



DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

SECURITIZATION OF MIGRATION

A discourse analysis of the Swedish migration policy during the Syrian refugee crisis

Henrietta Bergh

Essay/Thesis:	15 hp
Program and/or course:	Bachelor's Programme in European Studies, Political Science
Level:	First cycle
Semester/year:	Spring 2020
Supervisor:	Jonas Hinnfors
Examiner:	
Report no:	

Abstract

In the beginning of the Syrian refugee crisis in 2015 the Swedish Government pursued a generous refugee policy but changed direction in the late 2015. The Government introduced temporary ID controls and restricted the opportunities for asylum seekers to obtain a residence permit in order to reduce the stress on central societal functions caused by the large number of refugees seeking protection in the country. The changes in the migration policy took place drastically and the Government was criticized for not observing existing regulations regarding the preparatory work of legislative proposals and for exceeding one's authority. Drawing on the theoretical framework of securitization, the circumstances indicate that extraordinary political actions may have taken place, based on the idea that refugees poses a serious threat to the internal security of the country. By critically analysing governmental problematizations, this study investigates the role of state actors in transforming political issues into matters of security. The results show that a securitization of the Swedish migration policy has taken place by illustrating how the Government constructs refugees as a threat to legitimate actions that goes beyond normal political procedures.

Keywords: refugee crisis, securitization of migration, WPR approach, discourse analysis, Sweden, policy analysis, speech act

Title: Securitization of migration- A discourse analysis of the Swedish migration policy during the Syrian refugee crisis
Author: Henrietta Bergh
Supervisor: Jonas Hinnfors
Semester/year: Spring 2020
Institution: Department of Political Science- Centre for European Studies
Word count: 12 972

Table of content

- 1. Introduction 4
 - 1.1 Research problem..... 5
 - 1.2 Aim and research question 6
 - 1.3 Definitions..... 6
 - 1.4 Disposition 8
- 2. Previous research 9
 - 2.1 The emergence of migration as a security issue..... 9
 - 2.2 The European integration process and migration..... 10
 - 2.3 Securitization of migration in Sweden..... 11
- 3. Theoretical framework 14
 - 3.1 What is security? 14
 - 3.2 Securitization theory..... 15
 - 3.2.1 Copenhagen School and the speech act..... 16
 - 3.2.1 Criticism of the theory 17
- 4. Method and material 20
 - 4.1 Discourse analysis and ‘What’s the problem represented to be?’ 20
 - 4.2 Analytical tools from the WPR approach..... 22
 - 4.2.1 Question 1 23
 - 4.2.2 Question 2 and 4 23
 - 4.3 Analytical tools from the securitization theory 24
 - 4.3.1 Facilitating conditions 25
 - 4.3.2 Difference between politicized issues and issues of existential threat 25
 - 4.3.3 Distinction between a securitization move and a successful securitization 26
 - 4.3.4 Referent objects and securitizing actors 26
 - 4.4 Limitations and research quality 27
 - 4.5 Empirical material, delimitations and relevance 28
- 5. Results and analysis..... 30
 - 5.1 The WPR approach..... 30
 - 5.1.1 Representation of the ‘problem’ (Q1) 30
 - 5.1.2 Assumptions and silences (Q2+Q4) 32
 - 5.2 The securitization theory 33
 - 5.2.1 Who are the securitizing actors?..... 34
 - 5.2.2 Who or what is the referent object that the securitizing actor presents as in need of protection? 34
 - 5.2.3 What is the existential threat that the referent object needs to be protected from? 35

5.2.4 In what way does the existential threat justify extraordinary actions?.....	35
5.2.5 Who are the relevant audience, and in what way does the audience accept the extraordinary actions?	38
6. Discussion and conclusion	41
References	45

Index of tables

Table 3.1: From a securitizing move to a successful securitization.....	16
Table 4.1: Introducing the WPR-approach to policy analysis.....	19
Table 4.2: The analytical tools from the WPR approach.....	21
Table 4.3: Analytical tools based on the securitization theory.....	23

1. Introduction

The Syrian refugee crisis put EU and its member states under pressure and revealed its inability to get member states to cooperate and agree on common migration policy solutions. Due to the UN Refugee Agency over 5.6 million people have fled Syria since 2011 (UNHCR, 2018). At the same time, the European states have responded in various degrees with stricter asylum policies and in some cases closed borders to reduce refugee flows (Ostrand, 2018). Previous research shows that the migration in Europe has been securitized, both on a national and a supranational level (Huysmans, 2000, Benam, 2011, Abiri, 2000). There seem to be a transformation of the security/humanitarian dynamics in the EU, where irregular migrants today are portrayed as ‘threats’ to the EU’s external borders but on the same time as victims of smuggling, both in which a security intervention is presented as vital (Moreno-Lax, 2018).

During the beginning of the refugee crisis in 2015 the Swedish Government advocated a generous refugee policy (Ostrand, 2018) and the Swedish Migration Board processed 162 877-asylum applications, almost twice as many as the year before (Migrationsverket, 2016). The Government thus changed direction drastically from officially expressing the importance of helping migrants and people in need when other European states closed their borders, to a more restrictive migration policy introduced by the Swedish Prime Minister in the late 2015. The possibilities to obtain residence permits in Sweden were restricted (SFS 2016:752) and ID controls were introduced (SFS 2015:1073) to reduce the refugee flows. The legislative changes together with the increased efficiency of the Swedish Police executive work show signs of a change in the country’s migration policy (Lundberg, 2017, s. 349). Before the ID controls were introduced, both the Swedish Police Authority and the Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB) expressed concerns about the refugee situation, which they considered to be threatening the public order and internal security within the country and of major pressure to societal functions (Grönlund, Marmorstein & Kasurinen, 2015, 11 November).

The law that introduced the ID controls (SFS 2015:1073) entered into force on the 21 December of 2015. During the legislative process the Swedish Council on Legislation criticized the Government bill for being the result of insufficient preparatory work and for

lacking a clear problem definition. The Government's assessment that the refugee flows constituted a threat to the internal security of the country was questioned (prop. 2015/16:67, p. 13). From a Swedish context, the political changes during 2015 marks a change in the country's earlier position as a humanitarian frontrunner (Stokes-Dupass, 2017) and indicates that refugees may have become a security 'problem' in the Swedish political landscape, which enable political actors to use extraordinary measures (Buzan, Weaver & de Wilde, 1998, p. 23).

1.1 Research problem

There is a lot of previous research focusing on security and migration in the EU and in Europe at large (Lazaridis & Wada, 2015, Huysman, 2000, Kaya, 2012), but with little attention on the Scandinavian countries. As mentioned briefly in the introduction and which will be discussed more in detail in the section of previous research, Sweden has distinguished itself from other European countries when it comes to migration policy and the legislative changes during 2015 shows a shift from a *humanitarian* to a more *state-centric* approach to security (Stokes-Dupass, 2017), which is interesting to interrogate for understanding the processes and motives underlying this change. It will be an interesting contribution to previous research in the field, to investigate how migration relates to security in a Swedish context with a focus on central political actors and their role in securitizing political issues.

From a European context, the growing change towards antimigration legislation and restrictive migration policies in the European states (Ostrand, 2018) shows a shift from recent years *liberalization* of the citizenship towards a retrenchment in terms of access to it (Nicole Stokes-Dupass, 2017). The restrictive migration laws and policies adopted by EU member states indicate a shift towards a more autonomous acting by member states' within the field of migration and may challenge the EU's ambition to harmonize the migration policy in the union (Benam, 2011, Huysman, 2000, prop. 2013/14:197, p. 7). Furthermore, a restrictive migration policy contributes to widening the divide of *protection* and *rights* between 'non-citizens' and 'citizens' (Nicole Stokes-Dupass, 2017), which may conflict the EU's international commitments regarding human rights obligations (European Parliament, 2019, pp. 2-5, European Commission, 2020). Taking into consideration the above-mentioned, it is

highly relevant from a European contemporary context to investigate how political actors articulate performative discourses and shape the perception of security issues, especially as the EU's immigration policies and refugee policies were primary factors for British citizens to 'take back control' and leave the EU (Stokes-Dupass, 2017).

In sum, this study contributes to previous research by investigating the construction of security 'threats' within a Swedish national political sphere and in what way securitizing activities interacts with policy change. This thesis seeks to uncover the underlying assumptions that constitute the discourse behind the Swedish migration policy and to provide explanations on how political actions can be understood through a security perspective.

1.2 Aim and research question

The aim of this study is to investigate the changes that occurred in the Swedish migration policy in 2015 through the theory of securitization. The goal is to identify and offer an understanding of the securitization process and how political actors uses security rhetoric to legitimize political change. Due to previous research, theoretical framework and purpose of the thesis, this study aims to answer the following question:

Has the Swedish migration policy undergone a securitization process during the refugee crisis in 2015? If so, in what ways, and to what extent?

1.3 Definitions

Much of the previous research and empirical material used for the study relates to refugee- and asylum policies. The choice to use the term *migration* in the study depends on the fact that the refugee policy and asylum regulations in Sweden are a part of the Swedish migration policy in general (Justitiedepartementet, 2019). The meaning of these central terms will be defined to avoid ambiguity and to ensure the importance of its various legal definitions.

