as the case study for this thesis. Then, it will describe the methodologies used in order to examine the two main aims of this research: identifying the discourses constructed in ‘The Ghetto Plan’ of 2018 and seeking to reveal a securitizing dimension within the Danish government’s political discourse on ghettos and non-western immigrants.

5.1 Single-case study

Case study is one of the most widely used methods within the field of social sciences (Thomas, 2011: 511). It provides an in-depth examination in relation to the complexity and uniqueness of a specific project, institution, program, policy, or system within “*real life*” contexts. Case study is a design frame and functions as a deciding factor of the chosen methods for a specific case. Therefore, it is important to note that case study itself should not be understood as a method but rather a way in which methods are chosen (Thomas, 2011: 512). According to Thomas, it is important to distinguish between two key elements, which comprise a case study: 1) “*the subject*”; and 2) “*the object*”. The first is defined as an instance of some phenomenon, which consists of a “*practical, historical unity*”. The second constitutes the analytical frame, which builds the “*theoretical, scientific basis*” of a study (Thomas, 2011: 512-513). Following Thomas’s understanding of case study, the subject of this thesis is ‘The Ghetto Plan’ from 2018. The choice of this subject was guided by the three principal ways of subject identification proposed by Thomas. He states that the subject of a case study is selected because “*(...) it is an interesting or unusual or revealing example through which the lineaments of the object can be refracted*” (Thomas, 2011: 514). Thus, the subject of this thesis is selected based on the inherent interest of obtaining a better understanding of the way in which the democratic state of Denmark is justifying the implementation of policies and laws, which are openly contesting the human rights of one specific group. Therefore, it is important to note that the validity of this case study cannot be seen as a representative sample for a larger set of laws and policies. This means that the selection cannot be based on typicality. Rather it must be based on the dynamic relationship between subject and object (Thomas, 2011: 514). The object of this thesis is Huysmans’ theoretical framework on the securitization of migration and his three central themes in the context of European integration.

Furthermore, this thesis does not involve a comparative scope. Its methodological framework lies within the scope of a single-case study, which focuses on examining one single policy plan. Conducting a single-case study of ‘The Ghetto Plan’ allows for a more comprehensive and focused analysis of the chosen material (Thomas, 2011: 517). Moreover, identifying the context in which a case appears is crucial for its existence because in order to talk about a case, “(...) *you need the means of interpreting it or placing it in a context*” (Wieviorka cited in Thomas, 2011: 514). Therefore, it is crucial to identify the contextual background of a case to better understand and interpret the historical aspect, which formed the case as it is today. Thus, this thesis includes a contextual background of the major historical events that have led to the current political discourse on Danish ghettos.

5.2 Critical Discourse Analysis

The use of discursive approaches has been prominent within the literature of securitization to the degree that it has achieved impressive credentials (Balzacq et al. 2011: 39). In general, the construction of threat images manifests itself by mapping meaning through discourses. According to the Copenhagen School, “(...) *the defining criterion of security is textual and discourse analysis can uncover one thing: discourse*” (Balzacq, 2011: 21). Despite given a central role within securitization studies, a generic definition for the concept of ‘discourse’ has yet not been agreed on (Balzacq, 2011: 39). Therefore, it is important to explain how the concept of discourse is understood within the current thesis. This thesis will base its understanding of ‘discourse’ on the definition suggested by Jørgensen and Phillips, who defines it “(...) *as a particular way of talking about and understanding the world (or an aspect of the world)*” (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002: 1). They argue that the understanding of the world, identities, and social relations are not reflected neutrally through speech patterns. Rather, speech patterns play a more important role in creating and changing them (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002: 1).

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is an analytical practice (van Dijk, 2015: 466), which was established in the 1980s by scholars in Great Britain and Western Europe and has today developed into a “(...) *problem-oriented interdisciplinary research movement, subsuming a variety of approaches, each with different theoretical models, research methods, and agenda*” (Fairclough et al. 2011 cited in Linda et al. 2016: 72). It appears within social and political structures, practices, and contexts in which it examines the linkage and relationship between language use, its creators,

and receivers. CDA emphasizes how language is entangled in subjects such as power and ideology that define how language is used, what impact it has, and how it expresses, represents, and advances the interests, positions, aspects, and values of those who are in power. (Linda et al. 2016: 72). Primarily, it has been used to study text and talk within social and political contexts in order to understand how social-power abuse and inequality have been enacted, legitimated, reproduced, and resisted (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002: 63; van Dijk, 2015: 466). CDA implies a ‘critical’ approach, which means that this thesis will conduct a critical analysis as well (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002: 63).

Since CDA offers a critical approach to analyze how language is discursively constructed and reproduced in text, this thesis considers CDA as a relevant approach to answering the current research questions. It allows analyzing written texts to identify and reveal discursive sources of security. By combining CDA with Huysmans’ framework on the securitization of migration, it provides an opportunity to examine whether the identified discourses can be classified as an attempt of securitization. Nevertheless, CDA draws on the importance of including the social and historical context of discourse in order to capture the meaning of it. Threats are, after all, emerging from and through the work of a specific context (Balzacq, 2011: 36-37). In this regard, this thesis employs Fairclough’s text-oriented three-dimensional model as the analytical tool to analyze ‘The Ghetto Plan’, which will be presented in the next section.

5.3 Analytical tools

This section will present Fairclough’s three-dimensional model, which will be applied in order to analyze ‘The Ghetto Plan’ of 2018. The choice of this model is based on the method’s ability to depict the relationship between text and context.

5.3.1 Fairclough’s three-dimensional model

According to Fairclough, discourse is an essential form of social practice in which both identities, knowledge, and social and power relations are reproduced, changed, and shaped. He argues that discourse engages in a dialectical relationship with other social dimensions (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002: 65). Thus, Fairclough suggests three ways through which the concept of discourse can be applied. First, discourse refers, in a broad sense, to language use as a form of social practice. Second, discourse is defined as the language used within a particular field, such as scientific or

political discourse. Third, discourse is used as a count noun where the way of speaking provides meaning to experiences from a particular perspective (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002: 66-67). Furthermore, Fairclough states that discourse contributes to the construction of social identities, social relations, and systems of knowledge and meaning (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002: 67).

