



The Construction of the 'Refugee Crisis'

Securitization and Moral Panics

A qualitative study on the constructed threats and underlying ideologies within the debate



Student: Sarah Bekaan Allermann Hitz

Supervisor: Peter Hervik

Abstract

On several occasions, the word ‘crisis’ has been used in the framing of a specific situation or event and the recent situation, where refugees are seeking towards Denmark and Europe, is not an exception.

In this research it has been discovered, that in the debate, refugees are constructed as a part of a ‘Muslim category’ which implies problematizations to Europe. In this construction, refugees are wrapped into a narrative where clashes between a European civilization and an Islamic civilization results in the Islamization of Europe. Furthermore, it has been discovered, that welfare is used in the construction of refugees as a threat, in the mobilization of a ‘us’, and more specifically, welfare as an instrument, appeals to a ‘working-class segment’, which, due to the fear for neoliberal globalization consequences, is easier mobilized against refugees. In the end of the analysis, the processes behind the constructed threats are described as a moral panic concerning refugees and, it is argued, that these processes consists of underlying neo-nationalism as well as neoliberalism. In relation to this, it is argued, that the processes behind the moral panic leads to, and supports arguments related to political initiatives within foreign policy as well as asylum policy, where, more concretely, the formation of the ‘Asylum Package’ is one of the direct political consequences of the moral panic concerning refugees.

This research is based upon a qualitative content analysis approach, with 28 editorials and feature articles, collected within the time frame: 1st of September 2015 and the 1st of November 2015, as the empirical data. Through the work with this approach, the themes *Islam and The European Allies* and *The Welfare Threat* emerged. These themes describe how refugees are debated and what kinds of threats are constructed in relation to refugees. The research is structured around these two themes, and it is through the analysis of these themes, that the research questions have been answered.

Keywords: securitization; moral panic; neo-nationalism; globalization consequences; neo-liberalism; eurabia

Table of contents

1.0 Introduction.....	3
1.1 Problem formulation	5
1.1.2 Research questions	5
1.2 Methodology	6
1.2.1 Research design	6
1.2.2 Analytical approaches.....	9
1.2.3 Limitations	11
2.0 Theory	11
2.1 Framing Theory.....	11
2.2 Securitization theory.....	14
2.3 Moral Panic.....	18
2.4 Neo-nationalism	21
2.5 Globalization discourse theory	28
2.6 Clash of Civilizations	29
2.7 Mediatization theory.....	30
3.0 Islam and the European allies.....	31
3.1 Europeanism	31
3.2 The Islamic threat.....	39
3.3 The European Allies.....	47
3.4 Conclusion	52
4.0 The Welfare Threat	54
4.1 Conclusion.....	60
5.0 Discussion	61
5.1 Conclusion.....	68
6.0 Conclusion.....	69
6.1 Reflections.....	75
List of references	
Appendix	

1.0 Introduction

In 2015, Denmark got into an 'emergency' situation, where the construction of the 'refugee crisis' played a role in the political discussion, took a lot of space in the debate and became a way to frame the actual situation with refugees coming to Denmark. From my perspective, the processes related to the construction of the 'refugees crisis' was a part of a moral panic concerning refugees.

According to the Danish Ministry of Immigration, Integration and Housing, the number of people applying for asylum in 2015 was 21.225 from where 10.856 received residence permit. In 2014 the number of asylum seekers was 14.792 from where 6.104 received residence permit and comparing with the numbers from 2011, with 3.806 applicants and 2.249 receiving residence permit, it can be argued, that the situation has become more challenging over the last 4 years (Udlændinge, Integration og Boligministeriet, 2016). However, is this really an expression for a 'crisis' and if, when did the situation evolve from 'normal' to 'crisis' level?

It is not the first time in history that issues or challenges have been framed as 'crises'. Terms such as the 'financial crisis', the 'Greek debt crisis' and the 'oil crisis' are other examples of how a specific situation is constructed as a 'crisis'. By using the crisis concept in framing a specific situation or event, that situation in question evolves into a security issue - it becomes a threat. In medical terms a crisis is the turning point in case of an illness, the moment where the patient has 'one foot in the grave' (Tangjia, 2014, p. 258). By framing a situation as a 'crisis', one is somewhere in between 'life and death', the 'well-known and the unknown' or even between 'good and bad'. With one foot in each place, one is in the middle of a crossroad and an immediate reaction is necessary.

“Crisis is also an experience of necessity: a crisis is a situation where we can go no further, or carry no longer without a fundamental change. For better or worse, in a crisis, a decision must be made, it is a danger that must be resolved” (Tangjia, 2014, p. 258).

If one is in a crisis situation his security is in danger. Therefore, by using the crisis concept the situation with refugees in Denmark is constructed as a security issue, where political leaders gain a degree of public assent to use extraordinary measures to combat the threat (Vultee, F, 2010, p. 33). By using securitization as a constructing tool, political leaders and opinion makers can shape people's knowledge and understanding of the reality in order to justify laws which otherwise would not have been accepted by the public as well as they can impose ideologies on the audience in favor of the interest of the 'opinion makers'.

I find securitization challenging as it gives political leaders and opinion makers extended opportunities in framing the reality in favor of their specific goals, such as using neo-nationalistic appeals in the mobilization of an audience in the constructing a reality favoring a neoliberal agenda with an interest of themselves. One would perhaps argue, that manipulation, misrepresentations and spin are a part of the political game and follows the guidelines of the democratic debate, however, I find this problematic, as not all participants of the democracy have the same starting point and the same resources in order to deal with the political game. Disregard some exceptions, related to age, citizenship and legal capacity, members of a democracy have the right to vote, however, members of the democracy are at the same time differently exposed to the dynamics of the political game. This challenges the democratic discussion, it becomes more unequal and it removes the focus away from debating sustainable solutions on issues faced by a society.

In November 2015, the Danish government published an initiative in relation to the developments with refugees coming to Denmark (Statsministeriet, 2015a). The Danish government introduced a number of changes within the asylum area in order to intentionally weaken the conditions for refugees in Denmark (Statsministeriet, 2015b). Some political opponents and commentators called it a 'panic', however, Asylpakken - 'Asylum Package' - was passed by a great majority within the parliament even though it was criticized of being in contravention of the human rights (Petersen, 2015). In an article in the Danish newspaper Politiken, spokesman of the party Venstre explains the passing of the controversial 'Asylum Package' with the 'extraordinary' refugee situation (Petersen, 2015).

1.1 Problem formulation

How are refugees constructed as a threat in the debate taking place before the 'Asylum Package' was invented and how does the debate imply specific ideologies?

In this project I shall investigate the debate on refugees coming to Denmark during autumn 2015. What kinds of threats are constructed in relation to their arrival into the Danish society? I am aware, that it is not the first time refugees are seeking to Denmark and it is not the first time they are a topic of discussion. However, I find this specific period interesting to investigate as the 'Asylum Package' was invented in the late autumn 2015, as a political response to the situation, one could argue. Moreover, Denmark elected a new government in June 2015 which could also have had an impact on how the situation is framed.

The underlying hypothesis of this problem formulation is that politicians and others with opinion creating strength problematize refugees in the debate with the purpose of constructing a specific agenda.

The premise of this research is, that communication and the underlying dynamics and appeals influences people's opinions and knowledge on specific issues and by constructing a specific reality on a certain issue through communication, political leaders and opinion makers can easier justify and go through with controversial initiatives. Moreover, to take this premise further, I rely on Togetby's notions on Danes and their experiences with migrants, and argue, that Danes only have very little direct experience with refugees, instead, most Danes get their knowledge from the media and they are therefore more exposed to a constructed reality concerning refugees (Togetby, 1998).

1.1.2 Research questions

The purpose of the below research questions is to understand the problematizations constructed in the debate, the dynamics behind them as well as to understand what kind of 'output' these problematizations seek to reach. By getting an understanding of these considerations I shall be able to answer my overall problem formulation.

- *How is the situation with refugees coming to Denmark contextualized in the debate?*
- *How are refugees constructed as an 'enemy' and as a threat?*
- *How is the 'us' and 'them' dichotomy constructed and what role does it play in the debate?*
- *To what extent does the debate target a specific audience?*
- *How does the debate imply elements of neo-nationalism and neoliberalism?*

In investigating the first research question, I seek to investigate what context the situation with refugees is constructed as being a part of. This will provide the research with a more clear understanding of what kind of 'narrative' is constructed in relation to refugees. In investigating the second research question, I seek to understand how refugees are constructed as an enemy and as a threat. In investigating the 'us' and 'them' dichotomy, I seek to understand how the differences and the hostility between the two is created in order to understand how the 'us' is mobilized as a contributing factor in the enemy creation. In researching the target audience, I seek to investigate what kinds of appeals are being used in the construction of these threats, and whom they appeal to. In researching the fifth research question I seek to theorize upon the possible processes the construction of refugees leads to.

1.2 Methodology

In the first part of this section, the research design will be developed together with a discussion on the chosen sources. This will be followed by a discussion on relevant methods and finally, the limitations of this research will be discussed.

1.2.1 Research design

The focus area in this research is the debate concerning refugees in the period before the 'Asylum Package' was invented. The first parts of the 'Asylum Package' covering 13 areas of the total 34 changes presented by the Government, was passed through by a majority within the parliament including the Government, The Conservative, Danish People's Party, Liberal Alliance and The Social Democrats, the 17th of November 2015 (Nygaard, A & Mansø, G, R, 2015). In order to investigate the debate in the period before the intervention of the 'Asylum Package', the period for investigation will be between the 1st of September and the 1st of November 2015.

This period provides the research with valuable data on the debate concerning refugees at the time before this controversial range of law changes went through and thereby provide with information on how a specific situation is framed right before a controversial political initiative related to this debate is invented - how is the debate shaping people's knowledge and understanding of the reality in regards to this specific issue? Is it 'persuading' or speaking in favor of a specific politic in order to deal with the constructed reality?

In order to perform this research, primary sources such as newspaper articles will be used. Newspaper articles allows researcher to investigate the debate in depth through the language used in the articles. How are the articles framing the specific situation? How are they shaping the reality regarding refugees in Denmark? As the focus in this research will be on communication, newspaper articles have been chosen as a source, as this data type allows researcher to go into depth in studying the communication compared to other relevant sources such as television news or verbal debates on tv. On tv, one has less time to speak out and is therefore not able to play with the language in the same way as in written articles. On the other hand, the advantage of using tv news and debates as a source is, that it reaches a larger audience compared with newspaper articles. Another source, which could have been relevant for this research, is political speeches such as Lars Løkke Rasmussen's speech at the yearly congress of the party Venstre. However, this type of data would provide researcher with information on the relation between Lars Løkke Rasmussen as a leader of a party and the members of that specific party and how he frames the reality for that specific audience. What is interesting in this study is how refugees coming to Denmark are constructed for the general audience - for the Danish population - and this type of speech is therefore not relevant.

The articles used for this research will be collected within the timeframe: 1st of September until the 1st of November 2015. Feature articles will be selected as they represents the voice of experts within a specific field or politicians, and by using this type of data, researcher gains direct insight into the language and communication used by politicians or experts or what I chose to call 'people with opinion creating strength', in the discussion of a specific issue. This said, there is a pitfall which I

shall be aware of in my research, that in the end, the different newspapers decide on their own who they want to write their feature articles. This means, that the ideology and background of the newspaper will have some impact on the article output. Furthermore, editorials will be used for this research as they represent the voice of the concrete newspaper. Even though editorials are not written by politicians or experts, I shall use them in researching the political communication by relying on Stig Hjarvard's theory on mediatization and the changing role of the media, presented in chapter two. Moreover, feature articles and editorials are relevant as both data types represents an opinion more than a fact and by studying these data types, I will therefore be able to understand how the reality refugees is shaped by powerful people with opinion creating strength.

The newspaper articles will be collected from the Danish media database 'Infomedia'. Articles from the 7 largest nationally circulating newspapers will be collected. Moreover, it is of great significance that the 7 newspapers can be categorized as having an opinion creating strength by reaching out the 'ordinary' Dane. What I mean by this is that newspapers such as 'Arbejderen' or 'Børsen' will not be chosen as they target a specific audience. The chosen newspapers are: *Politiken*, *Berlingske*, *Information*, *BT*, *Ekstra Bladet*, *Kristeligt Dagblad* and *Jyllands Posten*. Below table shows the average reading pr. newspaper in a given time period:

<i>Nationally weekly distributed newspapers</i>	<i>2nd term 2014</i>	<i>1st term 2015</i>	<i>2nd term 2015</i>
<i>Politiken</i>	298.000	314.000	301.000
<i>Berlingske</i>	190.000	188.000	182.000
<i>Information</i>	88.000	84.000	102.000
<i>BT</i>	160.000	167.000	148.000
<i>Ekstra Bladet</i>	139.000	129.000	134.000
<i>Kristeligt Dagblad</i>	95.000	98.000	105.000
<i>Jyllands Posten</i>	246.000	247.000	238.000

Source: TNS Gallup, 2016

In searching for useful articles on Infomedia certain key terms have been used: Flygtninge* AND Trussel* (refugees, threat). In searching for editorials with these key terms, 7 articles emerged and by searching for feature articles 21 articles emerged. In the choice of these key terms, it has been of great significance, that they connect threat with refugees and that a good handful of articles emerged from the search. Other combinations of key terms have been tried out such as 'refugees, crisis, threat' or 'refugees, security, crisis' or 'refugees, Islam', however, the best output concerning number of articles as well as relevance for the problem formulation came from the chosen combination.

1.2.2 Analytical approaches

The aim of this research is to study how refugees coming to Denmark during a certain period is constructed in the debate - how is the reality shaped and what knowledge is projected upon the recipients? For this reason, the analytical process will be divided into two steps with the following purposes: Step one: establishing an overview of the data set; step two: implementation of frame analysis. In this section, step one will be explained into depth, whereas, I will elaborate on the second step concerning framing analysis under chapter two.

As the empirical basis of this research is 28 articles, it is of great significance, that the analytical method concerning step one has the right 'competences' in order to deal with a great data set. Moreover, as the aim of the analysis is to answer the research questions, the method must be able to narrow down the data set and, at the same time, let the valuable information concerning the research questions come out. For this reason, a qualitative content analysis (QCA) approach will be applied, as this method allows researcher to get an overview of a great data set and interpret the meaning of it (Bryman, 2012, p. 557). Moreover, this approach is helpful in doing qualitative research, especially in writing in a limited time period, as it narrows down the data set and makes the process focused. Besides, this method allows the research questions and the theory to direct the way the data is examined which strengthens the validity of the research. (Schreier, 2012, p. 3) In order to further increase the validity of this research, Schreier's 8 steps in qualitative content analysis will be followed starting with 'The Coding Frame' (Schreier, 2012, p. 174).

One coding frame will be developed based on the feature articles and editorials chosen for this research. The coding process starts with an initial coding based on some keywords. These keywords are developed from a combination of the theory and the research questions of the project, as well as from pre interpretation concerning the content of the articles, after a pre-reading of the articles has taken place. By using these keywords, I will be able to find the exact information needed to answer the research questions. In order to make a clear overview of the data, the different codes have different colors. The chosen keywords describe some underlying sub-codes:

- **Security:** threat, fear, war, crisis, chaos, military, police, crime, security, existence, civilization, emergency, actions, fight, brutality, terrorism, consequences, necessity, pressure, danger, collapse.
- **Western civilization:** morality, democracy, freedom, civilized, liberalism, capitalism, human rights, freedom of speech, western values, EU, globalization, Europe.
- **Refugees:** uncivilized, culture, religion, Islam, refugees, racism, multiculturalism, nation-state, foreigners, asylum, newcomers.
- **Integration:** labor market, economy, immigration, migrants, integration, unemployment, employment, welfare

The purpose of this initial coding is to get an overview of the data in order to make the research process focused. After the initial coding, a new excel sheet will be developed with focused coding. Through the process of working with focused coding, new themes within the debate will emerge together with relevant quotes related to these themes. These quotes will work as the 'evidence' of the research. After working with the focused coding, I will be able to write the analysis with a clear overview of the themes in the debate and with the empirical data in system ready to support my arguments. The focused coding is found under appendix.

1.2.3 Limitations

In this research, I do not seek to investigate differences in the different newspapers, instead I seek to understand the debate as a whole. As the data used for this research will be Danish newspaper articles, which are in Danish language, relevant quotes will be translated into English, however, this means that there is a risk, that some of the understanding gets lost during the translation process. If needed, reader can find these quotes in Danish language under appendix. In order to get a deeper and more comprehensive understanding of this topic, and to understand if the debate concerning refugees in Denmark has led to a social change, social media and comments on editorials and feature articles could have been useful to look at, in order to get an understanding of how the general public actually perceives the situation and how they debate refugees. However, such research would require a larger research period.

2.0 Theory

In order to establish a theoretical framework for this research, relevant theories will be discussed on the basis of its relevance and usefulness. First I shall discuss different approaches to Framing Theory and in line with that, a presentation and discussion of Securitization Theory and Moral Panic will be performed. Moreover, different approaches to Neo-nationalism will be discussed as well as Globalization Theory will be presented, and in the end, the chapter will be completed with a presentation of Media Theory.

2.1 Framing Theory

In this section different approaches to Framing Theory will be presented and discussed. First I shall present different approaches to Austin's Speech Act Theory and secondly, I shall discuss the different elements of Carol Bacchi's "What's the problem represented to be?".

"I . . . governe . . . with my pen; I write and it is done", observed King James of Scotland and England in 1607 in describing how he used writing for his instructions

to take effect (Yeo, 2010, p. 95). His words were not just words, they were performing an act and with his pen and by writing he was able to govern, to go through with his politic and to maintain power.

