

University of Tampere
School Of Management
International Relations

Mixed Migration in the Mediterranean

Media Portrayals of Refugees and Migrants

Anna Järvinen
PEACE 034: Master's Thesis
Supervisor: Tuomas Forsberg

Tampere University

School of Management

Master's Programme in Peace, Mediation and Conflict Research

JÄRVINEN, ANNA: Mixed Migration in the Mediterranean: Media Portrayals of Refugees and Migrants

Master's Thesis, 60 pages

International Relations

March 2015

Mixed migration in the Mediterranean has since 2013 increased significantly, leading to an unprecedented amount of deaths at sea. For the first time in 2014, over half of the people crossing the sea were refugees. The Mediterranean has not only come to be referred to as a graveyard, but it also represents a border zone dividing people and worlds, one in which the inherent conflict between national security and human rights is sadly depicted.

The present thesis sets out to analyse how migrants and refugees, and migration and asylum, are portrayed in news articles and photographs published in the newspaper *Helsingin Sanomat* during 2013 and 2014. The focus is on the Central Mediterranean, covering mixed migration movements from Northern Africa to Southern Europe. By utilising ideas put forth by the Copenhagen School's securitisation theory, Jef Huysmans' security framing approach and the linkage between security and visual communication, the research seeks to understand how refugees and migrants are portrayed, and more specifically, whether refugees and migrants are portrayed as primarily a security concern or a humanitarian concern.

A content analysis of the articles was conducted, and the quantitative data together with more qualitative analysis indicated that while both security and humanitarian perspectives are recurrent, the security perspective has more emphasis. This is done by portraying migrants and refugees negatively and linking them to illegality, and by portraying them predominantly as numbers and passive agents. Together with the former, the lack of individual accounts from migrants and refugees renders them an anonymous mass, which portrays them as security concerns instead of highlighting their individuality, rights and distress. The results support the general tendency to invest in security responses over humanitarian ones when reacting to mixed migration.

Key words: mixed migration, securitisation, security framing, media portrayals

Table of Contents

- 1. Introduction 1**
 - 1.1. Aim and Research Questions 4

- 2. Background 7**
 - 2.1. Migration Terminology 7
 - 2.2. Mixed Migration in the Mediterranean 10
 - 2.3. Media Portrayals of Migrants and Refugees 13

- 3. Theory 16**
 - 3.1. Securitisation Theory 17
 - 3.2. Jef Huysmans’ Conceptualisation of Framing Insecurity 22
 - 3.2. The Securitisation of Migration 25
 - 3.3. Visuality and Security 31

- 4. Methodology 34**
 - 4.1. Material 35
 - 4.2. Method 37

- 5. Analysis 43**
 - 5.1. Portrayal of Migrants and Refugees 43
 - 5.2. Portrayal of Migration and Asylum 52
 - 5.3. Security Framing of Migration and Asylum 54

- 6. Conclusions 58**

1. Introduction

International migration has occurred as a central phenomenon in world affairs for centuries. However, after the Peace of Westphalia and the subsequent birth of the modern nation-state with boundaries defining it as a sovereign unit, cross-border movement has been increasingly restricted through border-control and immigration policies. At the same time, armed conflicts, repression, persecution and poverty are displacing millions of people around the world. Moreover, through technological advances information has become more accessible than ever before, which has on its part contributed to increased migration from economically and/or politically distressed countries to more affluent and democratic ones in recent years.

The end of the year 2013 saw the highest recorded forced migration numbers since the Second World War, with 51,2 million people displaced (UNHCR 2014b). Most refugees stem from Afghanistan, Syria and Somalia in what the Migration Policy Institute has dubbed the “Largest Humanitarian Crisis since WW II” (Esthimer 2014, UNHCR 2014b). Especially the ongoing civil war in Syria together with, for instance, instability in Somalia and persecution in Eritrea are reflected also in rising numbers of people crossing the Mediterranean from North Africa to Southern Europe. In addition to refugees, the number of undocumented migrants crossing the sea has increased, which has led to an unprecedented amount of people arriving, predominantly, in Italy.

With the increasing amount of people crossing the Mediterranean, accidents mostly caused by unseaworthy, often over-crowded, vessels and bad weather conditions have also increased, making the Mediterranean the most deadly sea route for migrants and refugees (UNHCR 2014a). Southern European countries’, and the European Union’s (EU), approach to cross-border movement has become stricter with, for instance, the returning of vessels carrying migrants to the departure countries without respecting the principle of *non-refoulement*, and the passing of national laws criminalising assistance to undocumented migrants in several countries. Increased sea crossings have also extended surveillance on EU’s external borders together with search and rescue missions. At the same time there have been calls for all European countries to contribute to helping migrants and refugees

arriving by sea, mainly to Italy.

Indeed, international borders have become the areas where human rights are often disregarded and the issue of migration as a security concern is atomised (Ribas-Mateos 2011:51). The Mediterranean border zones represent not only that, but also larger barriers than those between two nation-states. Indeed, the sea has come to represent also a divide between South and North (Ribas-Mateos 2011:58). Balibar has argued that the globalised world has been divided into ‘life zones’ and ‘death zones’, which is sadly illustrated by thousands of migrant and refugee deaths in the Mediterranean (2004:126). Importantly, the external borders of Europe have also become to represent the hypocrisy of the European Union’s values: freedom and rights are mainly reserved for EU nationals, while others are excluded (often by force) from the scope of protection. The divide has been described as ‘Fortress Europe’ and even the ‘European Apartheid’ (Balibar 2004:117,121).

Similar debates are at the heart of linkages between migration and security. Only in the beginning of 2015 the terrorist attacks in Paris and Copenhagen sparked debates on the relation between security and immigration. In Finland, the right-wing populist party the True Finns’ news outlet has even gone so far as to suggest Finnish reception centres for asylum seekers to be terrorists’ holiday destinations (Suomen Uutiset 2014). Indeed, the True Finns could be described as the crusaders of framing migration as a security concern in Finland, as, for instance, their recent programme for immigration policy suggests (Perussuomalaiset 2015). However, as Jef Huysmans has put forth, migration and asylum have long been framed as security concerns in Europe (2006:1). This is not least demonstrated by EU practices, such as Frontex border surveillance operations and the recent *Mos Maiorum* operation, a European-wide crack-down on undocumented migrants (Léonard 2011, Brenner 2014). Thus there is a risk that individuals’ (in this case migrants’ and refugees’) rights are compromised in the name of security. This on the other hand increases the already existing gap between EU citizens’ rights and non-citizens’ rights, as exemplified in the Mediterranean case and at the EU’s external borders in general. It is thus essential to highlight the potential harmfulness of portraying migrants and refugees as security concerns.

Migrants and refugees who cross the Mediterranean are often talked about in the media, mostly when people have been rescued, or, when they have drowned. The phenomenon

itself is covered too, often reflecting and reproducing the aforementioned division lines by talking of a ‘migrant problem’, ‘illegal entrants’, but also of ‘tragedy’ and referring to the Mediterranean as a ‘graveyard’. The media plays a significant part in producing and reproducing these division lines, as media portrayals affect its consumers’ views and attitudes, and thus ultimately policy responses (Vultee 2011:77). Therefore it is central to scrutinise how migrants and refugees are portrayed, and migration and asylum in general.

This, indeed, lies at the core of the present thesis. There are unanswered questions, which have sparked this research. Namely, how is it possible that people fleeing from threats have themselves become viewed as threats? How is one to understand the inherent contradiction between human security and national security in the case of migration and asylum? What makes a humanitarian crisis a security crisis? How is it that in Finland, where immigration and the intake of refugees are on a European level comparatively low, controlling migration is a recurrent debate in politics and social discussion, and often talked about as something threatening or negative?

What is ultimately a question of ensuring the right to life and human dignity for all equally, turns into a complex political and philosophical debate of the equal worth of human beings, human security opposed to national security, and restricted political communities, among other things. Before it being a political or security issue, however, it is a human tragedy and ought to be handled and talked about as one. Indeed, every individual’s right to life and dignity is the departure point of the present thesis, and is undeniably the underlying value bias running through the thesis.

By looking at Finnish media portrayals of migrants and refugees crossing the Central Mediterranean from Northern Africa to Southern Europe, the thesis at hand seeks to shed light on how people are represented in the media, and whether migration and asylum is framed as a security or humanitarian concern. While the two latter concerns are not necessarily mutually exclusive, whichever is prioritised will arguably affect the other with either a primary focus on national security or a primary focus on migrants’ and refugees’ security. Furthermore, specifically Finnish media portrayals are scrutinised, since while migration and asylum in the Mediterranean area are far away it is a pressing humanitarian crisis that requires action also from Finland. Thus it is interesting to see how the situation is portrayed specifically in Finland. Furthermore, as news reports and images also affect

general attitudes towards migrants and refugees, how they are portrayed as people is essential in this (Vultee 2011:77).