With his three-dimensional model, Fairclough suggests an analytical framework for conducting empirical research in which communication and society can be investigated. He argues that any kind of language use is a communicative event that consists of three dimensions: 1) *text*; 2) *discursive practice*; and 3) *social practice* (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002: 68).

5.3.1.1 *Text dimension*

The first level of Fairclough's three-dimensional model focuses on the formal linguistic features of text, such as vocabulary, syntax, grammar, and sentence coherence. It is from these features that discourses and genres are realized. These linguistic features and the articulated discourses and genres, which comprise a text, have an influence on both the production and the consumption process of a text (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002: 68-69). Fairclough states that by applying particular tools in a detailed analysis of the linguistic features of a text, it is possible to capture how discourses are activated textually and how a particular interpretation can either be identified or supported. He proposes the following tools for analyzing a text: *grammar*, *wording*, *metaphors*, and *ethos*. With the application of these tools, it is possible to obtain a deeper understanding of how events and social relations are treated through texts and thus how particular versions of reality, social relations, and social identities are constructed (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002: 83). Furthermore, it is important to note that conducting such an analysis of the linguistic features of a text will inevitably include an analysis of the discursive practice as well, which will be elaborated in the following section (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002: 68-69). In this thesis, the material consists of one single policy document (white paper of 'The Ghetto Plan' 2018) comprised of only written text. The above-mentioned tool selection proposed by Fairclough will be applied in order to investigate how the Danish government portrays ghettos and non-Western immigrants.

5.3.1.2 *Discursive practice dimension*

The second level of Fairclough's three-dimensional model focuses on the processes, which through text is created and consumed (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002: 68). These processes involve text production, consumption, and distribution, and it is the social factor of these processes which

determine the type of discourse (Fairclough, 1992: 78). Within this dimension, Fairclough proposes an analysis of discursive practices, which examines two elements. First, it examines how text producers utilize already existing discourses and genres in order to produce texts. Second, it examines how the receivers interpret and consume these texts by applying available discourses and genres as well (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002: 81). This thesis will apply this dimension to analyze the material by adopting the theoretical framework in order to identify the discourses constructed in 'The Ghetto Plan'. The analysis proposed by Fairclough points out the importance of considering the interpretation of the audience. However, this thesis will not cover this element. The material included in this thesis consists of one single written policy document released by the Danish government as one-way communication. Therefore, it is not possible to include the response and interpretation of the audience. Furthermore, by taking the aims of this thesis into consideration, it appears irrelevant to include the element of the audience.

5.3.1.3 Social practice dimension

The third level of Fairclough's three-dimensional model focuses on social practice, which is where the communicative event belongs (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002: 68). It is within this level of Fairclough's model that the dimension of discursive practice is determined, and the dimension of text is shaped (Fairclough, 1992: 86). According to Fairclough, while analyzing a communicative event, it is important to consider two aspects in relation to its contextualization. First, whether the identified discursive practice is reproducing or restructuring the current order of discourse. Second, what implications and consequences do this induce for the wider social practice (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002: 69). However, Fairclough further states that the answers to these questions cannot be provided by discourse analysis alone. Instead, it is necessary to adopt on other theories, such as social or cultural theory, in order to shed light on the social practice (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002: 86). This thesis will draw upon this dimension of social practice in order to examine and situate 'The Ghetto Plan' and the surrounding political discourse within a relevant context. It is therefore important to be conscious about what to designate as relevant. To do so, this thesis will include the previous research, the theoretical framework, and the two first dimensions of Fairclough's framework in order to contextualize 'The Ghetto Plan'.

5.4 Selection of material

The main research material for this thesis has been selected based on Jørgensen & Phillips criteria for material selection: First, its relevance to the research question. Second, the researcher's knowledge and interest of the material within the social domain or institution. Third, its accessibility (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002: 78).

The analysis of this thesis consists of qualitative data and involves one single primary material in the form of a white paper, which was released in March 2018 by the former Liberal-Conservative government of Denmark, who took office from 2015-2019. The title of the white paper is: "*One Denmark without parallel societies – No ghettos in 2030*"¹⁸(Regeringen, 2018), but is referred to as 'The Ghetto Plan' 'The Ghetto Plan' is 40 pages long and comprised of 22 initiatives, which aims at combating ghettos and 'parallel societies' in Denmark. The chosen material is crucial for the research questions of this thesis since RQ1 aims at identifying the discourses engaged in the chosen material, and RQ2 seeks to reveal a securitization dimension based on the identified discourses. The researcher's knowledge and interest are also playing a crucial role in selecting this material, which will be elaborated under section 5.5. The white paper is available for everyone and can be accessed through the Danish government webpage. However, it is only published in Danish, which means that the researcher of this thesis will translate quotes into English themselves. A difficulty may appear during the translation of Danish sayings and metaphors. Here the researcher will use online search engines and dictionaries to translate and include the original Danish wording as well.

The material is limited to one single document, which might affect the validity of the results. However, since the chosen material is the main governmental white paper, which includes a detailed presentation and explanation of the initiatives, it allows for an in-depth analysis of the main discourses surrounding the Danish ghettos and can thus provide an insight. As the white paper is a formal governmental policy document, it is expected to constitute high credibility. In addition, secondary sources, in the form of previous literature, will be included in order to support and answer findings and research questions.

¹⁸ "*Ét Danmark uden Parallelsamfund – Ingen ghettos i 2030*" (Danish title)

5.5 Limitations

As mentioned earlier, this thesis will exclude and not investigate the role of the audience within the applied method of Fairclough's three-dimensional model. The role of the audience constitutes an examination of the response and interpretation of the receivers, which the scope of this thesis will not be able to cover. Consequently, this thesis will not be able to determine whether the Danish government securitization is successful or not because the response and interpretation of the audience play the crucial part in making such determination. Thus, this thesis will limit its scope to only focus on revealing a securitization dimension in 'The Ghetto Plan'.

