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Abstract

The legislation for the second phase of the European Union’s Common European Asylum System (CEAS) was finished in March 2013. Even though the asylum situation in Greece illustrated the unequal burden sharing and even though critique had been raised concerning the Dublin Regulation, the issue of joint responsibility and equal distribution of asylum seekers in the EU was not revised in the second phase of the CEAS. The research project is thus concerned with investigating:

*Why has the asylum situation in Greece not encouraged the European Member States to take a greater joint responsibility for asylum seekers in the European Union?*

To investigate this research question, the research project is conducting a case study of the Danish media’s articulation of the asylum situation in Greece. The methodology of Norman Fairclough on critical discourse analysis is in combination with framing theory applied to disclose the dominating discourse on the subject. The research project found that three discourses are dominating the media articulation. These discourses are: A Sympathy discourse, a discourse on Border Control and a Solidarity discourse.

Entailing the theory of Jef Huysmans to analyse the arisen discourses illustrates how the discourses are all embedded in three principles. The discourses surrounding the articulation on the asylum situation in Greece are thus: Neglecting the asylum motive, having an internal focus and regarding asylum to be solely a burden. Further analysing the objectives of the CEAS shows that these principles are also to a great extend entailed in the political objectives.

The principles seem to be naturalised and are dominating both the media debate and the policy. Therefore, the debate on asylum in Europe and the question of a joint responsibility for asylum seekers in the EU is turned into a question concerning the security of the Danish society rather than being a question of Human Rights and international protection. The debate distances itself from the asylum seekers in question and their motives for fleeing. The principles surrounding the discourses are thus downgrading the need for a joint responsibility and are furthermore illustrating a securitization of asylum. The situation in Greece has not led the EU Member States to take greater joint responsibility for asylum seekers, because the issues is embedded in the process of securitization, which reduces the need for responsibility measures in favour of security.
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# 1. Introduction to the Area of Research

Since the first six European Member States signed the Treaty of Rome in 1957 the European cooperation has developed and increased radically. The cooperation is no longer solely an economic community and the European Union now comprises 27 Member States, and Croatia is expected to be the 28th member state (The web site of the Danish EU information).

The question of further European integration is in many European states a delicate subject, the Euro scepticism is blossoming and the subject has in several Member States led to demonstrations and political opposition. Hence, the British Prime Minister, David Cameron has announced a EU referendum in Britain where the public has the opportunity to take a stand on the European co-operation. (The web site of DR-Danish Radio) The aversion towards the European Union is also present in other Member States, and demonstrations against the EU policy of crisis have taken place in e.g. Spain, Portugal, Italy, and Greece (The web site of [fagligt.eu](http://fagligt.eu" \t "_blank)). The political unrest calls in question the European solidarity in regards to asylum seekers in the EU. Are the European countries solidary? And if so, to what extend are they solidary?

For more than 20 years the EU-countries have been working on harmonising their immigration and asylum policy. The European Commission has stated that it makes sense to harmonise the conditions for asylum seekers in a Europe without borders and where the Member States share the same essential values. On these grounds several elements were introduced to harmonise the asylum regulations of the EU in the period from 1995-2005. (The web site of the European Union & the web site of the European Commission & the web site of UNHCR) This period is regarded as the first phase of the implementation of a Common European Asylum System (CEAS). In this period the Dublin Regulation, stating which EU-country has the responsibility to process the asylum claim was introduced as well as the directives determining a set of minimum standards for the reception conditions and the conditions for the asylum procedure. Furthermore a qualification directive, determining who is entitled to international protection and how it can be assured that a refugee can find the same level of protection all across Europe, was introduced. (The web site of the European Commission)

In 2008 the main objectives for the second phase of the CEAS were presented. Experiences gained from the implementation of the first phase of the CEAS clarified that adjustments needed to be made in the second phase of the CEAS. However, a complicated power relation and many opposing interests characterised the negotiations (Gammeltoft-Hansen 2009: 1) and the legislation for the second part of the CEAS, which initially was planned to be completed in 2010, was not finished before the end of March 2013. (Peers 2013: 1)

The revised legislation addresses some of the issues directed towards the CEAS’ first phase legislation. However, many points of criticism remain unchanged. The Dublin Regulation, that determines, which Member State has the responsibility to process the asylum claim, has been strongly criticised for transferring responsibility away from the Northern Member States toward the Southern. (Peers 2013: 5)

The asylum situation in Greece clearly demonstrates some of the down falls relating to the Dublin Regulation and the uneven distribution of asylum seekers in Europe. The asylum situation in Greece can be characterised as desperate. 80% of the refugees entering Europe enter through Greece. (McDonough 2012: 3) This has led to a disproportional amount of asylum seekers in Greece compared to e.g. the Northern European countries. Eventually, the Greek asylum system broke down and many refugees in Greece were and are still forced to live as illegal migrants, because they cannot get their asylum case processed. (McDonough 2012: 3) The pressure on the Greek asylum system has led to several human rights abuses (Peers 2013: 8) and the UNHCR has declared the asylum situation in Greece a humanitarian crisis (Human Rights Watch 2011: 19) The poor financial situation in Greece, the riots in the streets, the conditions for asylum seekers and the resistance towards the immigrants and asylum seekers living in the country have not escaped the attention of the Danish media. The Danish media also reported the results from the judgment in the case M.S.S. vs. Belgium and Greece presented by the European Court of justice on the 21st of January 2011[[1]](#footnote-1). The Court held that Greece was violating the Human Rights and that Belgium did the same by deporting the asylum seeker back to Greece. (The web site of the European Commission) Deportations to Greece has since then been temporarily stopped.

Hence, the consequences of the Dublin Regulation are not unfamiliar. Neither is the recognition of the uneven distribution of asylum seekers. However, the legislative changes concerning the Dublin Regulation do not deal with the fundamental principles of responsibility. Consequently, the main changes integrated in the second phase of the CEAS concerning the Dublin Regulation are focussing on ameliorating the efficiency of the Dublin system as well as the protection standards for asylum seekers entailed in the system. (Peers 2013: 5-8) The issue of responsibility remains unchanged. On these grounds it can be argued that the Common European Asylum System does not contribute to a more even distribution of refugees.

With this point of departure the intention of the research project is to answer:

*Why has the asylum situation in Greece not encouraged the European Member States to take a greater joint responsibility for asylum seekers in the European Union?*

The research project is thus concerned with finding explanatory factors for the limited responsibility proposed by the European Member States concerning the issue of an even distribution of asylum seekers in Europe. Different explanations can be applied in answering this research question and many factors have an effect on the motivation and possibility of the EU Member States taking a joint responsibility. This research project will examine how the articulation of asylum in Europe is part of making the introduction of a joint responsibility difficult. However, knowing that other factors are also present. Referring to discourse theory it can be argued that the dominating discourses determinates what action is possible. Our conception of the world and thereby also our framework of action will accordingly be limited by the existing discourses. The discourses make some actions possible and others impossible.[[2]](#footnote-2) The issue of asylum is also set in a framework and the possible actions concerning the issue are according to social constructivism limited to the discourses available on the subject. To answer the research question it is therefore relevant to investigate which discourses are present concerning the issue of asylum in a European context.

The focus on discourses is furthermore interesting because according to Bryman: ”*What is said is always a way of not saying something else”* (Bryman 2004: 372) Bryman illustrates thatinvestigating the discourses is also a question of investigating what is being prioritised and what is being downgraded. The analysis of the discourses concerning asylum responsibility in Europe will therefore also visualise what is not being said on the matter. Hence, the issues being downplayed are also relevant for understanding why it is difficult to get the EU Member States to take a joint responsibility.

The existing discourses are played out on many different scenes and on many different levels. Accordingly, discourses are e.g. present in: political debates, in our legislation, in social interaction and in the media. This research project will take a starting point in the discourses articulated by the media and their treatment of the subject of asylum.

The media is part of the civil society and the media is an essential source for information and part of defining the reality that surrounds us. (Gripsrud 2007: 15 & 76) The media additionally plays an essential role in forming political opinions and entails the ability to provoke strong feelings towards different population groups. (Gripsrud 2007: 23 & Faulks 1999: 2 & 149) This is also an argument entailed by McCombs and Shaw, who focus on how the media plays an influential role in the process of agenda setting and in shaping the political reality (McCombs & Shaw 1972: 1). The media can therefore be said to influence both the individual’s perception as well as the topics of the political debate. The media’s presentation of the asylum situation in Greece is thus of great relevance for answering the research question and to understand why the issue of a joint responsibility among the EU-Member States is difficult.

In the following section concerning the methodological framework, the delimitations of the research will be presented.

# 2. Methodological Framework

In this section the methodological framework of this research project will be presented and operationalized. The methodological aspects will take their starting point in the research question:

*Why has the asylum situation in Greece not encouraged the European Member States to take a greater joint responsibility for asylum seekers in the European Union?*

The subject of this research project can be categorised as a macro-oriented socio-political topic, and as stated, many factors are involved in making the process of joint responsibility difficult. Therefore, different methods could also be applied to answer the research question. This research project, however, finds that a discursive approach will be of great relevance. This research project has a hypothesis that the discourses dominating the subject of asylum are also exerting influence on the process of sharing responsibility. The methodology of discourses will thus constitute a key position in the structure of this project and in answering the research question. The importance and power of discourse will be further dealt with in the section on social constructivism and in the section introducing this research project’s discursive method. Introductory, the design and the structure of the research project will be presented.

## 2.1 Denmark as a Case

The starting point of the discourse analysis will be the Danish media’s articulation of the subject: joint responsibility for asylum seekers in Europe. This research project has thus been delimited to Danish media. Therefore the design of the research project incorporates elements of a case study. The case study entails a detailed and intensive analysis of a single case. (Bryman 2004: 48) In this research project the Danish media constitutes the case. The research project is thus dealing with a EU-affair by investigating a national debate. The Danish media articulation constitutes the case representing present media discourses in the European Union. However, reservations to the differences in the media debates across the European Union must be taken. As the paragraph on social constructivism will illustrate, discourses are not independent of their social setting. This naturally limits the generalizability of the discourse analysis.

## 2.2 The Structure of the Research Project

As stated the research project is concerned with investigating the Danish media discourse on the subject of asylum in Europe. The research project found it to be favourable not to determine theoretical limitations beforehand. Accordingly, the aim has been to conduct an explorative discourse analysis.

However, in order to understand the articulated discourses outside their immediate media frame, and instead investigate them on a political and economical level, it is necessary to include relevant theoretical aspects. A theoretical section outlining and operationalizing the chosen theoretical aspects will thus follow the discourse analysis.

Following the methodology of Fairclough, the research project will furthermore investigate the social practice[[3]](#footnote-3); hence, after having conducted the textual analysis, the articulated discourses will be further investigated, by incorporating relevant sociocultural theory. The analysis of the social practice will also include a more practical element than usually proposed by Fairclough. The research project will entail and analyse the political objectives set out for the Common European Asylum System (CEAS) in order to investigate if and how the policy on the subject of asylum in Europe is compliant with the discourses dominating in the media. The research project finds the political context of the discourses particularly relevant for the research project and finds that the objectives of the CEAS is a relevant means for investigating the political surroundings.

The textual analysis and the following analysis of the social practice surrounding the discourses will enable the research project to answer the research question.

## 2.3 A Social Constructivist Approach

In this paragraph the theory of science embedding the research project will be introduced along with the consequences this approach entail on the research project. The research project is investigating the Danish media articulation surrounding asylum seekers in Greece and is placed within the theoretical field of discourses. Discourse analysis is concerned with how language effects and constitutes social reality[[4]](#footnote-4). Accordingly, the articulation of asylum in Europe exerts influence on the social reality concerning asylum in Europe. The method of discourse analysis is thus founded within a constructivist approach. (Hansen 2004: 397)

Social constructivism is the theory of science embedding the research project. Social constructivism argues that knowledge is socially constructed and the social reality is subjective. Social phenomena are thus constructed by the actions of human beings and therefore social phenomena can also be changed by human activities. (Rasborg 2004: 352) Referring to the research project it can be argued that in order to change or improve the current social practices on the issue of EU-asylum, it is necessary to clarify and become aware of the existing social practices.

When knowledge is socially constructed it is not static. Knowledge can therefore change over time. Furthermore knowledge is socially and culturally dependent. Ergo our approach to understanding and looking at reality is also part of social processes, entailing fights over what is wrong and what is right. This also implies that several truths and reality can exist parallel. A word or a statement can create several meanings and one meaning is not necessarily more right than the other. (Rasborg 2004: 351) On these grounds it can be argued that this research project will not be able to reach an objective truth, because the results and conclusion are dependent on the cultural and historical context in which it is founded. Therefore, knowledge should not be considered a mirror of reality, but rather a product of a certain way of categorising the world. (Jørgensen & Phillips 2011: 13) Another aspect making social constructivism relevant for the research project is that it is generally critical to what we consider common sense.

### 2.3.1 Different Degrees of Social Constructivism

There are different degrees of social constructivism. This research project distance itself from the radical social constructivism and instead takes a position, in which not all aspects of reality is regarded as being socially constructed. Within this project it is thus the epistemology that is consider to be socially constructed.

The view that reality is also constructed by other factors than social factors correlates with the approach of Fairclough and the critical discourse analysis. Fairclough further argues that the social sphere surrounding the discourses influences the meaning of the articulation. The actor, who produces discourse, therefore has different opportunities when choosing a term or formulating an opinion. However, the receiver similarly has different options of interpretations, which can influence the perception of a certain text. (Jørgensen & Phillips 2011: 93-98) The research project thus recognises that it has certain presumptions and interpretations of the object being investigated. These interpretations are part of a social and cultural process and from a social constructivist approach inevitable. Fairclough accentuates the distinction between a word's meaning and formulation of meaning. The research project will investigate this distinction by looking for the possible meanings of a word and what meaning the word is given in the article. Fairclough’s view on reality and discourse will be elaborated later in this section.

## 2.4 Limitations

In the following section, the research project will set out the limitations the methodological choices exert on the research project.

As stated, choosing Denmark as a case and focusing solely on Denmark sets certain limitations to the degree of representativity. Generally, representativity can be difficult in social science. Representativity within this project is thus not statistical, but rather a theoretical representativity. The ability to refer findings to theory makes the results valid outside their immediate frame.

A disadvantage often accentuated with social constructivism is that knowledge is perceived to be a dynamic concept. However, the critical discourse analysis, which is the approach chosen for this research project, considers the social to be more fixed. According to discourse theory, the particular situation provides a certain frame indicating what norms and values are present and knowledge and identities can be categorised as rather definite in the situation. (Jørgensen & Phillips 2011) However, it remains important to analyse the social phenomena within the given context, when operating in the field of social constructivism.

In regards to this research project, the social constructivism also entail a limitation concerning the representativity of the research project, and reservations ought to be taken if wanting to transfer the results to other EU-Member States. In accordance with the objective of this project, it is consequently important to keep in mind and incorporate the societal context in which the articles have been produced. Furthermore, it must be recognised that due to this theoretical approach and understanding, the results reached are also set within a context and can therefore be characterised as subjective knowledge.

Limitations are also entailed in the choice on media discourses. As opposed to scientific or political discourses, media discourses generally have a wide reach and are thus available to a larger part of society than etc. discourses entailed in political agreements. However, analysing the media discourses sets a limitation in the sense that the research project will not be able to determine political struggles and power relations, which can also exert influence on the EU Member States ability and willingness to take joint responsibility.

