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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBCG</td>
<td>European Border and Coast Guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMSC</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>European Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europol</td>
<td>European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontex</td>
<td>European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIWC</td>
<td>Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Member States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Paris School of Security Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCTA</td>
<td>Serious and Organised Crime Threat Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abstract

This literary piece addresses the contribution of EU-agencies Frontex and Europol to the securitisation of (irregular) immigration in the European Union through discourse. I first look to introduce securitisation theory through the Copenhagen School and Paris School of Security Studies before considering the securitisation of immigration in the EU. Here I aim to correct the bias that exists in scholarly literature by ascertaining that the securitisation of immigration has not been completed in the EU, but rather that it is a continuous process. I then combine the Copenhagen and Paris school by creating my very own theoretical framework in which an open-ended security continuum is present.

For my research, I deployed a quantitative method by using the LIWC programme based on Stephane Baele and Olivier Sterck. This allowed me to upload a ‘security dictionary’ against which all selected texts were tested. Here I found that Europol speaks much more security than Frontex. After hypothesising on the reasons why, I dedicated a chapter to the interviews I conducted in Warsaw and The Hague in order to check the results against statements from employees of the respective agencies. In the case of Frontex, I found that the spokesperson's remarks were very much in line with the quantitative research results. In the case of Europol it was more difficult to highlight clear similarities or differences between the interviewees' statements and the research results.
1. Introduction

This paper seeks to determine how the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union (Frontex) and the European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Cooperation (Europol) contribute to the securitisation of immigration in the European Union (EU). It also looks to see which one of the two agencies under scrutiny securitises immigration the most and explain the reasons behind it.

Over the last five years the perception of (irregular) migrants throughout the EU has become increasingly negative. This is largely due to the large flows of irregular migrants making their way to the European continent as a result of civil wars, political turmoil or for economic reasons. Since 2013 over two million irregular migrants have reached the EU (Frontex, 2017). As a result of this migration ‘crisis’, public debate has become heated, xenophobia has been on the rise and consequently right-wing political parties across the continent have enjoyed an increase in popularity. The 2014 European Parliament elections were a huge success for the far right, The Freedom Party’s leader Norbert Hofer only just missed out on becoming Austria’s new President, Marine Le Pen’s made it to the second round of the presidential elections in France and the Brexit campaign was largely successful because it made the issue of uncontrolled migration a focal point of its agenda, even more unsure about their future while others choose more dangerous routes and take more risks in order to reach the continent. The latter has over the years resulted in overcrowded vessels and
their consequent sinking which sometimes causes hundreds of deaths at the time (Coghlan, 2016). Since 2015 over 8,000 people have lost their lives in the attempt to reach the southern borders of the European continent (Refugees, 2016; Quinn, 2016).

It is in this context of political turmoil, anti-migrant sentiment and uncertainty in Europe that I have chosen to discuss Frontex and Europol. Both EU-agencies have gotten progressively more involved in the migration ‘crisis’ over the last few years and have both seen an expansion in their budgets and capabilities. The European Border and Coast Guard (Frontex), the European external border agency, which was created in 2004, has received a EUR 150 million increase in its (annual??) budget since the onset of the migration ‘crisis’ in 2015 (C.P.R., 2015) It has furthermore already received a 100 more staff which is expected to continue to rise to a 1,000 by 2020 (from how many now). As the agency’s budget and resources have grown, so has its responsibilities; Frontex is expected to offer support to MS at the external borders, organise joint operations, deploy search and rescue missions and play a larger role in the return of migrants who have had their asylum request rejected.

The European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Cooperation (Europol) is the European Union's (EU) law enforcement organisation handling criminal intelligence, and its aim is to improve the effectiveness of and cooperation between the competent authorities of the Member States responsible for preventing and combating serious international organized crime and terrorism. Historically Europol started out as an intergovernmental counter-terrorism agency. After the creation of the European Union in 1992, the agency focused primarily on fighting drug-related organized crime. As the integration process continued, Europol branched out to different crime areas. One of these is fighting the facilitation of illegal immigration. This crime area became a priority for Europol in 2013 following the events of the Arab Spring. Since 2015, even more funds and staff have been dedicated to the issue.

It is therefore, in the current space and time, that discussing these two agencies in the context of migration in Europe is highly relevant. It becomes even more interesting when considering these two agencies in the context of the securitisation of immigration; finding evidence of securitisation in EU-agency activity would highlight irregularities in the EU’s message to refugees and even some of its values. Moreover,
my research could highlight the possibility that even European agencies work within a migration-security nexus, thus perpetrating the idea that migrants pose a security threat to the EU from within.

Having painted a picture of the current migration crisis and established the relevance of my thesis, I will now propose my methodology. Here I explain how I aim to operationalise my research question, what mechanisms I will use and justify my choices. After doing so, I will move on to the literature review, where the Copenhagen School of Security Studies as well as the Paris School of Security Studies will be introduced. This will lead into a discussion on the securitisation of migration (with a focus on the EU) where I aim to correct the bias that exists in the scholarly literature. To do so, I will advance a number of alternative views, which will allow me to develop my own understanding of the securitisation of immigration and lay out my theoretical framework. After, I will provide the reader with the history and genesis of Frontex and Europol before presenting my discourse analysis results. This will then allow me to analyse and make comparisons between the two agencies’ discourse. Finally, I will dedicate a chapter to the interviews I conducted in Warsaw and The Hague to highlight similarities and/or differences from the LIWC results. In the end I hope to make sound conclusions regarding

1.2 Methodology

In order to operationalise my research question, I will be largely basing my method on the one proposed in *Diagnosing the Securitisation of Immigration at EU-Level: A New Method for Stronger Empirical Claims*, an article written by Stephane Baele and Olivier Sterck (Baele and Sterck, 2014). In this article, the authors propose a quantitative approach to assessing the securitisation of immigration at the EU-level. They do so by looking to ‘measure the presence of words, verbs and concepts with a high security connotation within carefully selected written or spoken accounts’ (Ibid., 1125). To accomplish this, they use the Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) programme. The LIWC programme detects linguistic regularities in written statements and can also be used to ‘calculate the frequency in any given text, of
specific words and kinds of words (e.g. verbs, words with more than three syllables); it provides the ratio of the occurrence these words and kinds of words in comparison with the total number of words in the chosen text’ (Ibid., 1127). While this programme is predominantly used as a support tool for psychological counselling, it can easily be tweaked to be of great use for the research I wish to conduct. In my research, I will be using the software to measure the intensity of the securitising language within my chosen texts. This is made possible by the software, which also allows one to ‘modify or even create the set of preselected words, parts of words, or kinds of words whose occurrences have to be automatically counted within the corpus of the given texts’ (Ibid., 1128). The software can then calculate the proportion of those pre-selected words over the full amount of words in the chosen texts. In short, it is possible to create one’s very own dictionary, upload it into the software and find out how many times these words appear in each individual text.

Baele and Sterck thus created their own ‘security lexicon’. The more a political actor (i.e. Frontex or Europol) makes use of the words that can be found in this security lexicon, the more his or her narrative establishes a securitising move (Ibid.) So, if a high ratio of security lexicon/total words is found in a text, it is more securitising and vice versa. As Baele and Sterck looked at the securitisation of immigration at the EU-level and I am looking at the possible securitisation of immigration in the EU from the diffusion of texts of EU-agencies, I can easily adopt the security lexicon they produced. They did so by combining two reference glossaries dedicated to security issues (UN Glossary of Terms and Concepts in Peace and Conflict Studies and the final index of the Palgrave Handbook of Security Studies). They then adapted it in order to avoid ambiguities (Ibid.). First they omitted names of scholars (i.e. Mearsheimer, Waltz) as they cannot securitise an issue such as migration. They did on the other hand, leave in names associated with criminal acts such as Bin Laden or names of places that are widely associated with military intervention or high strategic military importance such as Afghanistan (Ibid.). This is because the ‘evocation of these individuals and places may in theory suffice to securitise via powerful metonymic effects (Ibid.) They also erased terms such as ‘asylum’ or ‘immigration’ as these are considered to be basic-level categories in the immigration debate: they are the ones under analysis in this thesis. Finally the authors merged terms whose lexical basis is identical in their minimal common group of
It must be noted here that when the results of the programme come in (the security scores and ratios) have no significance on their own; they are just a numbers. However, they make sense when used comparatively; in my case I will be comparing the selected discourse of Frontex and Europol. In order to detect significant differences between the results, I will make use of the Welch-t Test. This adaptation of the Student t-Test will allow me to confront the samples of both Europol and Frontex that might have unequal sample sizes (Ibid.). This is important as most Frontex texts considered are long (20+ pages) and Europol publications are often short (1-2 pages). Moreover, using the Welch t-test provides a statistical tool for scholars which is ‘directly implementable to the widest possible array of case studies (Ibid.) For two sample of size \( N_1 \) and \( N_2 \), means \( X_1 \) and \( X_2 \) and unbiased variance \( s^2_1 \) and \( s^2_2 \), the Welch's t-statistic is given by:

\[
\begin{align*}
  t &= \frac{\overline{X}_1 - \overline{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{s^2_1}{N_1} + \frac{s^2_2}{N_2}}} \\
  \nu &= \frac{(s^2_1/N_1 + s^2_2/N_2)^3}{(s^2_1/N_1)^2 + (s^2_2/N_2)^2} \\
  \text{with } &\frac{(s^2_1/N_1)^2}{N_1-1} + \frac{(s^2_2/N_2)^2}{N_2-1} \text{ degrees of freedom.}
\end{align*}
\]

Using the LIWC programme provides a number of advantages for research into the securitisation of immigration in the EU and at EU-level. First, in contrast to other discourse analysis programmes such as Nvivo or Atlas T.I., the LIWC programme offers a neutral (or at least a partially neutral) reading of the texts. In the former, the reader constructs different categories of interpretation as he/she goes along. With LIWC, the user sets the parameters before the analysis is done. The programme then gives an automated response to the query, thus eliminating the possibility of subjectivity. Baele and Sterck argue here, that working with LIWC does not qualify as ‘discourse analysis’ but rather as quantitative ‘content analysis’ (Ibid., 1129). Moreover, the method I will deploy provides a way to measure the intensity of security narratives within my samples. This helps to overcome the simplistic binary (yes/no) answers to the question of the securitisation of immigration that scholars often give (Ibid.) This method thus falls in line with the call to see securitisation as a
continuum, which I will elaborate on further in my theoretical framework. Second, unlike with qualitative research, the LIWC programme can analyse a great number of texts without taking up too much time. This becomes evident in the next section.