Migration is commonly used to refer to all kinds of movement. The terms *refugee* and *migrant* are often used interchangeably but according to UNHCR there is a distinction between refugees and migrants, which is of great importance. Refugees and asylum seekers are protected by international law. According to UNHCR refugees are:

Refugees are people outside their country of origin because of feared prosecution, conflict violence, or other circumstances that have seriously disturbed public order, and who, as a result, require international protection. Their situation is often so perilous and intolerable, that they cross national borders to seek safety in nearby countries, and thus become internationally recognized as ‘refugees’ with access to assistance from states, UNHCR, and relevant organizations. They are so recognized precisely because it is too dangerous for them to return home, and they therefore need sanctuary elsewhere. These are people for whom denial of asylum has potentially deadly consequences (UNHCR, 2016).

UNHCR states that there is no legal definition of a migrant at the international level but explains the term as follows:

‘Migration’ is often understood to imply a voluntary process, for example, someone who crosses a border in search of better economic opportunities. This is not the case for refugees, who cannot return home safely, and accordingly are owed specific protections under international law (UNHCR, 2016).

Thus, there is an important difference between migrants and refugees, as refugees are protected under international law. There is also a difference between an asylum seeker and a refugee, where an asylum seeker is someone claiming to be a refugee, but whose request has not been evaluated yet. Individuals have the right to seek asylum, but it is up to national asylum systems to determine who will be granted asylum. During situations of mass movements of refugees, there is not always possible to control all refugees seeking asylum in a country. During the refugee crisis of 2015 this was the case for the so-called ‘prima facie’ refugees (UNHCR, 2020).

1.4 Disposition

This thesis contains 6 chapters. This section ends the first chapter that introduced the research problem, purpose of the study, the research question and central definitions. The first chapter follows by a presentation of the previous research in the field of migration and security (chapter 2), starting with a short historical view, followed by research focusing on an international-, EU- and national context. Thenceforth, the theoretical framework of the study will be presented (chapter 3), which consists of the securitization theory and a presentation of the criticism of the theory. Furthermore, the method will be presented (chapter 4) together with the material used for the study, delimitations and relevance. The ‘What’s the problem represented to be?’ approach, a methodology based on critical discourse analysis, will work as the method of the study and will be explained in detail together with the analytical tools from the securitization theory. The empirical results collected through the WPR approach will be presented (chapter 5) and analysed by using both the analytical tools from the WPR approach and the analytical tools from the securitization theory. At last, the results from the analysis will be discussed and the thesis final conclusion will be presented (chapter 6) which intends to answer the overarching research question.

2. Previous research

This chapter presents previous research in the field of migration and security to provide an understanding of the topic. The selection of previous research will be based on two orientations focusing on securitization of migration within the EU and on a Swedish national level. The emergence of migration as a security issue will be presented first, followed by a presentation of the European integration process in relation to security and migration. Finally research of securitization of migration in Sweden will be introduced.

2.1 The emergence of migration as a security issue

Since the end of the Cold War, *migration* has become more integrated into the security discourse (Huysman, 2000, p. 751). The idea of migration as a security ‘problem’ is not new in security studies. Researches have treated the topic in various ways and analyses have shown that securitization of migration is happening both on a state level and in the EU institutions (Huysmans, 2000, Benam, 2011, Abiri, 2000). Continuing in the same path, Lazaridis and Wadia (2015) argues that Western states have integrated security issues in their migration policies and have connected migrants as a subject to societal instability.

The 9/11 terrorist attacks in 2001 have been referred by many researchers in security studies as a crucial event, which discursively and practically linked migration to security issues such as terrorism (Huysman 2006, Kaya 2009, Van Munster, 2009, Lazaridis & Skleparis, 2015, Stokes-Dupass, 2017). According to Rytter and Pedersen (2013) the 9/11 events placed Muslim immigrants in a new security dimension and framed them as ‘internal enemies’ to the European nation states. Christina Boswell (2007) on the other hand claims that it is complex to argue for a securitization of migration in the post-9/11 context, which was characterized by an increased fear of terrorism. Instead she positions against critical studies of security and argues that there is no evidence for a securitization of migration in the post-9/11 context in Europe. The conclusion of the study is that there is no causal link between migration and terrorism in the European political discourses. Vicki Squire (2015) argues that processes of securitization do not require causal linkages but instead can be explained through associative

relations as the indirect association between migrants and terrorism framing migrants as a security issue.

Not only have events such as the Global War on Terror since 9/11 been crucial for the securitization of migration in Europe according to Vicki Squire (2009). She argues that economic, social and political conditions in Europe are and have been substantial for the framing of migrants as threats. The increased numbers of asylum seekers during the break-up of the former Yugoslavia in the 1990's, the European integration process and liberalization within EU, that on the other hand restricted the external border controls, and periods of economic instability have conditioned the creation of associational links between cross boarder threats and migrants.

2.2 The European integration process and migration

Jef Huysman (2000) has described the European integration process and its impact on the securitization of migration in Europe. According to Huysman, the creation of the single market in Europe led to increased security when the internal border controls were abolished. The 'Europeanization' of migration policy integrated migration issues within the security framework of the EU. He argues that there are three factors pushing the securitization process, which can be described as 'inner security', 'the crisis of the welfare state' and 'cultural security'.

Lena Karamanidou (2015) explores how EU policies have securitized migration in the EU context by analysing discourses and practices of securitization processes. She argues that migrants appear as threats to the internal security of the EU through discourses framing them as 'illegal' and associated with risks. She further argues that some policies aimed at controlling migrants have been normalized and incorporated in the daily practices of the internal and external security control of the EU. According to Squire (2009) such exclusionary practices have securitizing effects by framing migrants as subjects with no right to the inner territory of the EU. She also addresses the importance of the wider European political and societal context in which the restrictive asylum policies in the EU emerge. Changing economic, political and societal conditions in Europe during the late 1990's have been crucial as a platform for security discourses and security practices emerging within the

EU migration policy. Jef Huysmans (2006, p. ix) stresses this further and argues that migration have been central for the EU identity politics, which have framed migration as a security issue built on fear of ‘the other’ and that this marks a shift from earlier being part of the economic and employment policies.

2.3 Securitization of migration in Sweden

During the late 1980s there was a change in migration patterns in Sweden when ‘unskilled’ migrant workers were replaced by asylum seekers. The change made migration a more central political issue for Scandinavian parties. However, it was first later that the issue became prioritized and today it is placed very high on political agendas (Lazaridis & Tsagkroni, 2015, p. 230). Elisabeth Abiri (2000) describes the Swedish migration policy changes in the 1990s in her Ph. D. Dissertation ‘The securitization of Migration’. The dissertation analyses the Swedish migration discourse and according to Abiri the migration policy in Sweden was treated as a security issue already in the 80s although it was not the case in the public discourse. She further argues that the debate was introduced distinctly in the Swedish migration policy in the early 90’s, when Sweden received a large number of refugees during the Bosnian war and the report ‘Sweden in Europe and the World’ was released. In the report, refugees were presented as threats towards Swedish security.

According to Abiri there are traditional aspects of security that have affected the migration discourse in Sweden and which have connected migration with threats such as terrorism and espionage. Other aspects are the assumption that the military organizational capacity is important in dealing with large-scale refugee situations and that migration is a transnational threat, which needs to be treated on an international level. At last Abiri describes how migration is treated as a security issue because it challenges the state sovereignty and the state’s ability to act sovereignly in migration issues (Abiri, 2000, p. 190).

A study by Gabriella Lazaridis and Vasiliki Tsagkroni (2015) highlights ‘the rhetoric of extremes’ and analyses how far right parties in Scandinavian countries securitize migrants by using rhetoric to link migration with societal issues like crime and unemployment to strengthen the national identity. The study describes how the electoral support for far right

parties in the Scandinavian countries has increased over the last years, which makes migration policies an increasingly prominent issue in the national political landscape. Huysman (2000) emphasizes the fact that there has been an increase in the society when it comes to connecting migration with security threats. Migration has been discussed as a threat to internal security and national identity not only by right-wing populist parties but also by the media and internal and external security agencies like the secret service.

Nicole Stokes-Dupass (2017) examines Sweden, Norway and Denmark's responses to the Syrian refugee crisis and argues that there is less research about security and migration in the Scandinavian countries because they are newcomers to the Western European discourses about security and mass migration. The author stresses that the restrictive migration policies, introduced by the Swedish Government during the refugee crisis in 2015, marked a change from what earlier would have been of a humanitarian response, as Sweden has long been seen as an advocate of immigrant's social and political rights. Stokes-Dupass states that the irregular migrants struggle for social and political equality and to legitimate their presence challenges states' ability to enforce conventional citizenship. The Syrian refugee flows challenged the European states routinized patterns of political practices and hence the sovereignty of the states.

Michal Krzyzanowski (2018) on the other hand argues that there has been a long tradition of politicization (i.e., which means making an issue part of a political agenda) of immigration in Sweden. However, he further argues that a new form of hybrid discourse of politicization has developed in Sweden during the refugee crisis, which allows political actors to legitimize immigration policies through populist-like politicization.

In a study from 2018, Mathias Ericson addresses how a form of Swedish exceptionalism is constructed and articulated by actors to establish threat and crisis narratives, which frame Sweden as 'naïve' and connect migrants with security in the Swedish political landscape. The study explains the radical changes that occurred in the Swedish migration policy in the late 2015, by showing how crisis situations can be used to launch dramatic changes in politics, which at the same time can be threatening the ideas that claims to be defending (Ericson, 2018, pp. 95-96, 98).