## 2.5 Discourse Analysis

In the following section the discursive approach of this project will be unfolded and delimited. The theories and methods of discourse are, if not endless then numerous, and many of the different approaches have made contributions that could be of relevance, when answering the research question of this thesis. However, mixing elements from all the different approaches create difficulties. Even though all the different approaches within the field of discourse analysis have roots in social constructivism, disagreements concerning the discourses degree of constructive ability and the independency of the discourses exist between the different approaches. (Jørgensen & Phillips 2011: 11) This research project takes the position that discourses are also affected by non-discursive practices in society. This correlates with the position of Fairclough, whose critical discourse analysis will be the primary approach of the discourse analysis conducted in this thesis. This said, Jørgensen and Phillips[[5]](#footnote-5) also argue that a combination of elements is possible and desirable (Jørgensen & Phillips 2011: 16). Fairclough also proposes this argument. (Fairclough 2008: 7)

The critical discourse analysis provides us with the analytical tools to linguistically investigate the changes of society and discuss the way we speak of certain topics. Discourse is much more than language, it is constitutive of our social world and the discourse becomes a framework for the justification of different power practices. (Bryman 2004: 370) The critical discourse analysis is a way to investigate social problems and societal changes in society, through language analysis. Fairclough’s critical discourse theory can be applied whenever there is a social problem entailing a discursive aspect (Fairclough 2008: 14). According to the research project, the problem is the uneven responsibility sharing among the EU Member States, and the discursive aspect investigated is the Danish media’s articulation of asylum in the EU. Combining Fairclough’s critical discourse analysis with elements from other discursive approaches is, as stated, not impossible. However, it is necessary to consider if aspects of theory of science within the two approaches collide. The analysis carried out in this thesis will take its starting point in the Critical Discourse Analysis by Fairclough and include elements from framing theory[[6]](#footnote-6). Introductory, the theory of Fairclough will be introduced and operationalized. Followed by an introduction to the chosen framing theory and conclusively this paragraph will entail a section outlining how the two theories will be combined and how the discourse analysis will be executed.

## 2.6 The Critical Discourse Analysis by Fairclough

Critical discourse analysis differs from e.g. discourse theory by regarding discourse as a social practise that both constitute the social world, but is also being constituted by the social world. Language and discourse not only create and change structures and social processes; the discourses are also socially constructed. Discourses thus form part of a dialectic relations with other social practises (Fairclough 2008: 53-58). According to the research question the discourses dominating the articulation concerning asylum in Europe, can therefore not be characterised as the only practices influencing the issue of responsibility. There are e.g. economical and political practices that also exert influence on the issue.[[7]](#footnote-7)

Fairclough’s critical discourse analysis consists of both: theoretical methods, methodological guidelines, philosophical propositions and specific analytical tools for conducting linguistic analysis. (Jørgensen & Phillips 2011: 72) Fairclough’s thoughts on critical discourse analysis have been expressed in a wide range of articles and scientific works and he also accentuates that his critical discourse analysis vary across time. (McHoul & Rapley 2001) A complete introduction to all Fairclough’s theoretical concepts and variations is first of all hardly possible and secondly not relevant for this research project. The following introduction therefore only includes the concepts relevant for this thesis. The point of reference will be Fairclough’s three-dimensional model.

Fairclough's three-dimensional model will, as mentioned, constitute the starting point in the later analysis. According to Fairclough the model should be used as a regulative tool for the given communicative event, (Fairclough 1992: 225+238) this entails that the model is adjusted according to the analysis in question. Therefore, the purpose of this section is to conduct a detailed assessment of the parts of the model relevant to this discourse analysis and the way these can be applied in accordance to the research question.

### 2.6.1 The Discursive Event, the Order of Discourses & Hegemony

The starting point of an analysis of discourse is the discursive event – an event where language is used and where the order of discourse is exposed. According to Fairclough the order of discourses is the sum of discursive practices within a given setting and the relationship between them. (Fairclough 2008: 12). Every discursive event thus positions itself within the already existing discursive field and the new discursive event either reproduces the existing discourses or contributes to transforming it. Hence, the discursive events are both shaped by and shape the order of discourse.

Analysing the order of discourses it is also relevant to introduce Fairclough’s concept hegemony. When using the concept, Fairclough refers to Antonio Gramsci’s theory on hegemony. (Fairclough 1995b: 67 & Fairclough 2008: 52) The concept is focused on how cultural power is gained through consent in opposition to coercion. An analysis of hegemony is focusing on if the discursive events are articulated within the order of discourses in ways that sustain the relations of dominance. (Fairclough 1995b: 67 & 68) The articulation and rearticulation of the discursive orders are therefore part of the hegemonic battles constantly present in articulation. Analysing hegemony is a way of analysing the social context of the discourse and the power relations, in order to analyse whether the discourse reproduces or challenges the existing order of discourses. (Fairclough 2008: 56) The concept therefore also entails a degree of naturalisation and automatisation. (Fairclough 2008: 53) The research project will return to the concept of hegemony in the section on framing theory. Firstly, the research project will return to Fairclough’s analytical model.

### 2.6.2 The Three-dimensional Model

Social Practice

Discursive Practice

Text

(Fairclough 2008: 127)

According to Fairclough (and figured above) the discursive event contains three elements: *text*, *discursive practice* and *social practice*. All three aspects are interwoven, and it is not possible to separate the different aspects. Conducting a critical discourse analysis entails investigating all three elements and the relationships between them. The three aspects are linked so that the discursive practice is mediating between text and social practice, the discursive practice can be said to serve as an indirect connection between the other two parts. (Fairclough 2008: 127) The discursive practice is linking the text with the social practice and the discursive event is part of making the text relevant in the social surroundings.

#### Text

Fairclough’s textual analysis can also be characterised as a linguistic analysis and many of the elements included origins from linguistic tradition. Fairclough defines text as both spoken and written language. Furthermore Fairclough defines texts as being multifunctional. As written above the text and the discourses therefore have three constitutive qualities. Discourses constitute: social identities, social relations between people and systems of meaning and knowledge. (Fairclough 2008: 125 & Fairclough 1995a: 205) According to the research question it will be of relevance to investigate all three constructive abilities when analysing the media’s articulation of asylum in Europe. The construction of social identities, social relations and systems of knowledge and belief is of great relevance for understanding and explaining the reasons for the current situation. Fairclough also applies the three-dimensional model to analyse discourses in the media. The application of the analytical model thus seems relatively unproblematic.

In this particular analysis a great focus will also be placed on the textual function; how is information either emphasised or downplayed and what is being chosen as subject or theme? How are the different parts of the text being linked together? And how is the text being linked with the social situation outside the text? (Fairclough 2008: 18). For analysing the textual function Fairclough focuses on different elements, among these: the vocabulary, grammar and cohesion (Fairclough 1992: 75).

The **vocabulary** covers the overall study of a text, the individual words, and the meanings of these. (Fairclough 2008: 34) The following critical discourse analysis will therefore focus on how specific words are used to describe the asylum situation in the EU and the meaning of the chosen terms.

The analysis of **grammar** focuses on the general functions of language (Fairclough 1992: 235). This entails the construction of the sentences as well as analysing if the sentences include an actor and whether or not the sentences are constructed as passive or active. **Modality** is part of the grammar andidentifies the specific mode of an expression (Fairclough 1992: 146) and the degree to which the writer (or speaker) supports his own articulation. In the following critical discourse analysis it will be relevant to examine the modality to illustrate the degree of affinity the journalist assess with his or her statement.

**Cohesion** analyses the textual organisation and the linking between the sentences as well as the wider textual cohesion. A focus in the analysis will therefore be repetition of a term or a statement as well as the construction of arguments.

Fairclough introduces other concepts in his textual analysis, e.g. transitivity and politeness. However, these concepts were found to be less relevant for the research project and are not included.

The following critical discourse analysis will be conducted in English; however, the articles constituting the empirical material are written in Danish. To avoid confusion and to secure transparency the critical discourse analysis will entail Danish quotes, which will be interpreted in English. Furthermore, essential words constituting markers will also be stated in Danish.

#### Discursive Practice

The discursive practice covers both the production and the consumption of the text and furthermore it constitutes the intermediary link between the text and the social practice. In other words it is through the production and the consumption of the text that it becomes part of the social reality. Furthermore, the analysis of the discursive practices is engaged in investigating, which discourses are used by the writer to present the discourses and which discourses are being used by the consumer to interpret the text. (Jørgensen & Phillips 2011: 81) Nonetheless, Fairclough neglects to present a tool to investigate the processes of production or consumption of the text. Especially the lack of information concerning the consumption of text has been criticised. (Jørgensen & Phillips 2001: 103) It could be suggested that qualitative interviews with the readers would be relevant in order to understand the consumption process. However, Fairclough does not elaborate on the aspect. Yet, Fairclough presents other concepts for the analysis of the discursive practice. Within this research project two components from Fairclough’s discursive practice has been chosen.

**Power of assertion** (or force) defines how a particular expression aims to lead to a certain action. An example of this could be that a sentence is presented as a warrant, a question, a promise, etc. (Fairclough 2008: 39)

**Intertextuality** investigates how the discursive event applies already existing discourses and how the text extends its possibilities within the orders of discourse. (Fairclough 1995a: 10). The intertextuality is a central element to critical discourse analysis and it will also be of great focus in the subsequent analysis of the Danish media discourse.

Fairclough suggests that the production and the consumption of a text also be investigated practically. According to this analysis, this inclines analysing the processes concerning the journalistic production of the text and the personal consumptions of the newspaper readers. As previously stated, Fairclough does however, not exemplify this and the discursive analysis within this analysis will be conducted by investigating the power of assertion and the intertextuality of the discourses.

This research project argues that downgrading the discursive practice can be defended because the research project is not concerned with the consumption of a specific group. Had the research project aimed to understand the discourses effect on e.g. asylum seekers living in Denmark, the discursive practice would have been essential, because the aim would have bee to determine how the discourses affect the interpreter. This research project is however, more interested in the interaction with the social practice.

#### Social Practice

A primary argument for choosing the critical discourse analysis in preference to alternative discourse analytical approaches is Fairclough’s three-dimensional view on analysis of discourse. According to Fairclough, fully understanding and comprehending the existing discourses also entails including the third dimension social practice.

Social practice constitutes the non-discursive, which the discursive practice is a part of. Hence, the media discourse concerning asylum in Europe is part of a society not only constituted by discourses. The understanding of the non-discursive cannot be obtained solely through a linguistic analysis and theoretical explanations will therefore be applied in order to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of the discourses. The discursive practice and the social practice has a mediating effect on one another (Fairclough 1992: 237), which is why Fairclough’s understanding of discourse becomes both constituting and constitutive. The social practice can therefore be characterised as constituting everything that is not part of the discourse. This covers both the specific situation of the communicative event as well as the wider institutional context and the social cultural frame. (Fairclough 1995b: 62) Analysing the social practice entails analysing the surrounding circumstances, which have both influenced the discourse and has been influenced by the discourse. As an example Fairclough applies the theories of Anthony Giddens in order to understand the post-traditional society surrounding university discourses. (Jørgensen & Phillips 2011: 99).

The analysis of the social practice will in regards to this research project entail a discussion including the articulated discourses in a broader context and examine the consequences of the propagated discourses. Fairclough believes that defining the social practices within discourse analysis can only be done if relevant theory is implemented, whereas a linguistic analysis alone does not illustrate the relations between text and the social and cultural processes surrounding it. The theoretical framework chosen to support the analysis of the social practice will be presented in section 4.

The research project will furthermore entail a more practical element in Fairclough’s third dimension. After having discussed the arisen discourses on a theoretical level, the research project will entail the policy paper listing the objectives for the Common European Asylum System. The research project argues that discussing the media discourses in relation to the political objectives will enable the research project to understand the media discourse in a political frame and enable the research project to answer the research question:

*Why has the asylum situation in Greece not encouraged the European Member States to take a greater joint responsibility for asylum seekers in the European Union?*

## 2.7 Framing

As a supplement to the critical discourse analysis, elements and perspectives from framing theory will be included. The following quote by Carol Bacchi illustrates why the subject of framing is relevant to investigate and include in the analysis:

 *“The point here is to recognize the non-innocence of how ‘problems’ get framed (…), how the frames will affect what can be thought about and how this affects possibilities for action.”* (Bacchi 2000: 8)

The quote illustrates the importance and power of the spoken word, and furthermore suggests why framing and articulation should be a focus. In the following, the aspects included from framing theory will be presented. The framing theory will not constitute the primary analytical tool, and a singular framing-approach will not be selected. The framing theory will, however, constitute the starting point of the analysis, as the approach provides relevant perspectives on selection and treatment of empirical material. James W. Tankard Jr. presents a short definition of framing in his article: “The Empirical Approach to the study of Media Framing”:

 *“A frame is a central organized idea for news content that supplies a context and suggests what the issues is through the use of selection, emphasis, exclusion and elaboration.”* (Tankard Jr. 2001: 100)

Accordingly, a focus in the analysis will besides from what is being highlighted also be, what is *not* being mentioned. Framing theory is concerned with how the media choses to frame a certain political theme. Media framings are important to investigate because they have discrete but powerful influence on the society. (Tankard Jr. 2001: 96-98) The concept is argued to be relevant because it has the potential of uncovering the sometimes hidden assumptions of the media coverage. (Tankard Jr. 2001: 96-97). Framing theory recognises a text’s potential to define a situation, a subject or a debate. Convincing people to accept a certain framing of a subject, to a great extend means winning the debate (Tankard Jr. 2001: 96).

A relevant concept used within framing theory and already presented in the previous section on Fairclough’s critical discourse analysis is mediahegemony. Media hegemony defines a situation where a frame is so dominating that it is accepted without being questioned. (Tankard Jr. 2001: 113) The concept is within framing theory presented more simplistic, and the two concepts are not identical. However, the concepts have many similarities and both concepts entail elements of power and naturalisation. When referring to the concept hegemony in the analysis, the research project is thus referring to both understandings of the concept.

Framing theory also presents a relevant concern in relation to the analysis of framing in media presentation; naming the found frames in an analysis, also implies a degree of framing. Accordingly this will also be taken into consideration, when conducting the later analysis of the Danish media discourse. Framing theory furthermore clarifies the importance of a systematic and empirical approach to analysing framing. (Tankard Jr. 2001: 116-117). The systematically approach of this discourse and frame analysis will be presented prior to the analysis.

Both Framing theory and Fairclough’s critical discourse analysis are concerned with the medias presentation of social subjects or problems and ascribe the media presentation great power. (Fairclough 1995b: 45-48) The object of analysis within the two approaches is thus very similar, which makes it relatively unproblematic to combine framing-perspectives with the critical discourse analysis.

The Framing-theory, nevertheless, contributes with useful perspectives on how presentation is used actively by journalists and politicians. Furthermore the Framing-approaches stress the importance of a systematic approach to both the selection of material and the conducting of the analysis, which is found to be very useful for the analysis in question as it will include a relatively large amount of articles.

## 2.8 Introduction to the Empirical Framework of the Project

In the following section the delimitation of the empirical material, will be presented. The empirical material primarily constituting the basis of this thesis and laying the ground for the answering of the research question is, 84 articles from a wide selection of Danish national newspapers. The selection and demarcation of articles will, according to the principles of framing theory be further elaborated in this section.

Choosing to base the empirical framework on written newspaper articles is primarily due to the quality of often in depth descriptions in the newspaper-media. The written articles entail a great potential to investigate the arguments behind the articulated discourses. It can furthermore be assumed that a certain amount of concentration and attention is present when reading a newspaper article. However, it should be stressed that this research project cannot conclude, whether the newspapers are more influential than e.g., the radio or television broadcasts. Delimiting the discourse analysis to solely focussing on media and newspapers entails that only a part of the factors influencing the discourses in society are being analysed. Nevertheless, it can be assumed that many of the discourses presented in the newspapers will also be present in other media.