I have chosen to analyse a total of 104 texts: 41 of them from Frontex and 63 from Europol. I believe that this number of texts of different lengths and from different dates will give a comprehensive overview of the type of language used by both agencies. For Frontex, I chose to consider all the Annual and Quarterly Risk Assessments since 1 January 2013 as these are the most comprehensive and most-read out of the agency’s publications. In the case of Europol, I accessed the ‘Crime Areas and Trends’ section of the site. One of the crime areas Europol combats ‘facilitation of illegal migration’. Here, I picked every publication since 1 January 2013. Moreover, I also visited the ‘terrorism’ section, where I chose to consider the texts that mentioned (im)migration. 2013 is the cut-off point for the texts I will analyse, as I desire to remain topical and as it was the year immigration became a top priority for Europol (17 publications before 2013, 78 since 2013).

There are of course some limitations to this method. One limitation is that the LIWC software programme does not account for the context in which words are used. What this means is that it does not take into consideration ‘negate words’ (that would reverse their meaning) (Kaatz et al, 2015, 74). Indeed, if the text reads ‘any person who is located outside of his/her country of origin and who is unwilling or unable to return to it owing to a fear of being persecuted’ the LIWC system will count ‘fear’ and ‘persecution’ as a securitising move even though it is not (Baele and Sterck, 2014, 1332). However, both authors (and I) do not believe that this limitation undermines the coherence of the overall picture of securitising narratives found in the discourse of the two agencies (Ibid.). Another limitation of this method is, that while it allows a vast number of texts to be studied almost objectively, it is not possible to read all the texts. This means that the academic cannot engage with the texts and get a feel of what the texts are trying to get across. To make up for this I opted to conduct interviews. This way I could hear from experts what their respective agencies wanted to get across in their online publications. I will briefly present my interview method in the next section.
After carrying out my quantitative research, I will present a summary and an analysis of the interviews I conducted with Frontex and Europol. I have chosen to conduct interviews in order to back up my quantitative findings. Here, I hope to find interesting similarities or differences between the results of my primary research and the qualitative interviews I did with people from the agencies. I opted to go for a relaxed interview method; as the topic that I address in this thesis is of a highly sensitive nature, I wanted my interviewees to feel at ease during the time that I spoke to them. What this meant in practice is that I did not record my interviews. This allowed for the interview to be a free flowing conversation rather than a Q&A style talk. I did however make sure to capture important quotes, interesting points and questions raised by taking notes by hand. Straight after the interviews, I made a conscious effort to note down as much as I could remember.

### 2. Literature Review

#### 2.1. Introduction

In order to achieve this thesis’ aim, I need to lay out a theoretical framework which will guide my research. It is thus necessary to assess the relevant literature on the topic of the securitisation theory and of the securitisation of immigration (in the EU). I will first give the reader an idea of the basics of securitisation theory, I will consider the Copenhagen School of Security Studies as well as the Paris School of Security Studies. I will also compare these two schools and assess their critiques. Following this, I shall introduce the history of the securitisation of immigration, the perception of migrants in the EU and the events of 9/11 as a watershed moment in securitisation and migration studies. Then, a number of alternative views based on the works of authors such as Andrew Neal, Christina Boswell, Antonio Messina and Stephane Baele and Olivier Sterck will be considered. Following this, I will turn my attention to the two agencies that are going to be studied. All of this, will eventually lead into the laying out of my theoretical framework, in which I pick and choose parts of both securitisation theories to develop my own understanding of the securitisation process.
2.2. Securitisation Theory: The Copenhagen School

After the end of the Cold-War in 1991, many academics became disillusioned with realist theory in international relations. Academics noticed that competition between states in an anarchic world had become outdated and distanced themselves from the works of Waltz or Mearsheimer (Waltz, 1979; Mearsheimer, 1985). Instead some came to see the world in a different light and Alexander Wendt’s social constructivism became increasingly popular (Wendt, 1992). As the name of the theory suggests, it focuses on how aspects of international relations are socially constructed by shared ideas rather than material forces (Wendt, 1992). A simple example Wendt gives is that 500 British nuclear weapons would be much less threatening to the United States than 5 North Korean nuclear weapons due to the fact that there is a shared understanding of alliance between the USA and Britain (Wendt, 1995, 73).

In the case of Security Studies, both realism and neorealism assume that insecurity derives from the objectively threatening complexion of certain issues - that these issues call for the use of force and that this renders states permanently suspicious of each other (Balzaq et al, 2016, 496). However, following a constructivist line of thought, the ‘security-ness’ of an entity does not depend on objective features, but rather stems from (inter?)subjective interactions between securitising actors and its audience (Ibid.). Security issues thus do not appear only in the military but can permeate into any sector of social life. It is based on these ideas that the Copenhagen School develops its theory and began the era of Critical Security Studies.

‘Securitisation’ was a term first coined by Ole Waever in 1995 before being presented as a theory in the seminal book Security: A New Framework For Analysis, which was co-authored by Barry Buzan, Waever and Jaap de Wilde in 1998 (Waever, Buzan, de Wilde, 1998) These authors, as well as others, make up the body of researchers that have come to be known as ‘The Copenhagen School of Security Studies’ (CS) (Leonard, 2010, 235). Following the trend at that time, it works from a broadly constructivist approach that looks at the social aspects of security and studies how certain issues can become security issues by virtue of their presentation.
In their book, the authors assert that ‘security’ is the ‘move that takes politics beyond the established rules of the game and frames the issue either as a special kind of politics or as above politics’ (Waever, Buzan, de Wilde, 1998, 23). What this means is that any issue, regardless of its political or public importance, can be presented as an existential threat and can be moved from the realm of ‘ordinary’ politics into the realm of ‘emergency’ politics (Ibid., 24). ‘Emergency politics’ are emergency measures that could be frowned upon under normal circumstances (Jeandesboz and Pallister-Wilkins, 2014, 115). This action also known as a securitising move is undertaken by a securitising agent who presents a certain issue (e.g. immigration or terrorism) as a threat to the survival of a ‘referent object’ (e.g. the state) (Leonard, 2010, 239). A securitising agent can take many forms, the only prerequisite being that it speaks from a point of legitimacy (e.g. a politician). Buzan and his colleagues call this discursive move of the securitising agent a ‘speech act’ (Waever, Buzan, de Wilde, 1998, 24). For this speech act to be successful, an audience must first accept and recognise the issue as a threat. Only then is the securitisation complete and can the securitising agent break free of the rules of regular politics and use emergency measures to tackle the presented issue (Ibid., 25). The Copenhagen School thus lays out an inter-subjective relationship between the agent uttering the ‘security’ and the audience, who accept or reject the securitising move.

In sum, the core concepts of securitisation theory are the ‘securitising agent’ (the actor who presents an issue as a threat through a securitising move), the referent subject (i.e. the entity that is threatening), the referent object (i.e. the entity that is threatened), the audience (the agreement of which is necessary to confer an intersubjective status to the threat), the context and the adoption of distinctive policies (‘exceptional’ or not) (Balzaq et al, 2016, 495). The CSSS thus sees ‘security’ as a socially constructed term that is used by an agent to convince an audience that a certain issue threatens its very existence, thereby gaining the right to use any means necessary to block the issue (Neal, 2009, 335; Waever, 1995, 55).
2.3. Securitisation Theory: Didier Bigo’s Sociological Approach

Over the past two decades, the Copenhagen School’s securitisation theory has been subject to plenty of debate and critique while efforts have also been made to further develop and refine the theory (Hansen, 2000; Booth, 2007; Wilkinson, 2010). Unfortunately, these critiques go beyond the scope of this thesis. Nonetheless, in light of my question, one important contribution to the field of securitisation must be taken into account as it lays down the basis for a further insight into the securitisation of immigration as well as my theoretical framework.

Didier Bigo, the founder of the Paris School of Security Studies (PS), acknowledges the importance of language in the securitising process as presented by the CSSS, but suggests considering an alternative and more practical approach to securitisation (Bigo, 2000, 194). Thus, Bigo came up with the so-called ‘sociological approach’, which privileges the role of practices (Balzacq, 2010, 1). Here he advocates examining the technocratic practices of experts, which he calls ‘professionals of unease’, in the security field rather than focusing exclusively on political discourses at the macro-level like the Copenhagen School does (Leonard, 2007, 15). Bigo highlights that it is possible for securitisation to take place without discourse and asserts that some of the military’s and police’s practical work, discipline and expertise can be as important (Bigo, 2000, 194). Boswell supports this argument by claiming that sometimes, public legitimation does not have to be a precondition for such (securitising) practices (Boswell, 2007, 593). Huysmans explains: ‘the acts of the bureaucratic structures or networks linked to security practices and the specific technologies that they use may play a more active role in the securitisation process than securitising speech acts’ (Huysmans, 2004). The key idea of the sociological approach is that continuous practices and activities’ intrinsic qualities can convey, either directly or indirectly, to an audience that the issue they are tackling is a security threat (Leonard, 2010, 237). In contrast to the Copenhagen School, Bigo does not offer a definition for a ‘securitising practice’, but sees the ‘securitising agent’ as a fixed unit for analysis (Ibid., 236). This means that securitising practices are not explicitly defined and can take different forms. Furthermore, Bigo and Léonard see the confinement of security in the extreme i.e. ‘existential threats’ and ‘survival’ as too narrow (Leonard, 2007, 12). Instead they
propose a model where these two ideas are not abandoned, but rather represent the end of a securitisation continuum (Ibid., 13). Accordingly, by adopting a more open-ended definition of the concept of securitisation, lower level security issues (and day to day practices or discourse) can play a part in the securitisation process as well (Ibid., 15).

It is important to note here that the PS does not render the CS inadequate, rather it complements it. Indeed, both schools use the same aforementioned concepts of securitisation theory, but focus on different aspects of it. While the CS scholars looked to develop a new analytical approach to the study of security and study the consequences of ‘invoking security’, the PS chooses to focus on how security professionals and experts ‘do security’ (Peoples and Vaughan-Williams, 2015, 9). While CS is analytical, the PS is sociological. However, one should not take the categorisation of Security studies into differently geographically located school too seriously (Ibid., 10). Instead, one should see security studies as an extensive network ‘with overlap and dialogue between the different schools generally outweighing their distinctions (Ibid.). Certainly, looking at both discourse from securitising actors and practices from ‘professionals of unease’, one would get a more comprehensive overview as to how security is constructed, institutionalised and managed.

2.4. The Securitisation of Immigration in the EU

Having presented the main claims of both Security Studies Schools, it is now necessary to discuss the securitisation of immigration in the EU. First, it must be noted that the general perception is that states/securitising agents are keen to depict immigration as a security threat because it helps them to secure public legitimacy and control (Boswell, 2007, 1). A state, or an EU agency for example, can be seen as a power maximiser who, by depicting certain phenomena as security threats that citizens need to be protected from, can confer legitimacy on itself (Ibid.) I will first look at the diverging claims regarding the securitisation of immigration in the EU, before turning my focus to Frontex and Europol.