To summarize the previous research field about securitization of migration in Sweden, the research overview shows that there is a lack of research of security and migration in a Swedish context. The study made by Abiri in 2000, contributes to an increased understanding of the effects of securitization of migrants. At the same time, the study is limited to analysing the situation in Sweden during the 1990's and cannot be easily transferred to a contemporary Swedish context. Although previous research shows signs of a securitized migration discourse in the Swedish context, there is no previous research that investigates the contemporary political legislative changes that occurred in 2015 with a focus on political actors in the Swedish Government and Parliament. Previous research focuses on rhetoric used by political actors with a focus on far right parties (Ericson, 2018, Lazaridis & Tsagkroni 2015) and the media as securitizing actors (Huysman, 2000) but no study investigates the effects of the security rhetoric on legislative changes in a contemporary Swedish context. Previous research focuses on the security moves taken by actor's through security rhetoric, but not the complete securitization process, which involves audience legitimacy (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 25). At the same time, it is interesting to investigate if the Swedish migration policy is securitized in 2015 and to what extent, as Nicole-Stokes Dupass (2017) states that a new political situation occurred in Sweden in 2015 that cannot be compared with any previous situation, as the humanitarian perspective that have dominated the Swedish migration discourse shifted in such a drastic and extensive manner, giving priority to a state-centric approach.

3. Theoretical framework

This chapter will introduce the study's theoretical framework, which is the securitization theory. First of all, the term *security* will be explained and in what way it relates to the emerging of the securitization theory. Then, the theoretical framework will be discussed and in what way the theory contributes to the understanding of the research problem. Finally, some of the critic against the theory will be presented as well as alternative interpretations of its structure. The theory contains central tools for practical security analysis, which will be used in the analysis to operationalize the research question. The analytical tools will be explained together with the analytical tools of the WPR approach in chapter 4.

3.1 What is security?

The definition of *security* is not 'static'; it is historically determined and differs over time. The term explains various practices and actors have always competed about controlling its content (Williams, 2013, p. 125). Security issues in international relations research have to be separated from the common use of the term. In this context security has an enlarged meaning compared to social security issues, often related to police functions. Using the traditional narrow definition, security can be defined as a form of survival. In this context a security issue is something that poses a threat to the survival of the state and its components: government, territory and society (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 21).

Barry Buzan is a well-known researcher in the field of international security studies and argues that 'in the case of security, the discussion is about the pursuit of *freedom from threat*. Its bottom line is about survival, but it also reasonably includes a substantial range of concerns about the conditions of existence' (Buzan, 1991., p. 18-19, emphasis added). Buzan continues by stressing that security issues have different meanings in discourses and are dependent on the *referent object*, which in traditional security studies has been the state and threats have often been related to military concerns between states. As the world globalised

and the international environment changed, the call for a wider perspective of the security studies occurred (Buzan, 1991., p. 14).

The concept of security has changed during the last part of the 20th century and a wider concept of security is today commonly found in the research field. New issues are introduced into the security discourse, which involves cyber security, economic security and societal security. It involves transnational threats like terrorism and environmental challenges, but also issues related to migration and cultural aspects (Spear & Williams, 2012, p. 13).

The widening of the concept of security must also be understood in the light of the political situation in Europe after the end of the Cold War in the 1980s. After a long period of military reconstruction, the end of the war gave room for new untraditional security threats (Buzan et al., 1998). Security as a theoretical concept widened as new scholars entered the academic field and in the wake of this, the *securitization theory* was developed. The theory aimed at satisfying both the new scholars of security studies that wanted to widen the concept of security by bringing in more referent objects in the field, and at the same time intended to keep the traditional narrow approach to security by focusing on issues of survival and existential threats (Nyman, 2018, s. 102).

3.2 Securitization theory

The securitization theory provides a central theoretical basis for understanding the political changes that occurred in the Swedish migration policy during 2015. The theory's critical approach allows in-depth analysis of the power relations within politics and the exposure of political processes that are often taken for granted. The theoretical framework provides analytical tools for explaining how political actors construct security 'threats' through discursive actions, which have effects outside the discourse (Nyman, 2018, pp. 100, 112).

The securitization theory developed during the 1990s at the Copenhagen Peace and Research institute by researchers Barry Buzan, Ole Waever and Jaap de Wilde (Benam, 2011, pp. 193-194). According to the Copenhagen school of securitization theory, which is based on a

constructivist approach, there are no natural security threats. The question is not if an issue is a real threat or not, but instead, how an issue is socially constructed to be a threat by actors like political communities. Security issues should not just include war between states like the classic security researchers argued. Economic, societal and environmental issues such as climate change or migration, become security threats as well through the processes of securitization (The Open University, 2014).

In addition to function as an analytical tool for analysing security processes, the theory functions as a normative element. Securitization allows for extraordinary moves outside the normal democratic political procedures. Desecuritization on the other hand, follows normal political democratic procedures when facing a special issue, which the Copenhagen school highlight as preferable (Buzan et al., 1998).

3.2.1 Copenhagen School and the speech act

The securitization theory focuses on the construction of security threats through language and its central concept is the *speech act*. According to the theory, securitization is defined as a speech act, which consists of *rhetorical criteria's* that securitizing actors use to securitize an issue (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 23). Speaking security is not just an utterance; it is an act in itself. Security is not descriptive in this case; the speech act is a particular form of language, which has a performative meaning (Nyman, 2018, s. 102).

According to the Copenhagen school *securitization* is the process in which an actor presents something as an existential threat towards a referent object and claiming the right to use extraordinary political measures to ensure the referent object's survival. By securitizing an issue, the actor moves the issue from its ordinary political context into a security area of highest priority and the actions happen beyond the usual political procedures (Buzan et al., 1998, p.23). When an actor securitizes an issue it has political effects as the actor operates in a way that was not possible before (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 30).

The important difference between a successful securitization and a securitizing move is the audience. The securitizing actor needs to convince the relevant audience about the security

threat to be able to justify the extraordinary measures (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 25). The theory does not require the emergency actions to be implemented, but points out that the threat has to be argued in a way that creates a platform, which allows for extraordinary actions to be legitimized, actions which had not been possible without the securitized discourse.

To summarize the securitization process it requires that: (i) there is an existential threat against (ii) the survival of a referent object and (iii) that the threat justifies extraordinary actions that are accepted by an audience (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 25). Figure 3.1 explains a successful securitization.

Figure 3.1 From a securitizing move to a successful securitization.



Comment: The securitization process based on the securitization theory (Buzan et al., 1998).

3.2.1 Criticism of the theory

The conceptual framework of securitization has been at the center of critique and researchers have sought to develop the theory by improving its analytical and methodological framework. Critiques argue about the securitization theory's limitations, the potential widening of the speech act, how to understand its central concepts and the difference between securitization and desecuritization (Balzacq, 2015, Wilkinson, 2007, Bigo, 2002, Roe, 2004, Jutila, 2006). Desecuritization is the process opposite to securitization, where a securitized issue 'returns' to the area of normal politics (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 23). The normative statement of the theory

has also been at the centre of critical analysis and Pinar Bilgin (2007) argues that in some cases it would be preferable and more effective with securitization instead of desecuritization when challenging the establishments' monopoly of defining security politics. Bilgin stresses the importance of societal actors in challenging the states monopoly over security issues and emphasises the possible positive outcome of 'security-speak' in political and economical reforms.

Matt McDonald (2008) argues that there is an analytical ambiguousness in the theory and too much focus on the structural part of the speech act instead of the external context that generates its power. Thierry Balzacq (2015) suggests that the speech act is better understood by including concrete conditions like the power relations between the referent object, the actor and the audience and the disposition of involved groups.

The theory has been criticized for focusing too much on the linguistic and researchers have moved beyond the formal procedures of the speech act to focus on routine practices when studying security issues. The Paris school has developed the theory, arguing that the way someone acts can be seen as an act of securitization (Williams, 2013, p. 1249). Didier Bigo (2002) explains security in relation to bureaucratic practices, which contributes to securitization of different issues. Routine practices by the police, military and private companies impact the securitization process. He argues that these 'professional managers of unease' create 'security continuum' by connecting different issues like migration and terrorism. He further argues that it is through this security continuum that practices and discourses develop. Vicki Squire (2009, p. 22) on the other hand, highlights the importance of both analysing speech acts of political elites and governmental practices involved in securitizing migration.

There have also been discussions on how to understand concepts in the theory and what defines the difference between politics of high priority that allows extraordinary actions and normal politics, which is crucial for being able to distinguish desecuritization from securitization (Williams, 2003, Hansen, 2006, pp. 31-32). The securitization theory is based on the logic of exception (Buzan et al., 1998), but the ambiguity of the concept allows for interpretations that may be too wide and attaches great importance to the methodological

framework. Researchers have pointed out the difficulty in creating a methodological framework for the theory that can fit all types of empirical analyses (Balzacq, 2011, Hansen, 2006).

4. Method and material

This chapter begins with an introduction of the study's methodological framework, which is based on discourse analysis by Carol Bacchi, and a presentation of its analytical tools. Further on, the analytical tools from the securitization theory will be explained. Thenceforth, the limitations and the quality of the research will be presented. Finally, the study's empirical material and delimitations will be presented together with the relevance of the study.

4.1 Discourse analysis and 'What's the problem represented to be?'

According to the securitization theory (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 25) the researcher should study discourses to understand who can do or speak securitization successfully and on what issues. Discourses can be described as a set of expressions and concepts that controls people's perceptions of the world. A discourse is a way of talking about and understanding social phenomenon (Fejes & Thornberg, 2015, p. 92).