On the 21st of January 2011 the European Court of Justice passed judgement in the case M.S.S vs. Belgium.[[8]](#footnote-8) This judgement declared, that the situation for asylum seekers in Greece is not in accordance with international human rights and the possibility of returning asylum seekers to Greece, provided by the Dublin regulation, was temporarily sustained. This judgement marks a defining point in EU history, because it by the European Court of justice was declared that a EU Member State could not simply assume that other Member States respect the Human Rights. The verdict caused awareness on the humanitarian situation and the conditions for asylum seekers in Greece. It can be assumed that the media has also covered the story in the immediate time before the verdict and the appointed day has thus been set to the 16th of January 2011, five days prior the day of judgement. The critical discourse analysis includes all articles written about the subject of asylum and Greece in Danish newspapers since the 16th of January 2011, five days before Greece was declared “unsuitable” for asylum seekers and till the 21st of February 2013, when the article search was begun.

The articles have been located on the grounds of a search on infomedia.dk[[9]](#footnote-9). A search including both “Greece asylum” (in Danish “Grækenland asyl”) within national newspapers in the chosen period offers 99 articles.

Of the 99 articles located on Infomedia.dk, the ones from “Ritzau” have been excluded. Ritzau is a news bureau, which provides news-story for the Danish media. The aim of this research project is to investigate the discourse articulated in the national newspapers, and Ritzau will not be included. An article from the Danish police web site, was also among the 99 and will be excluded as well as articles from the Danish magazine “Arbejderen”. After having excluded the mentioned articles. The number of articles included in the analysis is 84.

Articles from the following newspapers are included in the analysis: Politiken, Berlingske Tidende, Information, Morgenavisen Jyllandsposten, Kristelig Dagblad, BT, Ekstra Bladet and Weekendavisen. These are all among the most read national newspapers, however, the readers of the eight newspapers differ to a great extend e.g. concerning political views (Winther 2011). For the sake of including as many Danish newspaper readers as possible it is thus necessary to entail as many of the newspapers as possible. Unfortunately articles from the free newspaper Metro Xpress are not available on Infomedia.dk and it has not been possible to include them in the analysis.

According to the theory of framing, the division of the articles in different categories should start very wide. The perusal of the 84 articles displayed several different framings. The first reviews presented 15 possible frames entailed in the articles. Introductory in the critical discourse analysis the 15 initial frames will be presented. Subsequently, the research project will, according to the structural approach of framing theory, place the 15 frames in larger and more comprehensive categories, to create a manageable picture of the Danish media discourse concerning a united European responsibility for refugees.

The frames exposed in this critical discourses analysis are not isolated and incoherent. Hence, it is not impossible that an article entails elements from more than one of the initials frames. Articles entailing elements of more than one initial frame have been placed in the frame-category most dominating in the article.

Before initiating the critical discourse analysis it is relevant to state that the research project will not be focusing on the role of the individual journalists. When referring to the discourses present in the different articles, the research project will refer to these as being articulated by the article or the newspaper. Referring to the theory of framing this does not entail that the journalists are perceived as passive actors in the production of the article, the role of the journalist is however not a focus of the research project.

# 3. The Danish Media’s Presentation of the Asylum Situation in Greece – A Critical Discourse Analysis

The purpose of the critical discourse analysis is to investigate which discourses are dominant in the Danish media when debating the issue of asylum in Europe.The critical discourse analysis will constitute the starting point for the discussion concerning the consequences of these discourses and answering the research question: *Why has the asylum situation in Greece not encouraged the European Member States to take a greater joint responsibility for asylum seekers in the European Union?* In the following section the research project will therefore conduct the textual analysis that constitutes the first dimension of Fairclough’s model, which was introduced on page 13.

The initial 15 framings were found by using the structural approach presented by framing theory. This approach determines similarities such as specific use of words, themes, arguments and who has been quoted in the article. The initial frames are presented in the following model, which provides each frame with a comprehensive name, stating the number of articles in the category and a short description of what characterises the frame.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Initial frames** | **Num-****ber** | **Characteristics** |
| **1) Sympathy for asylum seekers and/or migrants in Greece + solidarity** | 2 | The articles are characterised by showing great sympathy for the migrants and asylum seekers living in Greece and all the articles to some extend claim a Danish responsibility. Both articles quote undocumented asylum seekers. |
| **2) Sympathy for asylum seekers in Greece and/or Italy + scepticism** | 10 | As well as the first category, these articles also show sympathy for the asylum seekers living in Greece (or Italy), however, the articles also express scepticism towards the asylum seekers motive for entering Europe and in some cases even criminalise undocumented refugees. The articles consider the situation to be a Greek (or Italian) concern. Implicitly it is indicated that Denmark, do not carry any responsibility. Quoting illegal migrants & asylum seekers. |
|  |
| **3) Sympathy for asylum seekers in Greece + sympa-thetic for the Greek population & police and their actions** | 3 | As well as the two first categorise the articles in this category also express sympathy for the asylum seekers in Greece. However, the articles also entail a certain amount of understanding for the actions of the Greek police towards the migrants and the resistance and scepticism among the Greek population. Quoting: illegal immigrants or undocumented asylum seekers, Greek police, Amnesty International, Doctors Without Borders. |
|  |
| **4) Sympathy for (failed) asylum seekers living in Denmark** | 8 | These articles show great sympathy for failed asylum seekers living either illegal in Denmark or waiting to be repatriated. Quoting: These articles refer to the stories of the asylum seekers and their stories and wordings are generally granted a lot of space in the article. |
|  |
| **5) Focus on EU & Border control** | 4 | The articles focus on which consequences migrations have for the European countries. The solution is increased border control. |
| **6) Focus on Denmark & Border control** | 16 | The articles are concerned with the consequences migration to Europe will put upon Denmark and the articles to a great extend find increased border control to be the solution. Often quoting politicians Karen Jepsersen (V) and Peter Skaarup (DF) together with Frontex. |
|  |
| **7) Focus on protecting DK & EU + solidarity** | 4 | These articles are concerned with EU & DK and how to secure these areas. The articles, however, do not avoid mentioning solidarity. |
| **8) It is Greece’s own problem** | 3 | These articles consider the situation in Greece to be only a Greek problem and to some extend also caused by the Greeks themselves. Denmark has absolutely no responsibility. |
| **9) Criminalisation of and suspicions towards refugees and asylum seekers** | 8 | The articles in this category present asylum seekers as very calculating and strategic and to flee is presented as manageable and in some cases very easy. The necessary solution is border control. Quoting: Karen Jespersen, Frontex and NUC (Nationalt Udlændingecenter) |
|  |
| **10) Solidarity is obvious, however indefinable.** | 2 | Solidarity is proposed as necessary, however, it is not articulated which kind of solidarity is necessary |
| **11) DK should follow the verdict from the European Court of Human Rights** | 4 | These articles indirectly show solidarity by acknowledging the verdict. Furthermore both articles are critical towards former Minister of Integration Birthe Rønn Hornbeck |
| **12) Unfair that Greece has to handle a dispropor tional amount of asylum seekers + criminal-lisation + helping in the immediate vicinity.**  | 1 | The article shows a small degree of solidarity, since it recognises that the Greeks are handling a disproportionally large amount of the asylum seekers entering Europe. The article, however, also criminalises migrants. Helping in the immediate vicinity is proposed as an action of solidarity. |
| **13) Solidarity, but NOT redistribution of asylum seekers** | 4 | These articles agrees that solidarity is necessary, however, this should be in the form of helping Greece with trained personnel and case procedures  |
| **14) Indirect Solidarity, DK has a responsibility** | 2 | Critical of politicians, who do not take responsibility. DK is articulated as having an obligation. Solidarity is not mentioned.  |
| **15) Internal & external Solidarity + redistribution** | 13 | The articles within this category are critical of The EU’s current handling and articulate that EU needs to show solidarity both within the Union and with the rest of the world. It is articulated that redistribution of asylum seekers could be a measure to the problem. Often quoting Cecilie Malmstrøm, EU-commisioner |
|  |

The 15 initial framings provide an overview of possible approaches to the subject of asylum and Greece presented in the Danish newspapers from January 2011 to February 2013. The found framings show that there are both many differences and many similarities. The framings will not be dealt with individually. However, the following critical discourse analysis will be referring to the different framings presented in the model in order to show the variations within the different discourses.

Categorising the articles into frames elucidate that a group of articles are showing sympathy for asylum seekers and/or refugees (marked with blue in the model displaying the 15 initial frames). The articles, however, vary in degree of sympathy and geographical focus; some are placing their sympathy for rejected asylum seekers in Denmark and others are concerned for the asylum seekers and migrants living in Greece. The frame “Sympathy for asylum seekers in Greece and/or Italy + scepticism” is the most prominent of the sympathy-frames and is represented in ten articles. Another group of articles present in the empirical material are articles focusing on border control. Within this group some are showing suspicion towards asylum seekers. As well as the articles concerning sympathy, this group of articles also vary in their geographical focus. The frame “Focus on Denmark & Border control” is the most prominent in this category and among all the articles. 16 articles represent this frame. A third group of articles show a varying degree of solidarity. Some of the articles are explicit and articulate a need for the European countries to show solidarity both internal in the EU and with our neighbouring countries others are more implicit by articulating injustice in the current situation, where Greece is responsible for a disproportionally large amount of asylum seekers. The most prominent frame concerned with solidarity is the frame: “Internal & external solidarity + redistribution”,which is articulated in 13 of the articles.

The 15 frames can thus be further reduced and regarded as articulating three main discourses.

**Model 2: The 3 Dominating Discourses**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Discourse** | **In number** | **Containing the initial frames** |
|
| **Sympathy** | 23 | - Sympathy for asylum seekers and/or migrants in Greece + “solidarity |
| - Sympathy for asylum seekers in Greece and/or Italy + scepticism |
| - Sympathy for asylum seekers in Greece, but also sympathetic for the Greek population, the Greek police and their actions |
| - Sympathy for (failed) asylum seekers living in Denmark |
| **Border Control** | 35 | - Focus on EU & Border control  |
| - Focus on Denmark & Border control |
| - Focus on protecting DK & EU + solidarity |
| - It is Greece’s own problem |
| - Criminalisation of and suspicions towards refugees and asylum seekers |
| **Solidarity** | 26 | - Solidarity is obvious, however indefinable. |
| - DK should follow the verdict from the European Court of Human Rights |
| - Unfairness that Greece has to handle a disproportional amount of asylum seekers + criminalisation + helping in the immediate vicinity. |
| - Solidarity, but NOT redistribution of asylum seekers |
| - Indirect Solidarity, DK has a responsibility |
| - Internal & external Solidarity + redistribution |

It is important to explicitly state the artificiality of categorising and placing the 84 articles into boxes. When comparing the findings from the initial frames presented in model 1 with the three dominating discourses presented in model 2, it is accordingly demonstrated how the discourses are not absolute and independent from each other. Each discourse therefore entails internal variation and furthermore there are similarities across the discourses. The perusal of the articles, however, clearly showed the existence of the three dominating discourses: revolving around the subject of Greece and asylum. Referring to the theorisation on framing, it is important to accentuate that the naming of these discourse can also be characterised as an act of framing. The titles chosen for the discourses, will thus inevitably lead the reader to certain interpretations and associations.

The following critical discourse analysis will analyse an article representing each of the dominating discourses in order to fully comprehend, how the discourses are displayed. To represent the discourses most accurately, the three chosen articles represent the three initial frames entailing the largest number of articles, and the critical discourse analysis investigating the sympathy discourse will take its starting point in the article: *“På tirsdag skal de videre. Nordpå. Bare væk”[[10]](#footnote-10)*, which is also representing the initial frame: Sympathy for asylum seekers in Greece and/or Italy + scepticism. The discourse on border control will firstly be represented by the article: *“Græsk asylkaos rammer Danmark”[[11]](#footnote-11),* initially representing the frame: Focus on Denmark & Border control. The critical discourse analysis on solidarity, will be conducted on the article “POLITIKEN MENER: Usolidarisk”[[12]](#footnote-12), which is part of the initial frame: Internal & external solidarity + redistribution”.

## 3.1 The Sympathy Discourse - “På tirsdag skal de videre. Nordpå. Bare væk”[[13]](#footnote-13)

This article was published on the 22nd of January 2011 in Politiken, the day after the verdict in the case of M.S.S vs. Greece and Belgium. Bo Søndergaard, who is editorial manager of domestics, is the author.

The article is initiated by the statement: *“På tirsdag skal de videre. Nordpå. Bare væk”[[14]](#footnote-14)* (Søndergaard 22.01.2011, p 1 l. 1)

 *“Det græske asylsystem fungerer så dårligt, at flygtninge kæmper for at undgå at blive en del af det. Moheb Shahrani og hans familie lever under jorden.”[[15]](#footnote-15)* (Søndergaard 22.01.2011, p 1 l. 2-3)

The quote demonstrates, how both heading and subheading indicate where the sympathy is placed. The journalist does not directly quote Moheb, however, it is strongly indicated that he possess an in depth knowledge of Moheb’s story. The vocabulary and the use of the term *refugee* instead of for instance *migrant, undocumented refugee* or *asylum seeker* is interesting because the journalist thereby indicates that the people in question are de facto entitled to protection. The quotes are entangled in a certain hopelessness; and so the phrase *“Bare væk”* indicates that the situation in Greece is so grim that any other place will be an improvement. The vocabulary used to describe the Greek asylum system: *så dårligt* that refugees avoid it, also determines that the sympathy lies with the refugees and not the Greek authority. Implicitly the wording also places responsibility on Greece.

The article takes its starting point in Moheb’s story. Moheb is quoted throughout the article. He is presented as trustworthy, sympathetic and caring. Accordingly, the journalist does not question Moheb’s statements. The following quote is an example of the positive presentation of Moheb.

 *“Hun* [[his daughter]](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bracket#Square_brackets_.5B_.5D) *kravler op og sætter sig på hans lår og peger på de blomster, der er på hendes jakke. Han aer hendes runde brune kind med tommelfingeren, men ser ikke ned på barnet.”[[16]](#footnote-16)* (Søndergaard 22.01.2011: 1 l 7-8)

Moheb is presented as caring and loving towards his daughter. According to Fairclough’s theory the journalist creates a specific social identity for Moheb by referring to him in specific terms. The quote, however, also expresses the suffering Moheb experiences. It can be argued that the last part stating that he does not look at his daughter, is referring to the restlessness and unease Moheb is experiencing due to the situation. The article further increases the sympathy; the reader should not only feel sympathy for Moheb because he is in a difficult situation. The sympathy is also tied to his character. The double sympathy is also present in the next quote:

 *“Jeg har ikke flere penge, vi spiser kun en gang om dagen, nogle dage er det kun børnene som får noget”[[17]](#footnote-17)* (Søndergaard 22.01.2011: 2 l. 6-7)

Moheb expresses the hopeless situation again and the journalist presents the statement as being indisputable, which makes the modality of the expression high and makes it hard not to feel sympathy for Moheb. This is further enhanced because the quote states that Moheb puts his children first and the sympathy becomes two-sided.

The trustworthiness tied to Moheb, also shows in the journalist only once asking Moheb an elaborating question. Moheb has explained to the journalist that they have to leave Greece and go north. The journalist questions if it is wise of Moheb to travel so far with his children. To which Moheb answers:

 “Hvad vil du have jeg skal gøre? Blive her og sove på gaden? Jeg har ikke en gang et tæppe vi kan tage over os.”[[18]](#footnote-18) (Søndergaard 22.01.2011: 2 l. 31-32)

Moheb’s answer thus brushes off any indication that he could be acting wrongly. His choice is presented as the only one possible in a desperate and unfair situation. Referring to Fairclough’s concept power of assertion, it can be argued that the presentation of Moheb and his situation combined with a strong affinity contribute to creating a system of knowledge, arguing that the reader should feel sorry for Moheb as well as stating that Moheb himself is not responsible for being in this situation.