1.1. Aim and Research Questions

The thesis at hand will scrutinise news articles and images of migrants and refugees travelling from Northern Africa to Southern Europe published in the largest and most widely circulated newspaper in Finland, *Helsingin Sanomat* (HS). All articles in the world news section of the paper edition published during the years 2013 and 2014 will be analysed. The aim is to establish whether or not there are general patterns in the portrayals of migrants and refugees on the one hand, and migration and asylum as more general phenomena on the other. By doing so it is also the aim to highlight possible problematic patterns, for instance, if migrants are linked to illegality.

The securitisation of migration (i.e. elevating it from a political to a security issue) in the EU has been a central subject of study in the field of international relations, specifically in the sub field of security studies (see e.g. Buzan et al. 1998, Huysmans 2006, Lazaridis 2011). Indeed, that different forms of migration are often referred to as security concerns in contemporary political rhetoric and media outlets in most European countries has been widely established (ibid.). Also materialised securitisation in form of the establishment and practices of the EU's external border control agency Frontex and stricter rules for immigration and asylum, for instance, point to national security concerns overriding human rights, such as the right to seek asylum (Léonard 2011).

A central argument running through the present thesis is that securitisation of migration is not only dangerous and should be avoided, as Buzan et al. have emphasised (1998:29), but it importantly, and paradoxically, is a potential source of insecurity. Negative labelling and stereotypes assigned to people in distress firstly, is not only disgraceful, but puts their human rights at risk. Secondly, the same kind of categorisation of any people can lead to their exclusion out of a political community. In other words, becoming a part of a political community, or being accepted to one, can never materialise if migrants and refugees are separated from others by being portrayed as threatening and potentially dangerous.

This, then, brings us to a shortfall of most international relations theory: by definition it focuses mainly on the international thus often ignoring the individual. While everything it studies evolves around the individual, how the individual is affected by, for instance, securitisation of migration is rarely an issue of scrutiny. Among few, Elspeth Guild has highlighted the conflict between the security of many and security of the individual (2009:6). Indeed, as a social—or human—science the focus should arguably lie on individuals more often in international relations research. Since it is felt that there is a tendency to forget that it is individuals that are the core of any human phenomena, the present thesis focuses on portrayals of individuals, and on how individuals are portrayed within a larger phenomenon.

Moreover, from a pure policy perspective focusing on individuals arguably leads to more humane policies. People are more likely to be emotionally evoked and feel compassion for people in distress if they hear a story, see an image, if they can identify and possibly relate to the individual. While, of course, the reaction might be drained into apathy moments after the impact, it is better than reacting with fear and/or distrust. At the end of the day, compassion and empathy are essential when contemplating action and responses to humanitarian crises. Thus, the thesis at hand seeks to emphasise the individual as much as possible.

Moreover, the categories (e.g. migrant, asylum seeker) which individuals are assigned to affect how they are thought about and treated (Phillips 2014, Bjarnesen 2014). While refugees might be met with compassion, migrants could be seen as ‘exploiters of the system’ and met with distrust (Horsti 2009:78). Mixed terminology, e.g. the common interchangeable use of ‘migrant’ and ‘refugee’, can potentially affect opinions and consequently policies in a way that the negative stereotypes of migrants ‘exploiting the system’, for instance, might be assigned to all types of migrants, also refugees. Thus, the general term ‘migrant’ is arguably too unspecific to account for the diversity within the group.

When one looks at the dire situation in the Mediterranean, which essentially is caused by distress further away, it does not seem justified that the EU has closed its doors and its eyes from people. While people keep saying that they ‘cannot believe how the world stood by and watched Rwanda happen’, or ‘we should really do something about Syria’—

simultaneously a human tragedy is unfolding on the Mediterranean, and ‘we’ could actually do something about it—it is ‘our’ business. It simply cannot be that in order to seek asylum in the EU, one has to risk their life *once more* by embarking on a dangerous and many times deadly sea crossing. Indeed, while this thesis not only aims to problematise the problematisation of migration, it also seeks to problematise the inaction of the EU.

While, undeniably, a piece of paper, i.e. the thesis at hand, cannot change the situation, it is always important to problematise the powerful ignoring the powerless. Furthermore, as the media helps form perceptions of people and phenomena, it is seen as a significant contributor to opinion formation and consequently to political action. The focus of the thesis lies on Finnish media portrayals, since those portrayals can play a significant role in informing Finnish and EU-level policies on immigration and asylum, specifically regarding the situation in the Mediterranean, but also elsewhere.

Consequently, in light of the aims of the present thesis, the research question is as follows:

How are migrants and refugees, and migration and asylum, portrayed in news reports and images published in Helsingin Sanomat in connection to mixed migration from North Africa to Southern Europe?

And more specifically, the thesis aims to answer the following questions:

How are migrants and refugees as persons and actors portrayed? How are official state actors portrayed?

Is migration and asylum framed from the perspective of human security or national security?

2. Background

In this section terminology of different kinds of migration will be opened up. Furthermore, migration and the EU with a focus on the Mediterranean area will be elaborated on. Next, migrant and refugee portrayals in the media will be addressed.

2.1. Migration Terminology

There is a tendency both in the media and political discourse to confuse terminology concerning migratory movements. Thus, it is seen as fit to briefly address the different kinds of migration and related terminology.

Migration is a very broad term and encompasses different kinds of migration. Evidently this thesis concentrates on human migration, namely the movement of people from one place to another. This can mean from one country to another, but also includes moving within a country. People who migrate, i.e. migrants, move for different reasons, for instance, to work or to study. Sometimes they are looking for a better life with more opportunities, and sometimes they are forced to leave. The former is often called voluntary migration and the latter forced migration.

Forced migrants are people who have forcefully been displaced from their homes. If they have been displaced within the country in which they resided, they are usually called internally displaced persons. If they are forced to flee to another country, they are generally called refugees. Forced displacement is often due to conflicts, violence, and other types of persecution, which puts the lives of people at risk. However, it can also be due to natural disasters and climate change. In most cases people flee to whichever place is safe and closest—often neighbouring countries.

It is a human right to seek protection in another country. An asylum seeker is a person who seeks protection from another country on the grounds of persecution or fleeing from war. If a country recognises the claim for protection, an asylum seeker is given an official refugee status and temporary or permanent residence permit. If however an asylum seeker's claim

for protection is denied, the person faces the risk of detention and deportation. Furthermore, many times refugees do not seek asylum, and some asylum seekers are not refugees.

While movement within the EU is largely unrestricted, to enter the EU a person needs almost without exceptions a visa. Especially for people fleeing conflicts it is often impossible to obtain a visa because EU countries do not generally give out visas to people they suspect to be potential asylum seekers. According to Brenner, there are three ways for asylum seekers to enter the EU legally: “through resettlement, humanitarian admission, and family reunification” (2014). The difficulty, if not near impossibility, to seek asylum in the EU has on its part increased undocumented, or irregular, migration.

If a person enters a country without having permission (e.g. a visa) to do so, or if a person overstays their visa or temporary residence permit, they are often referred to as undocumented or irregular migrants or immigrants. It is also habitual by many political parties and media outlets to call people without documentation ‘illegal’, which is increasingly criticised and becoming outdated due to its strong negative connotations (PICUM 2014).

Migration and immigration are often spoken of interchangeably. Immigration is meant when people move to another country permanently. Immigrants are thus people who have been born somewhere else, and then moved to another country, for instance, to work there. When they have moved, they have migrated, but are no longer migrants as they are permanently living somewhere. In most countries immigrants need a lot of different permits such as a residence permit and working permit, and depending on the country, often also visas to even be allowed to move to a country.

Stemming from the confusion over, and often interchangeable use of many of the aforementioned terms, ‘mixed migration’ has emerged as a more fitting description to diverse migration movements, for instance those in the Mediterranean (UNHCR 2014c, Regional Mixed Migration Secretariat 2014a). According to the International Organization for Migration (IOM), the term mixed migration covers “[c]omplex population movements including refugees, asylum seekers, economic migrants and other migrants” (IOM 2004:42). The Regional Mixed Migration Secretariat has also included victims of human trafficking, stateless persons and unaccompanied minors under mixed migration

(2014b:15). This illustrates how broad the term migration is, and the use of mixed migration is arguably more fitting as it emphasises and gives justice to the diversity of reasons for migration. It also acknowledges that the aforementioned categories are not mutually exclusive. According to the United Nations Refugee Agency (UNHCR), while the reasons for moving are different the routes are often the same, which again is illustrated in the Mediterranean are (UNHCR 2014c).

Depending into which ‘category’ a migrant is classified, they are viewed and treated differently. The classification is often seen as a way for states to control movements of people, especially within and in the vicinity of their own borders. For instance, while refugees might bring about reactions of compassion, others might be faced by mistrust and thus excluded from a community. After the events of 9/11 migrants have increasingly been assigned negative labels, such as ‘illegal’ and ‘criminal’. This has been contributed to, among other things, stricter border controls and new ways of limiting migration. It has also been argued that management of mixed migration both within and outside of countries has become more and more characterised by racial and cultural discrimination. Furthermore, the differentiation of people into what essentially are categories of inclusion and exclusion is especially strong in the EU, which will be addressed at a later stage. (Peoples & Vaughan-Williams 2010:135-139)

The categories of inclusion and exclusion, which basically determine who can enter a country and who cannot also contribute to negative labelling and stereotypes. An example of this is the aforementioned use of ‘illegal migrant’ or ‘illegal immigrant’. According to PICUM, the use of ‘illegal’ to describe people has become largely unaccepted both in international organisations and the press since it is stigmatising, inaccurate and against Europe’s values (PICUM 2014). Indeed, the generally recommended terms are ‘irregular’ and ‘undocumented’ (ibid.).