In the article: “Representing the Act: Records and Speech Act Theory” Geoffrey Yeo discuss Speech Act Theory with a point of departure in the work of J. L. Austin. According to Yeo, Austin challenged the assumption that the purpose of language is only to convey information, however, by making what he chose to call ‘utterances’ in language, one does not only describe the reality or create a statement, instead one performs an action (Yeo, 2010, p. 96). If a royal person names a ship, that person creates an utterance by saying: “I name this ship” (Yeo, 2010, p. 96). The uttering of a sentence performs an action. Utterances are therefore linked to actions and events instead of facts (Yeo, 2010, p. 97). In the article Yeo also presents the work of Searle who continued working with Speech Act Theory after Austin’s death. Searle presented five categories of speech act:

“(1) *the assertive*: setting out a proposition - stating how things are, were or will be;
(2) *the directive*: attempting to get the reader or listener to do something;
(3) *the commissive*: committing oneself in doing something;
(4) *the expressive*: expressing feelings or attitudes;
(5) *the declarative*: bringing out changes in the world such as declaring a war” (Yeo, 2010, p. 97).

I shall criticize Yeo for not making a clear distinction between Austin’s *constative* and *performative* utterances. Yeo mentions the performative utterances very shortly, however, the dichotomy between the two acts are not clearly explained in his article. Moreover, he does not take Austin’s thoughts on the three different speech acts: *the locutionary*, *the illocutionary* and *the perlocutionary* into consideration in his work. For this reason, I have chosen to support this theoretic discussion with the theories discussed in the book: *Key Notions For Pragmatics* where scholars discuss different approaches within language and communication studies (Verschueren, 2009). According to Marina Sbisa, performative utterances differentiates from constatives as they performs an act such as: “I promise that I will come tomorrow”, where constatives are related to facts and descriptions of reality

such as statements or reports. (Vershauer, 2009, p. 230). If we go back to Yeo and the Royal naming a ship it is another example of how a performative utterance is created.

As earlier mentioned, Yeo does also not consider Austin's three speech acts in his article, however, Sbisà does. According to Sbisà, *the locutionary act* is "the total speech act in the total speech situation" (Vershauer, 2009, p. 233). It is the production of a linguistic expression. *The illocutionary act* has a purpose related to the speakers or writers intentions to get the 'utterance' to count as a specific kind of act such as a representation of something or getting the reader or hearer to do something (Vershauer, 2009, p. 233). Moreover, an illocutionary act is uttering words in a specific context, under certain conditions and with certain intentions. *The perlocutionary act* is related to 'consequences'. Consequences that has been brought by the speaker in the performance of the perlocutionary speech act. This type of act has a convincing, persuading, getting someone to do something effect. Moreover, the perlocutionary act can be performed both intentionally as well as unintentionally (Vershauer, 2009, p. 233).

The work of Austin and Searle must be criticized for mainly being focused on verbal language instead of written language which this research is about. However, despite of the differences, I shall use their thoughts on Speech Act Theory, especially the five categories developed by Searle as well as the three different speech acts developed by Austin.

Another interesting approach to framing is presented in Carol Bacchi's "What's the problem represented to be?" approach to policy analysis. The aim of this research is not to do policy analysis, however, I find Bacchi's approach to framing relevant, especially her questions on how issues and events are represented as problems (Bacchi, 2009). As this research is investigating how the situation with refugees coming to Denmark is framed in a specific way, how it is being problematized, Bacchi's approach is very relevant. Bacchi proposes six questions to ask in policy analysis:

- “1. What’s the ‘problem’ (e.g. of ‘problem gamblers’, ‘drug use/abuse’, domestic violence, global warming, health inequalities, terrorism, etc.) represented to be in a specific policy?
2. What presuppositions or assumptions underlie this representation of the ‘problem’?
3. How has this representation of the ‘problem’ come about?
4. What is left unproblematic in this problem representation? Where are the silences? Can the ‘problem’ be thought about differently?
5. What effects are produced by this representation of the ‘problem’?
6. How/where has this representation of the ‘problem’ been produced, disseminated and defended? How could it be questioned, disrupted and replaced?” (Bacchi, 2009 p. xii)

In this research the focus will be on question 1: What's the problem? And question 2: What presuppositions or assumptions underlie this representation of the ‘problem’? And question 5: What effects are produced by this representation of the ‘problem’?

2.2 Securitization theory

In the article “Securitization theory and Securitization studies” Rita Taureck discuss Securitization theory and its usability such as what it does and what it enables us to do. According to Taureck, Securitization theory is a theoretic tool used for security analysis as well as it seeks to answer the question “what security does” (Taureck, 2006 p. 55). Taureck argues that ‘security’ is a speech act that solely by uttering ‘security’ something is being done. By referring to Wævers approach on security theory she continues: “It is by labelling something a security it becomes one” (Taureck, 2006 p. 54). According to Taureck, securitization allows policy makers to use extraordinary measures in combating the issue in question. By using an illocutionary speech act the situation in question evolves from normal politics into emergency politics:

“By stating that a particular *referent object* is threatened in its existence, a securitizing actor claims a right to extraordinary measures to ensure the referent object’s survival. The issue is then moved out of the sphere of normal politics into the realm of emergency politics, where it can be dealt with swiftly and without the normal (democratic) rules and regulations of policy-making” (Taureck, 2006 p. 54-55).

Taureck identifies 3 steps in the securitization process related to Vævers approach:

- “(1) identification of existential threats.
- (2) emergency action.
- (3) effects on inter-unit relation by breaking free of rules” (Taureck, 2006, p. 55).

According to Taureck, these 3 steps are related to what she calls *security move* - the first step towards successful securitization - first when a securitization actor has convinced the audience (inter-unit relations) of its legitimate need to go beyond binding rules and regulations (emergency mode) will we be able to identify cases of securitization (Taureck, 2006 p. 55). According to Taureck, *securitization move* is in theory open to all units, however, in practice this is not the case, Taureck argues:

“Rather it is largely based on power and capability and therewith the means to socially and politically construct a threat. In this way the study of security remains wide, but with restrictions pertaining to ‘who’ can securitize it is neither unmanageable nor incoherent” (Taureck, 2006 p. 55).

Taurecks notions on what I shall call ‘power relations’ within securitization is an important aspect within the data collection process for this research. As this research seek to investigate how a specific situation is being securitized I shall, as explained in chapter one, use data presenting the voice of powerful and opinion creating actors.

Another interesting perspective on Securitization theory which further strengthens the theoretical foundation of this topic is presented by Michael Williams in the article: “Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics” (Williams, 2003). As Taureck, Williams argues that securitization is a social construction, Williams argues: “Issues become ‘securitized’, treated as security issues, through these speech-acts which do not simply describe an existing security situation, but bring it into being as a security situation by successfully representing it as such” (Williams, 2003, p. 513). Moreover, Williams presents the concept *societal security* which refers to a specific threat on the identity of a group by

different dynamics such as cultural flows and population movement (Williams, 2003, p. 513). This concept is interesting for this research as it touches upon securitization within migration. As previously mentioned, not everyone holds a position to make securitization and for this reason there are some conditions which must be in place in order to construct a successful securitization, by referring to Buzan and Wævers, Williams argues:

“Conditions for a powerful speech-act fall into two categories: (1) the internal, linguistic-grammatical - to follow the rules of the act (or, as Austin argues, accepted conventional procedures must exist, and the act has to be executed according to these procedures; and (2) the external, contextual and social - to hold a position from which the act can be made (The particular persons and circumstances in a given case must be appropriate for the invocation of the particular procedure invoked) (Williams, 2003, p. 514).

As Taureck, Williams also touch upon, the ‘existential threat’ in securitization. According to Williams, ‘security’ is not just a speech act, instead, it is a specific kind of act, Williams argues: “It is a specific kind of act: what makes a particular speech-act a specifically ‘security’ act a ‘securitization’ - is its casting an issue as one of an ‘existential threat’ which calls for extraordinary measures beyond the routines and norms of everyday politics (Williams, 2003, p. 214). So, a threat must be existential in order to be a ‘security’, according to Williams. This is an interesting perspective especially considering the point of departure of this research which is the so called ‘refugee crisis’ and as argued in the introduction, a crisis is the turning point where one have ‘one foot in the grave’, it is an existential threat.

Another interesting approach to security studies related to Williams’s *societal security* is *human security* which emphasizes on the individual as the referent object of security analysis and thereby challenges the state-centric approach to international security studies. In the article: “Critical Human Security Studies” Newman writes on *human security*: “In broad terms human security is ‘freedom from want’ and ‘freedom from fear’: positive and negative freedoms and rights as they relate to fundamental individual needs” (Newman, 2010, p. 78). According to

Newman, scholars of human security argues that many people in the world fears internal conflicts, diseases, hunger, violence and pollution while for other people, the greatest threat comes from their own state and the threat is therefore not external (Newman, 2010, p. 78 - 79). In the article Newman presents different approaches to human security, however, the approach I find interesting for this research is the integration of human security into security studies, Newman argues: "From this perspective, human security is deployed to explore theoretical debates concerning the nature of security threats, referents and responses to insecurity" (Newman, 2010, p. 80 - 81). Moreover, this approach emphasize on the gender aspect of security, Newman argues: "This suggests that conditions of deprivation can only be understood with reference with gender relations and masculine institutions of power" (Newman, 2010, p. 81).

Another relevant theorist within securitization theory is Lene Hansen. In the article: "The politics of securitization and the Mohammed Cartoon crisis: A post-structuralist perspective" Hansen writes about securitization with a point of departure in the cartoon crisis (Pram Gad, U, & Hansen, L, 2011). Opposite Williams and Taureck, Hansen points out an interesting perspective in Securitization studies related to the importance of the context of the issue in question, Hansen argues:

"Securitization theory, advises Balzacg, should conceptualize context as an 'explanatory variable' that influences the ability of securitization actors to persuade an audience, and audience and context should be accorded as causal weight" (Pram Gad, U, & Hansen, L., 2011, p. 359).

According to Hansen, Securitization should not only be analyzed and understood as a speech act, however, it should be analyzed as a part of a context, as this context plays an important role in the persuading process between the security agent and the receiver of the security. By referring to an illustration of the 'audience' by Balzacg, Hansen also points out the relevance of the security actor to identify itself with feelings, needs, interests and experiences of the audience in order to perform a successful security (Pram Gad, U, & Hansen, L., 2011 p. 360). Lene Hansen's

combination in security analysis of language and context is an interesting approach for this research.

2.3 Moral Panic

In the article: “Moral Panics: Culture, Politics and Social Construction” Erich Goode discuss social problems and moral panics with a point of departure in civil disturbances between young people in a seaside resort community on England's southern coast in 1964 (Goode, 1994). According to Goode, the events lead to great attention and became a story of sensationalism in the British media even though the events were not a sensation as such (Goode, 1994, p. 154). In the days following the events, all nationally circulating newspapers except from one came up with horrifying titles such as “Day of Terror by Scooter Groups” and “Youngsters Beat Up Town” and later these stories of social problems was followed up by editorials concerning the subject of youth violence (Goode, 1994, p. 155). Even theories started to appear explaining the type of violence referred to as ‘mob violence’ and people with roots in the specific youth environment was interviewed for newspaper articles and even the Home Secretary was expected to deal with the problem (Goode 1994, p. 155). According to Goode, the problem with youth violence continued as a theme in the British media for around three years after these events took place and every story was covered in the same sensationalistic way (Goode, 1994, p. 155). In the aftermath of these events, Said Cohen launched the term *Moral Panic* explaining the exaggerated reaction to minor events as the one in the seaside resort community, from key actors such as politicians, the media, police and the public (Goode, 1994, p. 155). With reference to Said Cohen, Goode writes on moral panic:

“A condition, episode, person or group of persons emerges to become defined as a threat to societal values and interests; its nature is presented in a stylized and stereotypical fashion by the mass media; the moral barricades are manned by editors, bishops, politicians and other right-thinking people; socially accredited experts pronounce their diagnoses and solutions; ways of coping are evolved or... resorted to; the condition then disappears, submerges, deteriorates and becomes more visible. Sometimes the subject of the panic is quite novel and at other times it is something which has been in existence long enough, but

suddenly appears in the limelight. Sometimes the panic passes over and is forgotten, except in folklore and collective memory; at other times it has more serious and long-lasting repercussions and might produce such changes as those in legal and social policy or even in the way society conceives itself” (Goode, 1994, p. 155-156).

In this research Cohen’s concept of moral panic will be used in the analysis of the problematizations related to the situation with refugees coming to Denmark. Later in the article, as a response to Cohen’s concept, Goode raises a range of questions to be asked in relation to moral panics:

“Why is there a moral panic over this supposed threat but not that potentially even more damaging, one? Why does this cast of characters become incensed by the threat the behavior supposedly poses, but not that cast of characters? Why a moral panic at this time, but not earlier and not later? What role do interests play in the moral panic? What does the moral panic tell us about how society is constituted, how it works, how it changes over time?” (Goode, 1994, p. 156).

These questions will be raised in this research as they can help researcher to get a better understanding of what kind of problematizations we are dealing with. Especially the question on how the society works as well as the question on the timing of the moral panic seems relevant to this research.

Moreover, in the article Goode describes 5 elements which defines a moral panic: an extended *concern* related to the problem in question; *hostility* an increased ‘them’ and ‘us’ takes place; Consensus certain degree of agreement within the society that the threat is real; *disproportionality* the concern is out of proportion to the nature of the threat; *volatility* the moral panic can arise suddenly and subside suddenly (Goode, 1994, p. 158).

Another interesting perspective from the article is the theories of moral panics presented by Goode related to the proposed questions to ask on moral panics. According to Goode, there are two dimensions which distinguish the theories explaining moral panics. The first dimension is related to the motive: *morality vs.*

interest: is the concern related to a specific world-view such as ideology and morality or is it to do with gaining something valuable such as jobs, power, wealth or recognition (Goode, 1994, p. 159). The second dimension is related to the number of actors involved in the panic. Are many or only few involved in the creation and the maintenance of it? Moreover, the second dimension also consider *the levels of power*: if the panic starts from the bottom and progress up, or if it is a top down process or neither, but instead starts from the middle of the society (Goode, 1994, p. 159).

Goode presents a table with six possible theories on moral panics based on the different dimensions; levels; elite, middle, public; and motive; morality/ideology, material/status/interest. In this research I shall not go into depth with this table, however, Goode highlights three models developed from the table of greater significance to researchers: *the grassroot model* arguing that the panic starts from the general public with an existence in the believe that the phenomenon really represents a threat to values, safety or existence; *the elite engineered model* arguing that a small powerful group of people develops a campaign to create fear and concern over an issue which would otherwise not be considered as harmful in order to move away the attention from real problems within the society as an extended focus here would threaten the interests of the elite; *the interest group model* arguing that interest groups such as professional associations, police departments and the media brings up an issue of their interest independently from the elite (Goode, 1994, p. 161).

Another interesting approach to Moral Panic is presented by Matthew Durlington in the article: "The ethnographic semiotics of a suburban moral panic (Durlington, 2007)". According to Durlington, a moral panic progresses in five stages:

- 1: Something or someone is defined as a threat to values or interest;
- 2: This threat is depicted in an easily recognisable form by the media;
- 3: There is a rapid build-up of public concern;
- 4: There is a response from authorities or opinion makers;
- 5: The panic recedes or results in a social change" (Durlington, 2007, p. 266).

Especially the second stage concerning the way the media depicts the threat is an interesting approach for this research.

2.4 Neo-nationalism

In the article: “Neo-nationalism and the reconfiguration of Europe” Andre Gingrich writes on neo-nationalism with a point of departure in an anthropologic research performed in Austria in the period 1996 - 2000 with a focus on the leadership of the right-wing politician, Jörg Haider (Gingrich, 2006, p. 195). In the article Gingrich presents the concept of neo-nationalism together with the two core elements of it: gender and charisma, and finally he concludes that fears of downward social mobility and ‘angry white men’ syndromes was channeled and manipulated through charismatic leadership in Austria (Gingrich, 2006, p. 196). According to Gingrich, the ‘angry white men syndrome’ is the core of neo-nationalism’s greatest success in Europe to date (Gingrich, 2006, p. 206). In this section I shall not go into depth with Gingrich’s research on neo-nationalism in Austria, instead I shall use his more general thoughts and perspectives on neo-nationalism and how it differentiates from previous types of nationalism.

According to Gingrich, different types of right-wing movements and parties arise all over Europe and common to all of them is that they are very different in character and they have emerged out of different social and national contexts and under different political conditions (Gingrich, 2006, p. 197). Despite of their differences, Gingrich identifies some similarities or a ‘common pattern’ among what he chose to call the ‘new right’. The common pattern is related to ethnic topics such as multiculturalism, immigration and integration, Gingrich argues:

“Specific, essentializing forms of manipulating these topics always have served as important mobilizing factors in the success of these groups and parties. By and large, most of them have taken a restrictive and exclusivist stand on such issues as illegal immigrants, or on any further immigration from outside the EU. In relation to such topics, a narrow ‘law and order’ practice is one common denominator that is informed by relatively explicit, if not authoritarian, pro-state ideals, which may then

be supported by xenophobic elements of discourse” (Gingrich, 2006, p. 197).

In his presentation of the concept, neo-nationalism, Gingrich identifies elements of continuity between older and more recent forms of nationalism. According to Gingrich, the defense of a ‘state of its own’ is a key element in the ideology and practice of nationalist movements and parties (Gingrich, 2006, p. 198). Moreover, the construction and mobilization of an emotionalized ‘us’ and a stereotyped ‘them’, and a focus on downplaying the commonalities between the two parts is another element mentioned by Gingrich (Gingrich, 2006, p. 199). Another interesting perspective on neo-nationalism, which also distinguishes it from older types of nationalism, is the two groups of ‘them’. Where previous studies on social identity suggests a ‘us’ and a ‘them’ dichotomy, Gingrich suggests two groups of ‘them’, Gingrich argues:

“One group of ‘them’ is constructed, in terms of power, as being ‘above us’: the EU authorities in Brussels and their mysterious associates elsewhere. A second stratum of ‘them’ is perceived as being ranked in terms of status ‘below us’: local immigrants and other cultural and linguistic minorities living in EU, plus their ‘dangerous’ associates in Africa, Asia and elsewhere” (Gingrich, 2006, p. 199).