Hence, the article uses the vocabulary and the modality to create sympathy for Moheb. However, even though the sympathy is strongly stated, the article also entails small elements indicating suspicion towards the motives of asylum seekers:

 *“Nogle flygter fra krig og for at redde livet, andre jager job og penge. Men for dem alle gælder en ting – det var ikke her på Victoriapladsen, rejsen skulle ende (…) De kommer for at få asyl, men ikke her i landet, hvor økonomien er sunket i grus, mens arbejdsløsheden stiger.”[[19]](#footnote-19)* (Søndergaard 22.01.2011: 1 l. 16-21)

The quote states that some are there only due to financial reasons, which indirectly justifies to generally questioning people’s motives. Furthermore, the last sentence states that Greece is not an attractive place for asylum seekers and the phrasing indicates that asylum seekers are strategic in their choice of destination.

Earlier in the article, the journalist chose the word *sneget[[20]](#footnote-20)* (Søndergaard 22.01.2011: 1, l. 14) when explaining how the people crossed the Greek border. Sneaked is negatively charged and indicates that someone is acting incorrect or even illegal. Choosing a negatively charged word indicates and justifies a certain amount of suspicion. The article is thus slightly ambiguous. The sympathy is dominating, however, the sympathy seems to be directed solely towards Moheb. Therefore, the perspective of the article remains on an individual level and the article does not suggest that the situation of Moheb is equivalent to other undocumented refugees living in Greece. Staying on the individual level also keeps the article from taking action or directly placing responsibility. The question of why the situation in Greece is a severe as it is, or what measures could be done to improve it, is not presented.

### 3.1.1 Summarising the Sympathy Discourse

Withholding from suggesting solutions and not dealing with the reasons for the situation in Greece is also common for other articles in the sympathy category. Many of them quote migrants or undocumented refugees living in Greece and recognises that the situation is extremely difficult, however, the articles are not concerned with changing the situation or investigating explanatory factors.

The articles have narrative elements. They become very descriptive and all the articles dominated by the sympathy discourse express sympathy towards asylum seekers in one way or another. However, for most of the articles within the category, the sympathy is expressed with a certain reservation; either in the form of scepticism or suspicion towards asylum seekers. So, an article published in Morgenavisen Jyllandsposten states: *“Nogle er reelle flygtninge, andre er lykkeriddere.”[[21]](#footnote-21)* (Broberg 19.01.2011a: 1 l. 12) The quote thus justifies that some scepticism is present, since some of the asylum seekers applying for asylum are not entitled to protection. Other articles entail a reservation in the sense that they besides expressing sympathy towards asylum seekers are also sympathetic towards the actions of the Greek police and the Greek population. Hence, another article dominated by the sympathy discourse bear the headline: *“Grækerne kan ikke klare mere”[[22]](#footnote-22)* (Søndergaard 22.01.2011a: 1, l.1). Already in the headline this article displays sympathy towards Greece and the Greek population. The reservation or reduction in sympathy can also be seen in the article: *“Udvisninger: Juraproffesor: Italien krænker migranters rettigheder”*[[23]](#footnote-23) from Information. In this article the journalist seems to accept that the Italian government are not interested in receiving refugees at all. Paradoxically, the article shows sympathy for refugees, however, at the same time indirectly recognises that a majority of countries, rightfully, are not interested in receiving refugees. (Frese 16.05.2011: 1)

## 3.2 The Discourse on Border Control - “Græsk asylkaos rammer Danmark”[[24]](#footnote-24)

This article is written by journalist Mads Bonde Broberg and was published in Morgenavisen Jyllandsposten on the same date as the former, the 22nd of January 2011. As with the former article’s heading and subheading, the frame of this article is likewise expressed very explicitly in the beginning of the article: *“Græsk asylkaos rammer Danmark”* [[25]](#footnote-25)(Broberg 22.1.2011b: 1 l. 1)

The heading uses the word chaos and indicates that Greece is responsible for the chaotic situation. Denmark is represented as powerless, in that it *hits Denmark* and therefore Denmark is forced to deal with the consequences. The heading is followed by a subheading stating:

 *“Flygtninge: Asylansøgere som kommer til EU via Grækenland, har nu mulighed for at få ophold som flygtninge i Danmark, vurderer en ekspert.”* [[26]](#footnote-26)(Broberg 22.1.2011b: 1, l. 2-3)

The subheading states that all asylum seekers in Greece have the opportunity to acquire residence in Demark. The subheading uses overestimation and simplification. Accordingly, the journalist chooses not to mention that undocumented asylum seekers in Greece also have the opportunity to hand in their asylum application in other countries than in Denmark. It also neglects to explain that the undocumented asylum seekers have to arrive physically in Denmark to obtain the possibility to apply and last but not least, the journalist equals asylum seeker with refugees. However, even if the undocumented asylum seekers manage to go to Denmark and apply for asylum, they are not guaranteed residence. Analysing the wording and the cohesion of the sentence, it can be argued that the simplification and inaccuracy is applied in order to frighten the reader and indicate that something uncontrollable and undesirable is awaiting Denmark. The sentence is supported and justified by stating that an expert assesses the claim.

The article is revolving around the newly pronounced ruling, that states how undocumented asylum seekers, can no longer be returned to Greece, because the conditions in the country are inconsistent with the Human Rights regulations. However, only one line (Broberg 22.1.2011b : 1 l. 23) is preserved for explaining these conditions.

The article has two main focuses. One of which is how the Greek asylum ”chaos” and the verdict in the European Court of Human Rights will affect Denmark. This is expressed explicitly in the heading of the article and also in the following citation, where the article quotes Henrik Dam Kristensen, member of the political party Socialdemokraterne:

 *“Jeg har svært ved at se nogen vej uden om, at vi også skal behandle de sager, der kommer hertil. Der er intet der tyder på, at problemerne i Grækenland forsvinder lige med det samme”*[[27]](#footnote-27)(Broberg 22.1.2011b: 2, l. 7-8)

The statement from Henrik Dam Kristensen expresses displeasure and disappointment with the fact that Denmark has to handle the cases. Hence, he articulates that he does not see any way around this, as if they have tried everything possible to avoid it. In the second sentence Henrik Dam Kristensen states that nothing indicates that the problems in Greece will disappear. The cohesion in the quote is focused on Denmark. The problems with the asylum situation in Greece and the prolonging of the crisis is therefore primarily articulated as being problematic in regards to Denmark in the sense that it is necessary to treat the asylum cases of undocumented asylum seekers arriving in Denmark from Greece.

The issue of what is not being expressed in the article is therefore also interesting. The situation for asylum seekers living in Greece is, as stated earlier, narrowed down to one short sentence consisting of 13 words: *“Asylsagerne hober sig op, mens asylansøgerne lever på gaden eller under slum-lignende forhold”[[28]](#footnote-28)* (Broberg 22.1.2011b: 1 l. 23). Furthermore, the article does not explicitly articulate that European countries, including Denmark, have to process the cases of undocumented asylum seekers arriving in their countries from Greece. Hence, the focus remains on Denmark.

As written, the article also has another focus. This revolves around better and more efficient border control. This is expressed in one of the article’s subheadings stating: *“Bedre control”[[29]](#footnote-29)* (Broberg 22.1.2011b: 2 l.15) and also in the following quote:

 *“Han* [Peter Skaarup] *opfordrer til bedre kontrol af såvel EU’s ydre grænser som den danske ditto. “Når der er så hullet en grænsekontrol, får man alt for mange sager, der skal behandles. Det ligger pres på hele EU, at Grækenland ikke kan finde ud af at kontrollere sin grænser (…) det er endnu et godt argument for, at vi har en ordentlig grænsekontrol i Danmark”[[30]](#footnote-30)* (Broberg 22.1.2011b: 2 l. 17-18)

The quote is focused on border control. Lack of border control is expressed as the reason for the undesirable situation and more and stricter border control is presented as the only solution to the situation. This argument is further enhanced by the structure of the article, which firstly presents the negative consequences for Denmark and then ending the article by presenting one solution.

### 3.2.1 Summarising the Discourse on Border Control

Starting out by introducing the Danish consequences and closing the article with a solution: border control, is the case for many of the other articles revolving around the discourse on border control as well. However, the articles articulating the discourse have different angles, some expands their perspective and are concerned with protecting EU as a whole, while the answer remains to be more sufficient border control. Other articles to a large extend criminalise asylum seekers and suggest a stricter border control to restrain this issue. Commonly, the articles all share their focus on border control and the perspective of presenting something for the readers to be afraid of. Consequently, the situation for asylum seekers in Greece is mainly presented as something threatening our society, rather than being presented as a humanitarian crisis causing problematic living conditions for a large group of undocumented asylum seekers. In one of the articles published by Morgenavisen Jyllandsposten, the journalist quotes many of the non socialist parties and phrasings such as *“frygter stor trafik til Danmark”[[31]](#footnote-31)* (Broberg 25.01.2011: 1 l.3) and *“(…) en flodbølge af asylansøgere”[[32]](#footnote-32)* (Broberg 25.01.2011: 1 l.3) as well as *“De skal i hvert fald ikke have opholdstilladelse her (…)”[[33]](#footnote-33)* (Broberg 25.01.2011: 1 l. 18) are articulated. All three quotes categorises asylum seekers as something to fear and something that should be avoided. Furthermore, the quotes also withhold the internal focus dominating the discourse on border control. The consequences for Denmark remain the priority in the articles. The inward-looking perspective is general for the articles dominated by the discourse on border control. Here, the focus is either on the consequences for Denmark or on the consequences for EU, and it does not give particular concern to the asylum seekers or refugees.

Similar to the article analysed, many of the other articles that are dominated by the discourse on border control merely articulate more and stricter border control as the solution to the asylum situation in Greece. Accordingly, many of the articles revolve around the poor border control on Greece and articulate this as the main reason for the current asylum situation. In an article published in Berlingske Tidende the issue of illegal immigration is the focus and here border control also seems to be the only possible solution. The article pays a great deal of focus on Frontex’s border operation and articulates in positive frames the increased border control on the Greek-Turkey border. The Danish minister of justice, who is the author of the article, ends the article by stating: *“(…) EU skal fortsætte med at gennemføre handlingsplanen* *og fastholde den hårde kurs mod ulovlig indvadring.”[[34]](#footnote-34)* (Bødskov 25.10.2012: 2 l. 39-40) Consequently, the EU-actions regarding border control are presented as being positive and effective.

All of the articles concerning border control seem positively disposed towards border control and the majority further articulates a need for more and stricter border control.

## 3.3 The Solidarity Discourse - “POLITIKEN MENER: Usolidarisk”[[35]](#footnote-35)

The third article analysed represents the solidarity discourse, which is represented in 22 of the 84 articles. The article is published by Politiken on the 25th of January 2011 and written by Anita Bay Bundegaard, who is editorial manager of the paper’s culture and debate section and editor of the leader college on Politiken. The article can therefore be said to represent a joint opinion by Politiken.

Similar to the first two articles analysed in this critical discourse analysis, the third article also has a very explicit heading and subheading, strongly indicating the position of the article. Hence, the article already in the heading indicates the frame of the article and the discourse surrounding the article:

 *“POLITIKEN MENER: Usolidarisk”[[36]](#footnote-36)* (Bundegaard 25.01.2011: 1 l. 1)

 *“Kun en fælles EU-asylpolitik, der fordeler asylansøgere solidarisk, kan skabe orden i kaos.”[[37]](#footnote-37)* (Bundegaard 25.01.2011: 1 l. 2)

The above quoted heading and subheading indicates dissatisfaction towards the current policies. The heading saying: *Not solidary* both articulates critique and accusation. The Danish word *usolidarisk[[38]](#footnote-38)* is a strong and negatively charged term. The modality of the sentence is strong and the statement is presented without insecurity or ambiguity. Followed by the subheading stating that the only solution to improving the situation is a common European asylum policy that redistributes asylum seekers jointly, the article has already after just two sentences clarified its position.

The text explicitly criticises the then government (Constituted by the political parties Venstre and De Konservative) and the then Minister of integration Birthe Rønn Hornbech, from the political party Venstre for not promptly acting on the verdict put forward by the European Court of justice, the critique is proposed in a slightly degrading manner:

 *“De eneste, der ikke straks forstod dommens klarhed var den danske regering og integrationsminister Birthe Rønn Hornbech.”[[39]](#footnote-39)* (Bundegaard 25.01.2011: 1: l. 11-12)

Accordingly, the article ridicules the government by indicating that one should be unintelligent not to understand the unambiguity of the verdict. The sentence, however, does more than ridicule the government. The power of assertion in the sentence is strong, and as the statement is presented as being indisputable it also articulates to the reader that she/he should be of the same opinion.

In contrast to the two prior articles, this one does not use any quotes. The solidarity discourse is strong throughout the article as the journalist’s statements stands alone:

 *“(…) efterhånden er forordningen blevet en dybt usolidarisk aftale, som overlader til de EU-lande, der har de svageste asylsystemer, at bære den største byrde.”[[40]](#footnote-40)* (Bundegaard 25.01.2011: 1. L. 18-20)

The modality in the sentence is high; by using the word *er* the statement is presented as indisputable. Furthermore, the article once again claims the led policy to be *usolidarisk* and indicates that the EU-countries should be acting in solidarity with one another. Furthermore, the quote indicates a discourse, which considers the matter to be a joint EU-issue. This can also be seen in the articles´ last paragraph that states:

 *“Det græske asylkaos er en konsekvens af en forfejlet EU-politik og dermed også hele EU’s ansvar. Og den eneste måde, det kan bringes i orden på, er ved at erstatte Dublinforordningen med et system, der fordeler asylansøgerne på de enkelte EU- lande efter en solidarisk model.”[[41]](#footnote-41)* (Bundegaard 25.01.2011: 1 l. 29-30)

The modality and unambiguity is strong throughout the article and in this particular quote. Redistribution of asylum seekers is thus proclaimed to be the only solution. Furthermore the Greeks are not being ascribed any certain responsibility for the situation, the asylum issue in Greece is presented to be solely caused by the European asylum policy. Ergo the message of the article is underlined.

### 3.3.1 Summarising the Solidarity Discourse

The solidarity discourse contains internal variations and the degree and the form of solidarity differs across the 26 articles. Generally, the articles all recognise the uneven burden of the distribution and articulate either implicitly or explicitly that Denmark also hold a responsibility. Furthermore the majority of the articles mention the term solidarity. The variation occurs when it comes to defining what the solidarity entails. Some of the articles do not put forward concrete answers, others suggest helping in the immediate vicinity of the conflicts, and others explicitly state that redistribution of asylum seekers is not an option.

An article featured in Morgenavisen Jyllandsposten refers to Minister of Justice Morten Bødskov, who refers to the Dublin Regulation and states that it should still be the first EU-country, who has the responsibility of processing the asylum claim. In this article internal solidarity among the EU-states is presented as giving expertise to the countries, who themselves cannot handle the situation. (Plousgaard & Elbæk Maressa 07.03.2012)

An article published by Information bears the headline: *“Rønn og Grækenland Danmark vil hjælpe med asyl”* (Information 12.02.2011: 1 l. 1) and thereby insinuates that Denmark will help Greece. In the article this help is exemplified: *“De to organisationer* [[Danish Red Cross and The Danish Refugee council]](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bracket#Square_brackets_.5B_.5D)*kan hjælpe Grækenland med at opbygge et asylsystem.”* (Information 12.02.2011: 1 l. 3-4) Neither, the type of help that this article is referring to includes redistribution of asylum seekers.