Furthermore, for instance Phillips has pointed to even just the word ‘migrant’ being linked to a variety of negative stereotypes (2014). This is partly due to the broad use of the term to cover very different kinds of migrations. Furthermore, for instance the interchangeable use of migrant and refugee has prompted some to question the sincerity of refugees claiming asylum and arguing the asylum system to be used as a method of migration (Perussuomalaiset 2015, Karyotis 2011:13). UNHCR’s High Commissioner Al Hussein

bleakly affirms the negative portrayal: “Migrants are depicted as invasive, by a belligerent vocabulary—people ‘flooding’, ‘swamping’, ‘jumping the queue,’ ‘threatening our way of life’ ” (2014). Also Karyotis asserts that often migrants “are also believed to be ‘plotting’ to exploit national welfare provisions and available economic opportunities at the expense of citizens” (Karyotis 2011:13). It seems that a general negativity towards people is much more represented than empathetic portrayals.

These negative stereotypes together (and surely in symbiosis) with the increasing popularity of anti-immigration parties in the EU point towards rising negative perceptions of migrants and immigrants. Moreover, it goes hand in hand with the securitisation of migration, which, as will later be elaborated, on its part ensures the prevalence of negative portrayals. Importantly, this negativity is mostly directed towards a certain group of immigrants and migrants. It is not the Australian bartender or the Estonian construction worker, but the Syrian refugee or the Nigerian migrant who these negative portrayals are addressed to and that is exactly what makes these negative portrayals and stereotypes arguably tainted with racist overtones.

Altogether, the term ‘migrant’ tends to differentiate people from others—usually to their disadvantage. The ambiguously used term migrant is often misunderstood, confused and carries a more and more negative connotation. The term mixed migration is preferred, although that risks carrying the exact same portrayals as ‘migration’ on its own.

2.2. Mixed Migration in the Mediterranean

In 2013 the Central Mediterranean route was the “main entry point” to the EU for undocumented migrants and refugees (Frontex 2014). While according to Frontex the number was steadily increasing in 2013 from 2012, the year 2014 saw a steep increase of mixed migration to the EU from Northern Africa. According to the EU home affairs commissioner Dimitris Avramopolous, an estimated 276,000 undocumented migrants arrived in the EU in 2014, of which approximately 207,000 were said to have arrived by crossing the Mediterranean (Avramopolous 2015).

According to UNHCR, the number of arrivals in the Mediterranean increased from 60 000 in 2013 to 200 000 in 2014. Until November 2014, Italy received 160 000 people, which amounts to roughly 14 700 arrivals per month. Most people were rescued by Italy and its ‘Mare Nostrum’ search and rescue operation, which has since been replaced by the less substantial Frontex led mission ‘Triton’. Furthermore, 2014 saw exponential increases in especially Syrians and Eritreans crossing the Mediterranean. Also more and more whole families have crossed the sea, including women, children and elderly. An estimated 12 000 children arrived in the Mediterranean unaccompanied. (UNHCR 2014b)

According to IOM, the Mediterranean is not only the busiest entrance to the EU, it is also the “deadliest sea crossing for migrants”, and deadliest border crossing in general covering 75 % of migrant deaths around the world in 2014 (Brian & Laczko 2014:20). Deaths at the external borders of the EU have been estimated to 22 400 during 2000-2014 (Brian & Laczko 2014:24). Until the end of November, 2014 saw an estimated 3400 recorded deaths and people missing at sea—and this is only the incidents that have been recorded, the actual number of deaths is likely to be a lot higher (UNHCR 2014b). The deaths have more than doubled from the ones in 2011, which was before 2014 the busiest—and deadliest—year in the records.

Moreover, in 2014 for the first time, according to UNHCR, approximately half of the people crossing the Mediterranean were refugees seeking protection (2014b). This is due to increased hostilities in the Middle East and North Africa, especially in Syria. Indeed, in 2014 most people crossing the sea by the end of October were from Syria (31 %) and Eritrea (18 %) (UNHCR 2014b). Syria’s ongoing civil war and Eritrea’s poor human rights record usually fulfil the requirements for protection (ibid.). Most other people crossing the sea come from African countries, with 10 % from Sub-Saharan Africa.

According to the UNHCR, when legal ways to enter a country are lacking, the services of human traffickers are used—and risky ways, such as crossing the Mediterranean on unseaworthy vessels (UNHCR 2014c). The human traffickers are often portrayed as ruthlessly taking advantage of people’s distress. First of all, people have to pay significant amounts of money to get on a boat. Then they are usually forced to give the smugglers more money, and then forced into too small and too fragile boats and left on their own.

There have been numerous calls from especially Italians calling for increased collective measures to prevent deaths in the Mediterranean. Also EU officials have called for European solidarity in contributing to helping people at distress. At the moment, due to its location, Italy receives the majority of people crossing the Mediterranean and is struggling with resources to ensure people's safety. While in earlier years Italian responses were reportedly harsher with unlawful returns of vessels, for instance, the focus of operations has in recent years been on rescuing people at distress. Indeed, after in 2013 over 300 Eritrean refugees drowned just outside of the island Lampedusa, Italy launched an extensive search and rescue operation called Mare Nostrum. At the end of 2014 the operation was discontinued mainly due to a lack of resources and support. It has been replaced by the Frontex led Triton operation, which not only has a much lower budget, but also is limited to the vicinity of the Italian coast instead of its predecessor's patrolling of much wider areas of the Mediterranean. Its priority is also not search and rescue operations, but more the surveillance of borders. (Travis 2014, UNHCR 2014b)

Human rights organisations have repeatedly called for collective action from EU countries to prevent deaths by contributing resources to help people at distress, and also opening more legal ways for refugees to seek asylum (HRW 2014). At the same time, rescue operations have by some been deemed as 'pull factors' for people crossing the sea, and for instance Great Britain stepped out of them because of that (Travis 2014). While it is clear that rescue operations are not a long-term solution, it seems obscure to end operations and the support for them as that will effectively result in more deaths. It is the immigration and asylum politics of the European Union that need to be challenged and readjusted to fit the world we live in. It is simply unacceptable—and arguably in strong opposition to the human rights commitments made by the EU—that the only way to seek asylum is to enter a country undocumented, and extremely dangerously.

In the EU, the general tendency towards migration and asylum seems to be to view it from a security perspective rather than a humanitarian one. Most visibly this is demonstrated by the lack of ways to seek asylum in the EU. Furthermore, the actions of the external border control agency Frontex see migration largely as a security concern (Léonard 2011). While not focused on the Mediterranean directly, the recent *Mos Maiorum* operation within the EU included police from all member countries tracking down undocumented migrants with the aim of revealing patterns of human trafficking and points to a security perspective as

well (Brenner 2014). In connection, according to Phillips, “European countries are [...] demonstrating a clear preference for a securitized and deterrence-based approach” (2015).

2.3. Media Portrayals of Migrants and Refugees

How migrants and refugees are represented in the media plays a significant role in informing people’s perceptions of them. Both images and text affect opinions and reactions. Exactly therefore media portrayals lie at the heart of the present thesis. According to Esses et al., in the past ten to fifteen years “portrayals of immigrants and refugees in many Western countries have become increasingly negative, with the media focusing on the threats that immigrants and refugees pose to members of host societies” (2013:520).

In the book “Etnisyys ja rasismi journalismissa” (Ethnicity and Racism in Journalism), Sari Pietikäinen addresses coverage of ethnic minorities in the Finnish media. She asserts that most news coverage on ethnic minorities focuses on problems and further states that since it is a minority, something special needs to occur in order for the story to overcome the ‘news threshold’ (2002:20). According to Pietikäinen, when it comes to news coverage of ethnic minorities, the choice of words and agency are of specific interest. Journalists often know if they are using words that have certain annotations or are loaded with specific meanings (2002:24). The choice of words when events, agents and agency are described fundamentally shapes how those phenomena are understood (2002:24-5).

Pietikäinen stresses the role of language when allocating active or passive agency to the subjects of news reports. It is with the use of language that events and people are allocated different roles of agency (2002:28). This simultaneously allocates power and responsibility to specific actors (ibid.). Those actors who are described as active thus gain the power to act and have responsibility, while those described as passive are allocated outside of potential agency. The differentiation between active and passive actors, or agents and subjects of agency, is according to Pietikäinen often divided in the media into the active majority population and passive ethnic minority (2002:28). This creates juxtapositions that are common in news reports on, for instance, refugees: those in need of help (passive)

opposed to those who provide help (active) (ibid.). Arguably it also sets possibilities for what these actors can do; ultimately it also shapes portrayals and images of agents.