There are different ways of studying discourses and this thesis is based on the 'What's the problem represented to be?' approach, which is influenced by social constructivist ideas. The approach developed by Carol Bacchi consists of a theoretical framework, which explains political issues as social constructions. The theoretical idea behind the approach is that all policies are problematizing activities that need to be critically analyzed (figure 4.1). By studying political documents, the proposed changes indicate what is need to be 'fixed' and thereby what is thought about as a 'problem' (Bacchi, 2009, p. 3).

Figure 4.1 Introducing the WPR-approach to policy analysis.

1. We are governed trough problematizations.
2. We need to study problematizations (through analysing the problem representations they contain), rather than 'problems'.

3. We need to problematize (interrogate) the problematizations on offer through scrutinising the premises and effects of the problem representations they contain.

Comment: Key concept of the 'What's the problem represented to be' -approach (Bacchi, 2009, p. xxi).

Based on the theoretical ideas, Bacchi has devised a method, a discourse analysis, which offers analytical tools for explaining the relationships between discourses and social phenomenon and in what way problem representations advantages some groups while disadvantages others (Bacchi, 2016, pp. 5,7). In this thesis the discourse analysis will allow to identify how deep seated ways of thinking creates and perpetuates aspects of social life and how power is achieved through discourses and the way the distribution of power affect different groups in society (Denscombe, 2009, p. 393, 396). The discourse analysis will allow to dig deeper into the material to identify problem representations and help explain how and in what way migration is constructed in the selected material (Bacchi, 2009, p. 3). The difference between the WPR approach and traditional discourse analysis is that the WPR approach focuses on *knowledge* and not just language. The theory provides tools for examine social knowledge within a text, which underlies political practices (Bacchi, 2009).

The analysis of the study will be conducted by combining the analytical tools from the WPR approach and the securitization theory. The WPR discourse analysis will function as a method for exposing implicit meanings and underlying assumptions in the material. The method helps highlight central discourses in the material, which will then be analysed through the theory of securitization. The WPR approach and the securitization theory have common epistemological and ontological theories about the reality and are both based on constructivist ideas (Bacchi, 2009, p. 1, Buzan et al., 1998, p. 20). The Copenhagen school emphasises methodological pluralism (Nyman, 2018, p. 106) and considers as part of a critical approach, which makes the theory suitable to combine with the critical discourse analysis of the WPR approach. Moreover, both approaches stress the favourable position of actors like governments, in articulating performative discourses and shaping the perceptions of issues (Bacchi, 2009, p.37, Buzau et al., 1998, p. 24)

4.2 Analytical tools from the WPR approach

The empirical material used in this study need to be systematically limited to prevent it from being unstructured (Denscombe, 2009, pp. 398-400). The analytical tools from the WPR approach consist of six questions, which are formulated according to the theoretical framework (figure 4.2) and will function as empirical indicators in the analysis by systematically being applied to the material (Bacchi, 2009, p. xx1). Depending on the purpose of a study, questions may be selected or removed (Bacchi, 2009, p. 2). Question three, as well as five and six is excluded in this study, as the focus of the study is on the securitization process itself and not possible effects or the emergence of such. Question two and four will be explained together to prevent repeated explanations. The questions will be explained in detail to show how they will contribute to the analysis.

Figure 4.2 The analytical tools from the WPR approach.

Q1	What’s the ‘problem’ represented to be in a specific policy?
Q2	What presuppositions or assumptions underlie this representation of the ‘problem’?
Q3	How has this representation of the ‘problem’ come about?
Q4	What is left unproblematic in this problem representation? Where are the silences? Can the ‘problem’ be thought about differently?
Q5	What effects are produced by this representation of the ‘problem’?
Q6	How/where has this representation of the ‘problem’ been produced, disseminated and defended? How could it be questioned, disrupted and replaced?

Comment; Analytical tools from the WPR approach according to its methodological framework (Bacchi, 2009).

4.2.1 Question 1

The first question is ‘What’s the ‘problem’ represented to be in a specific policy?’ and aims to identify problem representations, because the central ideas of the WPR approach is that all policies are problematizing activities (Bacchi, 2009, p. 2). By identifying what is proposed as a policy change and analyzing strategies in legislative proposals, the idea and thought behind that change, the discourse, can be revealed. According to the WPR approach, politicians are not problem solvers but rather create ‘problems’. The approach challenges the common idea of politicians ‘searching’ for issues that need to be fixed and instead starting with the policy and working backwards to identify the problem representation behind it (Bacchi, 2009, p. 3). Bacchi states that the ‘problem’ can be related to different problem representations because discourses are not static and can be linked to each other (Bacchi, 2009, p. 3).

4.2.2 Question 2 and 4

The second question is ‘What assumptions underlie this representation of the ‘problem’?’ and aims at identify the assumptions and the underlying discourses behind the problem representation. The first question helps analyze the problem representation and this second step focus on a deeper understanding of the thoughts behind it and highlights knowledge that are often taken for granted (Bacchi, 2009, pp. 4, 5).

To identify the assumptions behind the problem representation Bacchi suggests a strategy of analysing *key concepts* in the policy texts. Political texts are often open for interpretations and the political views behind the text can be identified when analyzing the meaning of the concepts, which is embedded in governmental practices (Bacchi, 2009, pp. 8-9). Another tool for studying assumptions is through *binaries*. Binaries consist of an ‘A/not-A’ relationship where the other side is more valued than the other (Bacchi, 2009, p. 7). By identifying binaries, the prioritized idea can be highlighted.

Bacchi’s fourth question is ‘What is left unproblematic in this problem representation?’ ‘Where are the silences?’ and helps identify what is not talked about in the material. When identifying issues there are not problematized in a text (*silences*), the prioritized discourses

can be highlighted (Bacchi, 2009, p. 12). Bacchi proposes the same tools used in question two when identifying the ‘silenced’ discourses (Bacchi, 2009, pp. 12, 48).

4.3 Analytical tools from the securitization theory

The theoretical framework of the securitization theory offers tools for practical security analysis. Specified questions have been formulated and will operate as analytical tools during the analysis of the material, in order to measure whether or not a successful securitization has taken place. The questions will help identify central components in the material according to the logic of the theory and will prevent ‘everything’ from becoming an issue of security. The analytical questions are based on the Copenhagen school’s criteria for successful securitization and are explained in figure 4.3.

Figure 4.3 Analytical tools based on the securitization theory.

Who are the securitizing actors?
Who or what is the referent object that the securitizing actor presents as in need of protection?
What is the existential threat that the referent object needs to be protected from?
In what way does the existential threat justify extraordinary actions?
Who are the relevant audience, and in what way does the audience accept the extraordinary actions?

Comment: Analytical tools from the securitization theory (Buzan et al., 1998).

In order to conduct a scientifically correct analysis, an understanding of the securitization process and the analytical tools based on the securitization theory are vital, which in turn requires an understanding of the theory’s key/central components and important theoretical

insights. The theoretical insights followed by the theory's central components are presented below.

4.3.1 Facilitating conditions

According to the securitization theory, two facilitating conditions affect the chance for a securitization move to be successful. The *internal conditions* pay attention to the securitizing actor and its role in framing the security 'problem' according to the inner logic of the speech act. The security rhetoric needs to follow the logic of presenting something as an existential threat that can only be handled by extraordinary measures. The *external conditions* are dependent on the securitizing actors social capital and the threatening position of certain referent objects (Buzan et al., 1998, pp. 32-33). An actor who holds an authoritarian position has better chance of succeeding with the securitizing move and the same is the case when the audience already perceives a referent object as 'threatening' (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 33).

4.3.2 Difference between politicized issues and issues of existential threat

Non-politicized issues mean that a certain issue is not part of the general debate, but part of the social sphere. Politicized issues are part of the political system and are the subject of governmental decisions and debate. The difference between politicized and securitized issues are that politicized issues appear to be open and a matter of choice, in contrast to securitized issues that requires an emergency action outside regular political procedures. Securitized issues take precedence over the usual political agenda (Buzan et al., 1998, pp. 23-24). Securitization is an extreme version of politization and on the same time the opposite, because it moves the issue out of the open debate that characterizes the sphere of politization (Nyman, 2018, p. 104). The Copenhagen school explains securitization in contrast to politization as follows:

By contrast, securitization on the international level, (although often not on the domestic one) means to present an issue as *urgent and existential*, as so important that it should not be exposed to the *normal haggling of politics* but should be dealt

with decisively by top leaders prior to other issues (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 29, emphasis added).

As the migration policy is part of the Swedish political agenda, the non-politicized category will be excluded from the study and focus is on analyzing the other two categories.

4.3.3 Distinction between a securitization move and a successful securitization

When an actor presents something as an existential threat to a referent object according to the grammar and logic of the speech act, a securitization move has taken place. The important difference between this securitization attempt and a successful securitization is the audience. The actor needs to convince the relevant audience to legitimate the extraordinary move, which is explained as follow:

We do not push the demand so high as to say that an emergency measure has to be adopted, only that the existential threat has to be argued and just gain enough resonance for a *platform to be made* from which it is possible to legitimize emergency measures or other steps that would not have been possible had the discourse not taken the form of existential threats, point of no return, and necessity. If no signs of such acceptance exist, we can talk only of a securitizing move, not of an object actually being securitized (Buzal et al., 1998, p. 25, emphasis added).

4.3.4 Referent objects and securitizing actors

The securitization process involves a securitizing actor and a referent object. Referent objects have different meanings besides the fundamental principle of being seen as legitimate claimers of their own survival from an existential threat presented by a securitizing actor. The state is an example of a referent object where the threat may be directed against its sovereignty or a nation and its identity. From a wider perspective a referent object could be the EU and its institutions (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 36, 45). One important variable for a successful securitization is the scale of the referent object, where the middle-scale seems to be the most successful. Middle scale includes states, nations and civilizations.