Correspondingly, an article in Politiken shows elements of solidarity. However, according to Søren Pind, former Minister of Refugee- and Integration: *“Hvis det kan håndteres i nærområderne, er det langt at foretrække.”* (Davidsen-Nielsen 20.03.2011: 1 l. 29-30) This statement indicates that the solidarity is not a question of redistribution, it can also entail helping in the immediate vicinity of a conflict area.

So even though half of the articles entailed in the Solidary discourse favour redistribution and very explicitly articulates a joint European responsibility for the asylum seekers living in Greece, the discourse also entail strong statements rejecting this type of solidarity. The article “Politiken mener: Usolidarisk” can thus be categorised as entailing the most extreme type of solidarity present in the solidarity discourse.

## 3.4 A View Across the Discourses

In order to obtain a through picture of the Danish media’s articulation of the asylum situation in Greece, the following paragraph contains a comparative analysis of the three discourses. Having elucidated the three discourses it is interesting to investigate how the discourses are represented over time. The following model illustrates the timeframe of the discourses.

**Model 3: The Timeframe of the Discourses**

The graphics demonstrates that all discourses are most significantly presented in the immediate period following the verdict (2011 January-June). Referring to model 3 it is plausible that the passing of the verdict in the M.S.S. vs. Greece and Belgium has had influence on the Danish media coverage of the asylum situation in Greece and that the coverage of the asylum situation in Greece in the Danish media has been almost absent in the first two months of 2013. It can thus be argued that the verdict has increased the awareness on the asylum situation in Greece. The model further demonstrates that the sympathy discourse is the more equitable distributed discourse of the three discourses, however, the variations among their time range is not conspicuous.

Comparing and examining the discourses, demonstrates how the discourse on border control and the discourse on solidarity are more action-oriented than the discourse on sympathy. The discourse on sympathy is less concerned with the reasons for or solutions to the situation. Instead the articles dominated by the sympathy discourse prioritise to describe on an individual level, which consequences the asylum situation in Greece entails.

The discourse on border control and the discourse on solidarity both have a focus on action and articulate that measures need to be taken towards the situation in Greece. However, the inducements and the solutions are different. According to Fairclough’s perspectives on the abilities of discourse, the systems of knowledge being proposed by the two discourses are very different. Using the languages ideational functions differently the discourses creates different belief- and knowledge systems. Interestingly, even though they differ, the two discourses do entail similarities. When comparing the argumentation in the articles entailing a solidarity discourse, which rejects redistribution, with the argumentation present in the articles dominated by the border control similarities and overlap appear. Consequently, solidarity is in some cases also expressed as collaborating on border control and a restrain of immigration.

Another interesting aspect of the discourses analysis and obvious question to ask is: How the discourses are represented in the different newspaper media? The research project has examined the distribution of the discourses across the different articles to see if a discourse was only represented in a particular newspaper. However, the distribution is found to be relatively equal and the findings are not included. The model illustrating the distribution across the newspapers is enclosed as appendix B.

In the following section the theoretical framework of this research project will be presented. The theory will enable the research project to fully execute the methodology presented by Fairclough. The theoretical framework will lay the foundation for analysing and discussing the presented discourses on a broader socio-political level.

# 4. Securitization - The Theoretical Framework

According to Fairclough it is essential also to understand the discourse as a social practice. In order to do so, it is, however, necessary to include theoretical aspects that can draw lines from the text analysis into the society embedding the discourses. In the following section, this research project will present the theoretical framework, which will constitute the foundation of Fairclough’s third dimension *the social practices* and thereby enable the critical discourse analysis to investigate the arisen discourse in a socio-theoretical setting.

When conducting the critical discourse analysis, it became clear that the arisen discourses contained elements of the theoretical and social constructivist concept *securitization*. This research project argues that the concept of securitization is particularly useful in order to understand, how the arisen discourses function in wider society and in a euro-political optic. The theoretical aspects of securitization enable this research projects to fulfil the methodological guidelines provided by Fairclough and elevate the discourse from their immediate setting in order to analysis and investigate them on a societal level. Anthropological observations have been used to elaborate on one of the chosen concepts.

## 4.1 The Theoretical Field of Securitization

The concept *securitization* origins from the work of Ole Wæver. According to Wæver the term security has developed from being a question regarding a state’s ability to retain its sovereignty and protect itself from external threats posed by other states into being a broader concept not only focusing on military defence. (Wæver 1995: 3-4) According to Wæver, when addressing an issue in security terms, the issues is proposed as a threat, which means that certain measures are accepted to avoid or fight this threat. (Wæver 1995: 24-26)

Two schools; the Copenhagen school of security and the Paris school of security have since dominated the theoretical field concerning securitization. (Lemberg-Pedersen 2012: 24). Moreover a third school of security exists: The Aberystwyth school of security, which in terms of the two former is most closely related to the Copenhagen school of security. (C.A.S.E Collective 2006: 446) Wæver has been part of developing the Copenhagen school of security.

It is artificial to speak of the three schools as absolutely opposing movements. (C.A.S.E Collective 2006: 446) Nevertheless some differences do exist. The Copenhagen school is centred around the extraordinary politics, whereas the Paris school of security is more concentrated on the ordinary and daily processes that form the politics. (Lemberg-Pedersen 2012: 23) Furthermore, the Copenhagen school regards the securitization as entirely constituted by speech acts in which e.g. the EU-Member States announce an issue to be an existential threat and therefore demand the right to use extraordinary measures to counter it. Accordingly the Copenhagen school can be said to approach the subject of securitization in a discursive manner, in which a process of discursive steps develops a concept (etc. immigration) into a security issue and thereby legalising and demanding certain actions. (Lemberg-Pedersen 2012: 24) At first the approach of the Copenhagen school can therefore seem to be adequate for the analyses in question, as both are placed within the social constructivist field of science and focused on the discursive processes. However, a problem occurs when wanting to understand the arisen discourses in the view of the Copenhagen school. The Copenhagen school views security as a state matter, arguing that states: “(…) *are the prime vehicles of securitization.”* (Lemberg-Pedersen 2012: 25 l. 25-26) The research project entails the assumption that there are several actors involved in the process of securitization, states being one. However, this research project argues that media presentation is also part of the securitization process. This research project finds that the approach of the Copenhagen school neglects this aspect and the research project will instead turn to the Paris school of security, in which the securitization is argued to develop through daily process, involving a variety of actors and taking place in formal as well as informal networks. (Lemberg-Pedersen 2012: 26). In contrast to the Copenhagen School, the Paris school of security varies in its disciplinary starting point, and the school both represents works that origin form international relations, sociology, criminology etc., however, all having a common interest in policing as a structural practices. (C.A.S.E Collective 2006: 449) Several theorists represent the Paris school of security. In this research project, the work of Jef Huysmans on the securitization of migration in the European Union has been chosen as the dominating theory for understanding the discourses arisen in the critical discourse analysis.

## 4.2 Securitization of Migration

In order to fully comprehend how the concept of securitization can be applied in regards to the research question, Huysmans’ theoretical work concerning securitization of migration and the European Union will be introduced. Huysmans focuses on migration, however, mentioning that this also includes asylum seekers. (Huysmans 2000: 751) Furthermore, his approach to the concept securitization is wide and also includes aspects from the anthropological field. Thus, this research project argues that several of Huysmans theoretical aspects can be successfully applied in order to understand the setting in which the arisen discourses are constituted and constitute their surroundings.

In the article: “*The European Union and the securitization of migration”* from 2000,Huysmans focuses on how migration has been connected to representations of societal dangers and how the development of a common European migration policy has affected the process of connecting the two. (Huysmans 2000: 752) The statements and arguments presented by Huysmans are founded in the field of securitization theory, and in the article Huysmans refers to several other theorist concerned with securitization.

In the article Huysmans deals with the development of a common European migration policy and how migration within the EU has been securitised. Huysmans states that:

 “(…) *the European integration process is implicated in the development of a restrictive migration policy and the social construction of migration into a security question*. (Huysmans 2000: 751 l. 9-11)

The quote establishes that securitization of migration is a present fact in the EU. The process of securitising migration started in the 1980, where the tendency grew towards regarding migration as a factor that was disrupting both domestic integration and public order. (Huysmans 2000: 751) Thus, the issue of the European internal market also became an issue of the internal security in Europe. Earlier in the 1950s and 1960s immigrants were dominantly regarded as extra workers and the financial market were depending on a low-priced and flexible workforce. (Huysmans 2000: 755) However, Huysmans argues that:

 *“(…) migration has been increasingly presented as a danger to public order, cultural identity and domestic labour market stability, it has been securitized”* (Huysmans 2000: 752 l. 11-12)

The quote illustrates that there has been a change in the way migration is regarded. Andrew Geddes also proposes this point in his book on “The politics of migration and immigration in Europe”. (Geddes 2005: 4) Huysmans further argues that the economical logic of the internal free European market has been transferred into a logic of security, and that a Europeanization of migration policy is integrated in this logic. (Huysmans 2000: 753) Implying that the question of migration has become a highly debated political question in the EU. (Favell 1998: 1)

## 4.3 The Securitization of Migration – A Conceptual Theoretical Framework

Huysmans argues that the securitization of migration in the EU has developed on the basis of three correlating issues: Internal security, cultural security and the crisis of the welfare state. (Huysmans 2000: 758) This research project has chosen relevant theoretical concepts from the article by Huysmans, and in the following the concepts will be outlined under the headings of the three core issues. Huysmans does not explicitly accentuate the concepts as theoretical analytical tools. However, this research project has chosen to develop a range of Huysmans theoretical considerations into a conceptual theoretical framework.

The conceptual framework will, as abovementioned, be presented under three different headings, however, it is important to accentuate that the three themes are regarded as corresponding and influencing each other. They should on these grounds not be regarded as three isolated processes.

### 4.3.1 Migration & The Internal Security

According to Huysmans the security threat of migration is connected with the removal of internal borders. A process of integrating asylum and immigration into a policy framework, where they are regarded as security issues occurring due to the removal of internal border control, has therefore successfully been established and the downgrading of internal borders has been linked to the need for strengthening the external border control. (Huysmans 2000: 753 & 759) Consequently, the securitization of migration and asylum is closely connected to the European integration and the internal marked, and an inherent threat seems to be incorporated in the removal of internal borders.

This research project finds that particularly three of the concepts used by Huysmans when discussing the link between securitization of migration and internal borders are relevant for understanding the discourses arisen in this critical discourse analysis. These are: *Delegitimization, naturalisation* and *meta issue.*

#### Delegitimization

In addition to the link between European integration, removal of internal borders and the securitization of migration Huysmans argues, that in the process of providing Europeans with rights due to their status as EU citizens, the EU is indirectly depriving non EU-citizens these rights and this is part of a *delegitimization,* where both the presence of asylum seekers, refugees and immigrants is regarded as not being legitimate. (Huysmans 2000: 753) There are close links between delegitimizingthe presence of immigrants and the concept *welfare chauvinism*, which will be presented under the heading “The welfare state and securitization of migration”.

#### Naturalisation

Huysmans presents another interesting aspect, when investigating the securitization of migration. Huysmans states that securitization of migration has been *naturalised* to the extent, where it seems impossible to testify. (Huysmans 2000: 758) As an example: it was proclaimed that the creation of the free market would enable illegal activities as well as increase the number of asylum seekers and immigrants. (Huysmans 2000: 760) The link between abolishing internal borders and the need for strengthening the external border control is thus naturalised. This logic involved the police as an institution and combined “(…) *border control with terrorism, international crime and migration.* (Huysmans 2000: 760 l. 18-19)

Huysmans proclaims that the security policies have been legitimised and are regarded as the only means to the issue of migration. This tendency is also clarified elsewhere in the article, as Huysmans expresses: In EU there is a *“(…) growing consensus about the need to restrict migration”* (Huysmans 2000: 753 l. 21). Hence, the securitization has been naturalised and the measures being taken in the name of security are not questioned. This is further illustrated in the quote below:

 “*The development of security discourses and policies in the area of migration is often presented as an inevitable policy response to the challenges for public order and domestic stability of the increases in number of (illegal) immigrants and asylum- seekers.”* (Huysmans 2000: 757 l.3-6)

On these grounds it can be argued that the politics of security has been naturalised. Huysmans hereto argues that the European countries have developed a normative policy response, when it comes to the issue of migration. In addition to the naturalisation Huysmans points out that whether European states directly or indirectly support the securitization strategies it makes it more difficult to included both asylum seekers and refugees in the European societies. (Huysmans 2000: 753)

#### Meta Issue

Another important point adduced by Huysmans is how labels such as *migration*, *foreigner* and *asylum seeker* has become powerful political signifiers in the EU, and how these are words often used when combining the internal security logic to political issues such as cultural identity and challenges to the welfare state. Huysmans proposes that migration has become a *“(…) meta issue, that is, a phenomenon that can be referred to as the cause of many problems.”* (Huysmans 2000: 761 l. 36-37 +762: l. 1) This leads this research project to examine how migration according to Huysmans is also a threat to the cultural security of the EU.

### 4.3.2 Migration & The Cultural Security

As the quote above indicates, migration has become a phenomenon, which is used in many different settings and as the accentuated concept meta issue explains, an explanatory factor for many societal and political challenges. Hence, Huysmans states that the securitization of migration can also be said to have developed under the heading: Cultural security and migration. This section will present five theoretical aspects, useful to investigate the arisen discourses and the connection between securitization of migration and cultural security. These are: *The politicisation of migration, protection of cultural identity, cultural homogeneity, Euro-racism* and *the paradox of EU migration policy.*

#### The Politicisation of Migration

The politicisation of migration is a concept similar to the concept Europeanization and yet another interesting aspect to accentuate from Huysmans article. Even though not particularly distinguishing immigrants from refugees and asylum seekers, Huysmans specifically points to the politicisation of asylum seekers:

 *“(…) Immigration has been increasingly politicized through the question of asylum, or more precisely through the (con)fusion of immigration and asylum. Asylum has been increasingly politicized as an alternative route for economic immigration in the EU.”* (Huysmans 2000: 755 l. 11-14)

According to Huysmans the politicisation of immigration has led the tendency towards not differentiating between the categories; immigrant, asylum seekers etc. and furthermore the asylum seekers’ motives for fleeing are increasingly being regarded as economical. In the quote Huysmans points the attention to another aspect of this politicisation:

 *“The cultural mixing resulting from migration is politicized on the ground that multicultural developments challenge the desire for coinciding cultural and political frontiers”* (Huysmans 2000: 762 l. 25-27)

The quote illustrates, how Huysmans argues that the cultural diversity in the EU, which is caused by migration, is being politicised in a way where it becomes accepted not to differentiate between politics and culture, and as a result the protection of cultural identity is being carried out politically. Subsequently, it has become natural also to regard the question of security as a question concerning culture and cultural protection.

#### Protection of Cultural Identity & Cultural Homogeneity

The next two concepts being outlined are closely interlinked and will therefore be jointly presented. These are: *protection of cultural identity* and *cultural homogeneity.* According to Huysmans the issue of migration has also evolved in a political sphere concerned with the question of belonging. The protection of cultural identity is a fundamental concern by which the criteria for belonging are connected with migration. (Huysmans 2000: 762) Huysmans argues that immigrants in the EU are presented as *challenging the myth of national cultural homogeneity*. (Huysmans 2000: 762 l. 18-19) This understanding together with the comprehensive media coverage involving e.g. immigrants in riots is supporting the creation of a picture of migration as a cultural danger and something to protect the union against. Huysmans further argues, that there are claims that migration threatens nationalism, social values and political as well as social integration. (Huysmans 2000: 763). The understanding of cultural homogeneity within the EU is a precondition for the need for protection of the cultural identity.

Huysmans accentuates that the idea of cultural homogeneity is a myth. Other theorists also question the belief that culture should be tied to a place. Gupta & Fergusson e.g. problematize the understanding of “cultural differences” and the way we take for granted that each country entails its own individual culture (Gupta & Fergusson 1992: 6) Gupta and Fergusson urge the reader to focus on and investigate, how this naturalisation of cultural differences between countries take place.