Furthermore, Pietikäinen explores the use of metaphors as strong tools of bringing about specific conceptions or mental images of events and trends (2002:29). For instance, she uses the word ‘economic refugee’ to illustrate her argument: the expression combines being a refugee, economic gains and the abuse of refugee status (ibid.). Importantly Pietikäinen asserts that these types of expressions blur the differences between refugees and migrants and can bring readers to question the acute need of refuge (ibid.). Horsti argues along the same lines and asserts that since the 1990s the word ‘asylum seeker’ has gained a negative connotation (2009:78). Since then more and more weight has been put on the word’s—and essentially the individual’s—connection to crime, diseases and swindling than on the humanitarian need for protection (Horsti 2009:78).

Horsti has examined the portrayal of asylum seekers and undocumented migrants in the Finnish media and concluded two main narratives: either asylum seekers are framed as threats, or as victims (2009:77). Interestingly, the threat image and the emphasis on illegality are seen more common in Finnish and European journalistic portrayals of migrants and refugees than in others (2009:77-8). The author has noted a dichotomy between “sincere asylum seekers” who are portrayed as victims and “bogus refugees” who are portrayed as criminals (2009:78). She notes another tendency characteristic to Finland (which differentiates between UN ‘quota refugees’ and independent asylum seekers) in which UN refugees are seen as passive victims in ‘true need’ of protection, and all others are despite their active role in independently seeking asylum rendered as passive in the media—or linked to negative agency, for instance, “asylum shopping” (2009:78-80).

When writing about immigration, Pietikäinen states that the media often uses metaphors of natural catastrophes to describe it. Waves, flows and even floods of migrants and refugees bring about conceptions of “threat, negative consequences and the inevitability of events” in the reader (Pietikäinen 2002:29, see also Horsti 2009:77). “While these waves and streams turned out to be comparatively small, the conceptions of uncontrollable and immense immigration easily stay put in people’s minds and speech” (2002:29, own

translation).¹ Also Huysmans addresses metaphors such as “flood” and “invasion” as tools of securitisation of increasing amounts of immigrants and refugees (2006:47-8). Huysmans argues that also numbers in themselves serve as a securitising element without having to address how exactly more immigrants pose a security threat (2006:48).

Pietikäinen continues by explaining that the use of metaphors when writing or talking about ethnic minorities often creates stereotypes of these groups (2002:29). Using a few traits (e.g. threatening, passive) as common for all individuals representing a group not only disregards the individuality of the members of a group, but also misrepresents the truth and affects the lives of those represented (2002:30). Huysmans argues similarly when talking of the security framing of migration: “[p]ersonal histories of immigrants and refugees are submerged in images, such as flood or invasion, representing a mass that endangers” (2006:58).

Indeed, as Horsti argues, migratory movements are rarely put into a global context (2009:79). The fact that most refugees, for instance, are either internally displaced or in the near vicinity of their home countries is rarely mentioned when speaking of, for instance, the ‘European migration crisis’ (UNHCR 2014a). The Syrian war, which has displaced several million people serves as a good example. A large majority of Syrians fleeing the war are in the neighbouring countries Turkey, Jordan and Lebanon. Thus, talking about ‘floods’ and creating a ‘crisis-feeling’ does not seem to reflect reality.

Furthermore, Horsti points to the contradictory definitions of migratory movements in the Mediterranean. On the one hand it is seen as a humanitarian crisis and on the other as an “illegal migration crisis” (2009:83). The former thus puts emphasis on the migrants and their rights, while the latter points to migrants and refugees as a problem that needs solving, and links them to crime. Furthermore, whether news reports continuously merely report numbers of new arrivals and/or deaths, or run stories that bring the audience closer to the individual also affects from which perspective the issue is seen (2009:79).

¹ Vaikka nämä aallot ja virrat osoittautuivatkin verrattain pieniksi, mielikuvat kontrolloimattomasta ja valtaisasta maahanmuutosta jäävät helposti elämään ihmisten mieliin ja puheisiin. (Pietikäinen 2002:29)

Moreover, news articles are often accompanied by images. Images are also detrimental in affecting perceptions about the portrayed issue. Especially when it comes to events that happen further away, images help the readers ‘witness’ what is happening. According to Bleiker et al., “[m]edia images play a central role in framing how refugees are publicly perceived and politically debated” (2013:402). They also play an important part in humanising phenomena and evoking empathy in the viewers (ibid.).

3. Theory

The following theoretical discussion builds on the contradictions between national security concerns and human security concerns. In light of the aim of the research, namely examining portrayals and framing of migrants and refugees, and migration and asylum, a theoretical framework centring on processes of security knowledge production is seen as purposeful. While securitisation theory and security framing can help one understand underlying processes of the social construction of threats and insecurity and their potential and materialised consequences, the thesis also seeks to take into account alternative, less-security oriented perspectives.

In the following section, theoretical approaches to the security-migration nexus will be addressed by primarily focusing on securitisation theory and Jef Huysmans’ approach to security framing. First, the section will briefly address some essential developments in the field of security studies, thereafter the Copenhagen School’s securitisation theory and concept of societal security will be elaborated on. Then, Huysmans’ conceptualisation of the politics of insecurity and framing insecurities will be focused on, and thereafter Huysmans’ work on the securitisation of migration will be addressed. Finally, the visual turn in security studies and more generally the power of images will be explored.

While theoretical frameworks are used to increase understanding through categorisation, these frameworks are not seen as definite. Instead, it is held that the interconnectedness of all human sciences is often undermined by theoretical divisions of issues into separate fields of study (see e.g. Sil & Katzenstein 2010). This consequently hampers gaining ‘bigger pictures’ of any issue, because issues of international politics ranging from psychology to administrative practices are never mutually exclusive. Indeed, therefore in

this thesis security theory is actively combined to, for instance, the notions of compassion and empathy. While not theories as such, it is held that international relations theory simply can and should not ignore what are some of the most intrinsic human emotions.

3.1. Securitisation Theory

The end of the Cold War spurred a change in the prioritisation of security issues, as with the end of the war military threats were suddenly not critical anymore. Consequently, the New Security Agenda emerged. Whereas the traditional—or realist—security concerns focused on external security threats to states, the new security thinking encompassed a broader set of threats, and took into account more levels of analysis. The emphasis shifted from state security to human security. Although state security continues to play an intrinsic role in ensuring human security, the latter also accounts for internal threats. Furthermore, the notion of human security distinguishes between the freedom from want and the freedom from fear. The latter concerns protection from physical threats, and the former focuses on non-traditional threats, such as right to education and healthcare. The concept of freedom from want and more generally the widening of the security agenda have contributed to the securitisation of issues that have traditionally not been viewed as threats to security. Albeit the insight into the individual's security is valuable, the process of securitisation is rather problematic. The securitisation is a discursive practice, which introduces issues to the security agenda. Further, the representation as a security threat can legitimise special measures in the name of 'ensuring security' (Smith 2010:34). It is important to note, that no neutral definition of security is possible (Booth 2005:21). It is a derivative concept and thus theory-dependent (ibid). The knowledge constructed around security (and other issues) is always by someone and for someone (Moses & Knutsen 2007:187).

Securitisation theory was developed during the 1990s by the so-called Copenhagen School, including scholars such as Ole Wæver, Barry Buzan and Jaap de Wilde. It emerged in the wake of the widened security agenda when the field of security studies started looking beyond the state and the thinking central to the Cold War (Huysmans 2006:27). The theory could thus be seen as a forerunner for turning attention and interests towards other sectors than the military one.

The theory focuses on international security and identifies five sectors of security: military, political, economic, environmental and societal (Buzan et al. 1998:5,21). It is based on social constructivism and thus explores the process of the social construction of issues from political ones to security issues. More precisely it focuses on what differentiates processes of politicisation from processes of securitisation (Buzan et al. 1998:21). According to Buzan et al., an issue can evolve from a non-politicised one to a politicised and further a securitised one (1998:23). In that sense securitisation can be seen as an extreme version politicisation, in a security context (ibid.). It examines how public issues come to be perceived and constituted as threats and dangers (Hansen 2011:51, Balzacq 2011:40).

In securitisation theory a security threat is understood as an existential threat. Depending on the sector (e.g. military or societal), an existential threat can be clearly defined (e.g. a military attack), or blurry and interpretative (e.g. a different culture) (Buzan 1998:22-3). The existence of an existential threat justifies extreme (and immediate) measures to respond to it (Buzan 1998:26). Importantly, the threat does not necessarily have to be an actual one—it just needs to be presented and perceived as one (Buzan 1998:24). This, essentially, makes it possible for issues previously not seen as security concerns to become such even if the issue has not changed in character. For instance, the securitisation of migration has constructed migrants and refugees as threats (see e.g. Huysmans 2006, Buzan et al. 1998). While migrants and refugees have not drastically changed, the perception of them has. Therefore it remains crucial to question securitisation processes and highlight the difference between perceived and real threats.