A securitizing actor is a group or individual who performs the speech act to a referent object. The securitizing move is often taken in reference to a collectivity and the actor often represents political parties, governments, lobby-groups and bureaucracies (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 36, 40). According to Buzan et al. (1998, p. 40) it is tricky to point out an actor that represents a group, for example you can always argue that someone acts individually when representing a political party or an individual acting for the government. They explain it as follows:

But to disaggregate everything into individuals is not very helpful, because much of social life is understandable only when collectivities are seen as more than the sum of their members, and are treated as social realities (methodological collectivism) (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 40).

Individuals that have strong positions are often speakers for the collective through its representative roles. When an actor speaks for a state the rules are already made up, because a state generally has rules for who can speak for it. When it comes to the environment or nations there are no formal rules of representation, which explains that the legitimacy is more problematic in those contexts. When identifying a securitizing actor one way is to look at the logic of the action to see if it is the individual or the organization that generally will be held responsible for the action. (Buzan et al., 1998, pp. 40-41).

4.4 Limitations and research quality

This study is based on a *qualitative research approach*, which means that the researcher is part of the research and closely linked to the research 'instrument'. In qualitative research the *reliability* of the study becomes a matter of *dependability*, which means that the study's transparency is important in achieving reliable research results, as it is difficult in qualitative research to prove that the results would be the same if the study were repeated by another researcher (Denscombe, 2009, p. 381). The study's transparency has sought to be achieved by currently describe the procedures and considerations that form the basis of the results.

Regarding the study's *credibility*, or *validity*, the focus has been in showing that the study 'measures' what it intends to measure. The study is based on analytical tools, which have been motivated and explained in detail to increase the credibility of the study results (Denscombe, 2009, p. 380). However, this aspect is closely linked to the aspect of reliability, because regardless whether the research questions are credible and well designed to answer the purpose of the study, the researcher is involved in the process of the analysis and the results will be affected by the objectivity of the researcher. When using discourse analysis, as in this study, there is no ability of achieving any kind of impartial truth, because the researcher cannot completely distance from the objective (Winther Jørgensen & Philips, 2000, p. 46).

4.5 Empirical material, delimitations and relevance

This study focuses on the political changes that occurred in the Swedish migration policy during the late 2015. The time period is interesting to study from a securitization perspective, as the changes in the migration policy took place drastically and included both the government's rhetoric regarding migration issues as well as the migration legislation (Lundberg, 2017).

As seen in previous research there is external and facilitating conditions, which possibly affects whether or not a securitization move takes place and becomes successful (Huysman, 2000, Squire, 2009). This study is thus limited to investigating the securitization process itself and does not focus on the causes or possible effects of such, even if the large number of refugees in Sweden during 2015 can be seen as an external facilitating condition (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 33).

The empirical material used for the study is the Swedish Government bill 'Special Actions in Case of Serious Danger to Public Order or the Internal Security of the Country' (prop. 2015/16:67) underlying the temporarily law for ID controls (SFS 2015:1073). The Government bill will in this study 'represent' the Swedish migration policy in 2015 and will function as a basis for analysing how migration is constructed in relation to security. The legislative proposal is interesting to study from a securitization perspective, as it seems to

contain characteristics of extraordinary measures (prop. 2015/16:67, p. 28-30). Since the study is limited to analysing one legislative proposal, it is difficult to argue that the results of the study represent the overall Swedish migration policy. At the same time, the Government bill had a clear impact on the Swedish migration policy and lead to direct consequences in society, e.g. as it limited the opportunities for refugees to enter Sweden to seek asylum. The bill is interesting to study in detail to understand *how* political actors' controls discourses and uses security rhetoric to legitimate political changes.

The motivation for analysing the Government bill is that it is content-rich and contains problem representations, which are central for studying the underlying discourse and identify the securitization process (Bacchi, 2009, Buzan et al., 1998). The Government bill provides extensive information about the background, the legislative process, power relations between actors and 'hidden' problematizations, which is central for explaining the 'creation' of security issues.

To be able to determine if the Swedish migration policy is securitized or not, the audience reaction on the securitizing moves will be analysed by comparing the analysed Government bill with the final legislative decisions taken by the Swedish Parliament, to see which parts of the legislative proposal that was accepted or not by the Parliament. The empirical material that will be used is the final law (SFS 2015:1073) that entered into force on the 18th December 2015 and the Swedish Committee on Justice committee report for parliamentary decisions (bet. 2015/16:JuU24), together with the final proposals and decisions that was treated and voted in the Chamber, which is presented in the parliamentary record of proceedings in the Chamber (Riksdagens protokoll 2015/16:48) and the written communication from the Parliament (Riksdagsskrivelse 2015/16:122). The empirical material will be analysed by using the analytical tools from the securitization theory and compared with the analysed Government bill.

5. Results and analysis

In the following chapter, the analytical questions from the WPR approach and the securitization theory will be answered. The first section will present the results from the WPR discourse analysis and introduce the legislative proposal's problem representations and its central assumptions. The last section presents the results of the analysis when using the analytical tools from the securitization theory. Finally, an analysis of the audience reaction on the securitizing moves will be carried out, by comparing the Government's legislative proposal with the Parliament's final legislative decisions, to determine which parts of the securitization moves that was accepted by the audience. What is presented in this chapter will serve as a foundation for the final discussion and conclusion.

5.1 The WPR approach

5.1.1 Representation of the 'problem' (Q1)

The Swedish Government bill (prop. 2015/16:67) that is in focus of this study contains a number of policy actions. According to Bacchi (2009, pp. 2-3) there is always a problematizing idea behind a policy action, which can be identified by highlighting the actions and strategies in the legislative proposal. The basic action presented in the proposition is to give the government extended powers to announce regulations if there is a situation in which there is a danger to the public order or the inner security of the country. The actions that the government should be able to announce during the specified situation are identity checks during transport by bus, train or passenger ship, to Sweden from another state. The government should also be able to announce regulations concerning its role as a supervising body, control and sanctions, to ensure that the regulations taken with reference to the law is followed (prop. 2015/16:67, p. 1). The actions are formulated in three steps and presented with the purpose of creating a legal ground for further actions:

In the light of the stated circumstances, and in order to ensure that basic societal functions are not completely overridden, it is necessary to create the *conditions* for *further actions* that can be used if necessary in order to maintain public order and internal security (prop. 2015/16:67, p. 7, emphasis added).

The further actions are then formulated as:

The government thereby proposes legislative actions, which gives the government *power to take special actions* when there is a serious danger to the public order or the inner security of the country (prop. 2015/16:67, p. 8, emphasis added).

The proposition then specify the special actions that the government can take during the specified situation:

The government or the department decided by the government, will be able to announce regulations concerning *identity checks* during transportation to Sweden from another state by bus, train or passenger ships, when there is a serious danger to the public order or inner security of the country. The government will be able to announce regulations concerning *inspections and controls* regarding the identity checks. The government will be able to announce regulations concerning *sanctions* (prop. 2015/16:67, p. 11, emphasis added).

The Government bill emphasizes the acute situation where central societal functions are under high pressure (prop. 2015/16:67, pp. 9-10). The ‘current situation’ is often referred to in the bill (prop. 2015/16:67, pp. 7, 9, 10, 13), and described as a serious threat to the public order and the inner security of the country. The ‘current situation’ is not fully defined but put in a context, where it is considered to be the high number of refugees and the implications it causes:

The *migration flows presents acute challenges* concerning the functionality of the society, which is a part of the Swedish security. The Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB), point to major stresses, mainly for housing, healthcare, school and social services, but also to other important societal activities (prop. 2015/16:67, p. 8, emphasis added).

Based on the results, the problem representation behind the legislative proposal is in this case the high number of *refugees* seeking asylum in Sweden and the challenges it brings.

5.1.2 Assumptions and silences (Q2+Q4)

The second and fourth question aims at identify the assumptions and the silences behind the ‘problem’ that was highlighted in the first question to reveal and gain a deeper understanding of the thoughts behind the policy proposal (Bacchi, 2009, pp. 4-5). In the Government bill there are several assumptions that rarely are put into question. One assumption is that refugees are in need of being taken care of. They are portrayed as a concept of one unique group in need of housing and other forms of help from the Swedish welfare system (prop. 2015/16:67, pp. 7,8,9,13). Through this concept refugees are presented exclusively as a burden to the Swedish society, because no positive effects are presented. In this case there is a distinction between ‘useful’ and ‘unwanted’ where refugees are connected to the later concept. The actions in the policy proposal will protect the generous Swedish welfare system from the uncontrollable refugee flows prop.2015/16:67,p. 7). This marks a linkage between migration and a binary contributing/non-contributing, where refugees are placed in the negative pole.

Another assumption is that the economic challenges for the state and its societal functions caused by the refugee flows are given priority over values of an open society and freedom of movement:

In order to gain a better control over the persons entering Sweden and in order to *ward of the threat against public order and the inner security* caused by the large flows of asylum seekers, there should be a possibility to combine the border controls with identity checks on buses, train and passenger ships entering Sweden from another state, although *such an action may limit the opportunities for people to reach Sweden and seek asylum* (prop. 2015/16:67, p. 9, emphasis added).

Special actions like the identity controls are ‘required’ by the politicians to take responsibility for the Swedish society and the idea behind this assumption is that the perspective of the Swedish citizens approves it as necessary for the security of the Swedish state. Refugees are

perceived as a security threat to the Swedish welfare system and the society, because of the way they challenge the basic principles of the economic and political stability of the country. The ‘responsibility’ is directed away from the refugees and towards the Swedish citizens. However, there is an emphasis on a more even ‘distribution’ of refugees between member states, which directs the responsibility for the refugees towards other member states (prop. 2015/16:67, p. 19).