Immigration has been a salient subject on the agenda of most EU states since the Second World War. Huysmans explains that in the 1950s and 1960s, immigration
was welcomed as most European countries were in desperate need of external labour to rebuild their ravaged economies (Huysmans, 2000, 753) According to Huysmans and other scholars such as Fran Cetti, Raffaella Del Sarto and Chiara Steindler, this perception changed in 1985 when the Schengen accords were signed (Ibid, 755; Cetti, 2015; Del Sarto and Steindler, 2015, 371). These agreements not only allowed the free movement of people within the agreed common area but also created an inside/outside dichotomy between the EU and the outside world. Consequently, immigration became a more prominent issue and the EU’s MS started to coordinate their immigration policies. Huysmans explains, that it was from here onwards that discourse emerged that immigration was a threat to the welfare state as well as the cultural composition of the nation (Huysmans, 2000, 756). Such discourse, combined with the emergence of a common EU immigration policy created a consensus that uncontrolled immigration needed to be restricted (Ibid.) Huysmans further argues in *The European Union and the Securitization of Migration* that immigration had become increasingly mediatised and linked with crime, riots, domestic instability, unskilled labour and welfare fraud (Ibid, 770). He thus asserts that through European integration, immigration has become securitised (Ibid.).

Since then, plenty of scholars have claimed the same (Freedman, 2004; Karyotis, 2007; Leonard, 2009; Lazaridis, 2016; Berthelet, 2002; Zucconi, 2004; Shepherd, 2015). Even the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees has claimed that migration and asylum issues have been securitised in the EU;

> *the emergence of new security concerns for states, particularly since the events of 11 September 2001, has led to the ‘securitization’ of asylum practices. Increasingly refugees and asylum seekers are perceived as harbingers of insecurity, rather than victims of it* (Refugees, 2006).

The impact of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 on the securitisation of immigration has been widely debated. The general consensus is that the events gave securitising agents in the United States and the EU the opportunity to forge a link between immigration and terrorist threats, which in turn further deteriorated the image of irregular migrants. Andreas has claimed that the securitisation process ‘has been openly avowed and accelerated since 2001 (Andreas, 2003, 79). Indeed,
Anthony Messina asserts that most securitisation of immigration scholars either implicitly or explicitly agree… that September 11 was a critical juncture and a major accelerant of the process of securitising immigration in Europe (Messina, 2014, 533).

However, as seen earlier, the Copenhagen School established that before an issue can be securitised and emergency politics can be implemented, an audience must first accept it as such. Nina Perkowski writes that it is assumed by the public that immigration ‘should be stopped due to its negative connotation’ while Karyotis argues that despite the positive impact of immigration on European economies, it is perceived as a threat by the public (Perkowski, 2012, 14; Karyotis, 2012, 398). While asserting that perceptions of immigration are not uniform across all 28 EU MS, d’Appollonia supports Perkowski’s and Messina’s claims by providing some telling statistics from polls conducted by different enquirers (d’Appollonia, 2016, 23). The European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) found that in Western and Central Europe, 58 percent of the respondents believed that ‘immigrants’ constituted a ‘collective ethnic threat’ while 60 percent of respondents expressed a ‘resistance to multiculturalism (Ibid.). Ipsos MORI, a market research company in the UK, conducted a study that found that 76 percent of British, 70 percent of Spanish and 66 percent of Belgian respondents were of the opinion that ‘immigrants put too much pressure on their public services’ (Ibid., 24). d’Appollonia argues that these findings ‘point to the conclusion that such public perceptions are framed by a series of negative stereotypes and misperceptions that are the foundation for the support of the securitisation process (Ibid.). In short, most scholars believe that the discursive construction of posing immigrants as a threat has generated exclusionary outcomes amongst the public, indicating that immigration has been ‘successfully’ securitised in the EU.

This has only deteriorated in the last two years with the start of the migration ‘crisis’. Due to the large number of irregular migrants coming into Europe, largely as a result of the Syrian civil war, securitising agents such as politicians and newspapers have strengthened the link between migration and incoming threats even more. Indeed, stories such as the one of the Syrian terrorists that carried out the attack on the Bataclan in Paris, having come through Greece as an irregular migrant or the sexual assaults by migrants in Germany on New Year Eve of 2015 soon became popular
among the public and made the connection between ‘immigrant’ and ‘terrorist’, ‘criminal’ or ‘rapist’ even more explicit (BBC, 2016; Noack, 2016).

2.5. The Alternative Views

There are a small number of scholars in the field of security studies and securitisation theory who provide alternative interpretations. Christina Boswell seeks to counter the claims that 9/11 was a watershed moment for the securitisation of immigration that accelerated the securitisation process. She argues that immigration control policies in Europe do not appear to have become securitised (in discourse) and that there is ‘little evidence of attempts to securitise immigration in Europe’ in a post 9/11 world (Boswell, 2007, 590). Messina supports Boswell claims by writing that ‘there is a paucity of evidence that connects illiberal elite speech—either before or after September 11- to the explicit motive of wishing to transfer immigration-related issues to the realm of emergency politics (Messina, 2014, 552-553). Furthermore, he ascertains that there is scare empirical evidence to support the securitisation ‘paradigm’ as it has been applied to immigration, which validates Boswell’s view that reports of immigration being securitised might very well be exaggerated (Ibid., 553). Furthermore, in his review article, Messina seeks to convey to the reader that, despite the fact that a number of ‘security packages’ and ‘exceptional measures’ have been adopted by Western governments that could have burdened migrants, it does not provide objective evidence of securitisation (Ibid., 552). He continues by asserting that while it might be possible that immigration is securitised at certain levels, it does not mean it has been done on purpose. He writes, ‘there is little evidence that mainstream political elites have conducted a series of deliberate and sustained campaigns to convince the general public that immigrants constitute an omnipresent security menace (Ibid.). In short, according to Boswell and Messina, securitisation of immigration has not been accelerated since 2001, but it has been exaggerated. In the cases where securitisation has happened, it is possible it has not been done deliberately.

Boswell also calls for a more balanced and open-minded understandings regarding the framing of the concept. Boswell writes that irregular immigration is
increasingly susceptible to ‘framing’ and that the central thesis is that immigration has been portrayed as a threat to European societies (Boswell, 2007). She claims that irregular immigration is mostly framed in one of three ways; as a concern of uncontrolled entry, as having a negative impact on the society and economy of the host country and as a human trafficking and smuggling problem (Ibid., 594-595).

According to her, what unites these frameworks is the ‘emphasis of exclusion as the solution’ (Ibid., 595). She ascertains that this framing by different actors in politics, media and interest groups displays a worrying, simplistic one-sidedness that ‘only explains one possible pattern of organisational behaviour’ (Ibid., 592). So, while Boswell does not deny that a securitising dynamic of immigration is present or has occurred at certain levels in Europe at both a discursive and ‘sociological’ level, she wishes to exercise caution in applying the concept to empirical enquiry (Ibid.,).

She continues, ‘it should not be assumed that politics is always driven by an interest in encouraging public unease or introducing more stringent measures, neither should it be taken for granted that political agents always seek to maximise their own powers’(Ibid., 593). For example, too much securitising discourse could create unfeasible expectations from the public about the state’s capacity to control immigration, or it could conflict with the goal of attracting much needed external skilled labour (Ibid., 604; Boswell, 2008, 102. Andrew Neal supports Boswell’s claims by refuting the one-sided framing of immigration in security studies; he claims that EU immigration policies should be analysed in terms of risk management rather than in terms of security struggle strictly speaking (Neal, 2009).

Finally, Baele and Sterck assess the securitisation of immigration at the EU policy-level (Baele and Sterck, 2014). First, they ascertain that the question, ‘has immigration been securitised?’ is too simplistic and only seems to allow a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answer.(Ibid., 1123). After presenting both sides of the scholarly literature, they assert that there reigns confusion over the issue of securitisation of immigration and that there is a complex ‘variety of interconnected immigration-related actions that constitute the EU’s immigration policy (Ibid.) For example, ‘securitisation can occur in the subfield of asylum but not in the subfield of ‘highly skilled work’; if a scholar were then to conclude that immigration has been securitised, it would be an excessive generalisation (Ibid.). Furthermore, Baele and Sterck follow Bourbeau, Simon
Rushton, Didier Bigo, Sarah Léonard and Michael Williams in asserting that securitisation cannot be tied only to emergency and extremity, rather it should be seen as a continuum where less intensive practice and discourse should be included too (ibid., 1123-1124). In this framework, they seek to find security ‘semantic regularities’ in discourse rather than isolated speech acts, thus enforcing the idea of securitisation as a process (Ibid., 1124). After presenting their quantitative methodology and findings, they conclude that they are forced to observe ‘that immigration is not fully treated like a security issue’ (Ibid.). Conversely, they cannot ‘claim that immigration is not securitised at the EU level’, because all the texts they studied did contain a high level intensity of security words (Ibid., 1130). The results thus reinforce the authors’ view of securitisation as a process and there being a security continuum.

2.6. The Problematic of Assessing Securitisation of Immigration at the EU-level

As Baele and Sterck have shown, it is possible to assess the securitisation of immigration at the EU-level through a quantitative approach. However, assessing the impact of identified securitising acts remains difficult. Indeed, Neal explains that it is possible to identify EU institutions discourse as securitising, but its consequences and impact are lot less clear compared to an individual country (Neal, 2009, 336). This is because EU actions are not widely reported and only have a narrow, specialist audience (Ibid.). He continues: ‘the link between the securitising moves of the European Union institutions and the inter-subjectivity of the European public is much more uncertain than securitisation in a national context (Ibid). Boswell supports this claim by averring that this minimal public dimension of the EU challenges some of the assumptions of securitisation theory. Indeed, if there is no audience to accept the discourse, how can the securitising move be successful?

A logical answer would be that the audience is not a large group of people, but rather a narrow group of political elites, security agents or journalists who, in turn have their own broad audiences who they could convey the securitising discourse to. In this case then two sets of audiences would have to accept the speech act for the securitising move to be successful. In the case of Frontex and Europol, both EU
agencies, the audience would consist of national security experts, journalists as well as high profile political elites, which means that the securitisation process is still valid. Yet, assessing its impact remains problematic.

Interesting enough, Boswell writes that this lack of clarity is exactly what MS might look for; cooperation between MS at the EU level may not be the subject to the same intensity of scrutiny, which means that ‘through externalising migration control at the EU level, MS may have found a way of avoiding many of the conflicts created by attempts to securitise migration within their own territories’ (Boswell, 2007, 592). So, securitisation could occur at EU level as MS go European to avoid national parliamentary scrutiny or judicial accountability that would impede their activities at the national level (Ibid.) This so-called ‘venue shopping’ implies that security officials can expand their power through avoiding being the object of public debate (Ibid.) In the case of Frontex and Europol MS could thus support joint operations, or provide liaison officers for certain missions in order to advance their goals without having to be accountable to their public as they are operating under the EU banner. This however, all happens in the field and is not subject to my query.