When conducting an academic study, it is important that the researcher acknowledges and locates their views, beliefs, and values concerning the process of the research. Therefore, self-reflection is considered a mandatory process of any research as it enables the researcher to demonstrate their abilities in identifying, criticizing, and constructing their own position (Manohar et al. 2017). Thus, the researcher of this thesis acknowledges that the fact they are a descendant of non-Western immigrants can affect the reliability of this case. This contains a potential risk for the outcome of the research to be influenced by the view, belief, and values of the researcher. Therefore, the researcher of this thesis will put great effort into staying as objective as possible to the study. To increase the reliability of the outcome, the researcher has chosen to only focus on one single material, which will allow for in-depth and focused investigation.

Furthermore, the time-constrained, the scope of the thesis, the limitation on the number of words, the restrictions due to covid-19, the closed border between Denmark and Sweden, and the lockdown of libraries and educational institutions in Denmark have entailed limitations for conducting this thesis.

6. ANALYSIS

This section will provide an analysis of the selected material by applying Fairclough's three-dimensional model and adopting Huysmans' theoretical framework of securitization of migration. The analysis will consist of three parts: text dimension, discursive practice dimension, and social practice dimension. The researcher of this thesis will translate quotes from the material, and the original text will be attached as footnotes.

6.1 Text dimension

*"One Denmark without parallel societies – No ghettos in 2030"*¹⁹ (Regeringen, 2018) is the title and the first piece of text that the reader encounters on the very first page of 'The Ghetto Plan', and thus the aim of the white paper are clearly and directly stated: to combat ghettos and parallel societies because they do not belong in Denmark. By formulating the title in this way, the Danish government claims that ghettos and parallel societies exist in Denmark. The use of the words *"without"* and *"no"* connects negative connotations with ghettos and parallel societies and contrasts it to the cohesion of Denmark. The use of a hyphen in the title also contributes to outline the aim for the reader clearly, and by including the year *"2030"*, the Danish government engages in a major 'promise' that no ghettos will be existing till that time. This also implies the urgency and the seriousness of the issues concerning ghettos and parallel societies.

Furthermore, the introduction states that the government wants a coherent Denmark built upon democratic values, such as freedom, the rule of law, equality, tolerance, where everyone participates actively (Regeringen, 2018: 4). Using these words to describe Denmark, the government has already established that the ghettos, parallel societies, and anything that hinders the formation of such a Denmark classify as a contrast. Moreover, it is stated in the introduction that previous integration strategies and efforts have failed and resulted in the formation of parallel societies, which now need the implementation of extraordinary measures in order to 're-establish Denmark'. Right after this, it is stated that the Danish population has been growing significantly the last couple of decades and that this growth *"(...) is coming from outside"*²⁰ constituted mainly

¹⁹ *"Ét Danmark uden parallelsamfund – Ingen ghettoer i 2030"*.

²⁰ *"Væksten i befolkningen kommer udefra"*.

of ‘non-Western immigrants’ (Regeringen, 2018: 4-5). Additionally, this directs the reader’s focus towards immigrants in Denmark just by reading the first couple of sentences.

A theme present in ‘The Ghetto Plan’ is the “us” vs. “them” dichotomy. The use of the pronouns “us”/“we” and “them”/“they” occurs throughout the material, where the “us”/“we” are used to represent Denmark or Danes, and “them”/“they” are used to represent non-Western immigrants. This is made clear through the following quote:

For decades, we have allowed to many refugees and family reunifications into Denmark who have not been integrated into Danish society. And they have been allowed to clump together in ghettos without having contact to the surrounding society. Even after so many years in Denmark. Because we have not made clear demands for becoming part of the Danish society²¹ (Regeringen, 2018: 5).

Another example where the “us” vs. “them” dichotomy occurs can be found in the following quote:

(...) too many citizens do not take sufficient responsibility. They do not participate actively in the Danish society nor the labor market. We have a group of citizens who do not embrace Danish norms and values. Where women are considered less valuable than men. Where social control and lack of equality limit the individual’s free expression²² (Regeringen, 2018: 5).

Here, the Danish government uses the word “citizen” to include the representation of non-Western immigrants as well, which is an inclusive word choice. However, negative connotations are attached to the sentences due to the wording and indicate a stereotypical representation of non-Western immigrants. The words “norms” and “values” frequently appear throughout ‘The Ghetto Plan’, which means that the Danish government places strong emphasis and meaning on the words.

²¹ ”Vi har i årtier lukket for mange flygtninge og familiesammenførte ind i Danmark, som ikke er blevet integreret i det danske samfund. Og de har fået lov til at klumpe sig sammen i ghettoområder uden kontakt til det omkringliggende samfund. Selv efter mange år i Danmark. Fordi vi ikke har stillet tydelige krav om at blive en del af det danske fællesskab”.

²² ”Her tager en alt for stor del af borgerne ikke tilstrækkeligt ansvar. De deltager ikke aktivt i det danske samfund og på arbejdsmarkedet. Vi har fået en gruppe borgere, som ikke tager danske normer og værdier til sig. Hvor kvinder regnes for mindre værd end mænd. Hvor social kontrol og manglende ligestilling sætter snævre grænser for den enkeltes frie udfoldelse”.

Thus, 'The Ghetto Plan' is linguistically presenting Denmark and Danes in contrast to ghettos and non-Western immigrants, where positive connotations are attached to the former and negative connotations are attached to the latter. When the government refers to the residents living in ghettos, it uses the words "*non-Western immigrants*", "*immigrants*", or "*descendants*". Even though the terms are used frequently throughout 'The Ghetto Plan', the government has not included any definition for them in the material. Additionally, as mentioned above, the word "*citizen*" has been used a few times.