Interrelated, Buzan et al. address how differently threats can be perceived (1998:30). In other words, something that is not seen as a security issue in one society can be seen as an alarming one in others. Coincidentally Buzan et al. mention Finland as an example, where immigration is almost non-existent (0,3 % of the population at the time), yet a security concern (ibid.). Indeed, the authors emphasise that the process of securitisation heavily depends on the audience, and with variations in societies, also what can be perceived as a threat varies (1998:31,124). Here, in relation to their societal security concept, the specific nature of a society's identity is seen as decisive (1998:124). Thus, in Finland, which is said to have a common identity “based on separateness, on being remote and alone”, immigration can be perceived threatening even in small amounts (ibid.).

While the audience is decisive in a securitisation process, the first step is what Buzan et al. call a 'securitising move' made by a securitising actor (1998:25). Securitising actors have traditionally been seen as mostly comprising of political elites and security officials, but more and more also other actors, such as mass media, have been regarded as securitising actors. They initiate the securitisation process, and according to Buzan et al. it is always an intentional and calculated choice (1998:29).

As previously alluded to, securitisation theory holds that threats are socially constructed, namely, through discourse. A 'speech act' is a discursive process, which through an utterance (the speech act) constructs an issue into an existential threat, which has previously not been considered one (Buzan et al. 1998:27). It is thus not enough for someone to say 'this is a serious threat', but the speech act has to be convincing. It has to argumentatively make clear how and why something is to be considered an existential threat that requires extreme countermeasures. Buzan et al. call these the internal, or "linguistic-grammatical", conditions for a successful speech act (1998:32). It is also considered the 'securitising move'.

The second, external, conditions decide if the securitising move is successful or not. The external conditions are determined by the role of the actor, i.e. what position they hold in society, and the reaction of the audience (Buzan et al. 1998:32). The securitising actor has to have some form of legitimacy (e.g. political authority, specialist status) to back the arguments made. Importantly, and most decisively, the arguments have to be accepted as legitimate and, in essence, true, by a significant audience. According to securitisation theory, without an audience's acceptance securitisation does not occur (Buzan et al. 1998:31). Thus, while it is often seen as a top-down mechanism, it cannot be forced. On the other hand, a 'significant audience' might be considered as the majority of a population, for instance, and the rest might oppose to the arguments. Then, arguably, securitisation is forced, at least to some.

Furthermore, when securitisation happens, it often tends to become institutionalised. First, once arguments for securitisation have been accepted, or something is perceived as an existential threat by a significant amount of people, the object of securitisation becomes commonly accepted as a security threat. Thus, perception eventually becomes 'fact'. What

follow are the countermeasures, which are often materialised, for instance, in different kinds of policies.

Thus, securitisation as a whole should arguably not be seen as a mere speech act because it as an implication can be institutionalised and have concrete impacts on people's lives. While securitisation theory exclusively focuses on examining discursive securitisation processes, for others than theorists it is arguably more valuable and purposeful to consider it together with its consequences. Indeed, also Buzan et al. consider the negative impacts of securitisation. According to the authors, "security should be seen as negative, as a failure to deal with issues as normal politics" (Buzan et al. 1998:29). Thus, securitisation, which as previously mentioned is intentional, should not be used lightly—preferably not at all. Buzan et al. call for a "responsibility of talking security" (1998:34). One might argue that as the securitising actors and subjects of potential securitisation are increasing, there should also be a call for a 'responsibility of listening security'.

As a response to the dangers of securitisation the Copenhagen school scholars suggest desecuritisation. Desecuritisation basically means that issues are taken off the security agenda and 'repoliticised'. However, as argued by Buzan, "the process of desecuritization necessarily requires a political reconstruction of matching depth to the one created by a successful securitization" (in Huysmans 2006:x). Hence, if something has been securitised, it being a security threat has become an accepted 'truth'. To deconstruct that truth is an extensive and time-consuming process.

Securitisation theory has since its first formulations gained a dominant status within security studies, but has also attracted wide criticism in the broader field of international relations. Firstly, the focus on securitisation as a speech act has since been deemed too narrow and limiting for the field, as other factors such as security practice and institutional factors are seen as being able to securitise issues as well (Heck & Schlag 2013:894, Huysmans 2006:3). Secondly, the moral justification of the theory and especially its consequences has been widely debated and by many viewed as unethical (Floyd 2011). In connection, Guild has pointed to the detrimental effects of securitisation on the individual (2009:6). Indeed, it is often forgotten that when, for instance, migrants are portrayed as threatening, it essentially portrays an individual, a me and you, as a security threat too. This is arguably not only highly stigmatising but also unethical as it portrays some of the

world's most vulnerable people, who are fleeing from danger, as dangers to others.

Societal Security

As the thesis at hand focuses on issues on migration and asylum, it is seen as fit to open up the concept of societal security that the Copenhagen school considers as one of the sectors of security, since it is through that sector the securitisation of migration is traditionally theorised. Indeed, Buzan et al. mention migration as the first example of most commonly securitised things in the societal security section (1998:121).

Threats to societal security are largely understood as threats to collective identity (Buzan et al. 1998:119). An existential threat to identity potentially endangers the existence of a community (ibid.). According to Buzan et al., “[t]hreats to identity are [...] always a question of the *construction* of something as threatening some ‘we’—and often thereby actually contributing to the construction or reproduction of ‘us.’” (1998:120). Thus, societal security arguably creates and/or strengthens differentiations between ‘us’ and ‘them’ and thereby makes it more difficult for ‘them’ to be incorporated into ‘us’, which is built through the existence of ‘them’. Potentially, then, portraying the ‘other’ as an *existential threat* (i.e. endangering *survival*) to a collective identity of the ‘self’, which justifies extreme measures, increases the risk of those measures being discriminating and unjust towards the ‘other’ being exponential.

The collective identity can mean a nation or religion, for instance (Buzan et al. 1998:22-3). In general when it comes to society and collective identities, which are often evolving concepts, it becomes, according to Buzan et al., hard to define strict boundaries of what makes something an existential threat to them (1998:23). Importantly, as previously alluded to, it is dependent on the audience (for instance, the members of a nation or a religious community) what they accept as a threat to their collectivity—at least in theory. Thus, factors challenging the status quo of collective identities can be interpreted as threats, or seen as a welcomed breath of fresh air affecting the naturally fluctuating dynamics of a community (ibid.). Indeed, focusing on migration, Buzan et al. assert: “whether migrants or rival identities are securitized depends upon whether the holders of the collective identity take a relatively closed-minded or a relatively open-minded view of how their identity is constituted and maintained” (1998:23).

Furthermore, interesting for this thesis in particular is the role of media as a security actor, which Buzan et al. briefly address. They see the media's role as pivotal in defining things for the public. Having said that, also due to a lack of space, news are often told by simplifying an issue and reducing it to an 'us' and 'them' dichotomy. Furthermore, categorisation of people into ethnic or religious groups is recurrent. In the end, the terminology, categorisations and simplifications become the standards by which the audiences understand and judge events. (Buzan et al. 1998:124).

In sum, securitisation theory defines securitisation as a discursive process, where a speech act constructs a public issue into an existential threat that requires emergency measures and justifies limiting some freedoms in the name of security (Buzan et al. 1998:26-7). The decisive condition for a successful securitisation is the acceptance of a significant audience (1998:31).

3.2. Jef Huysmans' Conceptualisation of Framing Insecurity

Jef Huysmans' work on the securitisation of migration addresses these very issues and problematises the social and institutional processes, which facilitate securitisation. His work is critical to the Copenhagen school's securitisation theory and aims to demonstrate that it is too narrow in focusing merely on speech acts and poorly equipped to understand how securitisation processes happen in practice. Much of his work has focused on the example of EU and the securitisation of migration, which makes it even more relevant to address in the present thesis. His book "The Politics of Insecurity: Fear, migration and asylum in the EU", published in 2006, is a significant contribution to the field of security studies in that it builds upon already existing theory and aims to present new ways of understanding and questioning processes of security framing.

First, Huysmans' security framing approach will be briefly touched upon, after which the evolution of the security studies field and securitisation of migration in the context of the European Union will be addressed.

Huysmans aims to address several questions about security studies and make an alternative addition to the existing range of theories, which focus on discursive practices as constitutive for securitisation. The author develops a conceptual framework for a more in depth understanding of the politics of insecurity. He writes about ‘security framing’, which simply put means that an issue is or becomes understood through a security point of view. Specifically, he refers to insecurities instead of security as such, and maintains that insecurities are politically and socially constructed by framing them in reference to security (2006:2).

Huysmans writes about the politics of insecurity, which simply put entails that insecurities, or threat definitions, are contested (2006:2). Firstly, the nature of the threat, i.e. whether the threat is a real or perceived one, is contested. Secondly, the degree of the threat, i.e. whether it should be high on the political agenda or not, is contested. Interestingly, according to Huysmans, the latter also includes ‘competing insecurities’ (2006:2-3). As an example he puts forth the balance between human security and national security. Whichever is prioritised consequently determines with what measures the threat is managed. Another factor included in the politics of insecurity is using security language as a tool to achieve political goals (2006:7).