2.7. Frontex, Europol and the Securitisation of Immigration

Sarah Léonard is the only one to have written an article on the contribution of Frontex to the securitisation of ‘asylum and migration’; EU Border Security and Migration into the EU: Frontex and Securitisation Through Practices (Leonard, 2010). She however, only focuses on practices and not on discourse. Andrew Neal’s (Neal, 2009) article does discuss the impact of the securitisation of immigration on the agency’s genesis and activity, but he does not consider how the agency itself might contribute or perpetuate the process. In her article, Léonard argues that the securitisation of immigration has been successfully completed through discourse and that it has had a negative impact on migrants (Ibid., 232). Because she perceives the securitisation of immigration to be completed before Frontex was created, she does not focus on how the agency’s discourse might contribute to the securitisation of immigration, but rather how its practices might perpetuate it through every-day ‘positive reinforcements’ (Ibid.). First, Léonard asserts, as laid out in the introduction, that
many of Frontex’ activities have generated much controversy and have been heavily criticised by human rights activists and pro-migrant groups (Ibid.) She writes that there are several Frontex operations that are contentious from a legal point of view i.e. the lack of respect of the non-refoulement principle (Ibid., 240). She continues by assessing all areas of Frontex activity (see introduction) and examines how they might aid in the perpetuation of the securitisation of immigration. An example is the RABITs (Rapid Border Intervention Teams) who ‘reinforce the perception and the representation of immigration flows as a threat that could become so acute that it would require emergency action’.(Ibid., 242). She concludes that ‘it can be argued that through the increasing coordination of practices spearheaded by Frontex, but with a strong involvement of some the EU member states with the most advanced securitising practices of asylum and immigration, there has been an overall increase in securitising practices directed at asylum-seekers and migrants in the EU’(Ibid., 247).

Despite her findings on Frontex securitising activities, she is quick to highlight that Frontex is not an important securitising actor itself due its early stages in its development and its severe lack of autonomy (Ibid.).

In the case of Europol, there has been no academic literature linking the agency with the possible securitisation (of migrants) either through its discourse or through practices. In that respect my research into the agency’s discourse will be a novelty in the field of migration as well as securitisation studies.

2.8. Theoretical Framework

In this section I will lay out the theoretical framework that will explain my understanding of the securitisation of migration based on the schools and authors presented in the previous chapter, which will consequently guide my research.

First, it must be noted that I believe that the issue of immigration is not wholly securitised at the EU-level. Here, I follow the arguments of Baele and Sterck who aver that while some categories of immigration such as asylum might be securitised, others such as legal migration might not. Arguing that immigration as a whole has been securitised at EU-level would thus be wrong. In the case of securitisation of
immigration in the EU, it cannot be denied that large parts of populations have negative perceptions of migrants (see D’Apollonia) or that emergency measures have been deployed by governments to halt migration (e.g. fences on borders). While it is clear that securitisation of immigration is happening in the EU, I do not believe one can claim that immigration has been securitised, as there are millions of people who do not accept these speech acts and there are countries that do not deploy emergency measures. On the contrary, states such as Germany and Sweden welcomed the large numbers of incoming migrants (Ostrand, 2015, 258). Following Boswell and Messina, I thus believe these claims regarding immigration being securitised in the EU are overstated and exaggerated.

Moreover, just like Bigo, Baele, Sterck, Williams and others, I see security as a continuum where different speech acts and activities can contribute to the process of securitisation at different levels of intensity. So, a small operation screening incoming migrants at a hotspot in Greece could be located at the lower end of the continuum while an isolated speech act from Viktor Orban stating that the European refugee policy is the ‘Trojan horse of terrorism’ would find itself higher up the security continuum (Brunsden, 2017). The latter statement would thus be located higher up the spectrum and closer to the extreme of ‘existential threat’. In my case, I will be focusing on discourse and the higher the score that the LIWC programme gives, the further along the text can be placed on the security continuum.

As my thesis focuses on discourse, I will be considering the Copenhagen School of Security Studies as my basis. What this means is that I will consider both Europol and Frontex as securitising agents (who have a certain level of legitimacy on the issue of irregular immigration), who use speech acts to reach out to the previously determined audience. However, I will not focus on isolated speech acts but instead take from Bigo’s sociological approach and apply it to discourse rather than real life activities. What this means is that I consider routine, every day discourse (regular publications) to be a contributor to the process of securitisation of immigration too. I thus connect the two different aspects of the theory; I don’t look at isolated speech acts made by political elites nor at routine activity by security professionals in the field. Instead I look at routine, day-to-day speech acts by two EU agencies.
As I solely focus on the issue of irregular immigration, I can already expect the security language to be of more importance in the texts that I will study. My research thus does not seek to provide a yes or no answer to the question whether the agencies’ discourse contributes to the securitisation process (Baele and Sterck, 1123-1124). Instead, it is interested in finding the levels of intensity both agencies use securitising language at and attempt to explain the reasons behind them. Hence my research question is not ‘Do Frontex and Europol contribute to the securitisation of immigration in the EU?’, but rather ‘How and at what intensity for Frontex and Europol contribute to the securitisation of immigration in the EU?’

3. Europol and Frontex Discourse

3.1. Introduction

Before assessing my LIWC results of the selected Frontex publications, it is first necessary to consider the history and genesis of the agency as well as its activities and critiques. After doing so, I will do the same for Europol. Then, I will present the LIWC programme results of both agencies in a table as well as a graph format. This way the reader gets an overview of how many texts are produced each year, at which intensity texts are written, which texts are left out and how the intensity of the securitisation develops over time. It is then necessary to evaluate and analyse these results. The results will allow me to hypothesise over the reasons why publications have skyrocketed since 2015, why the agencies’ securitising language is so different and inconsistent and assess the claims of a humanitarian style of discourse.

3.2. Frontex: History and Activity

Frontex’ origins can be found in the creation of the Schengen Area in 1985, which saw European Community states open their internal borders to each other. As the Single European Act was implemented, MS became increasingly interested in the coordination of policies regarding immigration into Europe as well as asylum claims and external borders. Consequently, treaties such as the Dublin Convention (1990)
were signed. During the 1990s the European integration accelerated: the European Union was created in 1992 and the Amsterdam Treaty was signed in 1997. Through the creation of the area of *Freedom, Security and Justice*, which was put under the ‘first pillar’, the EU’s role in the issues of immigration, visas and asylum was strengthened considerably. It was then, in the context of the looming 2004 enlargement that the Laeken Conference took place in 2001. During the conference the issues of entry into the Schengen Area and the new states’ ability to protect their external borders were a central point of concern. This feeling of need for a system of integrated border security was also intensified by the events of 9/11 and the consequential perceived threats of terrorism in the EU (Vaughan-Williams, 2008, 66). As a result, the idea of a European Border Guard was proposed (Fijnaut, 2015, 320). However, the project was abandoned after France and the Netherlands vetoed its implementation (Ibid.). However, the idea of a mechanism for the common management of the external borders of the EU remained popular and was given new life when Greece held the EU Council presidency in 2003 (Neal, 2009, 342). The idea of Frontex, a less extreme version of the previously proposed European Border Guard, was proposed by the European Commission in November 2003 and was established on 26 October 2004 by Council Regulation EC 2007/2004 (Hobolth, 2006, 6). Frontex officially became *The European Border and Coast Guard* on 14 September 2016 under EP and EC Regulation 2016/1624 (European Union, 2016). The agency however, has chosen to continue to operate under the name of Frontex. Therefore, I too will refer to the EBCG as Frontex throughout this literary piece.

Frontex is an EU agency that is headed by a Management Board, which consists of one representative from each EU MS, the Executive Director and two representatives from the EC; the representatives all have one vote each whereas the Executive Director does not (Leonard, 2009, 382). The Executive Director (Fabrice Leggeri) can be invited by the European Council and the European Parliament (EP) to report on the agency’s activities (Giannetto, 2014, 14). The EP however, is only legally allowed to review Frontex’ activities every five years; the Parliament can call for more reviews, but the agency can deny these if it so wishes (Leonard, 2009, 384). Aside from the Management Board, Frontex employs around 400 staff members (1000 projected by 2020) who work in various units (Frontex, 2017). It also has a
large number of liaison officers: currently the agency has around 1500 officers deployed to support MS at their borders (European Commission, 2017).

Its budget is mostly controlled by the EP and started off relatively small; 19 million euros in 2006. Now, in 2017, Frontex is in control of around 250 million euros and this is expected to increase to 320 million euros by 2020 (Foy and Robinson, 2015; European Commission, 2017). Frontex main tasks include: Joint operations, Risk analysis, Training, Research, Assisting Member States in joint return operations, Providing a rapid response capability (since 2007) and Information systems and information sharing environment. Furthermore, in December 2013, Frontex’ information-exchange agency Eurosur was established. Eurosur links MS surveillance systems, while also providing high-tech sensors that enhance MS’ data collection capabilities (Heller and Jones, 2014, 10). As a result MS can gain an increased awareness and reaction capability in combatting cross-border crime, tackling irregular immigration and preventing loss of migrants lives at sea (Ibid., 12).

Frontex has endured a lot of criticism since its inception. Especially its joint operations with MS at the external borders have received heightened attention due to their deadly nature. These critiques have come from pro-migrant groups, NGOs, the media as well as scholars (Baldacinni, 2010; Wolff, 2008). The main accusations that have been brought forward are that Frontex does not adhere to the principle of non-refoulement (principle that forbids the rendering of a true victim of persecution to his or her persecutor), the restriction of the EU’s geographical borders nor to the human rights obligations that are set out in the agency’s Preamble (Perkowski, 2012, 10). One of the first operations Frontex conducted was titled HERA and took place in the Canary Islands (Spain) in 2006 after the Spanish government claimed that it was dealing with a humanitarian immigration crisis (Carrera, 2007, 12). During the operations, tens of thousands irregular migrants arrived in the Canary Islands where according to a Frontex press release, the country of origin was detected a 100 percent of the time by the ‘Frontex experts (Leonard, 2007, 23). The second mission (HERA II) focused on controlling the zone between the West African Coast and the Canary Island Coast; if vessels were found within 24 miles of the West African Coast, they were returned, thus denying the migrants fundamental right to asylum (Carrera, 2007, 21). In the end, HERA II ‘successfully’ stopped 3500 migrants from reaching Spain.
(Ibid., 23). Since then, despite many critiques and even protests outside Frontex’s Headquarter in Warsaw, Frontex’s budget has been increased and more operations have been organised and coordinated (Refugee Movement, 2015). These operations range from optimising airport movement during the UEFA Euro 2008 in Austria and Switzerland, to ‘implementing coordinated operational activities at the sea borders of the Mediterranean in order to control irregular immigration flows towards the territory of the MS of the EU’ (Operation Triton), which is said to have saved 150,000 lives already (Frontex, 2008; Frontex, 2016; Zaiotti, 2016, 66).

3.3 Europol: History and Activity

The European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Cooperation (Europol) is the European Union (EU) law enforcement organisation handling criminal intelligence, and its aim is to improve the effectiveness of and cooperation between the competent authorities of the Member States responsible for preventing and combating serious international organized crime and terrorism.