Another important theme that 'The Ghetto Plan' draws attention to is that ghettos and parallel societies constitute a threat to Denmark, its values and norms, and social cohesion. Regarding this, the Danish government states: "*We see environments where in many cases a negative spiral emerges with a counterculture as a result*"²³ (Regeringen, 2018: 5). The government further states that ghettos and parallel societies are a huge burden for the cohesion in Danish society and for each individual living in Denmark. This is explained through five statements in which the government uses wordings of "*insecurity*" and "*threat*" (Regeringen, 2018: 5). First, "*It is a threat to our modern society when freedom, democracy, equality, and tolerance are not accepted as fundamental values*"²⁴. Second, "*The insecurity in vulnerable housing areas is pushing resourceful citizens to move out from the areas*"²⁵. Third, "*Growing up without learning proper Danish will hinder the opportunities of children and young people*"²⁶. Fourth, "*It is a serious interference with the individual's freedom and opportunity for expression when women and young people are exposed to social control. And when domestic violence occurs in the home*"²⁷. Fifth, "*It is an economic burden when citizens do not participate in the labor market*"²⁸ (Regeringen, 2018: 5). The Danish government's use of the words "*threat*", "*insecurity*", "*interference*", "*violence*", and "*social control*" can be related to words used within a military context. By doing so, the Danish government depicts ghettos and parallel societies as issues that need to be wiped out by 'military force'. This is made more evident in their statement that "*It is about to be the last*

²³ "*Vi ser miljøer, hvor der i en del tilfælde opstår en negativ spiral med modkultur til følge*".

²⁴ "*Det er en trussel mod vores moderne samfund, når frihed, demokrati, ligestilling og tolerance ikke accepteres som grundlæggende værdier. Og når rettigheder og pligter ikke følges ad*".

²⁵ "*Utrygheden i udsatte boligområder er med til at skubbe ressourcer stærke borgere ud af områderne*".

²⁶ "*Det hæmmer børn og unges muligheder, når de vokser op uden at lære ordentligt dansk*".

²⁷ "*Det er et alvorligt indgreb i den enkeltes frihed og udfoldelsesmuligheder, når der udøves social kontrol over for kvinder og unge. Og når der er vold i hjemmet*".

²⁸ "*Det er en økonomisk belastning, når borgere ikke deltager på arbejdsmarkedet*".

call”²⁹ (Regeringen, 2018: 6) to take action towards this ‘threat’. The Danish government continues its argument by comparing Denmark with other parts of Western Europe, where massive challenges are faced in relation to ghettos and parallel societies. These challenges and where they exactly take place remain undefined in ‘The Ghetto Plan’. However, the Danish government states, *“In Denmark, we have not reached that level yet. And that is why we must make a massive effort now, so that we can stop the development before the problems become impossible to solve”*³⁰ (Regeringen, 2018: 6). By including such a comparison, the reader can compare and relate the situation in Denmark with other places in Western Europe.

Furthermore, the Danish government creates a linkage between ‘threats’ and immigrants by including statistical facts and research throughout ‘The Ghetto Plan’. This is mainly done by including these facts and results of researches in the margins, quotes, or in small text boxes at the end corner of pages. An example of this is the statistic fact that has been included concerning violations of the Criminal Code, which states that *“About every tenth young male descendant with a non-Western background is annually convicted for violations of the Criminal Code, the Firearms Act, and the Euphoricants Act”*³¹ (Regeringen, 2018: 6). The statistics do only state facts in relation to immigrants. However, no statistics are brought up regarding Danes and Danish families. Consequently, the reader is not allowed to interpret it in relation to the broader Danish population, which can lead to the facts, stated about immigrants being exaggerated.

The text dimension analysis of ‘The Ghetto Plan’ demonstrates a clear dichotomy between non-Western immigrants and Danes, which is created through the representation of an “us” vs. “them” division by the Danish government. Moreover, the analysis also demonstrates that the (only) target group of the policies introduced in ‘The Ghetto Plan’ is non-Western immigrants and descendants. This is apparent through how the Danish government contrasts Danish norms and values and the perceived norms and values of non-Western immigrants and descendants. Furthermore, the wording and language used by the Danish government are also constructing a threat image of

²⁹ *“Det er ved at være sidste udkald”.*

³⁰ *“Der er vi ikke endnu i Danmark. Og derfor skal vi sætte massivt ind nu, så vi får stoppet udviklingen, før problemerne bliver umulige at løse”.*

³¹ *“Godt hver tiende unge mandlige efterkommer med ikke-vestlig baggrund bliver årligt dømt for overtrædelser af straffeloven, våbenloven eller lov om euforiserende stoffer”.*

ghettos as being a place where violence and social control take place, no form of freedom and equality exist, and the people living there are economic burdens to the Danish welfare state.

The following section will move on to the discursive practice dimension in order to analyze the identified discourses within the text dimension.

6.2 Discursive practice dimension

As demonstrated in the text dimension, the dichotomy of “*us*” vs. “*them*” is clearly visible throughout ‘The Ghetto Plan’, as well as the different set of values and norms connected to these two groups. It is represented that the “*them*”, which refers to non-Western immigrants and their descendants, do not share and accept the fundamental norms and values of the “*us*”, which refers to the Danes whose norms and values are based on liberalism, freedom, equality, and tolerance. This constructs a discourse where non-Western immigrants and descendants are perceived as incompatible with Danes and their values and norms. This discourse results in the discursive construction of ghettos as only consisting of non-Western immigrants and that their norms and values are way different from those of the Danes. Furthermore, the “*us*” vs. “*them*” dichotomy can be understood as a way in which the Danish government seeks to exclude non-Western immigrants and their descendants from the Danish society. This was also demonstrated in the text dimension, where the government only used the term “*citizens*” few times. Apart from this, non-Western immigrants and descendants have only been referred to as “*them*” and “*they*”.