His conceptualisation of insecurity has three main elements that make it a more holistic approach to security studies than the dominant discourse centred ones. Firstly, Huysmans sees the focus on securitisation as speech acts too narrow to understanding complex processes of security framing. While he agrees with securitisation theorists that defining something as a threat is always a political, intentional choice, and socially constructed, he argues that threat definitions do not come into existence only through speech acts (2006:3). In fact, he is critical towards focusing so much attention on discursively constructed threats and points to a broader understanding of insecurities.

Huysmans argues that there is a need to shift focus to the underlying practices of insecurity. These are social and political processes that shape insecurities. The author argues that issues do not have to be explicitly defined as security threats—they merely need to be referred to in a security setting (2006:3). Thus, issues can evolve into security concerns without being defined as threats. In other words, the context in which an issue is talked about is seen as more determining than an explicit threat definition. This evolving (i.e.

insecurity framing) takes place in what Huysmans calls ‘domains of insecurity’ meaning specific areas in which insecurities tend to be constructed.

Thus, Huysmans broadens the understanding of insecurities as mere discursively constructed threats by emphasizing the role of institutional and political processes in framing insecurities (2006:4). He argues that when a policy issue is institutionally and/or politically linked to larger debates, which focus on security issues, the policy issue is then seen from the perspective of security, even if it would not be directly linked to it. In other words, it is enough that a policy issue comes up in a security context to make a link between the issue and security.

Framing insecurities is seen as a complicated and multifaceted process, which can take place simultaneously on different levels and amounts. Especially intriguing is Huysmans’ argument of insecurity framing as a facilitator between insecurities. The author maintains that insecurity can be transferred from more traditional security threats to non-traditional threats without an existing, logical linkage. He uses the example of how immigration has become linked to terrorism, because in reference to ‘the war on terror’, immigration restrictions were debated. (Huysmans 2006:4)

Moreover, Huysmans addresses administrative and technological factors that through continuous and ordinary practice present institutional processes, which facilitate security framing. For instance, one might argue that asylum applications, which are normalised practices, could be seen as such processes. Asylum seekers have to go through interrogation-styled interviews and their stories are verified if they are doubted, before getting either an acceptance or denial. This practice is deeply embedded in, for instance, Finnish asylum practice and essentially is a tool of restricted and selective admissions. Thus, arguably, if institutional and administrative operations already embed the issue that is securitised by an existential threat definition, it is easier to accept as one. In other words, the issue already existed in a security frame through institutional practices before it was explicitly portrayed as one.

Secondly, Huysmans wants to add a technocratic perspective to purely discursive interpretations of security framing (2006:7). He explains how insecurities are embedded in institutional and political frameworks through “technological and technocratic processes”

(2006:8). What is more, the author argues that, for instance, institutional practices do not spring from reactions to threat definitions, but often function independently and are in place before something is claimed to be a security threat (ibid.). Crucially, Huysmans argues that “the solutions and available technologies do to some extent define the problems and they develop to some degree independently from the politicization of events” (ibid.). This, then, brings us back to the example of asylum applications. The practice has existed long before migration was securitised, and now that it is increasingly viewed as an insecurity, the practices already in place can just be made stricter as a solution.

Thirdly, Huysmans argues that his concept of the politics of insecurity not only involves contestations about insecurities, but also contestations about politics (2006:12). Namely, he presents a “dual politics of insecurity” (2006:13). On the one hand it involves competition between different kinds of security knowledge and ways of framing policy issues in relation to security (2006:12). For instance, should migration be framed in a human security or national security context? On the other hand, it also brings up broader questions of alternative ways of understanding and materialising political organization and political communities (2006:13).

Thus, with the previous three moves Huysmans calls for a broader approach to understanding the complex dynamics of the politics of insecurity. The first move away from focusing on the discursive construction of threats and threats as defining issues as security concerns gives more room for understanding political and social practices that frame security. His second move introduces a ‘technocratic turn’, which not only focuses on political elites and the media as security actors, but importantly also takes into account security experts’ and technology’s role in security framing. Finally, Huysmans’ third suggestion to conceptualise the politics of insecurity examines how the dynamics of shaping insecurities can also bring about debates about the nature of politics.

3.2. The Securitisation of Migration

Huysmans illustrates his approach with the example of securitisation of migration in the European Union. Next, Huysmans’ take on the onset of securitisation is examined, after which the case of migration in the EU is looked at.

According to Huysmans, the security discourse started to take migration and migratory movements as a reoccurring subject of debate in the beginning of the 1990s, whereas before that the focus had primarily been on military security issues (2006:15). In the field of international relations the end of the Cold War prompted discussions and reassessments of the meaning of security, which led to a broader definition of security focusing not only on international, or inter-state, relations, but non-military issues such as the environment and population movements (2006:16). It further led to differing conceptions of the effects of regarding non-military phenomena as security issues, with others focusing on the effects on security as a concept, and others on the effects on, for instance, migration and how it would now be defined and influenced (ibid.). Security became to be seen more and more in a constructive way—through discourse policy issues could be framed as security concerns (ibid.). Indeed, Huysmans emphasises “that the meaning of security does not primarily depend on the kind of threats one includes but on *the nature of the framing that security practice applies*” (2006:16, emphasis added).

It is in the beginning of the 1990s in the wake of the fall of the Berlin wall that also security specialists started to talk about the potential threat that migration can present to international security and stability (Huysmans 2006:17). Huysmans asserts that the end of the Cold War and the subsequent increased freedom and peace prompted an identity crisis in the field of strategic and security studies and called for, not only redefinition of the field, but also of security actors—and security issues (2006:17-8). Simply put, the search for phenomena that could be interpreted as potentially posing a security threat had begun.

Migrants increasingly became to be seen as a cultural threat, which created a dichotomy between migrants’ security, and migrants seemingly posing a threat to others. This very contradiction is arguably still at the heart of the problematisation of migration today. Looking at the issue from a human security perspective, Huysmans asserts that “[t]he ones in danger are not the citizens of the member states of the European Union but individuals fearing starvation or persecution on the basis of race, religion or political opinion” (2006:20).

Moreover, framing migration and asylum as an insecurity consequently affects the definition of migration and asylum, attitudes towards the issues, and, importantly, policy

responses to them (Huysmans 2006:23-4). Thus referring to migrants and refugees as a security issue fundamentally changes how they as people are viewed and treated, and justifies disregarding them as individuals, and essentially, individuals with rights. Security framing becomes, in Huysmans' words, "primarily a matter of mobilizing certain perceptions through the use of security language" (2006:24). Security framing can justify and strengthen what in other frames would be questionable policies (2006:31). For instance, regarding migration as a security issue directly fuels into increased border control and measures to fight 'illegal entry'. It justifies even harsh policies in the name of security, i.e. state security—these kinds of policies undermine the *human security* of migrants and refugees.

What is more, as previously alluded to, security framing and knowledge are always political. They can be used as instruments in power politics, or in the politics of insecurity (2006:32). Huysmans addresses the use of security rhetoric in trying to achieve political gains (ibid.). When politicians and/or officials speak of unprecedented increases in immigration and asylum seeking levels and their unpredictable, possibly destabilising effects on the nation they are not only framing migrants and asylum seekers as potential security threats, but also using them as political instruments to attract voters (2006:32).

Furthermore, Huysmans states that security framing is essentially political also in another way: "It reproduces certain understandings of what political relations and political communities are and should be" (2006:32). For instance, framing migration as a security issue prioritises a state's population's security over the security of people fleeing conflicts and persecution and thus undermines international humanitarian law (2006:32-3). Consequently, by prioritising some people's security over that of others it produces inequality between humans. On the other hand, the existence of nation states and borders in itself already guarantees inequality between people, as citizens' rights are separated from other's rights (see e.g. Benhabib 2004). Here one might see security framing to escalate inequality and to make it—in the name of security—socially acceptable.

Here, the arguable mutual exclusiveness of human security and national security is countered by 'deepening' the concept of security, which aims to make it less state-centric by adding more referent objects than the state (Huysmans 2006:34). However, because firstly security as a concept is historically too strongly linked to states as referent objects,

and secondly the political community that today is most imaginable remains the state, the deepening would require radical changes in thinking, and practice. For instance, citizens can claim protection from the state, but humans cannot claim protection from humanity, at least not in practice (Huysmans 2006:35). Thus, as the state remains the dominant organiser of political community, security (and insecurity) is also distributed through it. While there is, for instance, an international human rights regime in place, it arguably does not have any particular actor responsible for ensuring protection (except for ‘everyone’, which arguably in effect makes it the responsibility of ‘no-one in particular’).

The issue of migration to the EU illustrates this too well. It is the borders that usually bring afore the tension between the traditional state security of European nation states and the human security of migrants and refugees coming to Europe, usually to the disadvantage of the latter. Indeed, the deepening of the concept of security is primarily motivated by questioning the position of the nation-state as the main referent object of security, and its domination over individuals’ security, and that is arguably where its worth lies (Huysmans 2006:36-7).