Huysmans further states that these discourses, which represent migration as a cultural challenge to both social and political integration, have become essential in the rhetoric of security (Huysmans 2000: 762).

In the setting where the issue of migration and asylum is politicised, immigrants and asylum seekers are often pictured as being culturally different. (Huysmans 2000: 763) The quote below states that this view of migrants is also present in policy work:

 *“Integration policies often, at least indirectly, uphold the assumption that a culturally uniform society existed before migration started, irrespective of whether the policy expresses a desire for re-establishing the foregone homogeneity (…) Migrants emerge as late arrivers who disrupted a culturally homogenous space (…)”* (Huysmans 2000: 765 l. 17-22)

The quote illustrates the idea of the European societies being orderly and culturally homogenous and that migration is being regarded as in someway disrupting the cultural order, an assumption also opposing the view of e.g. Gupta & Fergusson.

#### Euro-Racism

Huysmans states that it can even be argued that the EU is developing a certain sense of racism:

 *“(…) racism also plays a role in the regulation of inclusion and exclusion of migrants. While nationalism is a cultural discourse, racism is a biological discourse that unifies a community in the name of somatic or biological criteria such as skin, colour, height, facial characteristics etc. The argument is that the EU develops an Euro-racism*.” (Huysmans 2000: 764 l. 14-19)

The arguments against immigration are therefore not entirely bound on cultural concerns; some seem to be arguing on a logic of race. Huysmans, however, also states that other viewpoints are present. Hence, one of the pro-arguments for a Common European Asylum System is that a common system will function as a safeguard towards racism and xenophobia in Europe. Subsequently, different anti-racist and pro-migration movements are rising across Europe to support the rights of asylum seekers and immigrants. According to Huysmans this politicisation of a non-racist Europe can be an indication that Europe fears a potential return of the past. (Huysmans 2000: 765)

#### The Paradox of EU Migration Policy

Correspondingly, Huysmans points to an interesting paradox in the development of a common EU migration policy. The policies often portray immigrants and asylum seekers negatively and as a problematic burden, the policies are thus indirectly sustaining the nationalistic and racist responses towards immigrants and asylum seekers, while simultaneously working to decrease racism, nationalism and xenophobia. (Huysmans 2000: 766) In addition to this observation Huysmans warns against reducing the question of migration to primarily concerning their cultural identity. (Huysmans 2000: 767)

### 4.3.3 The Welfare State & The Securitization of Migration

The political process in which migration is connected with crime and terrorism is part of a wider politicization, where immigrants and asylum seekers are depicted as a challenge to both the national identity and the welfare state. (Huysmans 2000: 751) This section will focus on, how the securitization of migration is related to the security of the welfare state, and in doing so accentuating the concepts: *Welfare chauvinism*, *immigration magnet* and *scapegoats*.

#### Welfare Chauvinism

Welfare chauvinism is a concept summarising the assumption that the provisions of the welfare state should be preserved for some. (Huysmans 2000: 770) The development of a common migration policy is according to Huysmans part of a political process:

 *“The development of a common migration policy in the EU is embedded in wider political and professional processes that articulate an endangered society.”* (Huysmans 2000: 752 l. 4-6)

The quote illustrates how migration is represented as something threatening the good life of the western European societies and the people belonging to these states. Huysmans points out that the issue of belonging is not only related to your cultural and national identity it is also a question of whether you have access to social and economic rights. (Huysmans 2000: 767) In other words the question of belonging is also a question of being part of the welfare state and having access to welfare benefits. Immigrants and asylum seekers are increasingly regarded as not having any genuine rights to these welfare provisions, (Huysmans 2000: 767) and asylum-seekers and immigrants tend to be securitized in the debate concerning the future welfare state. This is the attitude that Huysmans refers to as welfare chauvinism.

It can on these grounds be argued that migration is not only regarded as a threat to internal security and cultural security it is also regarded as threatening the European welfare states.

#### A Magnet-effect

Closely linked to the welfare chauvinism is another relevant concept connecting the welfare provisions with migration: *“Moreover, offering welfare provisions is presented as a magnet pulling migrants into the EU.”* (Huysmans 2000: 767 l. 32-36) The quote illustrates, how the link between the welfare state and the securitization of migration is not only concerned with the aspect: How can the European welfare states survive, when so many people “unjustified” should gain access to the benefits? The welfare state is also enrolled in the issue because it is commonly proposed that the well functioning welfare states functions as a magnet, attracting large numbers of immigrants and asylum seekers. Consequently, the asylum seekers’ need for protection and the reasons why they flee are often put to the background, in favour of demonstrating them as strategic and financially speculated in their choice of destination.

#### Justified Scepticism

The 11th and last concept that will be presented is justified scepticism. This is not a phrasing used directly by Huysmans, however, this research project finds that the concept can be established by referring to Huysmans, and furthermore the concept can be of relevance in order to analyse the articles. According to Huysmans the restrictive policy led by the EU combined with turning migration into a security issue and favoring free movement for EU-citizens at the expense of citizens from non-state members retains the picture of refugees and immigrants as scapegoats and a socio-economic struggle for the preservation of the welfare state.

Even though Huysmans choses to separate the aspects of threat to cultural security and threat to welfare state, the two are interlinked. The question of belonging to the welfare state has, even though this is a social policy area, increasingly been turned into a question of cultural identity. (Huysmans 2000: 768) Thus, politicians and others opposed to immigration portray immigrants and asylum seekers as: “(…) *strangers who exploit the society that is so kind to house them.”* (Huysmans 2000: 768 l. 30-31) and metaphors *“(…) such as an “invasion” or “flood” of asylum seekers* (Huysmans 2000: 769 l. 6-7) is also frequently used to disqualify migrants from the welfare systems. The articulation of migration as a threat to the welfare state and depicting them as scapegoats and somebody seeking to exploit others is therefore also becoming a part of the securitization of migration. Combining the disqualification, the reference to the military term *invasion* or the nature phenomenon *flood* as well as the general picture of asylum seekers being a threat both to economy and culture it can be agued that an accepted sense of scepticism has emerged a scepticism that is presented as justified.

In the following analysis, the theoretical framework constituted by Huysmans’s insights on the securitization of migration in the EU will be applied to investigate the third dimension of Fairclough’s analytical model: the social practice. Huysmans’ theorising brings many relevant aspects to understanding the arisen discourse outside their discursive setting on a socio-political level.

# 5. Which Consequences do the Discourses Entail?

The theory on securitization can help us understand the discourses outside the realm of the article and understand what consequences the discourses have for the issue of asylum. In this section the discourses will be examined by using the conceptual theoretical framework operationalized in the section on theory. The research project is based on the social constructivist belief that discourses exert an influence on the available means of action as well as the available policy options. This research project has now analysed which discourses dominate the Danish newspapers when dealing with the issue of asylum and European responsibility. The following analysis will by referring to the conceptual theoretical framework analyse which effects these discourses exert on the debate on asylum in Europe.

Relating the arisen discourses with the presented theory, the research project found three themes to be of particular interest when dealing with the consequences of the discourses. It can thus be argued that when relating the three discourses arisen in the critical discourse analysis with the theoretical concepts of Huysmans, the discourses show signs of entailing similar principles. The following analysis, will therefore both refer to the discourses separately and jointly in order to illustrate and analyse their common features.

Additionally, the analysis aims to determine the range of the discourses. The analysis will therefore include an example of the discourses displaying themselves outside the articles.

On these grounds the research project will analyse if and how the discourses are present in the objectives of the Common European Asylum System (CEAS). The research project will thus investigate if and how the principles outlined in the theoretical analysis are present in the objectives of the CEAS. The objectives of the CEAS thus constitute an example, where the discourses could be present outside of the articles. In order to answer the research question it is necessary to clarify the extent of the principles dominating in the media debate. Accordingly, discussing if and how the principles found in the media debate are present in the objectives of the CEAS will enable the research project to clarify the range of the principles and answer the research question.

The theoretical discussion of the discourses as well as the analysis of the discourses presence in the CEAS objectives are part of Fairclough’s third dimension, the social practice introduced on page 16. By including CEAS, the research project is including a practical example in Fairclough’s social practice. Thus, the discussion is entailing a policy document, which is part of the socio-political context in which the discourses in the newspaper articles are present. This research project argues that it is relevant to investigate if and how the discourses also are present in the European asylum policies. The discussion will bring further understanding of the discourses, their range and effects.

Introductory the analysis will analyse the three analytical themes separately. This separation is analytical. In reality the three themes are highly interlinked. After each analytical theme, the findings will be related to the objectives of the CEAS in order to illustrate if the principles dominating the discourses are also present in the objectives of the CEAS. Conclusively, it will be discussed if and how the discourses in the media collide with the discourses in the objectives of the CEAS. Additionally, the research project will analyse what influence the discourses and the principles surrounding the discourses jointly exert on the subject of asylum.

Initially the objectives of the CEAS will be introduced. The objectives are outlined in the following textbox.

**The central objectives of the CEAS are:**

A genuinely coherent, comprehensive and integrated CEAS should:

– ensure **access for those in need of protection:** asylum in the EU must remain

accessible. Legitimate measures introduced to curb irregular migration and protect

external borders should avoid preventing refugees' access to protection in the EU while

ensuring a respect for fundamental rights of all migrants. This equally translates into

efforts to facilitate access to protection outside the territory of the EU;

– provide for a single, **common procedure** for reasons of efficiency, speed, quality and

fairness of the decisions;

– establish **uniform statuses** for asylum and for subsidiary protection, which share most

rights and obligations, whilst allowing for justified differences in treatment;

– incorporate **gender** considerations and take into account the special needs of

**vulnerable groups;**

– increase **practical cooperation** in order to develop, inter alia, common training, as well

as jointly assessing Country of Origin Information and organising support for Member

States experiencing particular pressures;

– determine **responsibility** and support **solidarity**: the CEAS must include rules on the

determination of the Member State responsible for examining an asylum application and

provide for genuine **solidarity** mechanisms, both within the EU and with third

countries;

– ensure **coherence with other policies** that have an impact on international protection,

notably: border control, the fight against illegal immigration and return policies.

(Commission of the European communities 2008)

As written, the analysis will analyse the objectives of CEAS under each of the three analytical themes. This will enable the research project to determine the range of the discourses.

## 5.1 Neglecting the Asylum Motive

According to the UN refugee convention a refugee is someone fleeing due to fear of persecution related to race, nationality, membership of a particular social group or their political opinion. However, the majority of the articles do not deal with the motives for fleeing and none of the article has this as their main focus. Accordingly, the conflicts and wars forcing people to flee are not a subject of particularly interest in the articles concerning asylum in Europe. Besides neglecting the asylum motive, the articles do not seem to accentuate the rights of refugees and asylum seekers. Under the following three subheadings the research project will thus discuss how neglecting the asylum motive manifest itself in the discourses. Conclusively, the findings will be compared to the objectives of the CEAS in order to discuss if the asylum motive is neglected in the political objectives.

### 5.1.1 The Conflicts Causing People to Flee

The articles dealing with the subject of motive are usually sceptic towards the asylum seekers and do not mention fear of persecution as the main reason for fleeing. Even though the sympathy discourse is concerned with the conditions for the refugees, it is not particularly focused on the underlying reasons for fleeing, and the sympathy is not associated with the situation the asylum seekers were fleeing from in their country of origin. More so the sympathy is related to their current condition as asylum seekers in e.g. Greece. Resulting in prior conditions and conflicts not being included or dealt with in the sympathy discourse.

In continuation the articles do not focus on the rights of asylum seekers and refugees. The UN Human Rights securing that everybody has the right to apply for asylum is also not a focus. Consequently, the articles tend to neglect that people applying for asylum are legally entitled to do so.

### 5.1.2 Economy Being the Motive

The issue of neglecting the asylum motive in the debate concerning asylum in Europe can also be understood by using the presented theoretical concept: justified scepticism. When the articles refer to asylum seekers as scapegoats it contributes to disqualifying their presence. The justified scepticism concept naturally entails a great deal of scepticism towards asylum seekers and refugees. A large amount of scepticism can also be seen in the newspaper articles. Both the discourse on border control and the sympathy discourse entail elements of scepticism. The articles thus suggest and assume that many other motives besides the ones being outlined in the UN refugee convention are at stake when people flee their own country and apply for asylum in the EU. In some of the articles the scepticism is even turning the asylum seekers into mendacious people. When the motives for fleeing are accentuated in the articles it is because the article is dealing with the economical motives for fleeing. Referring to the theoretical aspects proposed by Huysmans, the logic of the free market and the focus on economy can also be said to characterise the subject of asylum. In continuation hereof Huysmans introduces the concept politicisation of migration. This research project argues that the politicisation is also present in the articles entailed in the critical discourse analysis. Hence, the issue of asylum seekers is to a larger degree dealt with as a financial issue than an issue concerning the rights of human beings. It seems that the logic of economy becomes predominant and does not leave any room for the actual asylum motive – protection.

Many of the articles can thus be said to show signs of the delegitimization that Huysmans is referring to. Hence, one of the articles dominated by the discourse on border control, quote a Danish politician stating that asylum seekers in Greece definitely should not have a residence permit in Denmark. (Broberg 25.01.2011) Based on the critical discourse analysis it can be argued that when the asylum seekers motives for fleeing are understated or even completely neglected it is also easier to delegitimise the presence of asylum seekers.

The delegitimization of asylum seekers is thus strongly linked with the economical logic, as it seems asylum seekers in some of the articles, are turned into immigrants, that migrate with the sole purpose of getting a job and earning money. Accordingly, Dagbladet Information published an article stating:

 *“For et stort antal afghanere er køb af sådanne falsknerier blot den første af mange store udgifter, der vil være forbundet med det højrisikable forsøg på at skabe sig et ny liv I Vesten.”[[42]](#footnote-42)* (Boone & Bakshi 23.01.2012 l. 21-22)

The quote illustrates how the article indicates that it is the motive of a better life that encourages people to flee, other articles use the term: try one’s luck, when describing the motives for fleeing. Explicitly mentioning a group of people as illegal is of cause also part of disqualifying their presence as a group.

### 5.1.3 Concept Confusion

Further enhancing the delegitimization of asylum seekers in Europe is the tendency not to make a clear distinction between immigrants and asylum seekers. In many of the articles the terms seem to be used very randomly - shifting from one to the other. In other articles illegal immigrants and asylum seekers are written as if this was the same.

On these grounds it can be argued that a consequence of the dominating discourses; sympathy, border control and solidarity, is that the asylum motive is being neglected in the debate. Bearing in mind that journalists have to make delimitations when writing an article, their delimitations can have influential consequences for the understanding of the story. When the asylum motive is neglected, in the debate concerning asylum and joint responsibility in Europe, it becomes easier not to take responsibility. The need for asylum is understated and it can appear as if there is no need for granting asylum.

On this basis, the argument of this research project is that when the articles neglect to include the conflicts refugees are fleeing from, and instead pay a great deal of attention to the economical motives as well mixing up the concepts immigrants and asylum seekers, the need for asylum is devalued.

### 5.1.4 Neglecting the Asylum Motive in the Objectives of the CEAS?

Turing to the objectives of the CEAS, it can be argued that oppose to the discourses dominating the media, the CEAS do incorporate the rights of asylum seekers (“*ensure access for those in need of protection”* Commission on the European communities 2008: l. 3). Oppose to the discourses in the media, the CEAS does therefore not neglect the asylum seekers right for protection. The CEAS neither mix up the concepts of asylum seeker, refugee and immigrant nor introduce the element of fleeing for financial reasons. However, the CEAS like the articles included in the discourse analysis leaves out the conflicts causing people to flee. The reason why people flee is thus not included in the political objectives for the CEAS. The answer to whether or not the issue of neglecting the asylum motive in the objectives of the CEAS is thus not unambiguous, as it seems that few elements of the principles are present.