The agency’s roots lay deeper in the European integration process than those of Frontex. In 1976, the intergovernmental TREVI group was created by the 12 European Community states in order to counter terrorism and to coordinate policing of the EC (Bunyan, 1993, 1). ‘Five working groups were set up in 1976, reporting to the Trevi Senior Officials group, who in turn presented reports initially annually to meetings of the Trevi Ministers; the 12 Interior Ministers of the EC. The Trevi ´troïka´ was comprised of three sets of senior officials from the current EU Council Presidency, the last Presidency and the next one. The job of the ´troïka' was to assist and brief the current Presidency and its officials (Ibid.). TREVI continued to be intergovernmental, focused on counter-terrorism and surrounded by secrecy until 1989 (It was not until 1989 that the first communiqué for public use was made available in the UK) (Ibid.)

It was in this year that the TREVI 92 working group was set up. This time around the European Commission also had a seat around the table. However, it remained outside the TREVI structure, as it did not have any ´direct police competence’ (Ibid., 5). This was soon to be changed as the German delegation to the European Council proposed the creation of a ´EC-level policing body’ in 1991
In 1992 the Maastricht Treaty set out a ‘commitment to full establishment of a Central European Criminal Investigation Office (Europol)’ to cover drug trafficking and organised crime by the end of 1993 (Ibid.) However due to difficulties with ratification Europol was only able to conduct limited operations for a number of years under the name ‘Europol Drugs Unit’. It was then, in 1998 that all the Member States ratified the agency at the Europol Convention; the agency came into full effect in 1999.

Europol is accountable at the EU level to the Council of Ministers for Justice and Home Affairs. The Council is responsible for the guidance and control over the agency; it appoints the Director and the Deputy Directors, and approves Europol’s budget (which is part of the general budget of the EU), together with the European Parliament (Europol, 2017). Since 1999 the agency has continuously received more resources; its staff increased from 323 in 2001 to 1065 in 2016 (with an extra 200 liaison officers) and its budget grew from 25 million in 2002 to a whopping 114 million in 2017 (Europol, 2017). Along this increase of resources came an increase of capabilities; progressively its mandate and operational capabilities were extended to different crime areas beyond the fight against drugs (Nunzi, 2006, 2). At this moment these include: trafficking in human beings, facilitate illegal immigration, cybercrime, intellectual property crime, cigarette smuggling, euro counterfeiting, VAT fraud, money laundering and asset tracing, mobile organised-crime groups, outlawing motorcycle gangs and terrorism (Europol, 2017). Its main activities in these crime areas are to provide a support centre for law enforcement operations, to be a hub of information on criminal activities as well as being centre for law enforcement expertise (Ibid.). The agency supports close to 40.000 federal investigations on a yearly basis.

While fighting the facilitation of illegal immigration is only one of the many crime areas Europol is involved in, it became one of the top priorities under the 2013-2017 Europol Policy cycle (EMPACT) (Europol, 2017) and will remain so for the next cycle beginning in 2018 (Europol Interview). Moreover, in 2016, the European Migrant Smuggling Centre (EMSC) was create (Ibid.) The EMSC ‘coordinates the collective response of law enforcement in Member States in countering the organised criminal groups orchestrating the illegal entry of migrants into the EU on a massive
EMSC experts provide operational and analytical support to national police forces, while Europol also has their own specialists present in migrant entry hotspots across Greece and Italy. In 2016, during one operation, police and border-management forces from numerous EU and non-EU countries managed to arrest 39 migrant smugglers as well as 580 smuggled migrants along the Western Balkan route thanks to the support of the EMSC (Ibid.)

### 3.3 Presentation of Frontex Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRAN Q1</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAN Q2</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAN Q3</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAN Q4</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARA</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEB ARA</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB ARA</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFIC</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEB Q2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB Q3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB Q2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEB Q1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEB Q4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB Q1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB Q4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEB Q3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ARA – Annual Risk Analysis, Q – Quarterly Reports from Frontex Risk Analysis Network, WB – Western Balkans, EEB – Eastern European Borders, AFIC – Africa Frontex Intelligence Community

In this table we can see the LIWC results of each selected Frontex publication from each year (last updated 1 May 2017). It is important here to reiterate that the numbers do not have any tangible meaning unless compared to other scores. It is thus
possible for the reader to identify which texts are more securitising or less securitising than others within the agency, but not how securitising they are externally. However, once these scores get compared to the Europol LIWC results, it will become possible to do so.

One can see that in the first considered year, 2013, only seven risk analyses were carried out; For each quarter of the year, the Frontex Risk Analysis Network published a risk assessment, while the agency also published a yearly Eastern European Border risk assessment, a Western Balkans risk assessment as well as a comprehensive Annual Risk Assessment. It is the Annual Risk Assessments that get the most publicity and get read the most (Interview with Spokesperson, 2017). Of these seven risk analyses published in 2013, the ARA had the highest intensity of securitising language (2.27), the Q4 Report had the lowest security score (1.37) and the average score was 1.82.

In 2014, the agency produced the same number and types of texts. However, this time it was the EEB ARA that had the highest rate of securitising language (2.38). It was again the Q4 Report that had the lowest score (1.39) and the average also went down compared to 2013 (1.76). 2015, saw a considerable increase in the number of risk analyses produced by Frontex; instead of seven, one could now find sixteen risk analyses on their site. On top of the WB and EEB Annual Risk Analyses, the agency decided to publish a Quarterly Risk Analysis for those regions too. On top of that, Frontex came up with a new type of Risk Analysis, which focused on the African continent (26 African countries participated). They called this the Africa Frontex Intelligence Community Reports (AFIC). Coincidentally, the AFIC also displayed the highest securitising language intensity out of the sixteen texts with a score of 3.15. The WB Q4 scored the lowest with 1.21 and the average was 1.78.

Frontex continued the trend set in 2015 and produced similar type of texts in 2016. It is interesting to note that in this year, the name of the EEB reports went changed from Eastern European Borders to Eastern Partnership. As it was only the name that changed and the reports are of the same type, length and topic, I decided to retain the name EEB in the table in order to avoid confusion and difficulties. It is interesting to note that some expected 2016 publications appear to be missing. To this
date (cut off point was 1 May 2017), there has been no sign of the Western Balkans Q4 report, the Eastern Partnership Q4 Report, the Eastern Partnership Annual Risk Analysis Report nor the FRAN Q4 Report. Overall, there were twelve risk analyses produced for the year 2016, with the AFIC again having the highest security language score (2.95) and the WB Q3 having the lowest (1.25). The average score of the texts was 1.81.

On top of providing a simple table with all the individual results, I deemed it important to demonstrate how the securitising language of Frontex in the selected texts developed over the course of the four years that are studied in this thesis. In order to do so, I have taken the average of the LIWC scores for each year and have put them in a linear graph. The result can be seen below.

![Frontex Securitising Language 2013-2016](image)

In this graph one can identify that the securitising language of Frontex publications is highest in 2013. It drops considerably for the year 2014, but then rises steadily through 2015 until it reaches 2016. In the following section, the results of both the table figure as well as the graph will be speculated on.
### 3.4. Presentation of Europol Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts/Year</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text 1</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text 2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text 3</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>7.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text 4</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text 5</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text 6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text 7</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>10.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text 8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>5.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text 9</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text 10</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text 11</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text 12</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text 13</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>8.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text 14</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>7.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text 15</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text 16</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text 17</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text 18</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text 19</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text 20</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text 21</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text 22</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text 23</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text 24</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>10.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text 25</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text 26</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text 27</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Just like with the Frontex results, I will now present the Europol results from the LIWC programme. As mentioned in the methodology, I considered every text that was under the crime area of ‘Facilitation of Illegal Immigration’ from 1 January 2013 until 31 December 2016. Moreover, I considered every text between those same dates under the category ‘Terrorism’ that had a mention of ‘migration’ or ‘immigration’ in the title. It is also important to note here that unlike with Frontex, these Europol publications are not categorised according to quarters of the year, geographical zones or types of risk analyses. Instead, the publications vary widely in topics as well as geographical location; one text is called ‘Austria, Hungary and Europol dismantle migrant smuggling ring’ while another is titled ‘Europol Supports Italian Carabinieri Strike again Georgian Mafia’. While all texts fall under the same category, they are more diverse and get published at irregular times. This means it is not possible to compare the texts in the same way as it was with the Frontex publications. This in itself is not a limitation as I wish to carry out quantitative unbiased research. In order to do so, the categorisation or naming of the texts under study is not necessary.

Europol published eleven texts and newsletters relating to the combat against the facilitation of illegal immigration in 2013. The text with the highest intensity of securitising language scored a 7.12, the lowest a 2.72 and the average of the year was 5.3. In 2014 only five texts were published and the most securitising text scored a 8.78 while the least securitising scored a 4.85. The average for the year was 6.34. In 2015, the number of texts produced went up massively; Europol published nineteen texts in this year. The highest score was 9.6, the lowest 2.87 and the average 6.2. The number of texts diffused concerning the tackling of the facilitation of illegal immigration went up again in 2016; This time Europol produced 27 texts. The highest score was 10.42, the lowest 1.88 and the average was 5.6.

Again, it is necessary to look at how Europol’s discourse might develop over time. In order to be consistent, I used the same method and made the same style of linear graph for Europol discourse. The result can be found below. Here, one can see that in 2013 the securitising discourse is actually lowest. It then reaches its peak in 2014, before slowly regressing in 2015 and 2016
3.5. The Welch-T Test Correction and Mean Results

In this section, I have applied the previously laid out Welch-T test in order to correct the margin of error that might exist due to the different length and number of samples under scrutiny from Frontex and Europol. However, the previous comments still stand. From the chart above, one can clearly see that Europol overall speaks vastly more security than Frontex does.
3.6. Analysing Results and Comparing the Two Agencies

Having presented the quantitative results of the LIWC programme of both agencies discourse, it is now necessary to analyse them. In this section, I aim to highlight interesting talking points from each agency individually, compare the discourse of the agencies and hypothesise about the reasons behind the results.

First of all, it can be noted that the output of both Frontex and Europol’s respective publications grew exponentially in the year 2015. Frontex published nine more risk analyses and Europol diffused fourteen more texts relating to the tackling of the facilitation of illegal immigration. This shows that in 2015, the issue of irregular migration became more important. This is of course logical as 2015 is seen as the onset of what many have called the ‘migration crisis’. As a result of the large increase in numbers of irregular migrants coming to the European continent, both agencies deemed it necessary to become more involved and dedicate more time and more resources to the issue. This was made possible by the increase in budget both agencies received from the European Parliament (10 million for Europol and 49 million for Frontex) (Europol, 2015; Frontex, 2015). In the case of Europol the number of texts continued to grow in 2016 from nineteen to twenty-seven, further showing to the EU and its civilians that the issue of tackling ‘the facilitation of illegal immigration’ became more important for the agency and that it is working hard dismantle criminal networks. In the case of Frontex, the number of risk analyses went down by three. This however should not be seen as a regression of interest or dedication to the issue of irregular migration, but rather a simple delay in the publication of those three texts.