This brings afore questions of, for instance, who is within the scope of security, i.e. being protected from threats (even if only perceived), which subsequently leads to questions of political community. Huysmans asserts that because the only political community we can imagine is the state, security is also understood through it (2006:35). This, then, brings up larger debates of tensions between having rights through citizenship (i.e. membership of an existing political community) and having rights granted by humanity (see Benhabib 2004). Huysmans concludes by questioning the underlying assumption that the state should be the main referent object when thinking of security and suggests that especially in the case of migration referring to other forms of political community is essential to ensuring human rights for migrants and refugees (2006:42-3).

Subsequently, the question turns from who is within the scope of security to who is left out of it. Huysmans argues that immigration and asylum are in Western societies often viewed as subjects of unease and insecurity (2006:45). According to the author, “[i]n political and academic debates and in everyday conversations immigrants and refugees are often portrayed as disturbing normal ways of life” (ibid.), they are “portrayed as endangering a collective way of life that defines a community of people” (2006:46). Indeed, Huysmans

asserts that the issue of migration has evolved from a subject of uncertainty and unease to being referred to as an existential threat (2006:47). This, then, brings about a politics of fear, what Huysmans calls “political communities of insecurity”, which tightens the community that is faced with the threat and increases the differentiation between nationals, and immigrants and asylum seekers—those left on the other side of security (ibid.). In essence, that is how the securitisation of migration works. Paradoxically, the prerequisite for “securing unity and identity of a community” is constructing insecurity (ibid.). Furthermore, this perceived insecurity becomes the corner stone upon which a secure life is judged on (ibid.).

How, then, does securitisation happen? How are immigrants and refugees transformed into security threats? To begin with, Huysmans argues that numbers serve as one tool to make the amount seem as overwhelming of the host countries’ capacity, and thus feed into the process of securitisation (2006:47-8). Culture and other traits of immigrants and refugees are said to be contributors to the process, but not the main elements that make the transformation from unease into a security threat happen (2006:48).

Interestingly, Huysmans addresses migration debates in the European Union and mentions the contradictory juxtaposition between ‘useful’ and ‘useless’, or ‘straining’, immigration (2006:48-9). On the one hand immigration is wanted and needed (if the immigrants are skilled workers) and on the other hand it is unwanted and potentially dangerous (if the immigrants are anything else than skilled workers). Huysmans notes that both arguments are based on a need to control immigration in order to ensure the best possible consequences for the society. Here the author presents undocumented migration—being out of reach of the aforementioned control—as being a security threat “not because it threatens a society’s wealth or stability but because it represents a challenge to its functional integrity, i.e. *its capacity to control the method of shaping this wealth*” (2006:49, emphasis added). Thus, securitisation brings into being a coherent society, which faces problems only when they are brought from the outside, for instance, in the form of immigrants (Huysmans 2006:49).

Indeed, Huysmans argues that securitisation presupposes and simultaneously brings about insiders and outsiders, those who face the threat together as a unit and those who pose the threat by trying to intrude into that unit (2006:49-50). In other words, “[s]ecuritization

constitutes political unity by means of placing it in an existentially hostile environment and asserting an obligation to free it from threat” (Huysmans 2006:50). Thus, the issue at hand is no longer limited to constructing migrants and refugees as security threats, but it is also about constructing unity of a political community (ibid.). By emphasising the unity and cultural integrity of a society it can thus become a tool of nationalistic forces as well (ibid.). In sum, Huysmans argues that migration is securitised by framing it as threatening to identity and autonomy of a political unit, and simultaneously it brings about the unity of that very unit (2006:51).

To continue, the claiming of this unity is done by, firstly, distributing fear and trust. Simply put, it divides people into those culturally similar and therefore to be trusted, and those culturally different and therefore dangerous (Huysmans 2006:51-2). In a society this is strengthened by, for instance, practicing the politics of fear.

Secondly, unity is also established by determining who is included and who is excluded in a society (Huysmans 2006:51). Institutionalised differentiation of people through the means of, for instance, border control and detention centres creates distance to immigrants and refugees (Huysmans 2006:55). Securitisation creates a unified and cohesive—and dangerous—group out of immigrants and refugees (Huysmans 2006:56). “Their different motives, family background, and social circumstances are silenced and skewed to make them representatives of a collective force endangering welfare provisions, everyday security of citizens, the moral fabric of society, etc.” (ibid.).

Thus, portraying migrants as a security threat is equal to their exclusion (Huysmans 2006:57). Huysmans argues that if a group is classified as a security threat, it also becomes justified to eliminate that threat: “[s]ecuritization has the capacity to frame systematic killing as a strategy of survival” (ibid.). Not only does this make securitisation a very dangerous and questionable issue, it also goes hand in hand with the concept of dehumanisation and adds more fuel to the conflict between national and human security.

Thirdly, security framing of an external threat establishes unity by alienating those included from those excluded (ibid.). Through intensified differentiation between included and excluded normal interaction between the two can become impossible and lead to interaction taking only violent forms (ibid.).

Huysmans argues that the securitisation of migration on the European level and the consequent negative portrayal of immigrants and asylum seekers feeds into and increases the securitisation on a national level (2006:83). It contributes to a ‘political spectacle’, in which political motives drive the linking of migration to security threats (ibid.). Importantly, it undermines integration and potentially renders it very challenging:

“Supporting the construction of destabilizing factors and dangers in policies regulating membership of a community renders the inclusion of immigrants, asylum-seekers and refugees in the EU more difficult and [...] potentially radicalizes the method of exclusion. These processes are highly relevant for the kind of solidarity, social integration, cultural identity, civility and public order that is promoted in the European Union.” (Huysmans 2006:84)

3.3. Visuality and Security

While word and image are often viewed as separate, independent means of communication and representation, according to WJT Mitchell “the interaction of pictures and texts is constitutive of representation as such: all media are mixed media, and all representations are heterogeneous; there are no “purely” visual or verbal arts” (1994:4-5). Mitchell talks of a “fluidity” between photographs and language, in which the verbal and visual elements interact (1994:283). He addresses practical differences between the two, for instance in the form of telling and showing, or the speaking ‘self’ and the seen ‘other’. Thereby he makes clear that both are co-dependent of each other (1994:5).

Importantly, media portrayals of migrants and refugees also include images. To leave them out of the scope of scrutiny would be to ignore an essential part of the communication. What is more, several security academics have argued for more attention to visual culture in the study of both security studies and international relations (Williams 2003, Hansen 2011, Campbell & Shapiro 2007). Hansen argues that this is due to developed visual and social media technologies, “spectacular events” which have been communicated powerfully through visual means, and scholars incorporating new elements into traditional research (2011:52). Indeed, Hansen continues by explaining that visuality, or the power of the

visual, has been a part of security studies from the beginning, but has attracted little attention thus far (2011:52).

Campbell and Shapiro point to the increasing role of visuality as a contributor to militarisation and securitisation, which has taken on especially after the intense visualisation of the events of 9/11. They see the image as a “social relation” being able to both aid securitisation and militarisation, and contribute to desecuritisation and criticism of securitisation (2007:132-3). In addition, Heck and Schlag point to a trend in the field of international relations, which puts increasing attention to the relation between visuality and power (2013:892). Specifically they focus on the increasing focus on the relation between media culture and security, and acknowledge that politics are embedded in visuality (ibid.). They emphasise the necessity to understand how images work and how they can on their part construct security issues (ibid.). Importantly, Williams argues that the sole focus on security as a speech-act is too narrow to incorporate the increasing role of visual communication in today’s politics (2003:512). With new forms of political communication also securitisation gains new dynamics, which should be researched (ibid.).

Indeed, the visual has recently been incorporated into security studies, and one way to understand the interconnectedness is in the form of visual securitisation. In Lene Hansen’s article “Theorizing the image for Security Studies: Visual securitization and the Muhammad Cartoon Crisis”, she makes the first attempt to formulate a theory of visual securitisation (2011:69). Hansen defines visual securitisation as taking place “when images constitute something or someone as threatened and in need of immediate defense or when securitizing actors argue that images ‘speak security’” (2011:51). Importantly, images are not to be solely analysed as ‘self-standing’, but together with the discourses that partly constitute them (ibid.).

Hansen seeks to find out what kind of power images can have in affecting politics: “to study visual securitization is [...] to engage the processes through which images come to have political implications” (2011:53). Arguably, also whether the absence of or the use of neutral images has no political implication is of interest. Indeed, it can also be a political tool to *not* visualise a particular issue. However, Hansen remarks that an image cannot by itself create a political response (2011:53). To be able to comprehend how an image has been politically constructed, one needs to scrutinise its specificity, namely, “how the visual

is responded to and constituted through spoken and written discourses” (ibid.). Hansen maintains that images are not less important than texts, only different in the way they communicate and are located within given contexts (ibid.).

Central to Hansen’s article is the question of whether an image can securitise on its own behalf or whether it needs a securitising actor to perform the securitising (2011:53). The author argues that similar to words, pictures cannot securitise on their own—both depend on previous discourses in order to be signified (2011:54). In other words, an image can only constitute a security threat, if it becomes embedded in a context in which it becomes linked to one.