Another interesting difference between older forms of nationalism and neo-nationalism is, according to Gingrich, the main potential client groups. Previously, supporters of nationalist movements were typically the masses of unemployed workers and farmers, however, the supporters of the ‘new right’ are more likely to be employed people who fears losing their jobs due to the changes of the globalization. What is interesting in Gingrich’s theory is, that these people are not actual loosing on globalization, instead it is a fear of losing that has brought them towards the ‘new right’, Gingrich argues: “These were not only, and not even the primarily ‘losers’ of globalization: It was the fear of losing, and more specifically the fear of downward social mobility that attracted them to these voting preferences” (Gingrich, 2006, p. 199). So, once again, where previous supporters of nationalism tend to be people that actually went through hard times, supporters of neo-nationalism tend to be

people only fearing harder times. This is a very interesting perspective in the study of constructed problematizations.

Moreover, by referring to the work of Bauman, Gingrich argues, that religious, ethnic and cultural form of 'minority' identification implies different potential problematizations to the Western nation states. Furthermore, these movements and parties tend to claim the right to address assumptions and problems or challenges faced by a nation-state on the behalf of the majority (Gingrich, 2006, p. 1998)

Also, by referring to the work of Holmes, Gingrich presents the term 'fast-capitalism' and the belonging growth in job insecurity. According to Gingrich, fast-capitalism and the insecurity it brings increases the support for neo-nationalist movements, on neo-nationalist movements Gingrich argues: "They are directly related to, and have to be analyzed in relation to all central developments of a globalized fast-capitalism (Gingrich, 2006, p. 199). This is another interesting perspective which I shall use in my research. In relation to the concept 'fast-capitalism' I must include Kalb's approach to neo-nationalism presented in the book: "Headlines of nation: Subtext of Class: Working-Class Populism and the Return of the repressed in Neoliberal Europe" (Kalb, 2010). According to Kalb, neo-nationalism is a working-class driven phenomenon affected by social changes related to neoliberal globalization. On working-class neo-nationalism Kalb argues: "..workin-class neo-nationalism is the somewhat traumatic expression of material and cultural experiences of dispossession and disenfranchisement in the neoliberal epoch (Kalb, 2010, p. 1). According to Kalb, class experiences are being silenced by the elite that has become 'cosmopolitanized' and has lost their interest of class and national social rights, Kalb argues: "We suggest that nationalist populism is in fact a displacement of experiences of dispossession and disenfranchisement onto the imagined nation as a community of fate, crafted by new political entrepreneurs generating protest votes against neoliberal rule" (Kalb, 2010, p. 2-3).

Another interesting distinction made by Gingrich between nationalism and neo-nationalism lies within the democratic participation. Where nationalist movements historically have been opposed to the democratic political system and worked

against it with anti-parliamentary and anti-constitutional groups such as the Neo-Nazis, neo-nationalist groups are more likely to work within the democratic system (Gingrich, 2006, p. 200).

Where previous types of nationalism were based on colonialism, neo-nationalism is, according to Gingrich, constructed around a 'fortress of Europe', a fortress that must be rebuilt around cooperating nation-states, fighting against the consequences of globalization such as immigration and the import of products from African and Asian farmers (Gingrich, 2006, p. 199 - 200).

As mentioned, I will not elaborate on Gingrich's findings from his research in Austria, however, I must include his perspectives on the role of gender and the 'angry white-men syndrome' in relation to neo-nationalism in Austria, especially in regards to security which is a core element of this research. In his research, Gingrich discovered that male associations were linked to notions of home community, homeland, nation, danger, alertness, commitment and bravery (Gingrich, 2006, p. 203). In other words, security or protection were related to the male gender whereas the female gender was associated with home, safety, belonging and affinity (Gingrich, 2006, p. 203). This is an interesting notion in studying social dynamics in the debate concerning refugees in Denmark. How does the debate appeal to the 'angry white men' in Denmark? Another interesting point in Gingrich's article is the importance of charismatic leadership within neo-nationalist movements. Gingrich refers to a meeting at the Freedom Party in Austria where the audience or participants get impatient with long speeches and want to see 'him' - Jürg Haider (Gingrich, 2006, p. 210). When Jürg Haider enters the stage the audience or crowd starts to cheer and scream, a situation which Gingrich describes as being more similar to a rock concert than a political meeting (Gingrich, 2006, p. 210). On the situation Gingrich elaborates:

"Haider was both star and hero, and for many he had obviously reached that status in part because he spoke their language, unlike many other politicians (including those from his own party who had spoken before him) who used a standard version of media German" (Gingrich, 2006, p. 2010).

Moreover, as Gingrich writes, Haider used his political opponents to put himself and his party into a better light by making jokes and as Gingrich argues:

“The speech reminded the audience again and again of the mainstream parties’ election slogans from several years before, when they had promised ‘employment for all’ and a strengthening of local democratic life - promises, said Haider, that had been betrayed by the other parties but would be pursued and kept by him” (Gingrich, 2006, p. 210).

So, looking at Gingrich reflections of the meeting at the Freedom Party, a strong charismatic authority that appeals better times for local working-class people seems to be another characteristic within neo-nationalist movements. Moreover, in line with the notions of ‘fast-capitalism’ as well as with Kalbs ‘working-class’ approach to neo-nationalism, Gingrich noticed that issues related to immigration was barely a topic of discussion during the meeting compared with employment and other social concerns, and, according to Gingrich, this proves that topics concerning immigrants are only one out of many issues that makes neo-nationalism attractive to people (Gingrich, 20016, p. 211).

In the article: “Something Varied in the State of Denmark: Neo-Nationalism, Anti-Islamic Activism, and Street-level Thuggery” Mark Sedgwich writes about neo-nationalism in Denmark in the period 2001 - 2011 and with a point of departure in Danish People's Party. As Gingrich, Sedgwich highlights the fear of globalization as one of the main issues related to neo-nationalism, Sedgwich argues:

“Globalization means erosion of national sovereignty, a process to which the increasing scope of the EU has contributed in Western Europe. Globalization brings economic consequences that threaten the welfare state. And globalization also brings, most visible of all, immigration” (Sedgwich, 2013, p. 211).

Another interesting perspective on neo-nationalism is presented in the article. By referring to the work of Natalie Doyle, Sedgwich argues that neo-nationalism is also a reaction to a crisis within the political representation of which the EU plays a significant role. In identifying the political platform of Danish People's Party, Sedgwich also highlights one plank in line with the work of Doyle, Sedgwich argues: "In addition, a fifth plank is that they can be trusted while mainstream politicians cannot be" (Sedgwich, 2013, p. 211). Moreover, in the article Sedgwich emphasizes the development and changes within neo-nationalist sentiment in Denmark. According to Sedgwich, neo-nationalist sentiment at the first place was focused on the EU, however, since 2000 there has been a shift towards a neo-nationalism primarily focusing on the fear for Islam and immigration (Sedgwich. 2013. p. 212). In addition to this, I must include what Sedgwich calls 'the Eurabia narrative' - the threat of Islamization of Europe (Sedgwich, 2013, p. 224). According to Sedgwich, 'the Eurabia narrative' emerged out of the reluctance from some European countries on the invasion of Iraq and the European criticism of Israeli actions in Palestinian areas, which by American and Israeli commentators was explained by an increased Arabization and Islamization of Europe (Sedgwich, 2013, p. 224). Afterwards, this narrative has been used frequently by journalists and as Sedgwich writes, in Denmark Lars Hedegaard, one of the main critics of Islam, used it in his book: "In the House of War" (Sedgwich, 2013, p. 225). As Sedgwich's notions on the 'Eurabia narrative' are quite limited, I will support this theoretic discussion with the ones of Carr. In the article: "You are now entering Eurabia" Carr argues:

"What began as an outlandish conspiracy theory has become a dangerous Islamophobic fantasy that has moved ever closer towards mainstream respectability, as conservative historians and newspaper columnists, right-wing Zionists and European neo-fascists find common cause in the threat to 'Judeo-Christian' civilization from muslim immigrants with supposedly incompatible cultural values" (Carr, 2006, p. 1)

A central aspect of Carr's notion is, that Europe is a collaborator in regards to the islamization of the continent, Carr argues: "The idea that Europe is the collaborator in its own downfall is a key Eurabian concept, though some commentators see

Eurabia as an incipient rather than an actual phenomenon” (Carr, 2006, p. 2). Elements of this collaboration are declining fertility rates and loss of ‘civilizational confidence’ (Carr, 2006, p. 3). A part of the narrative is also, the notion that islamists will not take over Europe on the battlefield, instead, the European civilization will collapse slowly where after muslims can take over, Carr continues: “Other Eurabian commentators have similarly depicted a spiritually exhausted Europe about to fall into the waiting arms of Islam” (Carr, 2006, p. 3). Later in the article he continues within the same track:

“In an article entitled ‘Is Europe dying?’ published by the neocon bastion, the American Enterprise institute, the American writer and Catholic theologian Georg Weigel referred to Europe’s ‘crisis of civilizational morale’ and the ‘disease of the human spirit’ caused by ‘exclusive humanism’ and a ‘failure to acknowledge Christian ideas and values” (Carr, 2006, p. 3).

Another important aspect of the Eurabian narrative is the role of what Carr calls the ‘politically correct petards’ which refers to the liberal humanists and multiculturalists, as well as European politicians “..who ‘in the name of tolerance’ and ‘multiculturalism’ have betrayed the people of Europe and the traditions of freedom, democracy and rationality..” (Carr, 2006, p. 3). Moreover, Carr criticises the Eurabians for depicting Islam in a specific negative way and often as opponent to Western values:

“In this way, Eurabians shape a particular version of ‘Islam’ which blurs or ignores the distinctions between Islam and Islamism, between violent and non-violent forms of Islamism, between Muslim as an ethnic category and Muslim as a statement or faith, between immigrant, terrorist and refugee” (Carr, 2006, p. 13). “In all these depictions, ‘Islam’ is invariably presented as the negative antithesis of quintessentially ‘European’ values such as tolerance, secularism and gender equality” (Carr, 2006, p. 13).

2.5 Globalization discourse theory

In the article: “Language and Globalization” Norman Fairclough argues that the shift from soft power to hard power within US foreign policy is related to the emergence of the ‘War on Terror’ discourse. According to Fairclough, instead of interpreting the ‘War on Terror’ and the consequences of it as a result of the 9/11, it should rather be seen as a part of a longer process of changes within US military strategy, a change from soft power to hard power with the extended use of economic and military forces as a response to the pressure on globalism agenda (Fairclough 2006, p. 141). According to Fairclough, globalism is a strategy and discourse within globalization that aims to construct globalization processes in a neo-liberal way. It is the liberalization and integration of markets and the ‘War on Terror’ discourse is a tool in the protection of it (Fairclough, 2009, p. 320). Fairclough identifies five themes related to the ‘War on Terror’ discourse:

“(1) The new era, posing new threats which require new responses;
(2) America and its allies face unprecedented risks and dangers which call for exceptional measures;
(3) Those who pose these risks and dangers are the forces of ‘evil’;
(4) America and its allies are the forces of ‘good’, and their actions are informed by moral values.” (Fairclough, 2006, p.144).

I find the themes in the ‘War on Terror’ discourse relevant to this research as they are related to threat talk and securitization. Moreover, Fairclough identifies six discourses related to globalization:

“(1) Globalization is about the liberalization and integration of global markets;
(2) Globalization is inevitable and irreversible;
(3) Nobody is in charge of globalization;
(4) Globalization benefits everyone;
(5) Globalization furthers the spread of democracy in the world;
(6) Globalization requires a war on terror” (Fairclough, 2009, p. 323).

Also, besides from describing globalization as a discourse, by referring to the work of Steger, Fairclough describes globalism as a narrative and an ideology (Fairclough, 2009, p. 323).

2.6 Clash of Civilizations

Another interesting approach to Globalization theory is presented by Samuel Huntington in the article: “Clash of Civilizations?” from 1993. In his article Huntington argues that future global conflicts will find its point of departure in culture or civilizations rather than ideology or economy, Huntington argues: “Nation states will remain the most powerful actors in world affairs, but the principal conflicts of global politics will occur between nations and groups of different civilizations” (Huntington, 1993, p, 22). Where previous conflicts were caused by ideological or economical differences and preferences such as communism vs. liberalism, future conflicts will be between different civilizations. According to Huntington, a civilization is a cultural entity that “is defined both by common objectives, such as language, history, religion, customs, institutions, and by the subjective self-identification” (Huntington, 1993, p. 23 - 24). In relation to this definition, Huntington highlights religion as the most important element that differentiates civilizations from each other. Moreover, he argues that the increased interaction between people from different civilizations contributes to people’s consciousness concerning their own civilization, Huntington argues: “The interactions among peoples of different civilizations enhance the civilization-consciousness of people that, in turn, invigorates differences and animosities stretching or thought to stretch back deep into history” (Huntington, 1993, p. 26). Moreover, due to the globalization, the nation state has weakened as an identity source, which is instead replaced by religion. In relation to this, Huntington argues that the next global conflicts will be between the Western civilization and the Islamic civilization: “The West’s “next confrontation”, observes M. J. Akbar, an Indian Muslim author, “is definitely going to come from the Muslim world. It is in the sweep of the Islamic nations from the Maghreb to Pakistan that the struggle for a new world order will begin.” (Huntington, 1993, p. 32). Huntington's theory is interesting to this research especially his perception on the increased civilization-consciousness as well as his ideas on the confrontation between the West and Islam. This said, his article is from 1993 and a lot of major global events have taken place since it was written especially concerning the relationship between the Western and

the Islamic civilization such as the 9/11, the War on Terror and more recent, the war against the so called Islamic State.

In order to have a more substantial discussion on Globalization theory, I will support the theoretic discussion with the approaches presented by Hannerz in the article: "Reflections on varieties of Culturespeak" (Hannerz, U, 1999). In this article, Hannerz criticizes Huntington's 'Clash of Civilizations' for being an expression of 'cultural fundamentalism', on this concept Hannerz writes: "human beings are by nature culture bearers; cultures are distinct and incommensurable; relations between bearers of different cultures are intrinsically conflictive; it is in human nature to be xenophobic (Hannerz, 1999, p. 395). Moreover, Hannerz argues that in contemporary discourse, culture is often brought into negative contexts or into contexts of conflict such as 'cultural clash' and 'culture shock', and the reason for this is that, what he calls 'culturespeak' - the way we speak about culture - draws people's attention towards the increased interaction between different cultures (Hannerz, 1999, p. 394). In the article Hannerz discuss different versions of 'culturespeak' such as 'multiculturalism' and their implications on public life as well as on scholarship (Hannerz, 1999, p. 394).

2.7 Mediatization theory

As mentioned under 'research design' the data for this research will be feature articles and editorials by relying on Stig Hjarvard theory on the changing role of the media and its influence on other social institutions in society. In the article: "The Mediatization of Society - A theory of Media as Agents of Social and Cultural Change" Stig Hjarvard presents a theory of the influence media has on society and culture (Hjarvard, 2008, p. 1). According to Hjarvard, mediatization is a double-sided process where at one side the media work as an independent institution with its own logic that other social institutions must accommodate to, however, at the same time, media has become an integrated part of other institutions such as politics as more of these institutional activities are performed through the media (Hjarvard, 2008, p. 1). Media and other social institutions within the society of today are therefore interconnected and we can therefore no longer accept the media as a

separated unit, Hjarvard continues: “Contemporary society is permeated by the media, to an extent that the media may no longer be conceived of as being separate from cultural and other social institutions” (Hjarvard, 2008, p. 1).

3.0 Islam and the European allies

The theme: “Islam and the European allies” is, as the title suggests, related to the notions on the narrative of the Islamization of Europe - Eurabia - which was presented in chapter two. The fear concerns Islam and that an expanding Muslim population one day will ‘take over’ Europe and change the European civilization, and, in the debate, refugees, are constructed as being a part of this process. Furthermore, another interesting aspect of this theme is the betrayers of Europe - European politicians and a constructed left-wing - are constructed as a part of the threat. During my work with the qualitative content analysis, I have discovered that this theme is highly relevant within the debate concerning refugees in Denmark. The codes behind this theme are “Refugees”, “Western Civilization”, “Security” and “Integration”. In this chapter the theme will be analyzed into depth, which will contribute to the answer of the research questions. In the end of the chapter, a conclusion will summarize the important points and give an answer to the research questions. Due to the comprehensive size, the chapter will be divided into the three sub-themes: “Europeanism”, “The Islamic Threat” and “The European Allies”.

3.1 Europeanism

The analysis of the sub-theme: “Europeanism” will contribute to the answer of research question one: “*How is the situation with refugees coming to Denmark contextualized in the debate?*” and research question two: “*How are refugees constructed as an ‘enemy’ and as a threat?*” and research question four: “*How is the ‘us’ and ‘them’ dichotomy constructed and what role does it play in the debate?*”.

In the article: “Grundtvig på ny” the situation with refugees coming to Europe is constructed as a threat to the European civilization, and by comparing the situation with the collapse of the Roman Empire, the situation is framed into a historical

context. Moreover, this framing contributes to the securitization of the situation as it becomes clear what kind of life changing situation we are in:

“The present refugee stream, that has the same characteristics as the migrations during the Roman Empire, is of historical dimension and will change the Danish and many European societies forever. Just as the Roman Empire that collapsed under pressure from migrations, are also Europe facing a breakdown in stages, first as an economic crisis, and now as a demographic, is one argument” (Jyllands-Posten, 2015 p. 1).

According to Jyllands-Posten, a migration threat is targeting our civilization, the European civilization of which Denmark is a part of. The threat is not targeting Denmark as such, however, instead it is constructed as targeting the civilization we are a part of - Europe. The parallel to the Roman Empire is strengthening the security in regards to refugees. The Roman Empire was a great civilization of that time, and if such a strong civilization could collapse due to migration, then we are indeed facing a threat. The historical dimension is also contributing to the problematization. By using the word ‘historical’, the situation is framed as exceptional, it is something that ‘does not happen every day’ - it has a life changing dimension in line with a crisis: “Crisis is also an experience of necessity: a crisis is a situation where we can go no further, or carry no longer without a fundamental change. For better or worse, in a crisis, a decision must be made, it is a danger that must be resolved” (Tangjia, 2014, p. 258). The historical dimension contributes to the construction of a ‘necessity of politics’ where ‘something must be done, otherwise our civilization will face the same destiny as the Roman Empire’. This historical framing of the situation is related to the ‘sensationalistic covering of threats’ as a feature within moral panics (Goode, 1994, p. 155).