Furthermore, this “*us*” vs. “*them*” dichotomy functions as an essential factor within the securitization of ghettos and immigration. First, by creating such a dichotomy between Danes and non-Western immigrants as well as between Denmark and the ghettos, the Danish government is able to ‘win’ the assent of the audience, which in this case are the Danes. This way, the government enables the use of whatever measure they deem appropriate in order to handle this issue. Thus, with the application of such rhetoric, the government does not need to make it evident that a potential security risk underlies the issue (Balzacq, 2016: 495). Second, one focus area in the Ghetto Plan is directly linked to a matter of security. The government introduces strengthened police response and severer punishment for crimes to create more security in the ghettos (Regeringen, 2018: 11). As demonstrated in the text dimension, the government states that violence and social control are taking place within non-Western families on a regular basis

(Regeringen, 2018: 22-23). This constructs a security issue in relation to the ghettos, and the non-Western immigrants designate them as threats to security and safety in the ghetto areas and to the maintenance of a coherent Denmark (Regeringen, 2018: 4). Thus, this allows the government to introduce and implement any measure they find appropriate in order for security to be re-stored (Balzacq, 2016: 495). Third, the government argues throughout ‘The Ghetto Plan’ that non-Western immigrants are incompatible with the norms and values of Danes. In doing so, the government succeeds in creating a security argument where the existentially threatened elements are the democratic state of Denmark, the rule of law, and its values and norms in relation to freedom, equality, and tolerance (Regeringen, 2018: 4). A threat does not need to be a ‘real’ threat in order to designate it as a security threat. Instead, it is enough to frame an issue as a security threat (Buzan et al. 1998: 24).

Huysmans states that three central themes comprise a securitization: 1) *internal security*; 2) *cultural identity*; and 3) *crisis of the welfare state* (Huysmans, 2006: 69). First, internal security is, in this case, understood as a linkage between the ghetto and the democratic state of Denmark, which is constructed as a matter of internal security in relation to three problems: the dichotomy between “us” vs. “them”, the violence and social control in non-Western families, and the incompatibility between norms and values. Thus, the Danish government has articulated these problems through discourses and by strengthening the police response, firming the control of who lives in these ghettos, and increasing the penalties for crime, production of a security continuum has been induced (Huysmans, 2000: 758-760; 2016: 69-70). Second, cultural security concerns, in this case, the norms and values of non-Western immigrants, which the Danish government links to a lack of integration and active participation within the Danish society. Throughout ‘The Ghetto Plan’, non-Western immigrants are represented as having no affiliation with the educational institutions and the labor market and are in possession of insufficient Danish skills (Regeringen, 2018: 4). This leads to articulating a discourse in which non-Western immigrants and their norms and values are presented as a cultural threat to both social and political integration in Denmark. According to Huysmans, the articulation of such discourse has a strong securitizing effect (Huysmans, 2000: 762; 2016: 73). Third, the crisis of the welfare state concerns the high number of immigrants who have no connection to the labor market and are, thus, perceived as economic burdens for the Danish welfare state (Regeringen, 2018: 4-5). This discourse results in non-Western immigrants being perceived as illegitimate recipients of socio-economic rights and that

the offering of welfare provisions is the only reason they come to Denmark (Huysmans, 2000: 767; 2016: 77). In this way, unemployment among immigrants is seen as a threat to the Danish welfare state and is therefore articulated into a discourse of security. The government has adopted strict measures in order to solve this security issue that is threatening the stability of the welfare state by introducing strict demands for recipients of childcare benefits and financial welfare benefits.

6.3 Social practice dimension

So far, the analysis has shown that a securitization discourse takes place within ‘The Ghetto Plan’, constructing the ghettos as a threat to the Danish nation, its norms, values, social cohesion, and welfare society (Regeringen, 2018: 4-5). As demonstrated in the two previous dimensions, the dichotomy between “*us*” vs. “*them*” and the incompatible norms and values are dividing and creating a contradiction between non-Western immigrants (minority) and Danes (majority). By doing so, the government seeks to achieve an exclusion of non-Western immigrants from Danish society. The identified securitization discourse on ghettos and non-Western immigrants strengthens this division between the two groups by producing and implementing fear among the population. The production and implementation of fear will result in exclusion and even segregation of non-Western immigrants. This has also influenced the requirements for membership, which are potentially exclusive in its nature towards immigrants.

Furthermore, the Danish government repeatedly mentions Danish norms and values, which involve freedom, the rule of law, equality, tolerance, and active participation in society. These values and norms are perceived as highly liberal in their nature, and the government emphasizes them throughout ‘The Ghetto Plan’. However, considering that ‘The Ghetto Plan’ specifically targets non-Western immigrants living in ghettos and introduces laws in which they are treated differently from the rest of the Danish population raises questions in relation to the government’s own commitment to the highly presented democratic Danish values and norms. It is clear that the government uses illiberal approaches and means towards non-Western immigrants in the form of discriminatory and unequal practices where rights and freedoms are granted to people based on the place they are residing. The way in which the Danish government attempts to justify these discriminatory and unequal practices can be legitimized through the securitization discourse that is constructed in ‘The Ghetto Plan’. By framing ghettos and non-Western immigrants as potential

security threats, the government legitimizes the use of extraordinary measures, which in this case are discriminatory and unequal practices introduced in ‘The Ghetto Plan’ (Buzan et al.,1998: 23). However, this would not have been possible to justify under normal circumstances (Banai & Kreidi, 2017: 905-906) of the established rules of the game (Buzan et al.,1998: 23).

Furthermore, the analysis has identified that the securitization discourse in the Danish Ghetto Plan is stigmatizing non-Western immigrants as being unwilling to contribute to the social fabric in Denmark and as being economic burdens to the Danish welfare state. This creates prejudices and stereotypes towards non-Western immigrants and will result in the dichotomy between “*us*” vs. “*them*” becoming even more evident.

The analysis in this dimension has demonstrated that the securitization discourse constructed in ‘The Ghetto Plan’ can be explained and understood based on the contextual background provided in this thesis. It is clear that since the first waves of immigration reached Denmark, a ‘change’ in the perception of immigrants has taken place in connection with the emergence of other events. Additionally, the changing perception of immigrants and the Ghetto Plan can be situated in a broader Western European context. The Ghetto Plan can thus be seen as an example of this move towards more restrictive policies, and the exclusion of non-Western immigrants can be based on their incompatibility with Danish values and norms.

7. CONCLUSION

This section will first describe the findings of the conducted critical analysis on ‘The Ghetto Plan’ and then present future research recommendations.