Identifying what is not problematized in the Government bill can reveal the prioritized discourse. When an actor controls a problem representation in a legislative proposal, the actor thereby controls the underlying values (Bacchi, 2009, p. 7). Something that is left unproblematic or silenced in the proposition is that migration is assumed to be a ‘problem’ that requires control and policy legislation. The Swedish Council on Legislation questions the bill for lacking a clear problem description and questions the government’s assessment that the situation would pose a threat to the public order or the inner security of the country. The Swedish Migration Agency and the Swedish Police Authority also points out the uncertainty of what constitutes a serious danger to the inner security of the country (prop. 2015/16:67, p. 13).

The humanitarian perspective is not problematized in the policy proposal. There is a strong focus on the security of the Swedish state and the humanitarian perspective is mentioned very briefly in the section for analysis of the policy impacts:

The aims of Sweden’s international commitment are that *no one should be forced to flee*. But the international situation that is occurring increases the number of asylum seekers /.../ It is *not possible to set a target for how many asylum seekers* can or should come (prop. 2015/16:67, p. 19, emphasis added).

The absence of a humanitarian discourse shows that the security discourse is prioritized in the policy proposal.

5.2 The securitization theory

In this section, the results from the WPR discourse analysis will be analysed according to the theoretical framework of the securitization theory. The analytical tools used in the analysis will help explain the securitization process according to the inner logic of the speech act (Buzan et al., 1998).

5.2.1 Who are the securitizing actors?

The securitizing actor in this case is the Swedish Government and the Swedish Parliament, which both controls the legislation process and through the policy proposal declares the Swedish society, to be existentially threatened by the refugee flows and thereby holds the privileged position in the articulation of insecurity (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 25). The Government presented the policy proposal for the Parliament and the Parliament then voted for the proposal. The securitizing move is taken with reference to a collectivity, because the politicians in the Government and the Parliament will be held collectively responsible for the actions in the policy proposal, even if there are differences in opinion between individuals or political parties (Buzan et al., 1998, pp. 40-41). The securitizing actors can thus be equated with the Swedish state as the Government and the Parliament speaks and acts on behalf of the Swedish state, because the state already have legal rules that confirms who may act on its behalf. (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 41).

Other so-called *functional actors* are involved in the securitization process without the power to move the issue above politics (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 36). The Council on Legislation, the Swedish Migration Agency and the Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB), whose comments recurs throughout the bill, influences the legislative proposal even though the Government is not bound to follow the advices given from these authorities.

5.2.2 Who or what is the referent object that the securitizing actor presents as in need of protection?

For a referent object to be existentially threatened it requires the characteristics of the threat to be of a kind, that if not warded off, it threatens the survival of the object (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 36). The policy proposal states that the refugee flows are threatening the inner security of

the country and poses great challenges for authorities and the society at large, mainly regarding societal functions like healthcare, school, housing and social services (prop. 2016/16:67, p. 9). According to the logic of the securitization theory, the referent object is the Swedish society and its institutions, which contributes to the prerequisite for a successful securitization due to its middle-scale level (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 36).

5.2.3 What is the existential threat that the referent object needs to be protected from?

In the Government bill the refugee flows are presented as a ‘threat’ to the country’s public order and internal security (prop. 2015/16:67, p. 9). Political threats are harmful to a state’s organizational ability and stability (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 142), and thereby threaten the fundamental structure of a state. The problem representation in the policy proposal, which is the refugee flows, is a central part of the securitizing move where refugees rhetorically are constructed as ‘threats’ towards the Swedish society and its societal functions (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 147).

Some authorities are given the role as extra important, as they are central functional components in the Swedish society and when they are existentially threatened, the society as whole are threatened. The following sentence shows the attempt in widening the meaning of the security threat from traditional ones:

The problems concerning security and internal order according to the policy proposal, must be seen from a *broader societal perspective* than the traditional, where the police aspects are the most important *.../ It threatens the functionality of the society* and risks creating new tensions (prop. 2015/16:67, p. 13, emphasis added).

The concept of migrants as in need of being ‘controlled’ is part of the security rhetoric and the large number of refugees constitutes a situation where the control cannot be maintained.

5.2.4 In what way does the existential threat justify extraordinary actions?

The policy proposal states that the emergency situation caused by the high number of asylum seekers requires special actions (prop. 2015/16:67 p. 7). The situation is described as a serious danger to the Swedish society and can be seen as an attempt to justify actions that goes beyond normal political procedures:

In situations where there is a *serious danger* to public order or internal security of the country, there is a need to be able to *quickly* take relevant actions, which at the same time can be *very intervening*. The current situation, with a very high influx of asylum seekers is an *example of such a situation* (prop. 2015/16:67, p. 10, emphasis added).

The situation is described as significantly more serious for the society than previous situations:

What the law means is something other and *significantly more serious* for the society as a whole than what is meant by serious disturbances of the general order in, for example, 24 § in the Police Act (1984:387) (prop. 2015/16:67, p. 21, emphasis added).

According to the securitization theory an extraordinary action is the result of a securitizing actor moving an issue from its normal political procedures to be dealt with by extraordinary measures. When an actor presents something as a threat to the existence or survival of a referent object, it justifies extraordinary actions to ward off the threat (Buzan et al., 1998, pp. 32-33). When analysing extraordinary actions it is vital to understand in what way the situation are described as an existential threat, but also in what way the political issue are normally dealt with by politics. In the policy proposal the government describes the situation as a serious threat to the internal security of the country and the public order and thereby argues for special actions to be taken:

A law on special actions in case of serious danger to public order or the internal security of the country will be introduced. When there is a serious danger to the public order or the inner security of the country, the government should be able to take *special actions*. The actions should be able to be taken *quickly* (prop. 2015/16:67, p. 11, emphasis added).

When analyzing the Government bill in relation to the logic of extraordinary actions, it is clear that there is a conflict between different actors to control its content and two main approaches are central. The Swedish Council on Legislation stresses that the legislative proposal is the result of extraordinary actions taken by the Government, which, on the other hand, states that the political actions are taken according to normal political procedures. The Council on Legislation criticizes the bill for being the result of insufficient preparatory work. The Swedish Government did not follow the normal political procedures when preparing the bill and several actions contains the characteristics of an extraordinary measure. In the policy proposal the Swedish Government presents the situation as acute and threatening to the extent that actions must be taken quickly, and suggests to the Swedish parliament to shorten the private members' motions period and the deadline for providing comments on the policy proposal (Prop 2015/16:67 p. 6). The Government stresses, with reference to a committee report from the Committee on the Constitution, that the mandatory preparation of a policy proposal is not the same in all cases, and can be considerably shortened during a crisis (prop. 2015/16:67, p. 6).

Another sign of extraordinary actions is the extended powers that the Swedish Government provides through the legislative proposal. The Council on Legislation states that the actions in the Government bill are too wide and that there is no practical reason for controlling the borders to Finland or Norway:

The border crossing to Denmark and Finland have no practical significance for the migration to Sweden. What matters is the possibility of closing the Öresund Bridge. The Council on Legislation proposes that the Governments' powers be limited to closing the roads at the border to Denmark (prop. 2015/16:67 p. 30).

The Swedish Migration Agency, the Swedish Police Authority and the Council on Legislation, stresses that the definition of a threat is unclear in the policy proposal (prop. 2015/16:67 p. 13). The Council on Legislation questioning whether the situation constitutes a threat to the internal security of the country. The lack of a clear problem definition in the policy proposal brings too extensive possibilities of applying the law. The Government on the other side, states that a threat should be described through general terms and the circumstances of situations can only be validated as they occur (prop. 2015/16:67 pp. 11, 13,

17, 21). At the same time, there is a hierarchy between the actors, and the Swedish Government is not bound to follow the recommendations of the Council on Legislation. The Government states that the policy proposal is in accordance with the minimum standards of the EU asylum policy (prop. 2015/16:67, p. 10) and that the Schengen agreement allows member states to temporarily restrict freedom of movement through border controls if the situation poses a threat to the internal security of the country (prop 2015/16:67, p. 7).

5.2.5 Who are the relevant audience, and in what way does the audience accept the extraordinary actions?

The Swedish Government has to convince the relevant audience of the threat, to be able to legitimate the extraordinary actions in the policy proposal (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 25). In order to successfully securitize the Swedish migration policy the Government has to convince the Swedish Parliament of the securitizing moves, as the Parliament has the power to adopt the legislative proposals from the Government. The Committee on Justice, which composition of members reflects the distribution of the members of the Parliament (Sveriges Riksdag, 2020), presented a committee report (bet. 2015/16:JuU24) for a final Parliamentary decision in December 2015. The committee report propose that the Parliament should adopt the Government bill and reject all the 15 private member's motion arising out of the Government bill (bet. 2015/16:JuU24, pp. 1, 4-6).

The Council on Legislation criticizes the Government bill for lacking a clear problem definition, which could give the Government too wide powers when applying the law and for being the result of insufficient preparatory work (Prop 2015/16:67 pp. 6, 13, 30). The council rejects the legislative proposal, but the Government states that the critical situation is considered to be such a threat to the Swedish society that it thus requires extraordinary actions (prop. 2015/16:67 p. 6). The Committee on Justice agree with the Government and states that the strained situation requires special actions to ensure that the Swedish society will be able to take care of the people entering Sweden and for maintaining confidence in and legitimacy of the asylum system (bet. 2015/16:JuU24, p. 13). The committee states that the Government discusses the problem description and definition of 'serious danger' and that there is no

obviousness in what should constitute a serious danger, but states that the risk of serious effects for the Swedish society should be considered first (bet. 2015/16:JuU24, p. 22).