This way of framing the situation in a sensationalistic way, within a historical context, continues in the article: “Mens Europa frivilligt lægger sig i graven” where the migration period during the Roman Empire is also referred to as the darkest period in European history: “The migration period marks the most probably darkest era in Europe’s troubled and incredible history” (Næsby, 2015). By saying that the migration period is the darkest period of all troubled periods in European history in

the debate concerning refugees, Næsby contributes to the securitization of the situation by pointing out what kind of extreme threat we are dealing with. Considering Europe as a continent that historically has been plagued by wars, the framing of the migration period during the Roman Empire as the darkest of them all, contributes to the construction of an extreme threat. Moreover, the word 'dark' in relation to European history often refers to the Middle Ages, another 'dark' period within European history. By using the word 'dark' reader associates the situation of today with the dark Middle Ages, with a time before enlightenment and modern constitutions and where religion played a dominating role in the construction of the society. By using 'dark' and migration together in the debate concerning refugees, refugees are related to the associations of the dark Middle Ages. By connecting refugees with the associations of the Middle Ages, writer constructs a stereotype of refugees which strengthens them as threats and contributes to a moral panic concerning refugees.

The sensationalistic covering of the situation, with the reference to the Roman Empire and the causes of its collapse, continues in the quote by Næsby:

“A very similar scenario unfolds in these years, not so much due to the recent months refugees streams towards the European nations - this is just a little part of something bigger - however, due to the recent years collective accept of a demographic change, which, in a very short time, will change Europe forever (Næsby, 2015)

According to Næsby, we are experiencing the same kind of collapse as what happened during the Roman Empire, and the reason for this collapse is migration and the following demographic change. This way of framing refugees as a threat towards the European civilization is contributing to the security concerning refugees as an 'existential threat', according to Williams:

“It is a specific kind of act: what makes a particular speech act a specifically 'security' act a 'securitization' - is it casting an issue as one of 'existential threat' which calls for extraordinary measures beyond the routines and norms of everyday politics (Williams, 2003, p. 214).

By casting the situation with refugees in Europe as a threat towards the existence of the European civilization, the situation evolves into an existential threat. It is the existence of the European civilization which is threatened due to migration.

There is also an ethnic element in this construction. The 'demographic change' as Næsby calls it, and the 'demographic stage' as Jyllands-Posten calls it, refers to the change in the European population as a part of the threat. The first stage of the European breakdown was the economic crisis, however, the second stage has nothing to do with ideologies or economic systems, it is about people. The threat lies within the people. There will be fewer of the 'right' people and more of the 'wrong' people in Europe. This securitization is related to Williams's 'societal security', which refers to the threat on the identity of a group by dynamics such as cultural flows and population movements (Williams, 2003, p. 513). The problematization and threat lies therefore within the changing population and the corresponding change in the European identity. Moreover, demography also refers to the number of people, both among the migrating people, however, also among Europeans. People with the 'wrong' background increases too fast compared with Europeans. They get more children than Europeans. This demographic threat represents a 'European neo-nationalism' related to the Eurabian narrative. In the Eurabian narrative, low fertility rates among Europeans are mentioned as one of the causes for the fall of Europe (Carr, 2006, p. 3). Instead of using the concept 'neo-nationalism' in regards to xenophobia and protectionism on a European level, I call this 'Europeanism'. Instead of focusing on the protection of a 'state of its own', Europeanism is about the protection of the European civilization. Thinking of Huntington's 'civilization-consciousness', where people in today's globalized society has an increased focus on their belonging to a specific civilization and where the nation-state is having a lacking role as a source for identity creation, one argument is, that Danes and others, have a greater focus on their belonging to the European civilization, especially in relation to questions involving non-Europeans (Huntington, 1993, p. 26). In this case, it is not only the nation which is threatened, it is our entire civilization and our common enemy is representatives from a different civilization. This is also related to the 'Fortress of Europe' a fortress based on cooperating European nation-states fighting against the consequences of

globalization. As mentioned in chapter two, the 'Fortress of Europe' is also, according to Gingrich, one of the main building blocks of neo-nationalism. The situation with refugees coming to Denmark is therefore constructed in line with the notions of the 'clash of civilizations' (Huntington, 1994). The European civilization is in the process of having a conflict with people from another civilization and refugees are a part of this process.

That the situation is constructed as a part of a 'civilization clash' with migrating people from a different civilization threatening the European civilization, is supported by below quote, however, in this case, the civilization is called 'Western':

“The next decades will therefore offer us several cultural clashes and an increased political polarization, while those core values the Western civilization is based upon, such as the Christian heritage, freedom of speech, democracy and freedom slowly but surely dilute and at the end disappears completely” (Jyllands-Posten, 2015 p. 2).

The European civilization is, according to Jyllands-Posten, a part of the 'Western' civilization. Like a prophesy of doom, writer predicts the collapse of the Western civilization and thereby emphasizes what kind of danger we are in. This collapse is constructed as it happens in stages: “several cultural clashes and an increased political polarization”, “slowly but surely dilute and at the end disappears completely”. By picturing the end of the Western civilization as something that happens gradually, slowly, slowly, the threat seems even more terrifying. People of the Western civilization will be able to follow the process, to see how everything they care about and appreciate falls apart. This way of framing the situation as a part of a gradually European breakdown, is a part of the 'sensationalistic covering of threats' in moral panics, and this gradually civilization collapse contributes therefore to the security concerning refugees as a more horrifying scenario than if the collapse happened from one day to another (Goode, 1994, p. 155). Moreover, this gradually collapse is related to the Eurabian narrative as argued by Carr: “Other Eurabian commentators have similarly depicted a spiritually exhausted Europe about to fall into the waiting arms of Islam” (Carr, 2006, p. 3). Also here, the situation is

contextualized as a part of a larger ‘civilization clash’ resulting in the end of the European civilization.

As already mentioned, migration as such is not the threat; the problem is the specific kind of people that are migrating. The problem is the people. By depicting the situation as “cultural clashes” writer constructs a kind of battle between ‘us’ and ‘them’- between our culture and their culture, between the different civilizations. The problem is that their culture does not fit into our civilization. In relation to this, the ‘core Western values’ such as freedom of speech, Christian heritage, democracy and freedom are mentioned as something that will disappear in near future due to migration. These values belong to ‘us’, only people from our civilization appreciate and understands these ‘core values’. Migrants from other civilizations seek to eliminate them. Using these values is therefore a way to mobilize a very easy recognizable ‘us’ within the debate. An ‘us’ which is based on these ‘core values’.

This way of depicting ethnic and cultural minorities as problematizations to ‘Western values’ is related to Gingrich’s notions on ‘minority identification’ from where minorities are identified in a specific way which implies different problematizations to the Western nation-states (Gingrich, 2006, p. 198). Moreover, it is also related to the negative depiction of Muslims as opponents to Western values as argued by Carr (Carr, 2006, p. 13). In the debate, refugees are therefore constructed as a problematization to the ‘Western’ values. Writer depicts refugees as opponents to democracy, freedom and other ‘Western’ values, despite of any factuality concerning their valuational starting point. Writer do not consider refugees as a diverse group consisting of people with different cultural backgrounds, instead writer depicts all refugees as being incompatible with European or ‘Western’ values. This construction of refugees is related to what Goode calls the ‘disproportionality’ within moral panics. The concern is out of proportion to the nature of the threat (Goode, 1994, p. 158). Despite of any facts concerning refugees, they are all depicted as being the enemy of European values which can be seen as a concern out of proportion. This disproportionality strengthens refugees as a threat and as an enemy and contributes to a moral panic.

In the debate, a 'us' and 'them' dichotomy based on values is therefore constructed where 'them' is depicted as having the opposite values to 'us'. As already touched upon, one argument is, that this 'us' and 'them' dichotomy is a part of the creation of a moral panic concerning refugees. According to Goode, one of the five elements in moral panics is the increased hostility, an increased 'us' and 'them' (Goode, 1994, p. 158). The European or 'Western' values are differentiating 'us' from 'them' and it is through these values that one, a European, should identify oneself. By setting up the key elements of the European identity against refugees, the security is strengthened, and one extra step towards a moral panic is taken. Moreover, this depiction of 'them' as being opposite or even the enemy of 'Western' values, are related to the stereotypical and easy recognizable depiction of the threat in moral panics as explained by both Goode (Goode, 1994, p. 155 - 156) and Durlington (Durlington, 2007, p.266). Including the values of the European civilization in the construction of refugees as a threat, contributes to the securitization of the situation as a 'societal security'. It is a threat targeting the group and the identity of that group (Williams, 2003, p. 513).

The construction of the 'us' and 'them' dichotomy is also an expression for neo-nationalism within the debate, as Gringrich argues: "A second stratum of 'them' is perceived as being ranked in terms of status 'below us': local immigrants and other cultural and linguistic minorities living in EU, plus their 'dangerous' associates in Africa, Asia and elsewhere"(Gingrich, 2006, p. 199). Their culture is less developed than ours. They do not possess the same values as 'us' which makes them 'below us'. This neo-nationalist 'below us' attitude strengthens refugees as a threat and contributes to the moral panic, however, it also contributes to the strengthening of the European or 'Western' values as something unique.

The context where refugees are a part of a 'clashing civilizations' and a part of the 'wrong' people continues in below quote:

"During only a few decades, a generation of well-meaning, however, totally irresponsible politicians, have succeeded in committing a historical failure, by fundamentally changing the ethnic and cultural

composition of Europe. The demography is working against the European people (Jyllands-Posten, 2015 p. 2).

The situation is again constructed as historical, it will go into history. The situation with refugees is a part of a development that has been going on for some decades. Also here, the 'societal security' plays a role in the construction. The refugee stream of today is contextualized as being a part of a larger migration process. Moreover, the refugee situation as such is not the problem, the problem is the overall migration which has been going on for some time. Moreover, the threat lies within the ethnicity of the migrating people; they are the 'wrong' people. By using 'fundamentally' in the description of the changing environment of Europe, writer constructs the migrating people as someone very different from 'us' which is contributing to the extended hostility between 'us' and 'them'. Also, by using 'fundamentally' the situation evolves into a security issue. If something is changed 'fundamentally' it is the foundation or the basic elements of that in question which is changed, it is the core elements. Moreover, if something is changed fundamentally, it can be difficult to change it back. We are not even in the middle of the crossroad; we are already on our way into the wrong direction. This is again related to the 'sensationalistic covering' of threats in moral panics (Goode, 1994, p. 155). Also here 'demography' is used to explain what kind of situation we are in and what kind of threat we are dealing with. 'The demography is working against the European people'; The changing demography with less of the 'right' people, which are the ethnic Europeans, and more of the 'wrong' people, which are those with a different ethnicity and culture, is a threat to the European civilization.

The study of the contextualization concerning refugees coming to Denmark is interesting in the understanding of how the situation is constructed as a security issue. Thinking of Lene Hansen's 'context as an explanatory variable', where the context influences the ability of securitization actors to persuade the audience, one argument is, that the context with the 'clashing civilizations' and the historical dimensions of it, contributes to the securitization of refugees, as it is easier to manipulate the audience of the constructed threats, if they are constructed as being a part of a larger migration process (Pram Gad, U & Hansen, L, 2011, p. 359). The

debate is therefore not only using language to impose knowledge and a specific reality on the Danes, however, also the contextualization of the situation plays an important role in the 'persuading' process.

3.2 The Islamic threat

The theme: "The Islamic Threat" will contribute to the answer of research question two: *"How are refugees constructed as an enemy and as a threat?"* and research question three: *"How is the 'us' and 'them' dichotomy constructed and what role does it play in the debate?"*.

Another important aspect of the debate concerns Islam and Muslims and the way these are used as a tool in the construction of refugees as a threat, where refugees are put into one category and automatically debated as Muslims more than as a diverse group of people, from the article: "Elitens Hjælpeløshed":

"Do they not consider the consequences related to those migrations of Muslims into the European countries, which are being triggered these days" (Jensen, 2015, p. 1).

According to Jensen, the problem with refugees is that they automatically bring one specific problematization - Muslims. By equalizing refugees with Muslims, Jensen constructs refugees as a part of one category. This way of framing refugees as a part of a specific group is related to Gingrich's 'minority identification' where religious, ethnic and cultural forms of minority identification implies problematizations to the Western nation-states (Gingrich, 2006, p. 198). Refugees are identified through a religious form of minority identification - Islam - which implies consequences for the European countries. Moreover, Jensen continues the 'Europeanism' by talking about the 'consequences' related to Muslims in Europe. By using the word 'consequences' related to Muslims in Europe, a security is constructed. Muslims in Europe is a security issue. Religion used as an instrument in the construction of refugees as a threat is presented again in the article: "Indvandringens konsekvenser":

“It is about time to let the recent weeks wishful thinking come to an end and think about how the increased immigration already now leads to welfare deteriorations and increased religious fundamentalism” (Andersson, 2015 p. 1).

Andersson equalizes religious fundamentalism and immigration in the construction of a proportionality; the more immigration we have, the more religious fundamentalism we will see. Immigration creates religious fundamentalism. By making this construction in a debate concerning refugees, Andersson frames refugees as religious extremists and continues thereby the categorization. If you are an immigrant, then you are religious extremist. As already analyzed, the arrival of refugees to Europe is framed as the return to the dark Middle Ages, where refugees represents those negatives of which we associates the Middle Ages, such as unenlightenment and religious insanity. Andersson’s construction of immigrants as religious fundamentalists goes in line with and supports this argument. Migrants are, with their religious fundamentalism, taking ‘us’ back to the dark Middle Ages. By creating this construction in the debate concerning refugees, refugees are depicted as an easy recognizable stereotype - they are all religious fundamentalists. This construction is related to the ‘War on Terror’ discourse, especially the theme “Those who pose these risks and dangers are the forces of ‘evil’ (Fairclough, 2006, p. 144). Due to the construction of migrants and refugees as religious fundamentalists they pose dangers to the society and they are thereby the forces of evil and an enemy to the society which implies the use of extraordinary measures to combat refugees as a threat.

Islam and Muslims as a problematization within the debate concerning refugees are supported by below quote which contributes to the categorization of refugees:

“If the rhetoric has caused crimes and terror in Denmark, it is very difficult to explain, why we see the exact same or even worse picture everywhere in Europe where Islam represents a big minority” (Jyllands-Posten, 2015, p. 2).

Crime and terror is connected with Islam. Moreover, the 'big minority of Muslims' is a security issue as it causes more crimes and terror. Islam in bigger doses is a security issue. It is therefore not only Islam which is the problem here; it is also the amount of Muslims in Europe. By writing 'everywhere in Europe where Islam represents a big minority' writer constructs a reality with big minorities of Muslims spread all around Europe, which strengthens the security of the problem. It is more difficult to deal with or to combat a threat which is spread everywhere and not just at the same or at a few spots. Moreover, 'everywhere' refers to how Muslims have already taking some great steps in order to 'take over' Europe. The Islamization of Europe has already started and we already now observe the consequences with increased crime and terror. This depiction of Muslims as an enemy and as a threat which is already spread all around Europe, in the debate concerning refugees, is related to the argument, where one of the problematizations concerning refugees is the increased population of the 'wrong' people. By using negative representations of Muslims and Islam in Europe, refugees are easier constructed as threats. By saying, that we already have a huge problem with Muslims in Europe, writer contributes to the panic concerning refugees. Why should we open our borders for someone that already creates problems in Europe? By depicting Islam and Muslims as equal to increased terror and crime in the debate concerning refugees, refugees becomes not only a part of a 'Muslim category', however, this category evolves into the 'bad' or the forces of evil. Thinking of Fairclough and the 'War on Terror' discourse and the theme concerning the forces of 'evil'. As refugees are connected with Muslims and thereby terror and crime, they pose risks and dangers to Europe and they are thereby the forces of evil (Fairclough, 2006, p. 144). This construction contributes to the enemy creation of refugees as a threat to Europe.

In the debate concerning refugees in Denmark, constative speech acts concerning Islam are used in the construction of refugees as threats, which contributes to the categorization of refugees as a part of the 'Muslim category'. This is especially visible in the article: "Indvandringens konsekvenser" where Andersson presents a range of negative facts on Muslims already living in Denmark:

“If you look at the survey ‘your Muslim neighbor’ from 2009, which investigates Danish Muslims stands on different topics, a majority of 55 percentage finds homosexuality unacceptable, however, only every fourth finds it acceptable. Almost 80 percentage finds that the Mohammed cartoons should be illegal, 55 percentage wants critique of religions to be completely prohibited, and 64 percentage finds that religious freedom should be restricted under certain circumstances” (Andersson, 2015, p. 1).

Andersson strengthens the ‘us’ and ‘them’ dichotomy by using what can be seen as some of the basic values of the Danish society. As already discovered, freedom of speech is a value which is used in the enemy creation, and in this case, it is expressed through the Mohammed Cartoons. Ever since the Mohammed Cartoons were published they have been used in depicting Muslims in a stereotyped way. The Mohammed Cartoons have become a ‘symbol’ of the differences between non-Muslim Danes and Muslim Danes or between ‘us’ and ‘them’. By mentioning these cartoons together with a negative figure on it, Andersson constructs a reality where Muslims are not compatible with Danish values. Moreover, by taking up this discussion in regards to refugees in Denmark, Andersson transfer those negatives to refugees, even though refugees are a diverse group and even though this survey concerns Muslims already living in Denmark. Furthermore, by mentioning homosexuality as one of the values incompatible with Muslims together with freedom of speech, Andersson contributes to a depiction of Muslims as being opponents to liberal values; Muslims are against the liberal values. Andersson continues on the same track by referring to a newer survey:

“A completely new survey from Wilke for Jyllands-Posten shows that the number of Danish Muslims that finds that the instructions of the Quran should be followed completely has increased from 62 percent to 77 percent from 2006 - 2015. The number of Danish Muslims that finds that girls should cover themselves has within the same period increased from 29 percent to 43 percent. At the same time, 52 percent finds that Islam should not adjust to the ‘Western’ society” (Andersson, 2015 p. 1).