When looking at how Frontex’s securitising discourse over time, it is important to note that the differences between each year are minimal. So while the graph might show a big drop between 2013 and 2014 and then a steady rise until 2016, one should be careful in making hasty conclusions. The differences in between the averages of each year are no bigger than 0.6 and the difference between the lowest and highest LIWC score is only 1.9 (AFIC 2015: 3.15 – WB Q4 2015: 1.21). While these numbers do not mean anything on their own, it is still significant that all 44
Frontex publications displayed similar securitising scores when put through the LIWC programme.

This is to be expected as Frontex has received harsh criticisms for its operations and for constructing an inhumane ‘Fortress Europe’ throughout the years (Horsti, 2012, 298). Indeed, many felt that Frontex treated incoming asylum seekers like threats or criminals during their operations and that the agency’s main goal was to halt irregular migration rather than filter or accommodate it (Horsti, 2012, 301). In response to this criticism, Frontex discourse has taken a strong humanitarian turn in the past years. It even amended its regulation in 2011, which focused more on fundamental rights and laws regarding international protection (Peers, 2011). What this entails for the agency’s discourse is that it has started legitimising its activities and operations at sea through the victimisation of incoming migrants and the need to save them. On the other hand, it still needs to portray itself as an agency that is dealing with the capability to solve the security issue at hand. Polly Pallister-Wilkins summarises the fine line the agency treads well by writing that Frontex discourse aims to merge the wellbeing of migrants and border security in uniformity (Pallister-Wilkins, 2015b). It should come as no surprise then that Frontex discourse between 2013 and 2016 speaks little security.

The claim that Frontex speaks little security becomes stronger comparing it to Europol’s LIWC results. When looking at the table above, the reader can easily see that the Europol security scores are much higher than Frontex’s. The lowest score from any Europol text was 1.88, which is higher than the average of any year of the Frontex publications. Furthermore, the highest score from Europol was 10.73, more than seven points higher than the highest scoring Frontex text (3.15). Finally, the Europol publications prove to be much more divergent in the way they speak security than those of Frontex; the difference between the lowest and highest score is 8.85 (compared to 1.9 for Frontex).

There are a few conclusions one can make from these observations. First, it quickly becomes clear that the Europol publications from 2013 to 2016 are much more securitising than Frontex’s are. Second, it is evident that Europol is much more erratic in its discourse than Frontex is. This is further accentuated by
the fact that there does not seem to be any consistency in the timeline presented above. On this linear graph one can see that securitising discourse is lowest in 2013, reaches its peak in 2014 and then decreases through 2015 until 2016. Before looking at the graph, one would expect that securitising discourse would be highest in 2015 or 2016 as these are the two years where migration flows into Europe were soaring. Nevertheless, when looking at the Europol publications, it become clear the agency does not follow this expected trend. Instead, it hints at irregularity and little control over its discourse. This is different for Frontex, where we can see a drop in securitising discourse in 2014 after the reduction of incoming numbers of irregular migrants following the Arab Spring to then pick up again following the onset of the migration ‘crisis’ in 2015 and the continuation of it through the year 2016.

Having compared the results of the two agencies, it is now necessary to hypothesise the reasons behind Frontex’s low scores and Europol’s high and erratic results. The first and most logical explanation for these large differences between the two agencies is that Europol is new to the game of irregular migration. While Frontex has been solely been dealing with this issue since its inception in 2004, Europol only became involved with the crime area of ‘facilitation of illegal immigration’ in 2011. Moreover, this crime area only became a top priority for the agency in 2013 when the new EU policy cycle (EMPACT) was launched (Europol, 2017). As the agency only started publishing a large number of texts on the topic in the past four years, it is first and foremost possible that the authors of the texts and newsletters are simply not aware of the different types of discourse. which narratives they could or should follow or the debates surrounding discourse, migration and security. Second, the agency has been significantly less in the spotlight compared to Frontex over the last few years and conducts different types of operations. Indeed, Europol conducts no search and rescue operations and does not have a history of human rights violations or non-adherence to the principle of non-refoulement. Moreover, the agency only has a small number of operatives on the ground at migrant hotspots. In other words, the agency has a different mandate and is simply less visible than Frontex. Consequently, they have received little or no criticism from academics, pro-migrant groups or civilians. Due to this lack of outside pressure and constant monitoring, it is highly possible that the agency has not had any impetus to change or be more careful with their discourse.
Thus, answers to why Europol discourse is more securitising than Frontex’s would be because the former agency is not aware that it is diffusing securitising discourse or because it can.

If on the other hand, Europol were to be knowingly diffusing discourse with a high security intensity, one must speculate on the reason(s) behind it. A logical explanation would be that it is in the agency’s own interest to do so. Diffusing securitising discourse can be a self-legitimation tool. Indeed, if Europol works within the security-migration nexus and paints smuggling networks and irregular migration as a security threat to the European Union and its constituents, it can present itself as the answer to that threat. In other words, if the audience (readers of Europol publications) accept Europol’s discourse, it will legitimise the agency’s role and highlight the importance of the work they are doing. Moreover, if successful, it can not only confer legitimacy upon itself, but also aid in the obtaining of more resources and capabilities for the agency. Certainly, while there is no evidence suggesting that the increase in Europol’s budget over the last few years or the creation of the European Migrant and Smuggling Network (EMSC) can be directly attributed to the agency’s high intensity security discourse, it is certainly possible that it aided in it.

3.7. Conclusion

In this chapter I have presented the LIWC results for each agency and analysed them individually as well as comparatively. First, I noticed that in the case of Frontex, the number of texts increased considerably in 2015. This was logical as this was when the migration ‘crisis’ started and the whole of Europe looked to the external border agency for answers. Consequently, more resources and time were spent in the producing of risk analyses. Europol, while only becoming involved in the issue of irregular migration (with a focus on dismantling smuggling networks) in 2011, did the same. Their output of articles and publications increased dramatically too.

After, I addressed the significant difference in the LIWC programme’s results for both agencies. While Frontex’s discourse seemed to be consistent and low in the
amount of security it spoke, Europol’s discourse was erratic and considerably more securitising. I averred that it was logical that Frontex’s discourse was less securitising because of the agency’s past. The agency endured a wide range of criticism from academics, pro-migrant groups and even the UNHCR regarding its operations at sea, its violation of human rights and the non-adhering to the right of non-refoulement during the HERA missions. Frontex was thus pushed to be more careful and opted for a more humanitarian narrative in its discourse. The LIWC results backed this humanitarian turn up. In the case of Europol, I provided a number of possible answers to the high and diverging LIWC scores. First, I considered that due to the fact that Europol is a novice actor in the field of irregular migration, it might not be aware of the different narratives and discourse tactics. It is thus possible that it diffuses highly securitising texts unknowingly. Then I considered that Europol is also less in the spotlight than Frontex. Consequently they might not have had any impetus to change their discourse and are free to securitise the discussed issues freely. They could do this because they can or as a tool for self-legitimation and self-promotion. After all, they are the answer to the security threat they describe.

In order to highlight any similarities or differences between the quantitative results and the stances from within the agencies, I will now turn my attention to the interviews I conducted.

4. Interviews

4.1. Introduction

In order to learn more about the way both agencies employ discourse in order to get their message across, I wanted to conduct interviews. I first carried out my discourse analysis research; this way I already had an idea of the intensity that each agency used securitising language. In order to check whether there were any congruencies, similarities or differences between published discourse and discourse within the agencies, I deemed interviews would be the best way to do so. However, organising interviews proved to be difficult. Unlike in the European Commission or Parliament, there are no publicised records of staff on Frontex or Europol’s site. This means that it is already a challenge to find out who works at the agencies, let alone organise a
meeting. Moreover, due to the sensitive nature of the work, both agencies do and the history of receiving fervent critique (in the case of Frontex), I expected hesitant responses (or no responses at all) to my requests.

I started off by emailing the general enquiry accounts of both agencies and calling Europol. Both methods reaped no rewards as I got no responses. Luckily, thanks to Professor Bouris’ connections and advice, I made a breakthrough after a couple of weeks. I got a response from an intern at Frontex to organise an interview in Warsaw with one of the three spokespersons of the agency. Due to the complete lack of response from Europol’s side, I decided to go on the business- and employment-oriented social networking service, Linkedin. Here, I added people on the site who worked for Europol and attached a short message explaining the topic of my thesis and my desire to organise interviews. Out of the 30 people I requested to add, four responded, asking me to further elaborate on my project. After doing so, I managed to organise an interview with two out of the four respondents. In the end, I was given the opportunity to interview a spokesperson of Frontex in Warsaw and two strategic analysts from Europol in The Hague. On request of all three interviewees, I shall not mention them by their name, but by their job title.

4.2. The Frontex Interview

In April, I was given the opportunity to have a one-hour interview with one of the three spokespersons of Frontex in their HQ in Warsaw. As mentioned in the methodology, I wanted my interview to be semi-structured and not recorded. This way I hoped to cover a wide range of topics and expected the interviewee would feel more at ease discussing sensitive matters. In this interview, I hoped to discover whether the agency was aware of the debates surrounding securitisation, whether it was aware of the type of discourse it produced.

In order to avoid coming off as too hasty or too intense, the spokesperson and I first discussed a wide range of topics that included the recent issues the agency has had with NGOs (and Medecins Sans Frontieres specifically), the supporting role it plays for MS in the migration ‘crisis’, the workings of Search and Rescue operations
and the importance of the Maritime Rescue Coordination Centre in Rome. Here, the spokesperson emphasised the ‘misunderstanding people have of Frontex’s mandate, duty and capabilities’. Indeed, he averred that the first part of the mandate is border management, not rescue missions. Consequently, the spokesperson found the critique of academics, newspapers, NGO’s and the MSF twitter hashtag ‘WhereIsFrontex’ unfair. He also shared with me that the agency does not believe that tighter border patrols causes more deaths by pushing migrants to more dangerous routes. He claimed that the agency worked under the principle of non-refoulement and that there is no danger for migrants to be brought back to their point of departure without being able to file an asylum claim. As a result, migrants actually want to be found by European vessels rather than trying to bypass them. In response to this claim I brought up the HERA missions that ran from 2006 to 2011 in which Frontex is known to have not respected the principle of non-refoulement and migrant’s rights (Perkowski, 2012, 3; Leonard, 2010, Carrera, 2007). The Spokesperson denied that Frontex ever stepped outside its mandate. I found this lack of self-awareness of the agency surprising, especially considering the low and consistent quantitative research results. Was it not the critique on the HERA missions that pushed the agency towards a more humanitarian narrative in the first place?