The committee report proposes that the Parliament should adopt the Government bill despite the insufficient preparatory work and states that there are no formal obstacles for replacing the normal routines for the preparation and consultation procedure by a faster procedure in certain exceptional cases:

According to the committee's assessment, the Government has justified why the current legislation is urgent – the situation that has arisen is a civilian crisis that must be dealt with so that the consequences in society do not become even more serious. On that basis, the mandatory preparation obligation of the Instrument of Government may be considered fulfilled (bet. 2015/16:JuU24, p. 14).

The voting protocol of the meeting of the Chamber presents the results of how the political parties voted about the legislative proposal. The voting results of the Chamber shows that the Chamber approved the committee proposal and the final law adopted by the Parliament (SFS 2015:1073) is identical to the Government's legislative proposal (prop. 2015/16:67, p. 4). Explanatory reservations and motions for the rejection of factual matters concerning the committee proposal were rejected by the Chamber and the voting resulted in the Chamber adopting the Committee of Justice proposal as whole, where part 4-6 and 8-14 were decided by acclamation (Protokoll 2015/16:48, pp. 77-79). The final written communication from the Parliament is:

By delivering the report of the Committee on Justice (2015/16:JuU24) 'Special actions in case of serious danger to the public order or the inner security of the country', I report that the Swedish Parliament this day have approved the committee's proposal for parliamentary decision. The 17th December 2015 (Riksdagsskrivelse 2015/16:122).

Not all people have access to a discourse, and the power relations behind the policy proposal help gain audience legitimacy (Bacchi, 2009). The Government holds a strong internal position by controlling the speech act and faces facilitating external conditions through its high social capital (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 33) as the Government and the Parliament are

legitimate representatives of the state (Buzan et al., 1998, pp. 40-41). The results of the analysis shows that the Government successfully convinced the Parliament of the securitizing moves as the Parliament accepted the legislative proposal as presented by the Committee of Justice without any modifications.

6. Discussion and conclusion

The aim of this study was to interrogate the changes that occurred in the Swedish migration policy in 2015 through the theory of securitization. The goal was to identify and offer an understanding of the securitization process and the way political actors justify extraordinary actions within politics by using security rhetoric. The study was conducted by exposing discourses in the Swedish Government's legislative proposal concerning ID controls and analyse the discourses through the theory of securitization. The results show that the process of securitization has taken place through the discourses of Swedish politicians', which are formulated on deep-rooted knowledge of *state-centric security* and when articulated according to the inner logic of the speech act, creates a 'securitized' platform that allows for extraordinary actions. Through this platform, the final securitizing move takes place in the shape of the final law adopted by the Swedish parliament. The securitization process becomes successful as the Government gains audience legitimacy by the Parliament, which adopted the legislative proposal presented by the Committee of Justice in accordance with the original Government bill. This study argues, that 'security' in this way is the political framing of migrants and refugees as 'threatening' towards the Swedish society and thereby integrates the migration policy into the security field.

This study argues that in the Swedish context, migrants are integrated into the security discourse in the shape of subjects of societal instability, which strengthens the results posed by Lazaridis and Wadia (2015) regarding the western states securitization of migrants. The WPR analysis revealed that the legislative proposal restricts the possibility for migrants and refugees to get access to the Swedish society and position them as 'threats' towards the functionality of the Swedish society, which is part of the Swedish security. The problem representation in the legislative proposal, which is the refugees seeking asylum in Sweden, is built on central assumptions: *the economic assumption*, *the security assumption* and *the responsibility assumption*, which are intertwined. The results distance from previous research connecting migrants with traditional security issues like criminality or terrorism (Huysman, 2006, Abiri, 2000).

The economic assumption supports the 'useful' by emphasizing the vulnerability of the Swedish societal functions regarding the possibility to meet the needs of Swedish citizens. There is a divide between 'contributing' and 'non-contributing' where migrants are portrayed as in total need of the Swedish welfare system. Migrants are directly connected to security in the legislative proposal as the security assumption is built upon ideas about 'control' and 'order'. The problem representation creates the perception and idea of migrants and refugees as a 'serious danger' to the Swedish society. The responsibility assumption showed how the Government directed the responsibility away from the refugees and towards its citizens, at the same time as the Government pointed to other EU member states to take responsibility, which strengthens the humanitarian perspective.

In addition to identifying the underlying assumptions, the discourse analysis resulted in highlighting the near-absence of a humanitarian perspective in the legislative proposal, giving priority to the security discourse, which is in line with Stokes-Dupass (2017) research of securitization in the Scandinavian countries during the refugee crisis. The analysis showed no signs of *identity assumptions*, which is often built upon the 'fear of the other' (Huysman, 2006). Security rhetoric based on ideas about national identity is primarily used by right-wing populist parties (Lazaridis and Tsagkroni, 2015) and may have been present if the study would have included political parties as securitizing actors.

The securitization analysis revealed that the securitizing rhetoric follows the inner logic of the speech act, which opened up for further securitization through the 'political level' (the legislative change). The security rhetoric used in the legislative proposal positioned the Swedish society as *existentially* threatened by the large number of refugees and enables *extraordinary actions* that goes beyond normal political procedures. The ID controls introduced through the proposal are extraordinary as the action restricts the free movement, which is a central idea of the EU and the Schengen agreement. The legislative proposal was made *quickly* and was criticized for being the result of *insufficient preparatory work*, which marks a change from normal political procedures. At the same time, the concept of extraordinary actions are built on the logic of *exception* and the results show that the legislative proposal is in accordance with the minimum standards of the EU asylum policy and that the preparation of a legislative proposal can be shortened during a crisis, which speaks for a politicization rather than

securitization, strengthening the results from Krzyzanowski's (2018) study. In this case, the difference between politics that allows for extraordinary actions and normal politics depends on how the Government acts in similar political procedures, which is difficult to investigate as the study is limited in time and empirical material.

The Government holds a strong internal status by controlling the discourses and thereby the perceptions of the issue. The securitization theory stresses that the main result of the securitization process is the creation of a platform that allows for extraordinary actions to be approved by the relevant audience, which would not have been the case without the securitized discourse. The analysis of the audience acceptance shows that the Government legitimates the securitizing moves by convincing the Swedish Parliament of the political actions in the legislative proposal. The Committee on Justice report for a final Parliamentary decision states that the Parliament should adopt the Government's legislative proposal and the voting results of the Chamber shows that the Chamber approved the committee proposal and the final law adopted by the Parliament (SFS 2015:1073) is identical to the Government's legislative proposal (prop. 2015/16:67, p. 4). The analysis shows that the migration policy has been securitized by the Government, as the Parliament, as the relevant audience, accepted all parts of the Government's legislative proposal.

To conclude the study, the results show that the Swedish migration policy has been successfully securitized during 2015 according to the inner logic of the speech act and by the Government gaining audience legitimacy from the Swedish Parliament. The legislative proposal contains political actions of extraordinary measures, which are implemented by the Government by using security rhetoric.

Finally, something should be said about the study's limitations. Since the study is based on two constructivist approaches (the WPR and the securitization theory), the analysis and the conclusions are based on a Swedish socio-political context. The phenomenon takes place within this context, which means that the results cannot be easily translated to another national context. The study's critically oriented framework also posed challenges to the objectivity of the study. Although transparency and objectivity has been in focus during the

research process, the researcher is highly participating in the analysis and the outcome of the study is dependent on my experiences and perceptions as a researcher.

This study focus on the securitization of migrants and refugees as a 'unified group' and the discourse analysis revealed that the legislative proposal is built upon problem representations of migrants and refugees, as both terms are used in the legislative proposal. However, the underlying assumptions behind the problem representations focuses on the refugee flows and the economic challenges it brings. The results show that it is the 'unwanted' migrant that is in focus of the Government bill, which points towards a securitization of refugees. The economic assumption, which connects the 'unwanted' migrant to the security discourse, differentiates between those who can contribute and those who cannot. Based on this, and the fact that this study differ from much of the previous research connecting migrants to security threats such as terrorism and transnational crime, it would be interesting in further research to investigate the securitization of migration in relation to the economic and societal sectors of security.

References

- Abiri, Elisabeth. (2000) *The Securitization of Migration: Towards an Understanding of Migration Policy Changes in the 1990s. The Case of Sweden*. Göteborg: Vasastadens Bokbinderi.
- Bacchi, Carol. L. (2009) *Analysing policy: What's the problem represented to be?* Pearson Australia: French Forest.
- Balzacq, Thierry. (2015) "The 'Essence' of securitization: Theory, ideal type, and a sociological science of security". *International Relations*, 29(1), 103-113.
- Balzacq, Thierry. (2011) "Enquiries into Methods: A New Framework for Securitization Analysis", In T. Balzacq (Ed.), *Securitization Theory: How Security Problems Emerge and Dissolve* (s. 31-54). Abingdon UK and New York: Routledge.
- Benam, Çigdem H. (2011) "Emergence of a "Big Brother" in Europe: Border Control and Securitization of Migration. *Insight Turkey*, 13(3), 191-207.
- Bilgin, Pinar. (2007) "Making Turkey's Transformation Possible: Claiming 'Security-speak' - not Desecuritization!". *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, 7(4), 555-571. doi: 10.1080/14683850701726039.
- Boswell, Christina. (2007) "Theorizing Migration Policy: Is There a Third Way?". *The International Migration Review*, 47(1): 75-100.
- Buzan, Barry. (1991) *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*. Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Buzan, Barry., Waever, Ole., & de Wilde, Jaap. (1998) *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Bigo, Didier. (2002) "Security and immigration: Towards a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease". *Alternatives* 27, Special issue, 63-92.