Andersson lists a range of figures concerning Islam and Muslims living in Denmark or a ‘Western society’. First of all, Andersson do not consider why these negative numbers have increased from 2006 - 2015, he is just using the change in order to

depict Muslims as completely incompatible with the Danish or 'Western' society. This way of using facts on Muslims already living in Denmark in the debate concerning refugees, contributes to the categorization of refugees. By using existing facts on Muslims in Denmark refugees become a part of one group - the Muslim category - and they are debated in relation to and associated with the existing connotations on other representatives from this category more than as different individuals. The notion is, they are from the same category, so they act in the same way. This way of identifying refugees with Muslims and pre-determinable certain problematizations in relation to this minority identification, is related to Hannerz's notions on 'culturespeak' and his critic on 'cultural fundamentalism': "human beings are by nature cultural bearers; cultures are distinct and incommensurable; relations between bearers of different cultures are intrinsically conflictive; it is in human nature to be xenophobic" (Hannerz, 1999, p. 395). In the debate, the differences in values between the European or 'Western' civilization and the 'Muslim category' as a part of the Islamic civilization are spoken up and constructed in a way that strengthens refugees as an enemy and threat to Europe.

In the debate the categorization of refugees continues: "The integration, which has always been complicated, will be impossible, due to the Islamic minority which is getting even bigger (Jyllands-Posten, 2015 p. 2). Also, in this case, the threat is related to the demographic change with more of the 'wrong' people. The enemy is the growing population of Muslims. Islam as a problematization within the debate is supported by Andersson: "And the increasing religiosity among Muslims is both a pan-European and a global phenomenon" (Andersson, 2015 p. 2). According to Andersson, Muslims are getting more religious which is not only considered as a threat to the European civilization, however, to the world in general. Islam is a global problem. The construction of Muslims as more religious is related to Huntington's 'Clash of Civilizations' where extended religiosity is one of the features of the more globalized world and one of the problematizations related to the clash between the 'Western' civilization and the Islamic civilization (Huntington, 1993, p. 32). By stating that Muslims are becoming more religious in the debate concerning refugees, refugees as a security issue strengthen, due to their constructed belonging

to the 'Muslims category'. In relation to this, this construction contributes to the narrative of the Islamization of Europe - the increased religiosity among Muslims is an expression for the Islamization of Europe. By saying that Muslims are becoming more religious writer contributes thereby to the securitization concerning refugees. Moreover, in the debate concerning refugees, Muslims are framed as belonging to one specific culture, which strengthen refugees as an enemy and a threat: "From this rationale, critique of the culture of the immigrants has also not been allowed, which has especially been obvious in regards to the most controversial of them all: Islam" (Næsby, 2015). Islam is a part of a specific culture, it is not a religion, it is a culture. Culture refers to the values, beliefs and behavior of a group of people and it is something which is very rooted in this group, it has developed over a long period. This implies, that culture is something which can be difficult to change. If one is born and raised within a specific culture, it can be difficult for that person to 'get rid' of that culture. Culture is a part of a person's identity; it determines who that person is. By constructing Islam as a culture, Islam becomes an even bigger threat to the European civilization as Muslims will have difficulties in leaving Islam behind. This strengthens refugees as problematizations to the European civilization as refugees, as a part of the 'Muslim category', are unable to leave their culture behind and adapt to the culture of 'us'. The focus on Islam as a culture within the debate concerning refugees and on the differences between the European civilization and the Islamic civilization, is related to Hannerz's 'culturespeak', where cultures, in contemporary discourse, are brought into negative contexts or into contexts of conflicts due to the ways cultures are spoken about - it is due to the way cultures are spoken about that draws people's attention towards the increased interaction between different cultures (Hannerz, 1999, p. 394). The focus on Islam as a culture and on the European vs. Islamic civilization is an expression for 'culturespeak', where the two civilizations are spoken up, which draws people's attention towards the differences between the cultures and towards the eventual problematizations related to these differences. 'Culturespeak' is especially visible in the construction of values as the differentiating element between 'us' and 'them, where the liberal values of 'us', such as freedom of speech and homosexuality, are set up against the 'Muslim category' which is constructed as being opponents of these values. 'Culturespeak' in the debate

concerning refugees contributes to the enemy creation and the construction of refugees as a threat.

The categorization of refugees as a part of a 'Muslim category' aiming to 'take over' Europe is supported by below quote:

“The illegal and predominantly Muslim barrier-breaking people of today, arrives of own free will, will often not identify themselves, make demands and complain if the conditions in those countries they have invaded, are not in line with their expectations” (Jensen, 2015, p. 2).

By using the word 'invading' Jensen constructs a war look alike situation, where Europe is invaded or 'taken over' by its enemy - Muslims. Also here, Muslims are depicted in a stereotypical fashion: “will often not identify themselves, make demands, and complain if the conditions are not in line with their expectations”. This depiction constructs Muslims as not being 'real refugees' in the sense that they have the resources to complain, and if they were 'real refugees' they would be happy just to be safe. Furthermore, they “arrive of own free will” implies that they are not 'real refugees'. Moreover, by saying “are not in line with their expectations” Muslims are depicted as someone who has been sitting in their home countries searching and studying European wealth and realized that life in Europe is much better than in their respective home countries. This is an expression for a condescending mindset where Europeans are 'above Muslims' and have a civilization which is more developed than the Islamic civilization. We have something that they also want. This neo-nationalist appeal contributes to the 'us' and 'them' dichotomy, however, it is especially strengthening the 'us' in the sense that, what we have is extremely valuable, something that non-Europeans are looking for. This construction contributes therefore to a uniqueness of 'us' and the uniqueness of the civilization of 'us'.

The construction of refugees as a part of a 'Muslim category' is supported by below quote where freedom of speech once and again is used in the enemy construction: “Looking at Denmark's and Europe's cities nowadays, it is though difficult to spot this enrichment. It is not really enriching, that the freedom of speech has limitations

when it comes to critique of Islam” (Næsby, 2015). Freedom of speech, which has already been depicted as one of the values of ‘us’ is incompatible with Islam, and Muslims are therefore not able to live in Europe. Muslims will always be the enemy. In the debate, the European or ‘Western’ values are spoken up almost as an ideology of the European or ‘Western’ civilization, and by putting this ideology up against Islam, the clash between the Islamic and European civilization is more visible for the audience. This argument with the European or ‘Western’ values as being an ideology is supported by Fairclough and his notions on globalism as an ideology (Fairclough, 2009, p. 323). The liberal European or ‘Western’ values have become an ideology and everyone questioning these values are the enemies of the European civilization.

‘Culturespeak’ concerning Islam as a problematization in the debate is reproduced in below quote:

“The truth is, that Denmark, Sweden and the rest of Europe have had the best intentions and spent lots of resources and working hours attempting to integrate and make Islam a part of the societies. However, the integration will never succeed, as Islam in its essence cannot be integrated” (Jyllands-Posten, 2015, p. 2).

Islam is not compatible with Europe. “Islam in its essence” refers to the main building blocks of Islam or the core of Islam as incapable of integration. It is in the nature of Islam not to be integrated within the European societies. There is nothing we can do, Islam is the problem. In this construction, a ‘good’ and a ‘bad’ dichotomy appear. The ‘good’ are the European countries that with all the best and moral intentions spent lots of resources on the ‘bad’, however, ‘bad’ does not want to become ‘good’. This way of depicting ‘us’ and ‘them’ as the ‘good’ and the ‘bad’ is related to the ‘War on Terror’ discourse and the themes: “Those who pose the risk and dangers are the forces of evil” and “America and its allies are the forces of ‘good’, and their actions are informed by moral values” (Fairclough, 2006, p. 144). As refugees belong to the ‘Muslim category’, they pose dangers to Europe and they are therefore the forces of evil, whereas the moral European countries are the forces of ‘good’. As already mentioned, freedom of speech is used as a way to ‘symbolize’ the differences between ‘us’ and ‘them’ and by saying: “It is not really enriching, that the

freedom of speech has limitations when it comes to critique of Islam”, Næsby represents a neo-nationalist attitude where our values are more important and correct than their values (Næsby, 2015). The freedom of speech give ‘us’ the right to criticize and demean their religion as this value is more worth and correct than their values. The values of ‘them’ are neglected. We do not care or respect if the values of ‘them’ are not in line with freedom of speech, as the freedom of speech is ‘above’ values that do not imply religious critique and disrespect. In this case, the European or ‘Western’ values are again used as a part of a ‘above them’ and ‘below us’ attitude.

What has been discovered in this section is, how Islam and Muslims are used in the construction of refugees as an enemy as a part of a ‘Muslim category’. An already negative image of Muslims in Denmark or an already existing islamophobic wave is used in the construction of an easy recognizable stereotype for a panic concerning refugees. The European or ‘Western’ values play a role in this construction as they are used to construct the ‘Muslim category’ as incompatible with the European civilization. Also here, it is important to mention Lene Hansen’s ‘context as an explanatory variable’ within securitization studies (Pram, Gad, U & Hansen, L, 2011, p. 359). It can be argued, that without this already existing islamophobic reality, it would be difficult to cast refugees as a security issue in the same way.

3.3 The European Allies

The analysis of the theme: “The European Allies” will contribute to the answer of research question three: *How is the ‘us’ and ‘them’ dichotomy constructed and what role does it play in the debate*”.

Another interesting aspect of the constructed threats and enemy creation is also related to the Eurabian narrative, where politicians in favor of a tolerant humanistic agenda are constructed as the ‘left-wing’ and as a part of ‘them’. Moreover, the humanistic tolerant political agenda is constructed as being a part of the reason why Europe is soon taken over by Muslims: “The strange thing has happened, that the left-wing during the years has created an illogical alliance with Islam” (Næsby,

2015). According to Næsby, this left-wing is allied with Islam; the left-wing is a part of 'them'. Later Næsby continues within the same track: "The left-wing has paid tribute to this ideal, that the immigration in the name of the holy tolerance should be more or less unlimited - however, at the same time had no tolerance towards critics of it" (Næsby, 2015). According to Næsby, the left-wing is a part of the problems concerning immigration. In his critique of the left-wing he is not considering that many immigrants came to Europe during the 1960's and 1970's as an answer to labor shortage in Europe. Many immigrants and descendants that live in Europe today, came therefore to serve liberal economic interests more than as a part of a tolerant left-wing project. However, Næsby is instead constructing a left-wing as the reason for what he calls 'unlimited immigration'. Also, by saying 'in the name of the holy tolerance' Næsby frames the tolerant political agenda as a problematization. Moreover, by saying 'at the same time had no tolerance towards critics of it' Næsby frames this left-wing as someone with double standards; they are not listening or they do not care about the argument of their opponents.

Europe as a collaborator on its own downfall is also touched upon in Jyllands-Posten: "Europe has through a wish of doing the right things, the tolerant and the humane been digging its own grave, and is in these years voluntarily about to lie down in it - and we are all heading towards a new dark migration age" (Jyllands-Posten, 2015, p. 2). By saying 'been digging its own grave' writer constructs the tolerant and humanistic political agenda as a part of the security issue. Due to the tolerant and humanistic political agenda, Europe is already having one foot in the grave. Moreover, by saying 'about to lie down in it' writer constructs the situation as being 'not too late to change' implying that another political direction must be chosen in order avoid both foos in the grave. With the political agenda of today, we are on our way into the grave, however, if that agenda is changed, the downfall of Europe can be avoided. The problematization of the humane political agenda in the debate concerning refugees continues: "The demography is working against the European people, and this is being accelerated, due to the, in the name of humanities, opening of borders for the refugee streams" (Jyllands-Posten, 2015, p. 2). Humanity is constructed as being a cause for Europe's downfall. Europe has simply been too 'good' towards the 'wrong' people - those people which are going to

change the demography of Europe. Humanity is the reason for the ‘societal security’; Due to humanity Europe is facing a threat towards the European civilization and this threat lies within the changing population.

The construction of a left-wing which is a part of ‘them’ - the threat and the enemy - is supported by below quote:

“That things have gone exactly as predicted by the centre-right and Danish People’s Party, seems to be completely neglected by the left-wing, and when the reality after all sometimes shows up, as it did during the terror attacks in Paris and Copenhagen in the beginning of the year, the statement from the tolerant alliance is, that the cause for the problems must be the ugly debate. The left-wing dreamer Carsten Jensen even went as far as to give the debate the direct fault for the brutal slaughter of two people in Copenhagen - the perpetrator was blameless - however, was just a product of the society’s treatment of Muslims” (Jyllands-Posten, 2015, p. 2).

The left-wing is depicted as the tolerant alliance of Islam; the left-wing is a part of ‘them’, and by calling Carsten Jensen ‘the left-wing dreamer’ writer frames the left-wing as being naive. Moreover, by ironically saying: ‘the ugly debate’ writer neglects the arguments of the left-wing and constructs the left-wing as someone that does not know what they are talking about. The left-wing is constructed as being detached from reality. Also, by saying ‘and when the reality after all shows up’ writer contributes to the construction of the left-wing as being detached from reality; even after a terror attack where two peoples dies, is the left-wing detached from reality. Furthermore, by ironically saying: ‘was just a product of the society’s treatment of refugees’ Jensen points out, that the problem is not the society, the problem is Muslims and the left-wing, which cannot recognize or accept Muslims as a problematization. In this construction writer contributes to the ‘us’ and ‘them’ dichotomy where the society is ‘us’ and Muslims and the left-wing are ‘them’. Moreover, this construction contributes to ‘us’ as the innocent and ‘them’ – Muslims and the left-wing - as the problematization. This way of using irony in the construction of what can be called a ‘political opponent’ – someone that follows a different political agenda than the one of writer – is related to Gingrich’s notions on how Jürg Haider uses jokes about his political opponents to put himself into a better light (Gingrich, 2006, p. 210). In this case, irony is used as a way to demean and to

depict the politics of political actors favoring a tolerant agenda as ridiculous; as someone that cannot be taken seriously. Furthermore, this depiction of the left-wing as 'naïve dreamers' detached from reality appeals to the 'authoritarian' element within neo-nationalism (Gingrich, 2006, 197). The left-wing is not protecting the nation-states due to their 'dreaming/naive' attitude and their unrealistic corresponding political agenda, and for this reason, we need some stronger authorities to lead our nation; someone that recognizes Muslims as a security issue.

In the debate concerning refugees, there is also skepticism towards politicians from other European countries and their way of handling the situation with refugees coming to Europe:

“Is chancellor Merkel not thinking of what the current headless German policy results in? Does she and other leading politicians not even know that unlimited numbers of human crowds are ready to follow the footsteps of the already illegal arrived people? Are they not considering the consequences of those migrants of Muslims into the European countries which they contribute to these days? East European politicians are far more realistic than German and Swedish politicians. The only realistic voices from European politicians come from the previous Czech president Vaclav Klaus and the Head of the Hungarian government Viktor Orban. He condemns the European politician's irresponsibility by not doing their duties - to protect the interests and security of their own nations” (Jensen, B, 2015 p. 2).

As mentioned above, a constructed left-wing and the corresponding political agenda is problematized as being the of betrayers of Europe by opening the borders for refugees and migrants, however, in this case, Angela Merkel and the politics of the German government is framed as a problem, even though Merkel is Conservative. Despite of the fact that she is only German chancellor, one can argue, that Merkel has become a symbol of EU politics and the problematizations related to refugees in Europe. Thinking of Gingrich's two groups of 'them', Merkel is a part of the 'above' us group, which, according to Gingrich, is the EU authorities, however, in this case also Merkel (Gingrich, 2006, p. 199). The German Government and other European Governments following the same political direction is constructed as having an, what I will call, 'open minded' migration politic which is constructed as a problem to

European security. Also here, the 'open minded' political agenda is more specifically a problem due to the migration of Muslims. By saying 'are they not considering the consequences of those migrations of Muslims in to the European countries which they contribute to these days' Jensen contribute to the construction of the 'open minded' European politicians as allies with Islam; it is due to the 'open minded' politic of these Governments that Muslims in Europe increases. Moreover, by saying 'are they not considering' Jensen depicts these European politicians as naive and as detached from reality. Also, by saying 'the only realistic voices' Jensen contributes to the construction of these political actors as being detached from reality. Also here, the 'authoritarian, pro-state ideal' within neo-nationalism is used as an appeal by saying "to protect the interest and security of their own nations" (Gingrich, 2006, p. 197). The politic of the German Government is not protecting the interest and security of Germany. The 'open minded' migration policy is a problematization to the protection of the interest and security of their nations. This construction contributes to these European politicians as the betrayers; instead of protecting their own nations, they follow a 'open minded' politic favoring 'them'. Moreover, by including the politics of other European politicians in the debate concerning refugees supports the argument on the debate as focusing on the European civilization as a target of the constructed threats. It is not only a Danish left-wing which is a problematization within the debate concerning refugees; the problem is also other European politicians following the same political agenda.

Moreover, not only politicians from other European countries are constructed as a part of the problem, however, in Berlingske EU leaders are constructed as a part of the problem concerning refugees: "If the European leaders only can manage to sit down and wring hands as so far, they will kill the open borders and the fundamental values of the EU" (Berlingske, 2015, p. 2). Berlingske is constructing the leaders of the EU as a reason for Europe's downfall. Moreover, by saying 'only can manage to sit down and wring hands as so far' writer constructs the EU leaders as someone that cannot be trusted; EU leaders are not taking action. Moreover, by saying 'the fundamental values of the EU' writer contributes to the 'societal security', where the identity of a group is threatened. It is the identity of the EU which is threatened. The construction of politicians following a tolerant humanistic and open minded

political agenda as a part of the enemy, and also, the construction EU leaders as ‘sitting down and wringing hands’ is related to Sedgwich’s notions within neo-nationalism and the lacking trust towards mainstream politicians, on Danish People’s Party Sedgwich argues: “In addition, a fifth plank is that they can be trusted while mainstream politicians cannot be” (Sedgwich, 2013, p. 211). EU leaders cannot be trusted, since they are just ‘sitting and wringing hands’ and the left-wing and other European politicians cannot be trusted since they are not protecting the values and interests of their nation-states. In this construction, these three groups become a part of the enemy and a part of ‘them’ since they are not serving the interest of ‘us’.