7.1 Findings

By conducting a critical discourse analysis, this thesis intended to identify the discourses constructed in ‘The Ghetto Plan’ of 2018, i.e., the white paper “*One Denmark without parallel societies – No ghettos in 2030*” (Regeringen, 2018). Moreover, it sought to reveal a securitization dimension in the Danish government’s political discourse surrounding ghettos and non-Western immigrants.

The Danish ghettos are clearly surrounded by a discourse, which fosters an “*us*” vs. “*them*” dichotomy between Danes (majority) and non-Western immigrants (minority). The “*us*” represents liberalism, democracy, and equality, whereas the “*them*” represents illiberalism, inequality, and oppression. This relates to the Danish government’s perception that non-Western immigrants do not share the fundamental norms and values that Denmark is built upon. Thus, the norms and values of non-Western immigrants are concluded as being incompatible with Danish values and norms. Constructing this dichotomy and designating it as an issue of security is embedded in the politics of belonging. This clearly indicates that non-Western immigrants are given an ultimatum: either they integrate into Danish society and adopt its values and norms, or they do not belong in Denmark. By designating this dichotomy between the majority and the minority, the Danish government constructs a process of securitization in which it uses words and speech acts in order to invoke semantic tools, which can legitimize the implementation of policies and laws introduced in ‘The Ghetto Plan’ and thus justify the discriminatory and unequal practice of them (Banai & Kreidi, 2017: 905-906).

Furthermore, the Danish government creates a direct linkage between immigration and integration and the security discourse on ghettos and non-Western immigrants. By doing so, it represents ghettos as being illegitimate and unaccepted parts of Denmark. As a result, a strong exclusion of non-Western immigrants who lives in ghettos is taking place by excluding them from the social fabric of Denmark. Moreover, this designation of ghettos and non-Western immigrants as being

security issues is also connected to the requirements demanded to be granted membership of the Danish community. This way, the Danish government's understanding of and approach to the concept of integration is perceived as having an assimilative nature.

7.2 Further research

Since the scope of this research does not include the role of the audience within the applied method of Fairclough's three-dimensional model, an exciting and relevant recommendation for future research could be to include this element. This way, it will be possible to examine the response and interpretation of the receivers in relation to 'The Ghetto Plan', which has not been covered by existing research. Another contribution to the field of study could be provided by including the views of the residents living in these ghettos, and particularly non-Western immigrants, as they are the main target group of 'The Ghetto Plan'.

8. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agius, C. (2017). *Drawing the discourses of ontological security: Immigration and identity in the Danish and Swedish cartoon crises*, Cooperation and Conflict, Vol. 52, No. 1, pp. 109-125, DIO: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010836716653157>

Andersen, H. S. (2019). *DF vil have Danmark ud af Menneskerettighedskonventionen: »Vi fremsætter forslaget igen og igen og igen og igen, indtil vi falder døde om«*. Berlingske, March 2019 [online] Available at URL: <https://www.berlingske.dk/politik/df-vil-have-danmark-ud-af-menneskerettighedskonventionen-vi-fremsaetter> [Accessed: 24 April 2021]

Balzacq, T. (2010). *Securitization Theory: How Security Problems Emerge and Dissolve*. London & New York: Routledge [online] Available at URL: <https://dk1lib.org/book/2481707/c72175>

Balzacq, T. et al. (2016). 'Securitization' revisited: theory and cases. International Relations, Vol. 30, No. 4, 2016, pp. 494-531, DOI: 10.1177/0047117815596590

Banai, A. & Kreide, R. (2017). *Securitization of migration in Germany: the ambivalences of citizenship and human rights*. Citizenship Studies, October 2017, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2017.1380649>

Bonjour, S. & Lettinga, D. (2012). *Political Debates on Islamic Headscarves and Civic Integration Abroad in France and the Netherlands: What can Models Explain?* Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies, 10:260-278, 2012, DOI: 10.1080/15562948.2012.693036

Brochmann, G. and Hagelund, A., 2011. Migrants in the Scandinavian Welfare State: The emergence of a social policy problem. Nordic Journal of Migration Research, Vol.1, No.1, pp.13–24. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2478/v10202-011-0003-3>

Buzan, B. et al. (1998). *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers [online] Available at URL: <https://dk1lib.org/book/2928593/8c2240>

Ceyhan, A. & Tsoukala, A. (2002). *The Securitization of Migration in Western Societies: Ambivalent Discourses and Policies*. Alternatives, Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 21-39 [online] Available at URL: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/03043754020270S103> [Accessed: 24 April 2021]

Danmarks Statistik. (2020). *Befolkningsfremskrivning*. Retrieved 30 April 2021, from [Befolkningsfremskrivning - Danmarks Statistik \(dst.dk\)](https://www.dst.dk)

Danmarks Statistik. (n.d.) *Invandrere og efterkommere: Indhold*. Retrieved 16 May 2021, from [Invandrere og efterkommere: Indhold - Danmarks Statistik \(dst.dk\)](https://www.dst.dk)

European Commission. (n.d.) *Governance of Migrant Integration in Denmark*. European Web Site on Integration. Retrieved 30 April 2021, from <https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/governance/denmark>

Farny, E. (2016). *Implications of the securitisation of Migration*. University of Leicester. Retrieved 24 April 2021 from [Implications of the Securitisation of Migration \(e-ir.info\)](#)

Fogh Rasmussen. (2004). *Anders Fogh Rasmussens Nytårstale 1. Januar 2004*. Regeringen [online] Available at URL: <https://www.regeringen.dk/aktuelt/statsministerens-nytaarstale/anders-fogh-rasmussens-nytaarstale-1-januar-2004/> [Accessed: 2 May 2021]

Freiesleben, A. M. (2016). *Et Danmark af parallelsamfund: Segregering, ghettoisering og social sammenhængskraft: Parallelsamfund i dansk diskurs 1968-2013 – fra utopi til dystopi*. PhD Dissertation, Det Humanistiske Fakultet, Københavns Universitet, December 2015 [online] Available at URL: https://curis.ku.dk/ws/files/160573902/Ph.d._2016_Freiesleben.pdf [Accessed: 24 May 2021]