- Denscombe, Martyn. (2009) *Forskningshandboken: för småskaliga forskningsprojekt inom samhällsvetenskaperna*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Ericson, Mathias. (2018) "Sweden Has Been Naïve: Nationalism, Protectionism and Securitisation in Response to the Refugee Crisis of 2015". *Journal of Social Inclusion*, 6(4), 95-102.
- European Commission (2020) *Common European Asylum System*. Retrieved 2020-05-19, from https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/asylum_en
- European Parliament (2019) *EU policies – Delivering for citizens, Human rights*. Retrieved 2020-05-31, from [https://europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2018/628293/EPRS_BRI\(2018\)628293_EN.pdf](https://europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2018/628293/EPRS_BRI(2018)628293_EN.pdf)
- Fejes, Andreas & Thornberg, Robert. (Ed.) (2014) *handbok i kvalitativ analys*. Stockholm: Liber AB.
- Grönlund, Erik, Marmorstein, Elisabeth, Kasurinen, Anton. (2015) "Sverige inför tillfälliga gränskontroller". *SVT-Nyheter*. Hämtad 2019-10-04, <https://www.svt.se/nyheter/sverige-infor-tillfalliga-granskontroller>
- Hansen, Lene. (2006) *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*. Abingdon, UK, and New York: Routledge.
- Huysmans, Jef. (2000) "The European Union and the Securitization of Migration". *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 38(5), 751-77.
- Huysmans, Jef. (2006) *The Politics of Insecurity: Fear, migration and asylum in the EU*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Justitiedepartementet (2019) *Svensk migrations- och asylpolitik*. Stockholm: Justitiedepartementet vid Sveriges regeringskansli.
- Justitiekommitténs betänkande 2015/16:JuU24. *Särskilda åtgärder vid allvarlig fara för den allmänna ordningen eller den inre säkerheten i landet*. Tillgänglig:

https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/arende/betankande/sarskilda-atgarder-vid-allvarlig-fara-for-den_H301JuU24/html

- Jutila, Matti. (2006) "Desecuritizing Minority Rights: Against Determinism". *Security Dialogue*, 37(2), 167-185. doi: 10.1177/0967010606066169.
- Karamanidou, Lena. (2015) "The Securitisation of European Migration Policies: Perceptions of Threat and Management of Risk", in G. Lazaridis & K. Wadia (Ed.) *The Securitisation of Migration in the EU: Debates since 9/11* (p. 37-61). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kaya, Ayhan. (2012) "Backlash of multiculturalist and republicanist policies of integration in the age of securitization". *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 38(4-5): 399-411. doi: 10.1177/0191453711435653
- Krzyzanowski, Michal. (2018) "We Are a Small Country That Has Done Enormously Lot": The 'Refugee Crisis' and The Hybrid Discourse of Politicizing Immigration in Sweden". *Journal of Immigration & Refugee Studies* 16(1-2): 97-117.
- Lazaridis, Gabriella & Skleparis, Dimitri. (2015) "Securitization of migration and the far right: the case of Greek security professionals". *International Migration*, 54(2), 176-192. doi:10.1111/imig.12219.
- Lazaridis, Gabriella & Tsagkroni, Vasiliki. (2015) "Securitisation of Migration and Far Right Populist Othering in Scandinavian Countries", in G. Lazaridis & K. Wadia (Ed.) *The Securitisation of Migration in the EU: Debates since 9/11* (p. 19-36). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lazaridis, Gabriella & Wadia, Khursheed. (Ed.) (2015) *The Securitisation of Migration in the EU: Debates since 9/11*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lundberg, Anna. (2017) "En kommentar till Sveriges krispolitik mot människor på flykt". *Tidsskrift for velferdsforskning* 20(4): 349-356.
- McDonald, Matt. (2008) "Securitization and the Construction of Security". *European Journal of International Relations*, 14(4): 563-587. doi: 10.1177/1354066108097553.

Migrationsverket (2016) *Inkomna ansökningar om asyl 2015*. Hämtad 2019-10-03, från <https://www.migrationsverket.se/download/18.7c00d8e6143101d166d1aab/1485556214938/Inkomna%20ansökningar%20om%20asyl%202015%20-%20Applications%20for%20asylum%20received%202015.pdf>

Moreno-Lax, Violeta. (2018) “The EU Humanitarian Border and the Securitization of Human Rights: The ‘Rescue-Through-Interdiction/Rescue-Without-Protection’ Paradigm”. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 56 (1): 119-140.

Nyman, Jonna. (2018) “Securitization”, in Paul D. Williams & Matt McDonald (Ed.) *Security Studies: An Introduction* (p. 100-113). Abingdon UK and New York: Routledge.

Ostrand, Nicole. (2018) “The Syrian Refugee Crisis: A comparison of Responses by Germany, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States”. *Journal on Migration and Human Security* 3 (3): 255-279.

Prop. 2013/14:197. *Ändringar i utlänningslagen med anledning av den omarbetade Dublinförordningens ikraftträdande*. Tillgänglig: <https://www.regeringen.se/49bb7c/contentassets/b7a9c4516c6b4860828f9e03e7f1a424/andringar-i-utlanningslagen-med-anledning-av-den-omarbetade-dublinforordningens-ikrafttradande-prop.-201314197>

Prop. 2015/16:67. *Särskilda åtgärder vid allvarlig fara för den allmänna ordningen eller den inre säkerheten i landet*. Tillgänglig: <https://www.regeringen.se/contentassets/23c37b142cd54d658d660dc5ca27afe5/sarskilda-atgarder-vid-allvarlig-fara-for-den-allmanna-ordningen-eller-den-inre-sakerheten-i-landet-prop.-20151667>

Protokoll 2015/16:48. Torsdagen den 17 december. *Riksdagens protokoll 2015/16:48*. Tillgänglig: https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/protokoll/protokoll-20151648-torsdagen-den-17-december_H30948

Riksdagsskrivelse 2015/16:122. Tillgänglig: <https://data.riksdagen.se/fil/3A6EB9B8-1DC6-4185-8367-30B02EB001FC>

- Roe, Paul. (2004) "Securitization and Minority Rights: Conditions of Desecuritization". *Security Dialogue*, 35(3), 279-294. doi: 10.1177/0967010604047527.
- Rytter, Mikkel & Pedersen, Marianne H. (2014) "A decade of suspicion: Islam and Muslims in Denmark after 9/11". *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 37(13), 2303-2321. doi:10.1111/imig.12219. doi: 10.1080/01419870.2013.821148.
- SFS 2016:752. *Om tillfälliga begränsningar av möjligheten att få uppehållstillstånd I Sverige*. Stockholm: Justitiedepartementet.
- SFS 2015:1073. *Om särskilda åtgärder vid allvarlig fara för den allmänna ordningen eller den inre säkerheten i landet*. Stockholm: Näringsdepartementet.
- Spear, Joanna., & Williams, Paul D. (Eds.) (2012) *Security and Development in Global Politics: A Critical Comparison*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Stokes-Dupass, Nicole. (2017) "Mass Migration, Tightening Borders, and Emerging Forms of Statelessness in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden". *Journal of Applied Security Research*, 12(1), 40-60. doi: 10.1080/19361610.2017.1228024.
- Sveriges Riksdag (2020) *Så arbetar utskotten*, Retrieved 2020-07-22, from <https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/sa-funkar-riksdagen/arbetet-i-riksdagen/sa-arbetar-utskotten/>
- Squire, Vicki. (Ed.) (2009) *The Exclusionary Politics of Asylum*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Squire, Vicki. (2015) "The Securitisation of Migration: An Absent Presence?", in G. Lazaridis & K. Wadia (Ed.) *The Securitisation of Migration in the EU: Debates since 9/11* (p. 19-36). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- The Open University [OpenLearn]. (2014, 3 October). *Securitisation theory – International Relations* [Videofile]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wQ07tWOzE_c
- UNHCR (2018) *Kriget I Syrien*. Retrieved 2018-11-27, from <https://sverigeforunhcr.se/syrien#fakta>

- UNHCR (2016) 'Refugees' and 'Migrants' – *Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)*. Retrieved 2019-10-04, from <https://www.unhcr.org/en-us/news/latest/2016/3/56e95c676/refugees-migrants-frequently-asked-questions-faqs.html>
- UNHCR (2020) *Asylum-Seekers*, Retrieved 2019-10-04, from <https://www.unhcr.org/asylum-seekers.html>
- Van Munster, Rens. (2009) *Securitizing immigration: the politics of risk in the EU*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Wilkinson, Claire. (2007) "The Copenhagen School on Tour in Kyrgyzstan: Is Securitization Theory Useable Outside Europe?". *Security Dialogue*, 38(1), 5-25. Doi: 10.1177/0967010607075964.
- Williams, Michael C. (2003) "Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics". *International Studies*, 47(4), 511-531.
- Williams, Paul D. (Ed.) (2013) *Security Studies: An Introduction*. New York: Routledge.
- Winther Jørgensen, Marianne., & Phillips, Louise. (2000) *Diskursanalys: som teori och metod*. Lund: Studentlitteratur