## 5.2 Focus on Internal Consequences

Another relevant focus emerging when considering the dominant discourses is the focus on internal consequences. This theme is closely related to the prior argument stating that the discourses neglect the motive for asylum. This section argues that the articles generally have an inward-looking approach to the subject of asylum in Europe, this argument will be stated by analysing how the articles tend to focus entirely on Denmark, how they delegitimise the presence of refugees and how only one solution is presented as an effective measure.

As in the prior section concerning neglect of the asylum motive, the analysis concerning the discourses tendency to focus on the internal consequences will also include a discussion on whether or not the findings are also present in the objectives of the CEAS.

### 5.2.1 Denmark as the Point of Reference

The following quotes illustrate how the articles tend to look at the consequences for Denmark. Morgenavisen Jyllandsposten writes: *“Det kunne ramme Norge eller Danmark”[[43]](#footnote-43)* (Broberg 26.01.2012a l.1) and Politiken writes: “Asyl: Flere syere søger til Danmark”[[44]](#footnote-44) (Davidsen-Nielsen 10.04.2012). In the articles Denmark is the main focus and the starting point. The concept of immigration magnet introduced by Huysmans is relevant to entail when arguing that there is a focus on internal consequences. In some of the articles dominated by the discourse on border control, Denmark is accordingly referred to as a magnet tempting unnecessary many asylum seekers. The following headlines thus appear in newspapers analysed in the critical discourse analysis: *“Her er Danmark populært”[[45]](#footnote-45)* (Broberg 19.01.2011a l. 1), *“Danmark topper flygtningenes hitliste”[[46]](#footnote-46)* (Broberg 19.01.2011b l. 1)and *“Rønn åbner for flere asylansøgere”[[47]](#footnote-47)* (Søndergaard & Holst 27.01.2011 l. 1). The debate on asylum is thus focused on the consequences for Denmark and the starting point in many articles is Denmark. It is not uncommon for journalism to take a starting point in the country of publication therefore it is not surprising that the subject of asylum in Europe is often taking a strong national perspective. Correspondingly, the internal Danish conditions are also the focus when explaining increasing asylum numbers. Thus, some politicians tend only to explain the increases in asylum numbers by looking at internal conditions rather than looking at external. The discourse analysis therefore, illustrates that Denmark in the Danish media is represented as an immigration magnet. The internal focus is also present in the coverage of the M.S.S vs. Belgium and Greece. Many of the articles focusing on this verdict are also mainly focused on the consequences this will have on Denmark.

Huysmans’ concept on welfare chauvinism can also be used to explain the internal focus present in the media discourses. The concept is linked with the concept of delegitimization. Asylum seekers are therefore not regarded as rightfully justified to receiving the benefits from the Danish welfare system. This is also closely interlinked with the already used concept immigration-magnet. Accordingly, many articles pose the argument that our beneficial Danish welfare system is causing more asylum applications.

Based on the abovementioned, the research project argues that applying Huysmans’ concepts immigration magnet and welfare chauvinism on the discourses arisen in the critical discourse analysis illustrates a tendency to focus narrowly on Danish consequences when dealing with the issue of asylum in Europe.

### 5.2.2 Delegitimizing on the Grounds of Culture

Illustrated by the discourse on border control, the asylum debate in Europe can be said to be focussing on protection. Referring to Huysmans’s concept cultural protection, the consequences and dangers that we are protecting ourselves against are therefore not solely economical or political. The issue and debate concerning asylum and migration in general has thus also become a debate about cultural differences and the cultural challenges associated with asylum seekers. The delegitimization referred to in the previous section can also be said to be implemented by disqualifying asylum seekers due to their cultural origin. Some of the articles entailed in the discourse on border control are therefore stating that it is better to help in the immediate vicinity. It can therefore be argued that the belief, opposed by e.g. Gupta & Fergusson, that culture is geographically rooted, seem to be present in the Danish debate on asylum in Europe. The inward-looking approach is thus also revolving around the acceptance that the European Members states entails homogeneous cultures that needs to be preserved. A logic entailing the principle that culture is a matter of belonging to a certain place is therefore also present in some of the articles. Hence, an article entailed in the sympathy discourse articulates that the stories of the afghan asylum seekers can not even be understood by the Danes because they are not from Afghanistan, and then quote an Afghan girl stating that: *“Vi er ikke som jer.”[[48]](#footnote-48)* (Hergel 04.02.2013: 1 l. 16). It can on these grounds be stated that the belief that culture is embedded in a place and your origin is not solely present among Europeans. Referring to the theory of Fairclough it can be argued that this system of knowledge can also be present among asylum seekers.

The concept of justified scepticism is also relevant to discuss when dealing with the subject of EU’s inward-looking focus. On this basis it can be assumed that the European countries find it easier to explain rupture with old traditions and culture with external factors such as asylum seekers and immigrants. However, in relation to Gupta and Fergusson it could be argued that culture is not static and should not be regarded as originating from a geographical fixed place. Hence, rupture in culture and tradition is not necessarily caused by external factors. However, the European societies are being presented as orderly and the migration is seen as in someway disrupting the cultural order. Their presence is therefore delegitimised and it is justified to behave sceptic towards them. This justified scepticism is e.g. present in one of the articles dominated by the sympathy discourse. This article is dealing with immigrants and asylum seekers living on the streets in Athens. The journalist is describing the illegal activity going on and hereby only referring to immigrants committing crimes and portraying it as if there are no Greek offenders. The issue of crime in the streets of Athens consequently seem to be solely caused by immigrants and asylum seekers and the sceptic attitude towards them is indirectly justified. (Broberg 21.01.2011)

The Euro-racism that Huysmans is describing can be another explanatory factor when trying to explain how the EU-states justify not dealing with the issue of human beings outside the union. The EU is to some extent revolving around itself and in some cases dignifying this with a “us” and “them” argument. The euro-racism can thus be argued to have a part in the process that delegitimises the presence of asylum seekers on the grounds of them being different. The principle of the Euro-racism is therefore that because they racially do not origin from Europe ergo they can be categorised as different from Europeans. The Euro-racism is therefore part of making it easier to distance oneself from asylum seekers.

### 5.2.3 One Solution

The focus in the articles is generally on internal problems and the solution to a large extend seems to be border control. The logic appears to be: If we can avoid getting immigrants and asylum seekers in the European Union, we can also avoid all the challenges they pose to “our” society. According to Huysmans it can be argued that border control as the solution has been naturalised. Correspondingly, increasing border control is presented as the answer, when we want to protect the internal. The naturalisation of border control being an effective measure and the primary solution is very prominent in the articles dominated by the discourse on border control.

Because the discourses retain this internal focus, the question of asylum is not a question of the need for protection, but has to a larger extend become a question of which consequences asylum seekers pose on our own national society or the European society. It can be argued that the tendency to make the question of asylum a question about the protection of the national or European society, as well as the naturalisation of more efficient border control as the necessary solution, turn the question of asylum in Europe into a non-question. Because if the logic is proposed so that asylum and immigration will undermine and destroy the Danish society, then the answer whether or not to grant asylum tends to be pre-given. Hence, the research project argues that the naturalisation of border control indirectly categorises asylum seekers as a threat to society and when asylum seekers are presented as a threat to society, then it seems natural to be opposing asylum.

On the grounds of this discussion the three elements present in the discourses - Denmark as the main focus, asylum seekers being perceived as culturally different and border control accentuated as the only solution is establishing a focus that is very focused on the internal consequences the asylum issue pose on Denmark.

### 5.2.4 Focus on Internal Consequences in the Objectives of the CEAS?

The CEAS can be said to entail elements that benefit the Member States: *“(…) organising support for Member States experiencing particular pressure”* (Commission of the European communities 2008 l. 15-16). The CEAS furthermore, presents objectives focusing on the relation between the Member States: *“include rules on the determination of the Member State responsible for examining an asylum application”*.(Commission of the European communities 2008 l. 17-18). The CEAS can thus be argued to share the inward-looking approach to the issue of asylum, which was also present in the media discourses, especially the discourse on border control. The CEAS is thus focusing on the consequences asylum will entail on the EU. Furthermore the CEAS also entail a focus on protection of asylum seekers and refugees outside the European borders. (*“(…) efforts to facilitate access to protection outside the territory of the EU”* Commission of the European communities 2008 l. 7). This was also a factor present in the discourse on border control.

The objectives of the CEAS are also concerned with border control and together with “*(…) the fight against illegal immigration”* (Commission of the European communities 2008 l. 22) border control is also associated with asylum in the policy papers. The discourse on border control, entailed in the larger process of securitization, can therefore also be argued to be indirectly present and continued in the policy papers regarding the CEAS. However, the CEAS also accentuates a warning concerning the border control and states: *“asylum in the EU must remain accessible”.* (Commission of the European communities 2008 l. 3-4) It can be argued that this quote indirectly entails a fear or a claim that there is a risk this will not be the case.

It can on these grounds be stated that the CEAS as well as the media discourses have an inward-looking approach focusing on consequences for the EU Member States. Furthermore, the naturalisation of border control as sufficient and necessary is also present in the CEAS. However, the CEAS does not explicitly entail a delegitimization on the grounds of culture, which was present in some of the articles.

## 5.3 Immigration and Asylum is a Burden!

Common for all articles included in the critical discourse analysis are that asylum is conceived as a burden to the Danish society and the European society. Both the solidarity discourse as well as the sympathy discourses does not question this logic. According to the discourse analysis it can be argued that the naturalisation of this logic is so strong that the logic does not even have to be accentuated. Hence, none of the articles entail a discussion or indicated that immigration and asylum could have a positive outcome for society. On the grounds of the critical discourse analysis, this research project argues that the principle: Asylum seekers are solely a burden to our society has been naturalised, as well as the principle: All societies seek to avoid and minimise the number of asylum seekers. In the following two subsections, the research project will discuss this naturalisation of asylum as a burden.

In this section it will conclusively be discussed if asylum is also regarded as a burden in the objectives of the CEAS.

### 5.3.1 How has the Naturalisation come along?

Huysmans theoretical perspectives can be helpful in understanding how this naturalisation has come to be accepted. It can be argued that the concepts: cultural homogeneity, cultural protection and welfare chauvinism can have influenced the naturalisation. If asylum seekers are regarded as being culturally different, and if these differences are regarded as something threatening the order and stability of the society, it becomes accepted to propose that our culture is something that needs to be protected. Simultaneously the welfare chauvinism also requests protection. In this case a protection of welfare benefits. The welfare chauvinism is focused on population groups not rightfully entitled to these benefits. Asylum seekers tend to be included in this category etc. in political debates. The protection thus becomes both economically and culturally motivated. The following headline and subheading exemplify how asylum seekers are presented as a an economical burden, as well as threat:

 *“Flere betjente til udlændingepolitiet”*

 *“Udlændingepolitiet opruster styrken med en tredjedel for at håndtere et stadigt stigende antal asylansøgere i Danmark.”[[49]](#footnote-49)* (Broberg 01.02.2011 l. 1-3)

Both the economic and cultural logic portray the asylum seekers as a burden to society and because these statements are not being questioned in the articles, it becomes natural to regard asylum seekers as merely a burden to society. It is important to clarify that processing and housing asylum seekers is of course costly. However, it is still noticeable that the issue of asylum being an expense for the Danish society is so often emphasised.

Huysmans’ concept meta-issue can further explain how it has been naturalised only to regard immigration and asylum as a burden. Huysmans states that the concept is being used as an explanatory factor for several varying problematic issues in society. It can on these grounds be argued, that when the logic of asylum being a burden is established according to one issue e.g. economy, it also becomes easier to transfer the logic to other issues.

Furthermore, it can be argued that as a concept asylum already severs many functions and it can be said that the concept does not seem to have the capacity to entail more than negative functions.

### 5.3.2 The Paradox in this Naturalisation

Huysmans points to a paradox that is of interest for the naturalisation of asylum as a burden. He accentuates the paradoxical in the policy documents concerning migration. He states that the policy documents concerning migration policy are also dominated by a discourse articulating asylum seekers as a challenge to society. The politics aiming to implement an efficient joint migration policy are therefore also articulating the discourse, which claim asylum to be solely a burden.

This paradox can also be seen in the discourses articulated in the newspaper articles. Looking at the articles in the analysis it is conspicuous that not even the articles dominated by the most extreme solidarity[[50]](#footnote-50) discourse articulate the possibility that immigrants and asylum seekers could bring positive elements to our society. This indicates that the idea of asylum seekers as a burden is very dominant in the debate on asylum and Europe. Accordingly, asylum seekers are not expected to bring anything positive to the society.

It is paradoxical that even the articles favouring a joint responsibility and seeking a common European asylum system are not abstaining from the claim. The idea of another possible approach to asylum is therefore not even presented. In Fairclough’s optic and in agreement with the theory of framing, the discourse stating that asylum is a burden can be categorised as being a hegemony discourse. Ergo, it can be argued that the understanding that asylum is a burden is so embedded in society that it seems unnecessary to ask why.

On the grounds of this discussion and the critical discourse analysis this research project states that asylum is perceived as a burden and that this perception has been naturalised in such way that it has become a hegemony discourse.

### 5.3.3 Immigration and Asylum as a Burden in the Objectives of the CEAS?

The objectives of the CEAS are wide and point in diverging directions. It can be argued that the policy plan entails the paradox that Huysmans also points our attention to. The document is intended to “*determine responsibility and support solidarity”*, (Commission of the European communities 2008 l. 17) however, indirectly categorises asylum seekers as a burden to society. Referring to the discourses in the newspaper articles, the CEAS do neither entail a focus on positive sides of asylum nor suggest that the European societies can gain anything from a fair and solidary CEAS. The issue of solidarity is therefore primarily referred to as something to ensure that the burden does not lay solely with one Member State. Consequently, the policy is underpinning the hegemony discourse, stating that society gains nothing from asylum seekers.

## 5.4 The Dominating Principles in the objectives of the CEAS

Including Fairclough’s third dimension the Social Practice has enabled the research project to analyse how the discourses exert themselves on the debate on asylum in Europe. Introductory in the following section the similarities and differences between the principles and discourses dominating the media and the ones dominating the objectives set up for the CEAS will be discussed. Subsequently, the analysis will discuss what impact the principles dominating the discourses jointly exert on the debate.

### 5.4.1 CEAS and the Principles Dominating the Media Discourses

Based on the above-mentioned findings it can be argued that the CEAS to some extent also entail the principles uncovered in the critical discourse analysis on the Danish media discourse. However, the accentuation appears weaker in the policy document. The following paragraph further illustrates how there are also other diversions between the discourse articulated in the media and the one articulated in the CEAS.

There seems to be some inconsistency between the debate and the policy. Hence, the policy’s first listed objective is to ensure access for those in need and to respect the fundamental rights of all migrants. In the debate this focus is not particularly accentuated. The question of the asylum seekers rights was not an issue accentuated in the media discourse. Furthermore, the CEAS also emphasises that the special needs of vulnerable groups should be acknowledged. This is a subject that was not dealt with in the media. On these grounds it can be argued that the policy discourse, by incorporating the issue of rights, entails a humanitarian focus that is either neglected or downplayed in the media discourse.

In order to understand the diverging objectives of the CEAS, this research project finds the philosophical aspects of realism and liberalism relevant to include. It can thus be argued that two diverging discourses based on the principles of realism and liberalism, respectively, are present in the objectives of the CEAS. These will in the following paragraph be shortly introduced by referring to the theorisation Sandra Lavenex[[51]](#footnote-51).