Fukuyama, F. (2006). *Identity, Immigration, and Liberal Democracy*. *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 17, No. 2, April 2006, pp. 5-20, DOI: 10.1353/jod.2006.0028

Grillo, R. (2003). *Cultural Essentialism and Cultural Anxiety*. *Anthropological Theory*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 157-173, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1463499603003002002>

Huysmans, J. (2000). *The European Union and the Securitization of Migration*. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol 38, No. 5, December 2020, pp. 751-777 [online] Available at URL: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5965.00263> [Accessed: 24 April 2021]

Huysmans, J. (2006). *The Politics of Insecurity. Fear, Migration and Asylum in the EU*. London & New York: Routledge, 2016 [online] Available at URL: <https://dk1lib.org/book/876996/d3c8e8>

Ibrahim, M. (2005). *The Securitization of Migration: A Racial Discourse*. *International Migration*, Vol. 43, No. 5, pp. 163-187, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2435.2005.00345.x>

Integrationsbarometer. (2021). *Hvor mange og hvem er indvandrere i Danmark?*. Det Internationale Integrationsbarometer. Retrieved 30 April 2021, from [Hvor mange og hvem er indvandrere i Danmark? — Integrationsbarometer](#)

Jensen, K. et al. (2010). *Tolerance and Cultural Diversity Discourses in Denmark*. ACCEPT-PLURALISM, 2010/07, 1. Overview National Discourses, Background Country Report, European University Institute, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies [online] Available at URL: <http://hdl.handle.net/1814/19780> [Accessed: 30 April 2021]

Jensen K. K. (2016). *Scandinavian Immigrant Integration Politics: Varieties of the Civic Turn*. PhD Dissertation. Denmark: Forlaget Politica [online] Available at URL: https://politica.dk/fileadmin/politica/Dokumenter/Afhandlinger/kristian_jensen.pdf [Accessed: 24 April 2021]

Joppke, C. (2007). *Beyond national models: Civic integration policies for immigrants in Western Europe*. *West European Politics*, Vol. 30, No. 1, 1- 22, January 2007 [online] Available at URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402380601019613> [Accessed: 24 April 2021]

Jordan, E. N. (2020). *Forcing People to be Free? A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Political Discourse on the Danish Ghettos*. Master Thesis, Faculty of Culture & Society, Malmö University [online] Available at URL: <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A1483802&dswid=-9469> [Accessed: 20 April 2021]

Jørgensen, M. & Phillips, L. J. (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd

Larsen, T. S. (2011). *Med Wacquant i det ghettopolitiske felt*. Dansk Sociologi, Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. 47-67 [online] Available at URL: [View of Med Wacquant i det ghettopolitiske felt \(cbs.dk\)](View of Med Wacquant i det ghettopolitiske felt (cbs.dk)) [Accessed: 24 April 2021]

Laustsen, C. B & Wæver, O. (2000). *In Defence of Religion: Sacred Referent Objects for Securitization*. Millenium: Journal of International Studies, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 705-739, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/03058298000290031601>

Linda, R. W. et al. (2016). *Critical Discourse Analysis: Definition Approaches, Relation to Pragmatics, Critiques, and Trends*. Perspectives in Pragmatics, Philosophy & Psychology Interdisciplinary Studies in Pragmatics, Culture and Society ed. Capone and Mey, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-12616-6_4

Manohar, N. (2017). *Positionality in Cross-Cultural and Sensitive Research*. Liamputtong, P. (eds) Handbook of Research Methods in Health Social Sciences. Springer, Singapore, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-2779-6_35-1

Messina, A. (2014). *Securitizing Immigration in the Age of Terror*. World Politics, Vol. 66, No. 33, July 2014, pp. 530-559, DOI: 10.1017/S0043887114000148

Meyer, P. K. (2012). *Governing Muslim Minorities as Security Threats: The Case of the Uyghur and the Concept of a New Chinese Nation*. PhD Dissertation, University of Cambridge [online] Available at URL: https://www.academia.edu/24003946/PhD_Thesis_Governing_Muslim_Minorities_as_Security_Threats_The_Case_of_the_Uyghurs_and_the_Concept_of_a_New_Chinese_Nation [Accessed: 24 April 2021]

Mouritsen, P. et al. (2009). *Immigration, Integration and the Politics of Cultural Diversity in Denmark: Political Discourse and Legal, Political and Educational Challenges. Integrated Country Report*. European Commission: Emilie. Aarhus University [online] Available at URL: [https://pure.au.dk/portal/en/publications/immigration-integration-and-the-politics-of-cultural-diversity-in-denmark-political-discourse-and-legal-political-and-educational-challenges\(557da520-c47c-11de-a30a-000ea68e967b\).html](https://pure.au.dk/portal/en/publications/immigration-integration-and-the-politics-of-cultural-diversity-in-denmark-political-discourse-and-legal-political-and-educational-challenges(557da520-c47c-11de-a30a-000ea68e967b).html) [Accessed: 22 April 2021]

Mouritsen, P. et al. (2009). *Immigration, Integration and the Politics of Cultural Diversity in Denmark: Political Discourse and Legal, Political and Educational Challenges. Integrated Country Report*. European Commission: Emilie. Aarhus University [online] Available at URL: [https://pure.au.dk/portal/en/publications/immigration-integration-and-the-politics-of-cultural-diversity-in-denmark-political-discourse-and-legal-political-and-educational-challenges\(557da520-c47c-11de-a30a-000ea68e967b\).html](https://pure.au.dk/portal/en/publications/immigration-integration-and-the-politics-of-cultural-diversity-in-denmark-political-discourse-and-legal-political-and-educational-challenges(557da520-c47c-11de-a30a-000ea68e967b).html) [Accessed: 22 April 2021]

Mouritsen, P. & Olsen, T. V. (2013). *Denmark between liberalism and nationalism*, Ethnic and Racial Studies, Vol. 36, No. 4, pp. 691-710, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2011.598233>