The spokesperson then approached the subject of Frontex’ new complaint mechanism and spoke about their new fundamental rights officer who has a team of five people working for her. However, he claimed that there had been no complaints since its inception, which could be due to the fact that the details of the mechanism have not been fully worked out yet.

When asked about the feeling within the agency during the past few years, the spokesperson admitted there was a lot of frustration over the fact that there were a severe lack of tools and human resources that were badly needed for the missions to be successful. He continued by arguing that the priority of Frontex was to register migrants, but that this was simply not possible due to the sheer number of people arriving on the Greek islands every day. ‘People had to be flushed through to make space for the incoming boats’. Moreover, The European fingerprint database (EURODAC) was not implemented fast enough.
The Frontex spokesperson then continued by claiming that he does not believe in the militarisation of the European borders. From a Frontex perspective, it does not make sense as the agency does not own any equipment. He further claimed that Frontex does not fund walls or any obstructions to control borders. When asked about the EUROSUR sponsored thermal vision cameras on top of a barbed wire wall on the Greek border, the spokesperson changed his answer by telling me that it is important to know who is coming in; ‘migration does not need to be stopped but it needs to be controlled’ (Heller and Jones, 2014, 4).

I then inquired about the relationship between Frontex and Europol; after all the comparing of the two agencies lies at the crux of this literary piece. The spokesperson told me that Frontex provides Europol information about smugglers, have joint action days that focus on a region or aspect of crime and launched the ‘Processing personal data for risk analysis’ project (PeDRA) (Frontex, 2014). He further claimed that the agencies do have overlapping areas and that ‘both agencies unofficially compete for resources’. However, he said that Frontex does not use particular discourse to get an edge over another agency’. The spokesperson did make an interesting claim regarding Europol’s discourse: ‘At Europol there are more people with enforcement backgrounds (police, military), which could mean they are less open and less careful. He argued that Europol could be at the same stage Frontex was at under the previous Executive director (Laitinen). He said:

‘the previous director had a more military background... under the new Executive director (Legerri) there has been a new philosophy which has filtered through the agency... after a while the discourse became respondent to the new director, more transparent, more humanitarian’.

While the spokesperson seemed to avoid questions regarding Frontex’s past, his following statements seem to strengthen the hypotheses made in the quantitative research section regarding the agency’s securitising language and humanitarian turn. He said:

‘we are careful about the words we use. Early on we had internal discussions about the use of ‘illegal immigrant/immigration’. We are still often critiqued for not calling irregular
migrants refugees, but we cannot do this as this needs to be determined first (separating economic migrants from people fleeing war).

While there were a variety of topics addressed during the interview, the most important point I took away from it, was that the agency seems to be aware that it needs to be increasingly careful in the type of discourse it uses in its publications. Indeed, the spokesperson told me several times that they ‘are more careful because of the situation and because we are under more scrutiny’. He continued ‘we are making our discourse more humanitarian’. He concluded by saying that ‘we are trying to be responsible with the way things are going’.

This awareness of critiques, debates and discourse seems to fall in line with the quantitative results from the previous section. There, one could see that Frontex spoke significantly less security than Europol and was much more consistent in using securitising language. By bringing up the law enforcement background of many Europol employees, the Frontex spokesperson also hinted at the fact that Europol might not be so careful with its discourse. In order to find out more, I travelled to the Hague two weeks later.

4.3 The Europol Interview

On May 5\textsuperscript{th}, I travelled to Europol HQ to speak with two Strategic analysts. One of them worked for the EMSC while the other interviewee worked for the Serious and Organised Crime Threat Assessment unit (SOCTA). Both agreed to speak to me, together, for a short period of time. Again, I was requested to not name the interviewees in my thesis. Both agreed to be called by their job titles. In order to facilitate things, I will refer to the interviewees as ‘the EMSC analyst’ or ‘the SOCTA analyst’.

We first discussed the EMPACT and SOCTA cycle and the crime area of facilitation of illegal immigration becoming a top priority for Europol in 2013–2017. The SOCTA analyst told me that the new cycle, beginning in 2018, will have eight priorities and that ‘migration will be the most important one’. Indeed, she averred that
the funding for migration was by far the largest, which meant that Europol had no other choice than to prioritise this crime area. The EMSC analyst added that this increased funding also made it possible for the EMSC to be set up in 2016.

The SOCTA analyst furthermore claimed that she believed that if the crime behind irregular migration can be eradicated, the issue will be tackled at its roots and that this will lead to successfully reducing numbers of incoming migrants. The interviewees furthermore spoke about the role of Europol and how the agency has no executive powers. They argued that Europol only had agents on the ground at the request of MS and that they only helped with secondary security checks at border hotspots.

After further discussing Europol’s role in the migration crisis and both interviewees explaining to me what their job function entailed, I approached the possible relationship between irregular immigration and the threat of terrorism. I did so by asking about some of the texts in the ‘terrorism’ crime area directly referring to ‘illegal immigration’. The EMSC analyst ascertained that while European agencies did not publically want to draw a link between the two, the internal view has changed. He continued by saying that while there is no direct link between irregular immigration and terrorism networks, the former definitely facilitates the latter.

While it comes as no surprise that a number of people in the EU understand irregular immigration within a security threat context, I found it interesting to see that even within European agencies, the link is clearly and openly drawn. It must furthermore be noted that the EMSC analyst had no problem using the terms ‘illegal immigrants’ or ‘migration crisis’. It would thus be compelling to highlight the connection between the highly securitising texts of Europol from 2013 and 2016 and the comments made by the EMSC analyst. However, doing so would be wrong; the second interviewee (SOCTA analyst) was much more careful with her words and avoided using such terms. Moreover, unlike with Frontex, the two people that agreed to be interviewed were not spokespersons for the agency. Consequently, I cannot attribute one of the interviewee’s words and attitude towards irregular immigration to the whole agency’s view or make the link between its publications and his comments. It does however, remain and interesting talking point.
At the end of the interview, I again asked about the relationship between Europol and Frontex. Especially after the Frontex spokesperson’s comments, I deemed it necessary to do so. Both interviewees agreed that the agencies work well together and that there is no overlap. Indeed, they informed me that Frontex is part of the EMPACT cycle, that bilateral meetings are organised often and that communal training days are no rarity. The SOCTA analyst concluded that the relationship between Europol and Frontex was not based on competition, but on cooperation.

These comments differed from the ones made by the Frontex spokesperson. While the Europol interviewees denied any overlap or competition between the two agencies, the spokesperson admitted that this was actually the case in practice. However, claiming that either agency used discourse in order to compete directly with the other would be too far-fetched, even though not unfathomable.

4.4 Conclusion

This chapter has introduced, presented and analysed the two interviews I conducted with Frontex and Europol. In the case of Frontex, I found the spokesperson’s comments to reflect the quantitative results well. The abundance of critique on the agency, the introduction of a new Executive director and to a smaller extent the beginning of the migration ‘crisis’ (2015) has pushed Frontex to be more careful with their discourse. The spokesperson confided that internal high-level discussions had been organised to discuss terminology and that there has been a push for a more humanitarian and ‘responsible’ type of language in Frontex publications. These comments thus fall in line with the low security scores from the quantitative research chapter.

In the case of Europol, the interview was less fruitful. First of all, neither interviewees were spokespersons for the agency. This rendered it difficult to make a direct connection between their comments and the results from the quantitative research chapter. Moreover, unlike the Frontex spokesperson they were not in charge (or a part) of the writing of publications on Europol’s site. This meant that I wanted to avoid making sweeping or overgeneralising statements. What I did find however, is that one of the interviewees (EMSC analyst) freely used outdated terms such as
‘illegal immigrant’ and saw a clear link between the incoming numbers of migrants and terrorism. However, the SOCTA analyst was much more cautious with her language when discussing the role of Europol in the migration ‘crisis’. So, while I cannot link these comments to the higher securitising language Europol used in its publications, it was an interesting point to note as the Frontex spokesperson had commented that Europol employees had a stronger law enforcement background and would most likely be less careful with their discourse. However, the SOCTA analyst was much more cautious when discussing the role of Europol in the migration ‘crisis’. A final talking point is the differing views the interviewees had regarding the relationship between the two agencies. While both stated they organised joint training days and provide each other with information, the Frontex spokesperson stated that there was some overlap between the two agencies and that they unofficially compete for resources. The idea of the relationship was vastly different from Europol’s end, who reiterated numerous times that there was no overlap, no competition and only cooperation. While this does not affect my research question, it is something that could and should be studied further in the future.

5. Conclusions, Limitations and Areas of Further Study

This thesis has sought to find an answer as to how the European agencies that are heavily involved in the area of irregular immigration contribute to the securitisation of immigration in the EU through discourse. The secondary research question I sought to answer was ‘which one of the two agencies securitises irregular immigration the most?’.

In order to answer these questions, I first painted a picture of the current situation in Europe regarding the issue of irregular migration and the phenomenon that many have dubbed as the ‘migration crisis’ or ‘refugee crisis’. I addressed the social relevance of this thesis and how it will contribute to security and migration studies. Before addressing the secondary literature I laid out my methodology. Here, I
introduced my quantitative research method and explained how I would use the LIWC programme based on the article of Baele and Sterck (Baele and Sterck, 2014). I averred that because they also addressed the securitisation of immigration (at the EU-level), I could use the same dictionary they assembled for their research. After explaining the workings of the programme I addressed the limitations of the method and decided that they did not undermine the coherence of the results or the research. I concluded that this relatively new method could offer a more objective and beneficial way to conduct political science research.

I then presented my literature review in which I addressed the two main theories of securitisation studies. I averred that the Copenhagen School of Security Studies defined security as the ‘move that takes politics beyond the established rules of the game and frames the issue either as a special kind of politics or as above politics’ (Waever, Buzan, de Wilde, 1998, 23). For the Copenhagen School framing and discourse are at the centre of the theory and it believes that through uttering ‘security’ to an audience, a political actor with authority can legitimise using emergency measures to tackle a certain issue (i.e. immigration).

When writing on securitisation studies one cannot ignore the Paris School. Lead by Didier Bigo, this school focuses on a more ‘sociological approach’ to security. What this means is that this school believes that an authority figure does not need to speak security to an audience, but that it can also be achieved through security experts in the field managing perceived risks in a less bureaucratic way and on a more routine basis (Husymans, 2006, 72 ; Bigo, 2008, 11).

While both Schools have vast different approaches to the same subject, it should be noted that they are not mutually exclusive. In fact, they are complementary. In both ways individually as well as combined can an issue become securitised. In order to lay out my own theoretical framework I chose to use different parts of each theory. Indeed, I based myself on the Copenhagen School by choosing to focus on discourse. I too opted to study two figures (agencies) that have authority on the issue. However, I did not focus on individual ‘speech acts’ that spoke of ‘existential threat’ to an audience. Instead, I chose to look at the Paris School and opted to study discourse that got published routinely and over time. Moreover, just like Bigo and
other authors, I argued that there is no yes or no answer to whether an issue such as immigration is securitised. Instead, I believe there exists a security continuum with no securitisation on one end and the existential threat at the other end. So, my research did not look to answer whether Frontex or Europol spoke security or not but at what intensity they securitised the issue of irregular immigration.