In this section it was discovered how three internal enemies of Europe are constructed in the debate and how the politics of these internal enemies are constructed as a security issue to Europe. Politicians following an open minded, tolerant and humanistic agenda concerning migrants and especially concerning Muslim are constructed as being detached from reality. Due to a tolerant, humane and non-protectionist political agenda, the left-wing and other European politicians are constructed as a part of ‘them’. Moreover, European leaders are, due to their lacking political actions, constructed as not being trustworthy. This construction contributes to the narrative with the Islamization of Europe, however, it also contributes to a rhetoric where humanism is a problem to European security as well as it contributes to a rhetoric where these three internal enemies are not protecting the interest of ‘us’.

3.4 Conclusion

In this chapter the theme “Islam and the European allies” has been investigated into depth. The aim of this chapter has been to look into the threats constructed in the debate concerning refugees in order to answer the different research questions. The chapter was divided into three sections on the sub-themes: “Europeanism”, “The Islamic threat” and “The European allies”.

In the answer of the first research question: “*How is the situation with refugees coming to Denmark contextualized in the debate?*” it was discovered, that the situation is constructed as a ‘societal security’, where it is the identity of a group -

the European civilization - which is threatened due to cultural flows and population movement. The situation is framed as being a part of a historical and life changing context. It is constructed as being a part of a larger migration process which has been going on for some time and results in clashes between the European civilization and the Islamic civilization ending with the fall of the European civilization. This contextualization is constructed in line with the notions of the Eurabian narrative where refugees are constructed as being a part of the Islamization of Europe. This contextualization is constructed in a sensationalistic way with parallels to the fall of the Roman Empire and the dark Middle Ages which contributes to the securitization of refugees.

In the answer of the second research question: *How are refugees constructed as an 'enemy' and as a threat?*, it was discovered, that refugees are constructed as being a part of one specific category – the ‘ Muslim category’ - and they are debated in relation to already existing negative connotations concerning this category. In the construction of refugees as a threat, an already existing islamophobic wave is therefore used in order to strengthen refugees as a problematization. Moreover, the enemy - refugees - is constructed as the opponent to the European or ‘Western’ values and as unsuitable for the European civilization which contributes to the securitization of refugees. Moreover, due to the equalization with Muslims, refugees are representatives of the forces of ‘evil’ or a part of the ‘bad’.

In the answer of the third research question: *“How is the ‘us’ and ‘them’ dichotomy constructed and what role does it play in the debate?”* it was discovered, that the liberal European or ‘Western’ values such as freedom of speech, democracy and freedom are constructed as the differentiating factor between ‘us’ and ‘them’. Furthermore, by using these values as neo-nationalistic appeals in the construction of a ‘us’ and ‘them’ dichotomy, extended hostility between Danes and refugees are established, which contributes to the creation of a moral panic concerning refugees. The European values are therefore used as a tool in the construction of refugees as a threat. In relation to this dichotomy, the liberal European values are constructed as being opponents to Islam and the values of the Islamic civilization which contributes to the enemy creation concerning refugees. Furthermore, there is a neo-nationalistic

tendency of seeing ‘us’ as being above ‘them’ with a corresponding condescending mindset thinking of ‘us’ and our values as better than the values of ‘them’. This construction contributes to the mobilization of a strong ‘us’. Moreover, another interesting aspect of the debate is how three internal enemies of Europe are constructed within the debate. Political actors favoring an open minded, tolerant and humanistic political agenda are constructed as a part of the threat and as a part of ‘them’. In the debate, actors favoring such agenda are constructed as the ‘left-wing’ and as other European politicians favoring an open minded agenda concerning immigration. Due to the tolerant, humanistic political agenda, these political actors are constructed as not protecting the interests of their nation-states. The construction of the left-wing and other European politicians as a part of ‘them’ contributes to a rhetoric, where the tolerant and humanistic political agenda is a problematization to European security. In relation to this, also European leaders are constructed as a problematization, as not being capable of taking action and as not being trustworthy. The construction of these three internal enemies of Europe contributes to a rhetoric where these political actors are not protecting the interest of ‘us’.

4.0 The Welfare Threat

The theme: “The Welfare Threat” has to do with the economic concerns related to the arrival of refugees to the Danish society. The fear that Danish welfare weakens due to expenses on refugees. The theme is related to the codes: “Integration”, “Security”, “Western Civilization” and “Refugees”. The aim of this chapter is to analyze this theme into depth in order to contribute to the answer of research question two: *How are refugees constructed as an ‘enemy’ and as a threat?* and research question four: *To what extend does the debate target a specific audience?* In the end of the chapter, a conclusion will summarize the main points of the analysis and give an answer to the research questions.

In the article from Kristeligt Dagblad: “Ingen logik i ulandsbesparelser” the situation with increased migration is constructed as a security issue by depicting it as a ragnarok and a threat towards the welfare-society:

“Millions are fleeing from the wars in Iraq and Syria, and also from Africa, the number of migrants and refugees increases to such an extent, that even refugee and relief agencies are talking about a ragnarok and a threat towards the welfare-society” (Rasmussen, 2015).

By using the word ‘ragnarok’, the situation evolves into a security issue. Nothing is under control. If one is experiencing a ‘ragnarok’, a deep crisis heading towards the end of the world is taken place. This construction contributes the existentiality of the situation. The situation becomes existential. This way of framing the situation as a ragnarok, is related to the ‘sensationalistic covering of threats’ in moral panics (Goode, 1994, p. 155). Moreover, by saying that ‘refugee and relief agencies’ are presenting this statement, the trustworthiness of the threat increases and contributes to the ‘necessity of politics’. If these agencies state, that it is a threat towards our welfare-society, then we must do something to combat these threats. The use of what can be called ‘experts within the field’, is related to what Durlington calls ‘the response from authorities and opinion makers’ (Durlington, 2007, p. 266) and what Cohen calls the ‘socially accredited experts’ in moral panics (Goode, 1994, p. 155 - 156). Migrants and refugees are also constructed as a problem to the welfare-state by Andersson: “Even the current immigration-level forces a number of municipalities to welfare cuts in order to finance newcomers. If the number increases, there will be a corresponding increase in welfare cuts” (Andersson, 2015, p. 1). According to Andersson, the enemy is the ‘newcomers’. By saying ‘welfare cuts in order to finance newcomers’ Andersson creates a dichotomy with, on one side ‘welfare’ and on the other side ‘migration’. Welfare excludes migration and vice versa. Moreover, as this implies that refugees are spending those money which normally would have been used to ensure welfare for the Danes, refugees or the ‘newcomers’ are the enemy. This construction is related to the increased ‘hostility’ between ‘them’ and ‘us’ in moral panics. Welfare is therefore used as a tool in the construction of refugees as the enemy and threat to the Danish welfare-society.

As analyzed in chapter three, the debate was constructed around the larger European scale, however, in this case, the threat is constructed on micro-level

targeting the municipalities. By mentioning municipalities in the construction, the threat gets closer to the ordinary Dane; it becomes nearer and more realistic. The situation evolves into a recognizable unit which Danes can relate to. This focus on proximity and welfare or what can be called 'emotionality' is related to neo-nationalistic appeals related to the fear for globalization consequences, as argued by Sedgwich: Globalization brings economic consequences that threaten the welfare state. And globalization also brings, most visible of all, immigration" (Sedgwich, 2013, p. 211). Moreover, the use of 'emotionality' in the construction of refugees as a threat is related to Lene Hansen's contextualization, where the security actor identifies itself with feelings, needs, interests and experiences of the audience, in the performance of a successful security (Pram Gad, U & Hansen, L, 2011, p. 360). Security actor uses emotional instruments in order to strengthen refugees as a threat. Also Gingrich touches upon proximity as an appeal within neo-nationalism: "...when they had promised 'employment for all' and a strengthening of the local democratic life.. "(Gingrich, 2006, p. 210). The focus on the proximity and immediate environment is a way to mobilize a 'us' concentrated on those people fearing the consequences of globalization. This is also related to Sedgwich's notions on the economic consequences that threaten the welfare-state. Moreover, thinking of Gingrich's notions on the potential client groups in neo-nationalism, one argument is, that the appeals in this debate are in line with those social drivers described by Gingrich: "These were not only, and not even the primarily losers of globalization: It was the fear of losing, and more specifically the fear of downward social mobility that attracted them to these voting preferences" (Gingrich, 2006, p. 199). In this case, welfare is used to construct a fear in the same way as what is the case in Gingrich's example. People are not actually losing on globalization, however, by constructing a weakening of the welfare-state as a result of immigration, a fear for globalization consequences is constructed. In relation to this, the target audience of the debate is the same as the client group mentioned by Gingrich, as many of those fearing losing jobs due to globalization consequences, also benefits from the welfare-society, and deterioration due to refugees will therefore hit them. Even though this threat is constructed as being external in terms of refugees weakening the welfare-society, this construction is related to Newman's notions on 'human security' within security studies. On human security Newman argues: "In broad

terms human security is ‘freedom from want’ and ‘freedom from fear’: positive and negative freedoms and rights as they relate to fundamental individual needs” (Newman, 2010, p. 78). Even though the focus in this approach is on the fear for own state, the insecurity concerning the weakening of welfare is related to the ‘fundamental individual needs’ in human security. Welfare is a social right related to the need of the individual. As previously analyzed, the construction of refugees as a threat is concerned on the European civilization and what can be called the more classic ‘state-centric’ or ‘societal security’ approach to securitization studies, where the focus is on the security of a group, society or state. However, if we think of welfare as a driver in the debate, in the mobilization of an ‘us’, the human security approach is used in the construction of refugees as a threat.

Welfare as a focus area in the construction of refugees as a threat is supported in the quote from the article: “Svensk politik i forandring”:

“New calculations implies that it becomes more and more difficult to maintain the current Swedish welfare at a tolerable level within hospitals, elder care and education, if the intake from outside continues in the same pace as today (Sørensen, 2015, p. 1).

Sørensen uses a Scandinavian welfare-state as an example of how wrong it can go. The current Swedish welfare-state is threatened in its existence. However, by saying ‘if the intake from outside continues’ writer creates a ‘directive speech act’ pointing out, that the situation is changeable, if another political direction is chosen (Yeo, 2010, p. 97). It is possible to save the Swedish welfare-state, however, this implies a different migration policy. Moreover, writer strengthens the security by using Sweden as an example. Sweden is a very well-known nation for most Danes, it is known and accepted among the public that they have a welfare-level very similar to the Danish. The Swedish society is therefore recognizable for Danes; it is something that Danes can relate to, and by using it in the construction of the threat, that threat becomes more realistic than if Portugal or Italy were used as examples. If it can happen to Sweden, it can happen to ‘us’. Moreover, Sweden is known for its humanistic and tolerant approach to immigration, and by using Sweden in the

debate concerning refugees, writer frames the tolerant and humanistic politic as the wrong political approach concerning refugees. He constructs the political direction of Sweden as a political direction leading to welfare impairments.

Refugees as a problematization to the welfare-state is supported by Mouritzen: “That the taxes increases a few percentage for middle incomes is not as such a treat. However, receiving one million refugees would destroy the welfare-state as we know it (Mouritzen, P, 2015, p. 2). Also here, welfare is used in the construction of refugees as the enemy. Moreover, by saying ‘the welfare-state as we know it’ writer appeals to those Danes which are insecure and fears the future. This is an neo-nationalistic appeal related to the fear for globalization consequences in line with ‘Det Danmark du kender’ (Denmark as you know it) - the slogan of the Socialdemokrater during the election in 2015. The protection of the Danish welfare-state is also mentioned in the quote by Berlingske: “It is very important, for a nation that seeks to keep a high-level welfare society, to preserve national control with the immigration” (Berlingske, 2015, p. 2). In this case, welfare is related to Danish protectionism. We have to protect our national borders in order to ensure Danish welfare. In this case writer uses welfare as a way to mobilize support for border control. Without border control we will lose our welfare-society. Also here, the insecurity related to the consequences of globalization plays a role as a driver. The abolition of national border control is a result of EU cooperation and the borderless Europe is therefore, in its nature, a consequence of a cosmopolitan or globalized mindset and agreement. In this case, the debate concerning refugees is also appealing to those people that are mostly benefitting from the welfare-society. In this argument, I must include Gingrich’s concept of fast-capitalism and the corresponding growth in job insecurity as a driver in neo-nationalist movements (Gingrich, 2006, p. 199). Welfare is constructed as the counterparty of fast-capitalism. Where welfare is connected with safety and security, fast-capitalism is connected with insecurity. Welfare protects people from the consequences of globalized fast-capitalism and by framing welfare as threatened, and especially in the aftermath of the ‘financial crisis’, people will get more insecure as they are afraid of losing what should protect them against fast-capitalism, and they are therefore more likely to support neo-nationalist movements. This argument is also supported

by the notions of Kalb, saying that neo-nationalism is a working-class driven phenomenon affected by social changes related to neoliberal globalization (Kalb, 2010, p. 1). Due to the possible consequences related to a globalized fast-capitalism, the welfare-society is seen as an important safety net for the working-class, and by using welfare in the construction of refugees as a threat, this client group is easier to mobilize.

As previously mentioned, the enemy is constructed as refugees and migrants as they weaken the welfare-society. Moreover, they are framed as someone coming from outside only to get Danish benefits: “He compares the German refugees after the Second World War, which primarily consisted of women with small children, with nowadays economic migrants, which primarily consists of young muscular men. The nonsense is monumental” (Jensen, 2015 p. 2). According to Jensen, the refugees of today are not real refugees fleeing from wars, instead they are coming for economic reasons. Moreover, by framing refugees as ‘muscular men’, Jensen neglects their need for protection and depicts them in an easily recognizable form which contributes to the moral panic. Furthermore, this construction is related to neo-nationalist appeals concerning gender and the ‘angry white men syndrome’ (Gingrich, 2006, p. 206). We have to protect our wealth or ‘what belongs to us’ against ‘muscular men’ from outside. This way of framing, appeals to the protectionist notions related to the male gender such as commitment, danger, alertness, bravery and homeland (Gingrich, 2006, p. 203). Also, by using the dichotomy ‘women with small children’ and ‘young muscular men’, Jensen points out what needs to be protected and against what - women and children needs to be protected against young muscular men.

Refugees as economic migrants are supported by the quote: “The reason for the relatively small number of migrants and refugees in East Europe is also that very few seek towards countries, where living conditions are worse than in North Europe” (Berlingske, 2015, p. 2). And again in the quote from Politiken: “It will hit the more attractive destinations (such as Denmark) hardest, as more refugees will try to get there” (Gammeltoft-Hansen et al. 2015, p. 1). Refugees are framed as economic migrants trying to go to North Europe and Denmark in order to get a better life

economically. As also mentioned in chapter three, refugees are framed as not being real refugees. This way of framing is both strengthening ‘them’ or the enemy as a threat, however, it is also a way to strengthen the mobilization of a ‘us’. By repeating Denmark as a country that everyone wants to live in, everyone wants a piece of, Danes appreciate their country more and they are more likely to accept the politics of the Government, as well as they will not questioning the values which they have been told that Denmark is based upon.

Refugees as someone that weakens the welfare-society is supported again in the a quote from Jyllands-Posten: “The first sees a migration that searches for benefits and impairs the Danish welfare society, which at the end collapses due to the pressure (Jyllands-Posten, 2015, p. 1). In this case writer uses ‘collapses’ in order to depict what kind of extreme threat we are dealing with. This security is constructed again in the quote: “The European welfare-states collapse under their own weight while the more and more divided communities lose faith in oneself (Jyllands-Posten, 2015, p. 1). By saying ‘more divided communities’ writer points out how different refugees are from ‘us’. Refugees in Denmark will create an extended division between ‘us’ and ‘them’.

4.1 Conclusion

In this chapter the theme: “The Welfare Threat” has been investigated into depth. The aim of the chapter has been to contribute to the answer of the research questions.

In the answer of research question two: “*How are refugees constructed as an ‘enemy’ and as a threat?*” it was discovered, that refugees are constructed as the enemy in the sense that refugees results in welfare impairments. In relation to this, ‘human security’, with the threat on the needs of the individual is therefore playing a role in the construction of refugees as a threat. In the debate, a dichotomy with welfare on one side and refugees on the other side and where the two parts cannot be combined, is constructed. It is set up as a choice between welfare and refugees. Welfare is therefore used as a tool in the construction of refugees as an enemy and

as a threat to the society. In relation to this, refugees are framed as being economic migrants more than as people fleeing from wars. In the construction of refugees as a threat to the welfare-society, recognizable units such as municipalities and the Swedish welfare-system are used in the construction of a recognizable threat which the audience can relate to.

In the answer of research question four: *“To what extent does the debate target a specific audience?”* it was discovered, that a focus on consequences of globalization, on proximity, the immediate environment and on welfare appeals to the working-class segment. The construction of an enemy that weakens the social safety net, which is the counterparty of the neoliberal globalized fast-capitalism, is appealing to the working-class segment as they rely on and benefits from the welfare-society at a time where fast-capitalism creates more uncertainty for these people. By using welfare in the construction of refugees as an enemy it is therefore easier to mobilize the working-class segment against refugees. Moreover, it was discovered that neo-nationalist appeals concerning the male gender such as a depiction of refugees as ‘young muscular men’ appeals to the ‘angry white men’.