Mouritsen, P. et al. (2014). *Integration Policies in Denmark*. INTERACT RR 2014/06, Robert Shuman Centre for Advanced Studies, San Domenico di Fiesole (FI): European University Institute, 2014 [online] Available at URL: https://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/32020/INTERACT-RR-2014_06.pdf?sequence=1 [Accessed: 30 April 2021]

Nannestad, P. (2004). *Immigration as a Challenge to the Danish welfare state*. European Journal of Political Economy, Vol. 20, No. 3, September 2004, pp. 755-767, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2004.03.003>

OHCHR. (2020). *UN human rights experts urge Denmark to halt contentious sale of "ghetto" buildings*. Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, Geneva, 2020 [online] Available at URL: <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=26414&LangID=E> [Accessed: 22 April 2021]

OHCHR. (2010). *Minority Rights: International Standards and Guidance for Implementation*. Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. New York & Geneva, 2010 [online] Available at URL: https://www.ohchr.org/documents/publications/minorityrights_en.pdf [Accessed: 26 April 2021]

Omar, T. (2013). *Førende ghetto-forsker: "Drop nu jeres syge ghetto-lister, Danmark"*. [online] Available at URL: <https://politiken.dk/debat/debatindlaeg/art5538219/F%C3%B8rende-ghetto-forsker-%C2%BBDrop-nu-jeres-syge-ghettolister-Danmark%C2%AB> [Accessed: 22 April 2021]

Regeringen. (2010). *Ghettoen tilbage til samfundet. Et opgør med parallelsamfund i Danmark*. Regeringen, October 2010 [online] Available at URL: https://www.regeringen.dk/media/1215/ghettoen_tilbage_til_samfundet.pdf [Accessed: 3 May 2021]

Regeringen. (2015). *Statministerens åbningstale 2015*. Regeringen [online] Available at URL: <https://www.regeringen.dk/aktuelt/statsministerens-aabningstale/statsministerens-aabningstale-2015/> [Accessed: 22 April 2021]

Regeringen. (2018). *Ét Danmark uden Parallelsamfund. Ingen ghettoer i 2030*. Regeringen, Marts 2018 dk [online] Available at URL: <https://www.regeringen.dk/aktuelt/publikationer-og-aftaletekster/%C3%A9t-danmark-uden-parallelsamfund/> [Accessed: 22 April 2021]

Rytter, M. & Pedersen, M. H. (2014). *A decade of suspicion: Islam and Muslims in Denmark after 9/11*. Ethnic and Racial Studies, 37:13, 2303-2321, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2013.821148>

Salem, S. (2018). *Denmark's Quest to Socialize the "Ghettos": The Dark History of Forced Assimilation in Europe*. Discover Society, July 2018 [online] Available at URL: <https://archive.discover society.org/2018/07/03/denmarks-quest-to-socialize-the-ghettos-the-dark-history-of-forced-assimilation-in-europe/> [Accessed: 24 April 2021]

Seemann, A. (2020). *The Danes 'ghetto initiatives' and the changing nature of social citizenship, 2004-2018*. Critical Social Policy, pp. 1-20 DIO: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261018320978504>

Shih, K. (2017). *Amerikansk forsker: Indvandrere er ikke skyld i vores skrantende økonomi*. Forskerzonen [online] Available at URL: <https://videnskab.dk/forskerzonen/kultur-samfund/amerikansk-forsker-indvandrere-er-ikke-skyld-i-vores-skrantende-oekonomi> [Accessed: 24 April 2021]

Simonsen, K. B. (2016). *Ghetto-Society-Problem: A Discourse Analysis of Nationalist Othering*. Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism, Vol. 16, No. 1, May 2016, pp. 83-99, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/sena.12173>

Stritzel, H. (2007). *Towards a Theory of Securitization: Copenhagen and Beyond*. European Journal of International Relations, Vol. 13, No. 3, August 2007, pp. 257-383, DIO: 10.1177/1354066107080128 [online] Available at URL: <https://booksc.org/book/28333001/311048> [Accessed: 30 April 2021]

TBST. (2020). *Udsatte områder og ghettoområder*. Bolig og Planstyrelsen [online] Available at URL: <https://www.tbst.dk/da/Bolig/Udsatte-boligomraader/Udsatte-omraader-og-ghettoomraader#> [Accessed: 24 April 2021]

Thomas, G. (2011). *A Typology for the case study in social science following a review of definition, discourse, and structure*. Qualitative Inquiry, Vol. 17, No. 6, June 2011, pp. 511-521, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800411409884>

Togral, B. (2011). *Convergence of Securitization of Migration and 'New Racism' in Europe: Rise of Culturalism and Disappearance of Politics* in G. Lazaridis (ed) *Security, Insecurity and Migration in Europe*, Ashgate, pp. 219-237

Triadafilopoulos, T. (2011). *Illiberal Means to Liberal Ends? Understanding Recent Immigrant Integration Policies in Europe*. Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, Vol. 37, No. 6, July 2011, pp. 861-880 [online] Available at URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2011.576189> [Accessed: 24 April 2021]

UNHR Tweet. (2018). Twitter, July 2018 [online] Available at URL: <https://twitter.com/unhumanrights/status/1014224267439943680?lang=da> [Accessed: 24 April 2021]

van Dijk, T. (2015). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. The Handbook of Discourse Analysis ed. Hamilton and Tannen (John Wiley & Sons Inc, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118584194.ch22>

Versi, J. (2020). *Denmark's 'ghetto plan' and the communities it targets*. Al Jazeera, Januar 2020 [online] Available at URL: <https://www.aljazeera.com/features/2020/1/15/denmarks-ghetto-plan-and-the-communities-it-targets> [Accessed: 24 April 2021]

Vitus, K. et al. (2009). *Analysis of integration Policies and public State-endorsed institutions at national and regional levels in Denmark*. EU-TOLERACE Working Paper. The Danish Centre for Social Research [online] Available at URL: <https://www.ces.uc.pt/ces/projectos/tolerance/media/WP2/WorkingPapers%20Denmark.pdf> [Accessed: 30 April 2021]