### 5.4.2 Liberalism and Realism in Migration Policy

According to Sandra Lavenex the diverging interests being proposed in European migration policy can be an indication of the balancing act between realism and liberalism. She argues that when dealing with immigration and asylum two ideal typical framings are often present. A frame based on realism and a frame based on liberalism. The realist frame is focused on internal security. It is restrictive, state-centred and focused on border control and the sovereignty of the state. The realistic frame seldom makes any division between refugees, asylum seekers and immigrants and conceives all three to be part of the same cross-border movements. The realism’s main focus according to this group of people is thus to control their entry into the state. Contradictory the liberal frame is embedded in a humanitarian frame and is focused on the rights of the individual. When focusing on migration this frame is concerned with the individual’s right to access the asylum procedure and the individual’s right to receive protection. (Lavenex 2011: 26-27)

This balancing act can also be said to be present in the CEAS. As the policy is both attending to the needs of the asylum seekers as well as the needs for the Member States. The CEAS can on these grounds be said to balance between two diverging discourses - maintaining control and securing liberal Human Rights. The principles: Neglecting the asylum motive, focusing on the internal and perceiving asylum as a burden are thus also part of a discourses founded in a realistic framework, which furthermore can also be said to characterise the discourse of securitization.

The CEAS, however, differ from the media discourse by also implementing elements originating from the philosophy of liberalism. Accordingly, the philosophy of liberalism focusing on Human Rights is hardly present in the media discourse.

Referring to Fairclough’s theory the discursive order of the media and the policy are differing when dealing with the issue of asylum in Europe. However, the two orders of discourse entail similarities. The model below illustrates the overlap of the two orders of discourse.

**Model 4: The Two Orders of Discourse**

 The black circle represents the principles The red circle represents the principles

 dominating the order of discourse in the Danish media. dominating the order of discourse in the CEAS

Neglecting the asylum motive

Border Control

Asylum is a burden

Internal focus

Human Rights

The model is of course a simplification of the two orders of discourses. However, it illustrates how the principles: border control, asylum is a burden and internal focus are common for the two orders of discourses. Consequently, it can be argued that the orders of discourses share principles founded in the philosophy of realism.

In other words it can be argued that the discursive event, being either an article concerning asylum in Europe or a policy document stating the objectives of a CEAS, is positioning itself within the already existing discursive field concerning asylum in Europe.

### 5.4.3 The Wide Range of the Principles

Analysing the objectives of the CEAS shows that the principles surrounding the media discourses are also present in the policy documents. So even though the CEAS explicitly mention the Human Rights it can still be argued that the presences of the principle of internal focus as well as the principle that asylum is a burden, is still reproducing principles of securitization. When comparing the principles dominating the discourses with the ones present in the objectives of the CEAS it can thus be argued that the principles, which are not promoting solidarity, also exist in the objectives of the policy aiming to implement a Common European Asylum System. Accordingly, analysing the CEAS objectives illustrate that the principles to an extent also dominate the policy objectives. Furthermore, and essential for answering the research question, it illustrates the wide range of the principles. Referring to theory of discourse, it can be argued that the media articulation as well as the policy articulation are depending and resting on similar principles.

## 5.5 The Principles Joint Influence on the Debate

Even though the discourses arising in the newspapers differ in their focus and approach to the subject of asylum in Europe, this research project argues that all three discourses are determined and bound to certain principles: They generally neglect the asylum principle, they focus primarily on Denmark and they consider asylum to be solely a negative burden to society. Naturally, not all articles and discourses share the same degree of determination when entailing the principles, and as well as there are variations within the discourses, the discourses are also differing in the way and degree they entail the principles. In this paragraph the consequences of the three principles will be discussed jointly.

This research project argues that the three principles presented are part of making it difficult for the EU to include asylum seekers as well as making it difficult for the European states to take a joint responsibility for asylum seekers in Europe. Returning to the issue of securitization, the research project argues that the three principles; neglecting the asylum motive, having an internal focus and preserving asylum as a burden, which are dominating the discourses are intertwined in the securitization of asylum seekers. Thus, the principles indicate that a securitization is present in the media articulation and to a great extent also in the articulation of the political objectives. Neglecting the asylum motive in the debate, or turning the motive into being primarily financial, as well as taking a starting point in the consequences for our own society, combined with articulating asylum as a burden makes it difficult to obtain a common European responsibility.

Accordingly, the Danish debate concerning asylum in Europe neglects the need for asylum and protection when articulating the issues combined with asylum. It can be argued that the debate to a large extent seems to be distanced from the people it deals with; hence their Human Rights are seldom a focus. This moves the focus of the debate from protection of refugees to protection of our economy and culture, and the need for asylum seems to be slightly ignored in the discourses dominating the debates. It can be argued that with the need for asylum being left out of the equation when debating asylum in Europe, it seems less urgent to deal with the question of a joint responsibility. Referring to the logic of securitization, the need to protect and securitise becomes predominant and furthermore the argumentations of protection and security are widely accepted.

The dominance of realism concerning the matter of migration policy turns the purpose of the CEAS into a question concerning our own gain and our own protection. The objectives of the CEAS, however, also entail principles relying on the philosophy of liberalism. Looking at the diverging elements of the media discourses and the discourses present in the CEAS, it can be problematized that the element of the liberal Human Rights, which is part of the policy does not seem to be part of the media discussion. Hence, the Danish media debate on asylum in Europe is applying a different focus than the one proposed in the policy. On the grounds of the discourse analysis and the analysis of the CEAS it can be stated that the Danish media debate is lacking humanitarian viewpoints and has not been particularly focused on the unequal distribution. The discourse analysis illustrates that the liberal viewpoint is neglected in the media debate and it can on these grounds be argued that the media discourse entails a distortion that does not represent the full picture of the policy.

In accordance to the research question, it can be argued that neglecting the humanitarian viewpoints can be problematic because these to some extend can works as a counter to the securitization impeding a joint responsibility for asylum seekers in Europe.

According to Huysmans, whether European states directly or indirectly support the securitization strategies or not, the securitization makes it more difficult to included both asylum seekers and refugees in the European societies. On these grounds it can be argued that even though the articulation of the discourses in the newspapers are in some cases rather unconscious it also has an effect on the integration process, because the people taking part in the integration process are also affected by the discourses.

# 6. Conclusion

The research project has revolved around the subject of solidarity and responsibility sharing among the EU Member States and the objective has been to answer the research question:

*Why has the asylum situation in Greece not encouraged the European Member States to take a greater joint responsibility for asylum seekers in the European Union?*

Entailing Fairclough’s methodology on critical discourse analysis and the principles of framing theory on selection and structuring of data material, the research project has conducted a critical discourse analysis of the Danish media’s presentation of the asylum situation in Greece since the judgment in the case M.S.S vs. Belgium and Greece was passed in January 2011 until the 21st of February 2013. The research project argues that the discourses surrounding the question of asylum in Europe are limiting the possible actions available.

Applying the discursive methods has unveiled three dominant discourses in the newspaper articles. A Sympathy Discourse, a Discourse on Border Control and a Solidarity Discourse are dominating the articulation in the newspapers. These three frames thus confine the articulation in the Danish newspapers concerning asylum in Europe.

To understand the disclosed discourses outside their immediate frame, the research project has entailed the theoretical aspects of securitization presented by Huysmans. Furthermore, the principles of liberalism and realism have shortly been outlined. Applying the theoretical concepts constructed from Huysmans’s theory on securitization of migration in Europe, the research project found that three dominating principles were underlying the discourses disclosed in the newspapers. Hence, the debate concerning asylum in Europe is entailed in the following three principles.

The asylum motive is neglected. The analysis shows how the motive for applying for asylum is either reduced or neglected. If it receives attention in the coverage it is mainly because the article cast doubt on the motives and assumes that the motives are primarily financial. Likewise, the newspaper coverage is not focused on the asylum seekers’ Human Rights, stating that they can rightfully apply for asylum. The articles inconsistency in their application of the terms asylum seeker, refugee and illegal immigrant is also causing the asylum motive to be neglected. The inconsistency creates confusion and furthermore equates asylum seekers with illegal immigrants. This decreases the motive for asylum, and also takes part in neglecting the asylum motive.

The second principle dominating all three discourses is a principle of internal focus. The newspapers are prone to taking a starting point in and revolve around the consequences the situation will entail on Denmark. The articles generally do not prioritise consequences emerging outside of Denmark and the EU. This principle furthermore entails a tendency to disqualify and delegitimise the presence of asylum seekers and refugees in the EU. Referring to asylum seekers, as being culturally different is part of this delegitimization. A principle of belonging is therefore included in the delegitimization. The focus on the internal and the consequences the asylum situation will cause on Denmark is also illustrated in the strong focus on border control. Hence, the solution to the asylum situation in Greece is presented to be more efficient border control. Asylum seekers are therefore indirectly being portrait as a threat to the European and Danish society.

The third principle, which is entailed in all three discourses, is the principle stating that asylum is a burden. Huysmans’ concepts: cultural homogeneity, cultural protection and welfare chauvinism illustrates how it is not only financially that asylum seekers are perceived as a burden. Referring to Huysmans this principle has been naturalised to the extent where it does not make sense to question it. Consequently, none of the articles are questioning the principle. Not even the articles entailing the most extreme solidarity discourse suggest that asylum seekers could contribute anything positive to society.

In addition to the theoretical aspects, the objectives set out for the CEAS has been included to obtain thorough insight in the socio-political context in which the discourses display themselves. Analysing the objectives set out for the CEAS it is illustrated that the objectives are alternating between discourses of realism and liberalism. The objectives contain the realistic elements of protectionism and focus on the internal, which are also principles present in the media discourse. Analysing the objectives of the CEAS illustrates the principles’ great range and extent.

Based on this argument, the research project further argues that the articulation of the asylum situation in Greece and the question of joint responsibility are embedded in three dominating principles: They generally neglect the asylum principle, they focus primarily on Denmark and they consider asylum to be solely a negative burden to society. These principles are naturalised and the newspapers do not discuss or question their exactness. These principles illustrate how the question of asylum in Europe is embedded in the discourse of securitization. The principles dominating the debate on asylum in Europe turns the question of joint responsibility into a question of own gain. Thus, the internal focus becomes so dominating that even when the issue is protection of asylum seekers – potential refugees, the focus is still what consequences it will entail on the Danish society. Neglecting the asylum motive distances the debate from the asylum seekers in question. Furthermore, turning the debate away from asylum motives and the conflicts causing people to flee makes the issue of shared responsibility less relevant.

Returning to the research question it can be stated that if the asylum situation in Greece to a larger extend is handled as threat to our society rather than as a humanitarian crisis, it becomes accepted to suggest security measures rather than solidarity measures. The debate is therefore less concerned with the question of responsibility.

When the situation in Greece has not encouraged the EU Member States to take a greater joint responsibility, it can be questioned if a joint responsibility sharing among the EU Member States will ever be possible as long as the question of asylum is embedded in a discourse of securitization.
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## Appendix B: The Distribution of the Discourses in the Different Newspapers

1. On the 21st of January 2011, the European Court of Human Rights issued the M.S.S. v. Belgium and Greece judgment, on the asylum seekers transfer system within the European Union. The Court held that asylum conditions in Greece were so bad that not only Greece had violated the ECHR, but also Belgium for having transferred an asylum seeker back to Greece. (The web site of the European Commission) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The principles of social constructivism are further dealt with in the section concerning Theory of Science. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Fairclough’s critical discourse analysis will be presented in section 2.5 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. According to radical discourse theorists physical reality is also constructed by discourses, this is however not a focus of this research project. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Marianne Winther Jørgensen and Louise Phillips [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The combination and interaction of the two theories will be further dealt with in section 2.6 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. This research project will not discuss which of the practices exert the most influence on the issue. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. On the 21st of January 2011, the European Court of Human Rights issued the M.S.S. v. Belgium and Greece judgment, on the asylum seekers transfer system within the European Union. The Court held that asylum conditions in Greece were so bad that not only Greece had violated the ECHR, but also Belgium for having transferred an asylum seeker back to Greece. (The web site of the European Commission) [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. The largest Danish article database [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Translation: On Tuesday they go on. North. Just away [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Translation: Greek asylum chaos hit Denmark [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Translation: POLITIKEN believes: Not solidary [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Translation: On Tuesday they go on. North. Just away [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Translation: On Tuesday they go on. North. Just away [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. The Greek asylum system is so malfunctioning that refugees fight to avoid becoming a part of it. Moheb Shahrani and his family is living in hiding. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Translation: She (red. his daughter) crawls up and sits on his knee and points to the flowers on her jacket. He caresses her round, brown cheek with the thumb but does not look at the child. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Translation: I do not have any more money, we only eat once a day, some days it is only the children who gets some. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. ”What do you want me to do? Stay her and sleep in the streets? I do not even have a blanket to cover us” [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Some flee from war and to safe their life others chase job and money. But for all one thing is certain – it was not here on the Victoria square, the journey was supposed to end. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Translation: Sneaked [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Translation: Some are genuine refugees, others are soldiers of fortune [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Translation: ”The Greeks can not handle anymore” [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. Translation: Deportations: Professor of law: Italy infringe on the rights of migrant. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Translation: Greek asylum chaos hit Denmark [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Translation: Greek asylum chaos hit Denmark [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Translation: Refugees: Asylum seekers, who come to Europe via Greece, now have the opportunity to get residence as refugees in Denmark, assesses an expert. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. I have difficulties seeing any way to avoid also having to consider the cases coming here. Nothing indicates that the problems in Greece will disappear right away. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Translation: The asylum cases accumulate, while the asylum seekers are living on the streets or under slum-like conditions. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Translation: Better control [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. He [Peter Skaarup] requests better control of both EU’s exterior borders as well as the Danish. When the border control is so full of holes you get too many cases to treat. It puts pressure on all of EU, when Greece cannot figure out how to control their borders (…) this is another good argument why we have an orderly border control in Denmark. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. Translation: Fear great traffic to Denmark [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. Translation: A tidal wave of asylum seekers [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. Translation: They definitely should not have residence permit here [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. Translation: EU should proceed in implementing the action plan and maintain the strict course against illegal immigration. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. Translation: POLITIKEN believes: Not solidary [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. Translation: POLITIKEN believes: Not solidary [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. Translation: Only a common EU-asylum policy, which distribute asylum seekers jointly can create order in chaos [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. Translation: Not solidary [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. Translation: The only ones, who did not understand the unambiguity of the verdict, was the Danish government and the integration minister Birthe Rønn Hornbech [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. Translation: Gradually the regulation has become a deeply not jointly agreement, which leaves to the EU-countries with the weakest asylum systems to carry the biggest burden. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. Translation: The Greek asylum chaos is consequence of an unsuccessful EU-policy and with that also all off EU’s responsibility. And the only way order can be restored, is by replacing the Dublin Regulation with a system, which distribute asylum seekers on the individual EU-countries according to a solidary model. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. Translation: To a large group of Afghans buying such forgery is only the first of many large expenses being related to the highly hazardous try to create a new life in the West. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. Translation: It could hit Norge or Denmark [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. Translation: Asylum: More Syrians look towards Denmark [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. Translation: Here is Denmark popular [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. Translation: Denmark tops the refugees’ charts [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. Translation: Rønn opens to more asylum seekers [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. Translation: We are not like you [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. Translation: More police officers to the department for foreign police. The department for foreign police rearm the force with a third to handle the a still growing number of asylum seekers in Denmark. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. The article ”Politiken mener: Usolidarisk” which is the one representing the solidarity discourse is part of the discourse entailing the most extreme solidarity present in the articles. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. Sandra Lavenex is Professor of International Relations and Global Governance at the University of Lucerne (homepage of the world trade institute) [↑](#footnote-ref-51)