5.0 Discussion

In chapter three and four, different aspects within the debate concerning refugees have been discovered. These aspects are processes which I will identify as being a part of a moral panic concerning refugees. Based on the findings from chapter three and four, the aim of this chapter is to discuss the processes related to the construction of a moral panic concerning refugees. In relation to this, I find it interesting to look above these processes and ask the question: “why?” In this chapter I will therefore have a critical view on the processes of the moral panic concerning refugees in order to theorize upon the possible processes which a construction of a moral panic concerning refugees leads to. In order to get a substantial starting point for this discussion, Goode’s questions within moral panics will be raised: “Why is there a moral panic over this supposed threat but not that potentially even more damaging, one? Why a moral panic at this time, but not earlier and not later? What role does the interest play in this panic? What does the

moral panic tell us about how the society is constituted, how it works, how it changes over time? By raising these questions in relation to the findings from chapter three and chapter four, it will be possible to theorize upon the processes which the constructed threats leads to and, this chapter will therefore answer research question five: *How does the debate imply elements of neo-nationalism and neoliberalism?*

In the analysis, three interesting aspects of the debate concerning refugees as a threat has been discovered: (1) The first aspect is related to Williams's 'societal security', which refers to the threat on a identity of a group by different dynamics such as cultural flows and population movement (Williams, 2003, p. 513). This aspect is concerned on how refugees are constructed as a part of the 'wrong' people, as a part of 'them' and as a part of a 'Muslim category'. Due to their constructed belonging to the 'Muslim category', refugees are not Europeans and they are therefore the 'wrong' people. In relation to this, the threat is constructed as targeting the European civilization as a whole, as well as the problematization concerning refugees is related to the changing population of the European civilization, in line with the narrative of the Islamization of Europe. The problem is the increased population of the 'wrong' people in Europe. Refugees are contextualized as being a part of this Islamization of Europe which strengthens them as a threat; (2) the second aspect concerns the construction of what is framed as 'the left-wing' as well as politicians from other European countries as the 'betrayers' of Europe. In the debate, politicians favoring a humanistic and tolerant approach to migration are constructed as the 'left-wing' and other European politicians following the same political agenda. The framed left-wing and politicians from other European countries are constructed as a part of 'them' due to their political agenda. Within the debate, politicians favoring a humanistic agenda concerning refugees are constructed as being a part of the enemy. This construction is also in line with the Eurabian narrative, where the left-wing, and other multiculturalists, are presented as European allies of Islam; (3) opposite the first aspect, which was concerned on the European civilization as a target of the constructed threats, the third aspect is on micro-level related to proximity and the nearer threats. Nearer threats and proximity refers to the use of welfare and emotional recognizable units such as the

fear for unemployment as instruments in the construction of refugees as a threat. It is the use of instruments which are close to the 'ordinary' Dane in the construction of refugees as a threat. By using these instruments, the constructed threats become realistic and real. Proximity and nearer threats refers therefore to problematizations related to the basic, more specifically, economic needs of the individual, whereas the focus on the European civilization is related to the threat towards the group and sense of belonging. Opposite the first aspect, which was related to the 'societal security', this aspect is related to Newman's 'human security', which emphasizes on the individual as the referent object concerning threats, and on the fundamental needs of the individual (Newman, 2010, 78). The focus in this aspect is therefore on how refugees are threatening the basic needs of the individual such as the security and safety related to the welfare-system. All in all, these three aspects are used in the construction of refugees as a threat within the debate and they are processes which contribute to a moral panic concerning refugees.

Considering the three aspects of the debate, all of them are processes which contribute to a moral panic concerning refugees. However, what is the reason for a panic concerning this group of refugees? It is not the first time that there are groups of refugees coming to Denmark and to Europe, however, why is there a panic at this time? Considering the first aspect of the debate, it was concerned on refugees as a part of the 'wrong' people. Refugees are constructed as a part of one 'Muslim category', they belong to a different civilization - the Islamic civilization - and in this construction, this category implies problematizations to Europe. Refugees are constructed as a part of a larger migration process of Muslims trying to 'take over' Europe and refugees are therefore framed into the islamophobic Eurabian narrative. In relation to this, already existing negatives concerning Muslims are used in the construction of refugees as a threat. Furthermore, this construction contributes to the creation of a common enemy for Europe as a whole and not only Denmark as a nation. However, what does this aspect of the debate tell us about the processes which this moral panic lead to? One place to start is to look at Goode's 'elite engineered model' which argues, that a small powerful group of people develop threats and concern over an issue in order to move the attention away from other problems within the society, as an extended focus here, would harm and threaten

the interest of the elite (Goode, 1994, p. 161) An already existing islamophobic wave can be used in such case as a way to mobilize and move focus away from other problematizations of the society. If there is a common enemy, nobody cares about the activities of the elite. Also, if we consider the welfare aspect of the debate, and the way it is used to create hostility mainly between the working-class group and refugees, one argument is, that refugees are used as an excuse or reason for the weakening of the welfare-society, in order to move focus away from the real reasons behind the impairments of the welfare system. Thinking of Fairclough, the interests of the elite concerning this construction can be related to the liberalization and integration of markets, where a weakening of the welfare-system, is a part of a neoliberal agenda (Fairclough, 2009, p. 323). Refugees are therefore used as an excuse in the protection of the neoliberal interests of the elite. In relation to this, the elite also have an interest in constructing a common enemy to Europe in order to keep EU united. Considering the elite as large companies benefitting from the European single market, which provides these actors with access to, among other, new markets and labor. This argument is related to Fairclough's notions within Globalization discourse theory, where globalization processes are constructed in a neo-liberal way aiming to liberalize and integrate markets and where the 'War on Terror' discourse is used to protect this liberal agenda. Especially the theme: "The new era, posing new threats which require new responses" plays a role in this case, as the construction of a common enemy, can be used as a way to gain support for the EU and thereby protect the globalism agenda of the elite (Fairclough, 2006, p. 144). Furthermore, considering how the liberal European or 'Western' values are spoken up in the debate as being unique, and how the enemy is constructed as being opponent to these values, this is contributing to the mobilization of support towards a neoliberal agenda, where the elite has an extended interest in the European or 'Western' values as these values or interests supports the globalism agenda. By framing the liberal European or 'Western' values as unique, support towards the protection of these values are mobilized, which benefits the neoliberal interests of the elite.

As already mentioned, another interesting aspect of the debate is related to how a left-wing is constructed within the debate and how this constructed left-

wing, together with politicians from other European countries, are constructed as being a part of the threat towards the European civilization due to a humanistic and non-nationalistic political agenda. The constructed left-wing and other politicians which follow the same political agenda as the one of, according to the debate, the left-wing, are constructed as the internal enemy of Europe. In the debate, politicians following a humanistic political agenda are constructed as being either a part of the left-wing or as a part of European politicians. However, why is this aspect a part of a moral panic concerning refugees? Considering the morality motive within moral panics, where the concern is related to a specific world-view, one argument is, that the process behind this aspect of the panic concerning refugees is related to a specific ideology (Goode, 1994, p. 159). By making a constructing, with a left-wing and European politicians following a humanistic agenda, as a threat to the European civilization, the politics of these political actors evolves into a problematization. Moreover, by repeating these actors as the internal reason for Europe's downfall, this representation becomes a social truth within the public, and the public is thereby easier convinced on a different political agenda than the one of the constructed left-wing and the European politicians. If humanism, and those political actors favoring a humanist agenda, are constructed as the reason why we are facing problems with Muslims and migrants in Europe today, it is easier to convince the audience to elect someone with a different political agenda. This construction is therefore a way to mobilize support for a neo-nationalist political agenda with arguments such as: 'the humanistic approach to global issues such as immigration is not working. We have to choose another direction'. Furthermore, as already touched upon in chapter three, this focus on humanism as a problematization in relation to refugees and migration, is contributing to a social change which is more critical when it comes to humanism and humanitarian projects in general. With this social change, and especially along with stories concerning welfare impairments, politicians will find it easier to convince the public towards an increasingly inhumane, nationalistic political agenda including initiatives such as a lowering of the Development Aid, a militarist foreign policy instead of a collaborative foreign policy as well as an inhumane asylum policy. If there is a public consensus and perhaps even followed by xenophobic elements of discourse in Denmark, on Denmark as being 'too humane' or even naive, which implies problematizations to

the nation, the public will more easily accept an inhumane nationalistic policy. This, also in relation to refugees. If there is a general public consensus on Denmark as a humanitarian nation taking good care of refugees and, if this is followed up by a xenophobic discourse concerning migrants and refugees, refugees sleeping in tents during the winter becomes public acceptable. Furthermore, this construction of politicians from other European countries as a part of the threat is creating extended hostility between the second group of 'them' and 'us'. As previously argued, other European politicians represents a second group of 'them' as being 'above us'. This hostility creation can be used as a way to move focus back to the nation-state from the EU. By negatively framing the politics of politicians from other European countries, these become unreliable, which strengthens the support for a politic focused on the Danish nation-state. Also here, the motive, with an underlying neo-nationalist ideology plays a role in the debate.

Another interesting aspect of the debate was discovered during the analysis, which is related to the way welfare is used in the construction of refugees as a threat. By constructing refugees as economic migrants impairing the welfare society and, by repeating this as a truth, and through the constructing of the situation as a 'black or white' choice between refugees or welfare, refugees as economic migrants becomes a social truth and a reality. In relation to this, the debate concerning refugees and welfare has had a direct impact on the political agenda in Denmark. Considering the starting point of this research, which was the formation of the controversial 'Asylum package' where the 'Jewelry law' made it possible to confiscate valuables from refugees, in order for refugees to pay for their stay in Denmark, this package is a political result of, or reaction to a construction of refugees as economic migrants. It is the process of constructing refugees as economic migrants that has made it easier for the Danish government to go through with these controversial law changes within the Parliament and to get them accepted among the public. Considering those drivers which are in play in a moral panic concerning refugees, such as the fear for globalization consequences, the morality approach to moral panic, which refers to a specific world-view as a driver behind the concern, is playing a role in terms of underlying neo-nationalist ideology, where the simply purpose is to demean refugees (Goode, 1994, p. 159). In this case, the moral panic concerning refugees

leads therefore to a situation where refugees are treated in a condescending manner. In relation to the morality motive and the underlying neo-nationalist ideology, the purpose of this construction has also been to create a scare campaign depicting Denmark as a country not suitable for refugees, in order to send a message saying that refugees are not welcome in Denmark. This leads the discussion back to the 'wrong' people, where refugees are constructed as a part of a 'Muslim category', as a part of a group from a different civilization than the one of 'us'. The underlying neo-nationalism of the debate is therefore concerned on Islam and Muslims as the problematization and it is therefore, more specifically, Muslims which are not welcome in Denmark.

The interest approach, where the aim of the construction is to gain something valuable such as jobs, power, wealth, or recognition, is also playing a role in the construction of refugees as economic migrants (Goode, 1994, p. 159). Considering the growing neo-nationalism within the Danish population, where one only have to look at the success of Danish people's party to support this argument, however, by constructing this moral panic, which appeals to Danish neo-nationalists, the Government receives credit for being a Government capable for decisive action. The Danish Government becomes a Government that takes action against those economic migrants. This neo-nationalistic approach to political decision making is therefore used as a way to attract voters from especially Danish People's Party and thereby used as a way to achieve political power.

The construction of refugees as economic migrants also contributes to the construction of a 'necessity of politics' in relation to foreign policy. By constructing refugees as economic migrants, refugees in Denmark are framed as being a globalization consequence, where the extended globalized reality, provides people from other parts of the world with better possibilities when it comes to migration, which implies new problematizations to countries such as Denmark. Due to the increased globalization, people from other parts of the world are easier to migrate to Denmark. This constructed globalized reality, can be used as an argument in the development of an active foreign policy protecting the neoliberal globalism agenda

with political arguments such as: ‘the consequences of globalization is a threat to the Danish welfare-society, and we must therefore use extraordinary measures to combat the threat in question’. This is also in line with the themes within the ‘War on Terror’ discourse, especially the theme: ‘The new era, posing new threats which require new responses’ (Fairclough, 2009, p. 320). Moreover, this is related to Fairclough's ‘Globalization discourse theory’ saying that globalization furthers the spread of democracy in the world (Fairclough, 2009, p. 323). Due to the problematizations related to the globalized reality, politics favoring an active foreign policy such as the fight against terror or the development of democracies around the world can be justified with reference to globalization consequences and the impact these are constructed to have on Danish security. This is an interesting perspective considering one of the recent initiatives within foreign policy of the Danish Government, where one single person has been chosen to develop suggestions for a direction concerning the future Danish foreign policy. The construction of refugees as economic migrants contributes therefore to this Globalization discourse which strengthens political arguments towards an active foreign policy protecting the neoliberal agenda.

5.1 Conclusion

The aim of this chapter has been to discuss the findings from chapter three and four in order to theorize upon possible processes which the construction of refugees as a threat leads to and the aim of this chapter has therefore been to answer research question five: *How does the debate imply elements of neo-nationalism and neoliberalism?*

In this chapter it was argued, that the debate consists of two underlying ideologies: ‘neo-nationalism’ and ‘neoliberalism’, and that the moral panic concerning refugees is related to processes concerning these two ideologies. The neoliberal ideology was expressed through a construction of refugees as a threat to the welfare-system as a way to move focus away from the real reason behind a weakened welfare-system, which is a political priority favoring the neoliberal interests. Refugees are problematized as the reason for the weakened welfare-system in order to move focus

away from the neoliberal agenda. Moreover, it was argued, that the elite, a larger companies, have an interest in creating a common enemy to the European civilization as well as to speak up the liberal values of the European or 'Western' civilization, in order to mobilize support for the EU in the projection of their neoliberal interests. Another interesting discovery of the debate is related to the way a left-wing is constructed, which, together with politicians from other European countries, is framed as a part of the threat towards Europe. In this chapter it was argued, that the critique of the humanistic and tolerant political agenda of the constructed left-wing and European politicians supporting the same political agenda, is a way to mobilize support for a more neo-nationalistic agenda concerning refugees as well as to create extended hostility between 'us' and the second group of 'them', which, in the debate are politicians from other European countries, with the aim of moving focus away from EU to the Danish nation-state.

Moreover, it has been discovered how refugees are constructed as economic migrants more than as actual refugees fleeing from wars. In this chapter, it was argued, that this construction has had a direct impact on the political decision making concerning refugees in terms of the formation of the 'Asylum Package' where the 'Jewelry law' made it possible to confiscate valuables from refugees. In this chapter, it was argued, that this initiative, and the construction of refugees as economic migrants, was an expression for underlying neo-nationalism, however, it was also used as an instrument in order to attract neo-nationalistic voters and thereby to achieve political power. Furthermore, it was argued, that the construction of refugees as economic migrants contributes to the 'necessity of politics' within foreign policy, where a construction of economic migrants as a globalization consequence makes it easier to convince the audience towards an active foreign policy protecting neoliberal interests.

6.0 Conclusion

The aim of this research has been to investigate how refugees are constructed as a threat in the debate taking place in the period before the 'Asylum package' was invented. The aim of the research has been to discover what kinds of

problematizations are constructed in the debate in relation to the refugees that arrived in Denmark during autumn 2015. Five research questions have been developed for this research, and by working with these questions, it has been possible to find an answer to the overall problem formulation. Through the work with the media database - infomedia - 28 articles related to the keywords 'refugees' and 'threat' emerged, and it is these articles that have created the empirical basis for this research. As it was of great significance to investigate the debate concerning refugees as a whole, a qualitative content analysis has been applied, which provided the research with an overview of the overall debate. The process with the qualitative content analysis started with the development of four codes with corresponding sub-codes. These codes were developed from and relate therefore to the theoretical foundation of the research, the research questions, as well as the pre-interpretation of the data. By applying the codes on the 28 articles, two themes emerged: "Islam and the European allies" and "The Welfare Threat". The analysis of the theme: "Islam and the European allies" was divided into the three sub-themes: "Europeanism", "The Islamic Threat" and "The European Allies". These two themes describe the way the debate is framing refugees and the situation where refugees arrive to Denmark.

In the debate concerning refugees, different linguistic instruments as well as contextualization have been used in order to construct refugees as a threat and in order to impose a specific reality in regards to refugees upon the audience or the Danes. The situation with refugees coming to Denmark has been covered in a sensationalistic, life-changing way with historical parallels to the fall of the Roman Empire and 'dark' periods within European history. Moreover, it has been discovered, that there is a specific neo-nationalistic pattern where refugees are constructed as being a part of an Islamization of Europe. An Islamization process which has already started. The situation with refugees coming to Denmark is therefore wrapped into an islamophobic narrative in line with the Eurabian narrative. The current refugees are constructed as a part of a larger migration process ending with a civilization clash between the European civilization and the Islamic civilization resulting in the fall of the European civilization. As a part of this,

the situation with refugees coming to Denmark is therefore also constructed as a threat towards the European civilization, and not only Denmark as a nation.

As mentioned above, the situation with refugees coming to Denmark is constructed as being a part of the Islamization of Europe. In relation to this, refugees are identified through a 'minority identification' where refugees are identified through already existing connotations related to Muslims and Islam which implies different problematizations to Europe. Through this 'minority identification' refugees are constructed as being a part of a 'Muslim category'. Refugees are therefore debated as belonging to one specific category and no distinctions are made between refugees. They are all a part of the 'Muslim category'. In the debate, an already existing negative image or an already existing 'islamophobic wave' is therefore used in the construction of refugees as a threat. More specific, problematizations related to refugees imply extended religious fundamentalism, terror and crime. In relation to this, a 'good' and a 'bad' dichotomy is taking place in the debate, where refugees are constructed as being a part of the 'bad' due to their belonging to the 'Muslim category' and as a part of the Islamic civilization whereas 'us' are the good ones. This construction contributes to the enemy creation of refugees within the debate. Moreover, in relation to this, it was discovered, that the European values or what is also framed as the 'Western' values, are used in the construction of refugees as an enemy and as a threat to the European civilization. Values such as freedom of speech and democracy are used to create extended hostility between 'us' and 'them'; between refugees and 'us'. Through their belonging to the 'Muslim category', refugees are constructed as being opponents to these values. At the same time, these values are used in the mobilization of a stronger 'us'. Moreover, the European values are constructed and set up as opponents to the values of the 'Muslim category' and the Islamic civilization, which contributes to the enemy creation and the construction of refugees as a threat. Furthermore, it was discovered, that these values expresses a neo-nationalistic tendency where refugees are constructed as being 'below us' which contributes to the security concerning them as threats. Furthermore, it was discovered, that the debate is constructing a left-wing, which, together with politicians from other European countries are constructed as a part of the threat. A humanistic tolerant political agenda of a constructed left-wing and

political leaders of other European countries, are constructed as a threat to Europe in the debate concerning refugees. This aspect of the debate is also related to the neo-nationalistic narrative of the Islamization of Europe where the left-wing is accused of being allied with Islam.