Before presenting my results, I introduced the agencies, its genesis and its areas of activities. Here I saw that Frontex’s origins can be found in the creation of the Schengen Area in the 1985 and the increased desire from EU MS to have the external borders of the union controlled. Since 2004, the agency has seen an incredible rise in its budget as well as its capabilities (RABIT 2007, EBCG 2016). However, the history of Frontex has not been all rosy; the agency has received many criticisms from pro-migrant groups and academics. This critique regarding human right and international law violations culminated into a ‘Shutdown Frontex’ protest in 2008 (Noborder, 2008). Europol’s origins could be found in the inter-governmental TREVI organisation and first prioritised international terrorism and drug related crime. However, the agency quickly diversified into different crime areas including the facilitation of irregular immigration. This crime are then became one of the eight priorities in the 2013-2017 EMPACT cycle and it is expected to become the top priority for the agency in the 2018 cycle.

After introducing Frontex and Europol I turned my attention to the LIWC programme and presented the reader with the results in tables. Here I observed that the number of Frontex publications had dramatically increased since 2015 and that some were still missing from the 2016-year. In the case of Europol I noticed too that the number of publications increased considerably in the year 2015. This was easily attributable to the onset of the migration ‘crisis’ and the consequential attention the external borders of the European continent received. I also noted that the Frontex results all seemed low and consistent over the years while in Europol’s case the results were much higher and much more diverse. This was further accentuated when looking at the timeline graphs I presented; in the case of Frontex, one could see that the differences between the security scores each year were minimal and diverged extremely little. When looking at how Europol’s securitising discourse over time, one can note that it is sporadic and that the differences are much larger than with Frontex.
I then analysed these results and hypothesised as to why Europol would diffuse such securitising discourse compared to Frontex. I argued that it could be first and foremost possible that Frontex was a more careful with their discourse following the plethora of critique they received since the agency’s inception. Europol on the other hand, has a smaller role than Frontex, has less people on the ground and deals with criminal networks rather than migrants themselves. As a result, they have not been criticised for their actions, which could mean they are not pushed to be careful with their discourse. Moreover, Europol is new to the game of ‘irregular migration’. Another explanation could thus be that they are diffusing securitising publications simply because they are not aware (yet) of the debates surrounding securitisation and irregular immigration. However, I also wrote that it is possible that Europol publishes high intensity security texts in order to confer legitimacy upon itself.

In order to check these hypotheses, I dedicated a chapter to describe and analyse the interviews I conducted. The interview with the spokesperson of Frontex reaffirmed my hypotheses completely. He stated that the agency was careful and responsible with its discourse and even had internal high-level meetings to discuss different terms the agency should or should not use. Both the quantitative and qualitative research thus point in the same direction; the agency underwent a real humanitarian turn and is aware of the type of discourse it uses in its publications. Consequently, it makes sense that the texts under study spoke little security.

For my Europol interview, I was not able to speak to a spokesperson. Instead two strategic analysts agreed to speak with me. This meant that even if I did find some similarities or differences between the quantitative research scores and their statements, I could not make a direct connection between the two. After all, they did not represent the agency. However, their statements could give me an idea of the feeling inside the agency toward irregular immigration and give me some interesting insights. During the interview I found that the SOCTA analyst was careful with her discourse and refrained from making bold statements regarding Europol or the issue of irregular immigration. The EMSC analyst on the other hand did exactly that. He averred there was a clear connection between the onset of the migration ‘crisis’ and terrorism in Europe while also using the term ‘illegal immigrants’ freely. The
analyst’s statements pointed in the same direction as the quantitative research findings, but again, making a direct link between the two as was possible with Frontex would be too far-reaching.

This thesis has only partly been able to answer the research question it set to initially answer. Indeed, assessing to what extent Europol and Frontex contributed to the securitisation of immigration in the EU proved impossible to measure, as the audience of the publications diffused by both agencies are not well known (Neal, 2009; Boswell, 2007; Baele and Sterck; 2014). Even if it were, it would be incredibly difficult to identify which ideas would be transmitted to the audience’s audience (the constituents). Consequently, I opted to change my research question to ‘How do Frontex and Europol contribute the securitisation of immigration in the EU?’ Because it was not possible for me to assess the agencies’ practices in the field, I chose to look at discourse. After presenting my understanding of securitisation of immigration and the laying out of my theoretical framework, I found that both agencies securitised the issue through their discourse. However, I found a large disparity between the intensity both agencies securitised irregular immigration with. The answer to my second research question regarding to which agency securitised immigration the most was easily answered thanks to the LIWC programme results. Europol’s texts spoke much more security than Frontex’s did.

This thesis has given an insight into the discourse from two European Union agencies that have become more and more involved in the field of irregular immigration. It did so by deploying a quantitative research method that was then backed up by a smaller qualitative research chapter in the form of interviews. There are of course some limitations to my research. By deploying quantitative discourse analysis, some validity concerns arise that need to be treated. I understand that I do not deliver a comprehensive take on the issue; I have not provided the reader with any evidence of securitising moves and speech acts from within the texts. Hence my research should not be regarded as holistic, but should be seen as an outline and a starting point from which other inquiries can be launched.

I have not looked at practice due to the inability to travel to migration hotspots and observe Frontex and Europol activity in the field. Consequently, it has not been
possible to study the other half necessary to paint a comprehensive picture of how both agencies might securitise irregular immigration in the EU. This is most definitely an area for further study that could base itself on a similar study that Bigo conducted in 2014 (Bigo, 2014). Here one would probably find that Frontex due to its larger more exposed activities it would securitise irregular immigration more than Europol does.

Another interesting study to conduct would be a visual analysis of Frontex and Europol pictures. Indeed, ‘discourse’ also incorporates images that have the ability to shape the collective consciousness, as they are simultaneously composed of ‘captions, titles, texts that surround the content of the photograph, etc.’ (Campbell, 2004, 62-63). Pictures would not trigger policy responses per se, but do have the ability to make a strong impact on the mental model of an audience, which in return can lead to a call for change. This study could be conducted by analysing the pictures Europol, Frontex that they use in their publications, Twitter pages or Facebook posts. Finally, it would also be worthwhile to launch a qualitative study delving more into the actual content of the texts. A downside to this however, would be that the study would have to take a lot longer or that a much smaller amount of texts would have to be considered.

Overall, I hope I have provided the reader with insights regarding securitisation theory, the securitisation of immigration in the EU (and irregular immigration in particular) and their connection to Frontex as well as Europe. Moreover, I have shown how to use a quantitative research method in the field of political science and I hope that it has laid out a starting point for other researchers to work from. I have found that both agencies in question securitise the issue through their discourse, but that Europol does this at a much higher intensity than Frontex. It is now necessary for others to delve into this intricate subject further and consider more texts, different types of texts, pictures as well as observations in the field.
### Appendix: The Security Lexicon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abatement</th>
<th>ABMT</th>
<th>Ghraib</th>
<th>Afghanistan</th>
<th>Aggression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airland</td>
<td>Airpower</td>
<td>Alliance</td>
<td>Alert</td>
<td>Al Qaeda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammunition</td>
<td>Amphibious</td>
<td>Anarchy</td>
<td>Antipersonnel</td>
<td>APT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>Arm*</td>
<td>Assassi*</td>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>Atomic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attack*</td>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>Ballistic</td>
<td>Battle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bin Laden</td>
<td>Biogolical</td>
<td>Bipolar*</td>
<td>Blitzkrieg</td>
<td>Block*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bomb*</td>
<td>Bullet</td>
<td>Capabilit*</td>
<td>Capitulat*</td>
<td>Casualt*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catastroph*</td>
<td>Ceasefire</td>
<td>Chechnya</td>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>Clos*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster</td>
<td>Coerc*</td>
<td>Collaps*</td>
<td>Colonial</td>
<td>Combat*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compel*</td>
<td>Compromise</td>
<td>Concession</td>
<td>Conciliat*</td>
<td>Conflict*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contain*</td>
<td>Control*</td>
<td>Cooperat*</td>
<td>Counteract*</td>
<td>Countrerinsurgen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterterrorism*</td>
<td>Countervail*</td>
<td>Coup</td>
<td>Crim*</td>
<td>Crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Cybersphere</td>
<td>Cyberwar</td>
<td>Damag*</td>
<td>Danger*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisive</td>
<td>Defen*</td>
<td>Demobilis*</td>
<td>Destab*</td>
<td>Destruct*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detent</td>
<td>Deter*</td>
<td>Dictator</td>
<td>Dilemma*</td>
<td>Disarm*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster*</td>
<td>Disease*</td>
<td>Disintegrat*</td>
<td>Disobedience</td>
<td>Dispute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td>Domin*</td>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>Embargo*</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enemy</td>
<td>Escalation</td>
<td>Evil</td>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>Expeditionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explos*</td>
<td>Extraordinary</td>
<td>Faction</td>
<td>Failed</td>
<td>Fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fight*</td>
<td>Firearms</td>
<td>FLN</td>
<td>Forbid*</td>
<td>Force*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamentali* Gang</td>
<td>Gaza Genocide</td>
<td>Globalization</td>
<td>Guerilla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf</td>
<td>Hamas</td>
<td>Hard Hazard*</td>
<td>Hegemon*</td>
<td>Hezbollah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroshima</td>
<td>Homeland</td>
<td>Hostage</td>
<td>Hussein</td>
<td>Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imminen*</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Infiltrat*</td>
<td>Inhuman</td>
<td>Insecure*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>Interdependen*</td>
<td>Interdiction</td>
<td>Interpol</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasion</td>
<td>IRA</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Israel*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurd*</td>
<td>Landmine</td>
<td>Law*</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Liberat*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malacca</td>
<td>Militar*</td>
<td>Missile</td>
<td>Munition*</td>
<td>Muslims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcotics</td>
<td>Nationalis*</td>
<td>NATO</td>
<td>Nazi</td>
<td>Netwar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonproliferation Korea</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>Offensive</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td>OSCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overwhelm*</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>Partisan</td>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Preempt*</td>
<td>Proliferat*</td>
<td>Protect*</td>
<td>Puniti*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radical*</td>
<td>Rescue Resist*</td>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliation</td>
<td>Revenger</td>
<td>Revolution</td>
<td>Rival*</td>
<td>Rogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALT</td>
<td>SALW</td>
<td>Sanction*</td>
<td>Sarin</td>
<td>Scar*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secur*</td>
<td>Seperatis*</td>
<td>Shock</td>
<td>Shortage*</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabilis*</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Strateg*</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>Suicide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superpower</td>
<td>Surge</td>
<td>Surveillance</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Tactic*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Terror*</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>Traffic*</td>
<td>Transnational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Violen*</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Weapon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wound*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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