Another discovery of the research is related to how the debate is constructed in a way that mobilizes the audience against refugees. On this matter, refugees are constructed as a threat towards the Danish welfare-society. The situation is constructed as being 'black or white', it is a choice between refugees or welfare, and a combination between the two is not an option. In the construction of refugees as a threat towards the welfare-society, emotional instruments such as proximity, the immediate environment and fear for globalization consequences are used in order to strengthen refugees as an enemy and to mobilize the audience against refugees. The focus on emotional instruments as a part of the debate concerning refugees is more specifically mobilizing the working-class group against refugees. The fear for globalization consequences, such as the fear for losing jobs, is related to the fear for a weakening of the welfare-society. The welfare-society is a safety-net for the working-class group and welfare is therefore bringing security and safety in an otherwise insecure globalized neoliberal reality. In other words, using welfare in the construction of refugees as a threat, touches upon some of the basic needs of the working-class individual and a mobilization against refugees is therefore easier established. In relation to the construction of refugees as a threat to the welfare-society, refugees are constructed as being economic migrants more than actual refugees fleeing from wars. This construction contributes to the enemy creation as refugees are seen as someone just coming to steal 'what belongs to us'. In relation to this, protectionist appeals related to the male gender are used in the mobilization of the 'angry white men'.

Another interesting discovery is, how the debate is not only constructing refugees as an enemy and as a threat, however, the way it also contributes to the construction of a strong 'us' and especially with the use of a condescending attitude. Throughout the debate there is a focus on the society or civilization of 'us' and the belonging forces

and benefits. The society or civilization of 'us' is spoken up and framed as better and as more developed than the societies or civilizations of 'them'. This is especially visible in the debate concerning the European or 'Western' values where these are constructed as unique and as something that only exists in the civilization of 'us'. Moreover, in relation to the construction of refugees as a threat to the welfare-society, the society of 'us' is framed as unique and as something that people from outside wants to have a piece of. Refugees as economic migrants are framed as someone that have been investigating the Danish society in order for them to migrate to somewhere better than their home countries.

In chapter five, a discussion based on the findings from chapter three and four, took place. In this chapter, it was argued, how the debate concerning refugees implies elements of neo-nationalism and neoliberalism ideologies. It was argued, that underlying neo-nationalism plays a role in the debate, both as a motive, in terms of neo-nationalism as a part of a political agenda, however, also as a tool in the mobilization of support for other political goals such as attracting the growing neo-nationalist group of voters from Danish People's Party. Moreover, it was argued that, neoliberalism is another underlying ideology within the debate. Especially thinking of the elite/interest approach to refugees as a moral panic, protection of neoliberal interests of the elite is an underlying reason for the construction of refugees as a threat. In relation to this, it was argued, that refugees are used to excuse welfare impairments in order to move focus away from the political priorities related to the real reasons behind a weakened welfare-system. Furthermore, it was argued, that the construction of refugees as a threat towards the European civilization contributes to a mobilization of support towards the EU, which supports the neoliberal ideology. Moreover, the construction a left-wing that, together with politicians from other European countries, favors a tolerant and humanistic political agenda, as a part of 'them' and as a part of the threat, contributes to a neo-nationalist agenda concerning refugees. Furthermore, it was argued, that the construction of refugees as economic migrants has contributed to the acceptance of the 'Asylum Package', as this construction has made it easier to convince the Danes and the Parliament of its relevance. In relation to this, it was argued, that the

'Asylum Package' is an expression for neo-nationalism especially in regards to Muslims, where the 'Asylum Package' is a scare campaign aiming to leave a message to Muslims not to come to Denmark. Furthermore, in relation to the construction of refugees as economic migrants, it was argued, that it contributes to a 'necessity of politics' in regards to foreign policy. By framing refugees as economic migrants in a globalization context, political decision makers get extended opportunities in the development of an active foreign policy protecting the neoliberal agenda. There are arguments saying, that neo-nationalism is used as a tool in the debate in order to serve a neoliberal agenda, however, there are also arguments supporting neo-nationalism as an independent objective. This said, neo-nationalism and neoliberalism are two ideologies which are, in one way or the other, present in the debate concerning refugees.

The hypothesis behind this problem formulation was that politicians and others with opinion creating strength problematize refugees in the debate with the purpose of constructing a specific agenda. Especially the construction of refugees as economic migrants contributes to the construction of a specific agenda. With notions on refugees as economic migrants and in relation to the use of welfare as a threatened element in this construction, an agenda favoring neo-nationalist approaches to political initiatives concerning refugees are easier constructed. In relation to this, the construction of economic migrants as well as the globalization element of this construction contributes to a specific agenda concerning foreign policy. Moreover, the construction of refugees as a part of a civilization clash resulting in the Islamization of Europe, contributes to a political agenda favoring European cooperation.

The hypothesis of this research was based on a premise saying that communication and underlying dynamics and appeals influences people's opinions and knowledge on specific issues and by constructing a specific reality on a certain issue through communication, political leaders and opinion makers can easier justify and go through with controversial initiatives. This premise was supported by the notions of Togeby saying that Danes only have little direct experience with migrants, instead, most Danes get their knowledge from the media and they are therefore more

exposed to a constructed reality (Togetby, 1998). What has been discovered in this research is that opinion makers, through the use of media, are easier to construct a certain reality and shape people's knowledge concerning refugees which has an impact on the persuading or justification process between politicians and the audience, in the sense that, the audience is easier convinced on political initiatives which relates to a reality constructed by the media.

6.1 Reflections

In this subsection, an evaluation of my own research, with critical eyes, will be performed, in order to pick out possible improvements for this research as well as for future projects. Moreover, I will reflect upon my own learning process in regards to this research.

As a way to start, I ask myself the question: "What would I have done differently if I had unlimited resources for this research?" First of all, I would have gathered extra data, more specifically; I would have collected a larger number of newspaper articles and from an expanded period, in order to improve the validity of the research. In my research, in some cases, I only have a few quotes supporting my arguments, which questions the scientific credibility of these arguments. Especially in relation to the theme "The European Allies", extra data on the 'EU leaders' would have improved my arguments in relation to this theme. Furthermore, the use of social media and the comments related to editorials and feature articles would have brought an interesting perspective into the research. With a point of departure in securitization theory, where Taureck argues, that not everyone has the power and capabilities to construct threats, feature articles and editorials have been chosen as a source for this research, as they represents the voice of those capable of constructing threats (Taureck, R, 2006, 55). However, this research would have been more interesting and also more contemporary if the top down approach to data collection was supported with a bottom up approach with data presenting the 'ordinary' Dane such as debates from social media. This would provide the research with knowledge on how the top down constructed threats are actually perceived and debated among the

public. Also, in order to investigate if a moral panic actually leads to a social change, social media would have been interesting to look at.

As a part of this critique, and as a part of a research consisting of both top down and bottom up approaches to data collection, theories concerning top down vs. bottom up approaches to social constructions would have been relevant to include, as these touches upon some of the problematizations related to knowledge construction in a modern society where people are more well-educated and enlightened. In order to criticize the top down approach to securitization studies, the notions of Thomsen would have been relevant to include in the theoretical discussion. In the book *Nationalism in Stateless Nations - Selves and Other in Scotland and Newfoundland* Thomsen argues: "People in enlightened liberal democracies are not easily manipulated by elites. They most often prefer to make up their own minds based on the subjective interpretation of their own experiences" (Thomsen, 2010, p.21).

Another learning point from this research process is that not having the research questions ready before starting the analysis process complicates the process to a certain point, and makes it more difficult to construct and follow the red thread of the project. However, not having the research questions completed from the beginning has brought a more open approach into the analysis process which has resulted in the discovery of new knowledge, and a reformulation of my research questions has therefore taken place along the way. I would say, that unfinished research questions complicates the process, it makes it more difficult to create focus and structure, however, it also brings a more open approach to the analysis and, a result which is not necessarily given from beforehand.

Another learning outcome of this research is that by working so intensely with a debate concerning a specific issue, there is a risk, that researcher adapts to the constructed reality of the debate and loses focus on the academic goals of the research. In other words, there is a risk of losing the ability of critical reading and interpretation of data. In this research, I will, more specifically, criticize myself for being too focused on the Eurabian narrative and its presence in the debate, as this

might have 'blocked' for other discoveries within the debate. This is also related to my concerns on the not finished research questions. By not having the research questions finished from the beginning of the coding process, there is a risk, that researcher let the data dictate the analysis and the way the data is examined.

Moreover, by reading through the finished research, I realized that quotes from only 9 out of 28 articles have been used as empirical data. This can be interpreted as a result of a coding process which has brought focus into the process of finding the relevant material, and where the most useful data has emerged. On the other hand, there is also a risk, that something has gone wrong in the coding process resulting in the loss of relevant knowledge, knowledge which could have increased the validity of the research. If I should point out a stage within the process which could have contributed to the loss of knowledge, it would be the stage of focused coding. As my research questions were not completely developed by this stage, the focus during the focused coding might have been affected by my pre interpretation of the data instead of my research questions. Also, I was stressing myself through the coding process in order to get to the analysis as quick as possible as I was worried about meeting the deadline, which might have affected the outcome of the coding. From this research, I have therefore learned, that spending enough time on the coding process is important, as this makes the analysis process easier, more focused and it increases the validity of the research.

Furthermore, in searching for articles on 'informedia' only articles from Berlingske, Politiken, Information, Kristeligt Dagblad and Jyllands-Posten emerged. This means, that no feature articles or editorials have been written in Ekstra Bladet and BT including the words 'refugees' and 'threat'. This is another critique which must be raised. This means, that there are no data presenting two out of the seven nationally circulating newspapers, which decreases the validity of the research. This leads the critique back to the key terms used in the search for articles on Infomedia. In the methodology section I argued, that 'refugees' and 'threat' were the combination resulting in the best article output in terms of number of articles, however, for future projects, not only the number of articles should count as a measurement, also representativeness of newspapers should perhaps be considered

as a measure within the data collection process, as this would increase the validity of the research.

List of references

Andersson, M (2015, October, 26). Indvandringens konsekvenser. *Berlingske*, Retrieved from: <http://www.b.dk/kronikker/indvandringens-konsekvenser>

Beskæftigelsesministeriet (2015, July 1). Aktuelt. Straksindgreb på asylområdet - ny integrationsydelse til nytilkomne flygtninge. Pressemeldelser, Retrieved from: <http://bm.dk/da/Aktuelt/Pressemeldelser/Arkiv/2015/07/Straksindgreb%20paa%20asylomraadet%20-%20ny%20integrationsydelse%20til%20nytilkomne%20udlaendinge.aspx>

Bacchi, C, L, 2009. Analysing Policy: What's the Problem represented to be? Australia: *Pearson Longman*.

Berlingske, (2015, October 2) Genopbyg Fort Europa. (Editorial Comments) *Berlingske*, Retrieved from: <http://www.b.dk/kommentarer/genopbyg-fort-europa>

Carr, M., (2006) You are now entering Eurabia. *Race & class*, 48(1), 1-.

Durington, M., (2007) The ethnographic semiotics of a suburban moral panic. *Critical arts*, 21(2), 261-275. doi: 10.1080/02560040701810040

Fairclough, N. (2006) Language and Globalisation. Routledge: London, pp. 140-161

Fairclough, N. (2009). Language and globalization. *Semiotica*, 2009(173), 317-342. doi: 10.1515/SEMI.2009.014

Gingrich, A (2006). Neo-nationalism and the reconfiguration of Europe. *Social anthropology*, 14(2), 195-217. doi: 10.1017/S0964028206002539

Goode, E., (1994). Moral panics: Culture, politics, and social construction. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 20, 149

Gammeltoft-Hansen, T & Holtug, N & Lemberg-Pedersen, M & Lucht, H & Richter, L & Sørensen, N, N (2015, September 29) Jagten på en bæredygtig løsning for flygtninge. *Politiken*.

Huntington, S. (1993). The Clash of Civilizations?. *Foreign Affairs*, 72(3), 22-.

Hannerz, U. (1999). Reflections on varieties of culturespeak. *European journal of cultural studies*, 2(3), 393-407. doi: 10.1177/136754949900200306

Hjarvard, S. (2008) Mediatization of Society: A Theory of the Media as Agents of social and Cultural Change. *Nordicom Review* 29(2), pp.105-134.

Jensen, B (2015, September 9) "Elitens" hjælpeløshed. *Jyllands-Posten*, Retrieved from: <http://jyllands-posten.dk/debat/kronik/ECE8023267/%E2%80%9DElitens%E2%80%9D-hj%C3%A6lpel%C3%B8shed/>

Jyllands-Posten (2015, September 9). Grundtvig på ny. (Editorial Comments) *Jyllands-Posten*, Retrieved from: <http://jyllands-posten.dk/debat/leder/ECE8015374/Grundtvig-p%C3%A5-ny/>

Kalb, D & Halmai, G (2011). Headlines of Nation: Subtexts of Class: Working-Class Populism and the return of the Repressed in neoliberal Europe. *Berghahnbooks*

Loke, S., & Golding, C. (2016) How to Do Things with Mouse Clicks: Applying Austin's speech act theory to explain learning in virtual worlds. *Educational philosophy and theory*, 1-13. doi: 10.1080/00131857.2016.1138394

Mouritsen, P (2015, October 10). Fornuft og følelser i flygtningedebatten. *Information*, Retrieved from: <https://www.information.dk/debat/2015/10/fornuft-foelelser-flygtningedebatten>

Newman, E. (2010) Critical human security studies. *Review of International Studies*, 36(1), 77-94. doi: 10.1017/S0260210509990519

Nygaard, A & Mansø, G, R (2015, November 17) Blå blok og S har lavet delaftale om 13 punkter i asylpakken. *BT* Retrieved from: <http://www.bt.dk/politik/blaa-blok-og-s-har-lavet-delaftale-om-13-punkter-i-asylpakken>

Neergaard, J, K. (2015, September 9) Fjenden kan have ret. *Kristeligt Dagblad*, Retrieved from: <http://www.kristeligt-dagblad.dk/kronik/fjenden-kan-have-ret>

Næsby, A (2015, October 13) Mens Europa frivilligt lægger sig i graven. *Berlingske*, Retrieved from: <http://www.b.dk/kronikker/mens-europa-frivilligt-laegger-sig-i-graven#!>

Pram Gad, U., Hansen, L., & Hansen, L. (2011) The politics of securitization and the Muhammad cartoon crisis: A post-structuralist perspective. *Security dialogue*, 42(4-5), 357-369. doi: 10.1177/0967010611418999

Petersen, M (2015, November 20). Regeringen gennemfører omstridt asylpakke. *Politiken*. Retrieved from: http://politiken.dk/udland/fokus_int/Flygtningestroem/ECE2940953/regeringen-gennemfoerer-omstridt-asylpakke/.

Rasmussen, M (2015, September 30). Ingen logik i ulandsbesparelser. *Kristeligt Dagblad*, Retrieved from: <http://www.kristeligt-dagblad.dk/leder/ingen-logik-i-ulandsbesparelser>

Rasmussen, A, H, M & Hitz, B, A, S & Hansen, E, K & Goffredo, S (2014) Mini-nationalisms in Europe - Scotland and Catalonia and challenge for EU? The creation of a European identity. 7th semester project. Ålborg University.

Rasmussen, L, L (2015, September 9). Et lille land i en stor verden. *Jyllands-Posten*, Retrieved from: <http://jyllands-posten.dk/debat/kronik/ECE8020177/Et-lille-land-i-en-stor-verden/>

Statsministeriet, (2015 a). *Publikationer*. Retrieved from http://www.statsministeriet.dk/a_2279.html. 2015, November 13

Statsministeriet, (2015 b). *Publikationer. Asylpakke*. Retrieved from: http://www.statsministeriet.dk/publikationer/Asylpakke_15/index.html. 2015, November 13

Sørensen, L, H. (2015, October 31) Svensk politik i forandring. *Berlingske*

Schreier, M. (2012) *Qualitative Content Analysis in Practice*. London: *SAGE Publications Ltd*.

Sedgwick, M (2013) Something Varied in the State of Denmark: Neo-nationalism, Anti-Islamic Activism, and Street-level Thuggery. *Politics, religion & ideology*, 14(2), 208-233. doi: 10.1080/21567689.2013.792650

TNS Gallup (2016) *Læsertal fra index Danmark/Gallup 2. halvår 2015*. Retrieved from: <http://www.tns-gallup.dk/work/media/laesertal/Index%20Danmark%20Gallup%20Læsertal%20H%202015.pdf>.

Togeb, L. (1998) Prejudice and tolerance in a period of increasing ethnic diversity and growing unemployment: Denmark since 1970. *Ethnic and racial studies*, 21(6), 1137-1154. doi: 10.1080/01419879808565656

Taureck, R., 2006. Securitization theory and securitization studies. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 9(1), 53-61. doi: 10.1057/palgrave.jird.1800072

Tangjia, W (2014) A Philosophical Analysis of the Concept of Crisis. *Frontiers of Philosophy in China*, 9(2), 254-267. doi: 10.3868/s030-003-014-0021-0

Thomsen, Robert C., 2010. *Nationalism in Stateless Nations - Selves and Others in Scotland and Newfoundland*. Edinburgh: Birlinn Ltd.

Udlændinge, Integration og Boligministeriet (2016, January 31) *Tal på udlændingeområdet* Retrieved from: https://www.nyidanmark.dk/NR/ronlyres/E3C50EAO-BD36-4DDD-9C8D-7AAF44DE1F12/o/seneste_tal_udlaendingeomraadet.pdf.

Vershauer, J & Ostman, Jan-Ola (2009) Key Notions for Pragmatism. Handbook for pragmatic highlights. *John Benjamin Publishing Company*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia

Vultee, F (2010) SECURITIZATION. *Journalism practice*, 4(1), 33-47. doi: 10.1080/17512780903172049

Williams, M. C. (2003) Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics. *International studies quarterly*, 47(4), 511-531. doi: 10.1046/j.0020-8833.2003.00277.x

Yeo, G, (2010) Representing the Act: Records and Speech Act Theory. *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 31(2), 95-117. doi: 10.1080/00379816.2010.506782 (online) Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00379816.2010.506782>.

Zhao, X. (2010) Study on the features of English political euphemism and its social functions. *English Language Teaching*, 3(1), 118-.