Furthermore, Williams writes about images as a form of communication. In contrast to Mitchell he argues that “images themselves may function as communicative acts” (2003:527). Also, according to Heck and Schlag “images carry their own interpretations” (2013:895). However, the interpretation largely depends on the viewer and their background. On the other hand, that does not reduce the potential impact of images. Hansen addresses the emotional impact an image can have that words cannot come close to (2011:56). Also Sontag writes about a shock effect that photographs generate in viewers—a kind of effect that most words cannot come close to (2002:83). While Sontag emphasises the shock effect she also maintains that pictures themselves are not drivers of change, but require a context.

When it comes to security, it is often bundled together with fear and other emotions, especially so in the case of securitisation. Here, images can indeed play an important role. The effects of the use of images are at the centre of Bleiker et al.’s article “The Visual Dehumanisation of Refugees”. They examine visual representations of refugees and determine what kind of images evoke empathy in a viewer, and thus have a ‘humanising’ effect as opposed to a dehumanising effect. The authors emphasise that visuals are strongly linked to compassion: if there is no visualisation of pain and suffering, there is no compassion. Indeed, they argue that “images of a lone sufferer humanise a political crisis” and stress the importance of “putting a human face to suffering”. Further, if images are strongly negative and linked to, for instance, illegality, they are likely to decrease empathy generation. (Bleiker et al. 2013)

4. Methodology

The next section offers an insight to the research process and seeks to address its departure points and underlying epistemological assumptions. Furthermore, it seeks to rationalise the choice of material and method, and also address underlying hypotheses and values of the work. Lastly, the research process itself is opened up to maximise the transparency and thus validity of the research.

First of all, it would be naïve at best to suggest any kind of objectivity or neutrality of this (or any other social sciences) research. Therefore, already in the introductory chapter of the thesis, the underlying value bias is laid out: the thesis is written from a ‘humanitarian’ perspective, meaning that its hypotheses and consequently research questions are informed by the core belief of and focus on the inherent right to life and human dignity to all people, across state borders.

Secondly, and essentially related, not only the theoretical discussions, but also the methodology as a whole lies heavily on a social constructivist approach. How are insecurities constructed? How are migrants and refugees portrayed, i.e. what kind of knowledge do their representations construct? Moses and Knutsen argue that a constructivist take on social research should include “[a] methodology which seeks to identify the (socially constructed) patterns and regularities of the world” (2007:192). Accordingly, such a methodology runs through the thesis starting from the questions it asks and continuing throughout the research design it employs by challenging the securitisation of migration (arguably, social construction by definition) and scrutinising what kinds of knowledge media portrayals of refugees and migrants produce. By focusing on language and imagery, patterns and processes of social construction can be revealed.

Moreover, a constructivist position holds that no ‘truths’ of the social world can be obtained objectively, which brings us back to the previously addressed value bias (Moses & Knutsen 2007:11). Furthermore, in light of the aforementioned, the present thesis offers interpretations instead of explanations, foremost it seeks to reveal dominant patterns and understand how social and institutional practices can affect how people are seen and treated. The theoretical discussion, which focuses on processes of securitisation and

security framing, and the research technique, which looks at what kind of knowledge is constructed in media communication, support this epistemological approach.

4.1. Material

The material of the research consists of articles and accompanying photographs concerning mixed migration from Northern Africa to Southern Europe released in the Finnish newspaper *Helsingin Sanomat* (HS). The newspaper is the biggest and most widely circulated newspaper in Finland. The articles serving as the material are from 2013 and 2014. These two years have been selected for the analysis for several reasons.

To begin with, 2014 has thus far been the most active year for mixed migration in the Mediterranean. 2013 has a high record as well with the number of crossings being higher than 2012, but less than 2011 and 2014. According to UNHCR, migrant movement in the Mediterranean started to increase to its current levels in June/July 2013. Given the unprecedented rise in numbers of persons attempting to cross the Mediterranean, articles published in 2013 and 2014 were seen as purposeful for the analysis (UNHCR 2014b).

Furthremore, 2013 and 2014 also serve as a comparison regarding the terminology used when describing people crossing the Mediterranean. According to UNHCR, around half of the people reaching Southern Europe in 2014 were refugees intending to seek for asylum, while compared to the amount of migrants the number in previous years has been smaller (2014b). Thus, it is interesting to see if in 2014, as the number of refugees increased, the terminology and reporting in general also changed.

2013 and 2014 have also seen thousands of people dying while attempting to cross the Mediterranean. This has prompted especially Italians to call for shared responsibility and help in rescue missions from other EU countries. Thus, in the wake of increased calls for collective action in recent years, it is also interesting to see if migrant deaths are problematised and if the call for collective action is reflected in the Finnish media's reporting.

Finally, as mixed migration is a contemporary occurrence and its portrayal not only reflects, but also affects current political rhetoric and policies, it is especially interesting and meaningful to scrutinise how it has been reported on in recent years. As both the phenomenon and the political debates surrounding it are continuously evolving, by examining dominant patterns its portrayal the present thesis seeks to shed light on the current state of their portrayals.

The articles include all related articles published in the ‘World’ news section (‘Ulkomaat’) of the printed version of HS during 2013 and 2014. The printed editions, which are identical to the digital editions, have been accessed with a subscription through the newspaper’s website. In addition to the articles and images, which appeared in the world section, also their possible previews on the first double-page spread (which indicates the day’s headlines) were considered in the analysis.

The analysis is limited to articles covering mixed migration from Northern Africa to Southern Europe. More specifically, only articles covering sea crossings on the Central Mediterranean route have been considered. Consequently, articles concerning migration via land and sea from Turkey or the Middle East to Europe (mainly Greece) were not included in the analysis. Neither were articles solely focusing on crossing the border between Morocco and Spain, which is another frequent migratory route via land and sea. Some of the considered articles do, however, refer to all of these routes when, for instance, reporting general trends of mixed migration to Europe. Only articles that have main focus on the Central Mediterranean have been considered. This selection is done to not only limit the scope of the material, but also to focus on the area, which is the busiest and deadliest migratory route, and, importantly, which both refugees and other migrants use.

The analysis includes 18 articles and 18 photographs published in 2013, and 23 articles and 15 photographs published in 2014. This totals to 41 articles and 23 photographs.

Helsingin Sanomat is seen as a suitable newspaper to scrutinise since it is, as aforementioned, the biggest newspaper in Finland. Indeed, it is seen as important to select specifically a Finnish media outlet for the analysis. The thesis at hand is partly motivated by Finnish political rhetoric on mixed migration to Europe. As Finland has a comparatively low immigrant and refugee population on a European level, and is not directly (as, for

instance, Italy is) affected by migratory movements, they nevertheless seem to generate heated political debates. For instance, the political party True Finns has proclaimed that with the freedom of movement within the EU, people crossing the Mediterranean can freely “shop” for asylum also in Finland. Furthermore, “[t]he possibility for family reunification [in Finland] also acts as a pull-factor for those who cross the Mediterranean to enter Europe” (Perussuomalaiset 2015, own translation,)². While these arguments have little truth-value and it is not believed that HS portrayals reflect these sentiments, the analysis of HS articles does however give valuable insights on how the events and the people are portrayed in Finnish media, which can ultimately be reflected in political rhetoric.

More generally, a newspaper analysis was chosen due to the interrelation between media and international politics. Media is a significant form of communication and a major source of information. Its role in most people’s knowledge (and opinion) formation about world affairs is central (Heck & Schlag 2013:893). Therefore it also plays an essential part in people’s political opinion formation, voting behaviour and consequently policy formation.

Importantly, images attached to news articles are also analysed in the present thesis. As images are central means of knowledge formation, especially when accompanied by text, it would be unjustified to not include them in the analysis. How migrants and refugees are portrayed in images can not only reflect discursive representations, but also point to general patterns of the visual framing of them.

4.2. Method

The media’s portrayals of people crossing the Mediterranean has been chosen as the subject of study, because it can serve as an invaluable insight on Finnish discourse on migratory movements. That on the other hand is a pivotal subject of scrutiny, since it forms a significant part of the more general immigration discourse, which is often informed by the media’s portrayals. Critically assessing dominant portrayals and representations of migration and asylum is crucial since they play a part in informing policy-making, which in its turn affects and possibly even determines the fates of thousands of people. Furthermore, considering the urgent need to develop alternative policies for asylum seeking (i.e. ways for

² Mahdollisuus perheenyhdistämiseen toimii myös yhtenä houkutustekijänä niille, jotka pyrkivät Välimeren yli Eurooppaan. (Perussuomalaiset 2015)

gaining access to European countries with authorisation) it is seen as purposeful to examine how media portrays migratory movements and what consequences those portrayals might have.

To do this, content analysis has been chosen as a suitable method of research. Content analysis, as its name suggests, researches the content of different types of communication, or more specifically, meanings that various kinds of communications convey (Bryman 2012:289). It is a quantitative research method that utilises different fixed categories of understanding. By cumulating even large amounts of data from written communication, it is used for drawing conclusions from those sets of communication (Balzacq 2011:51). It is further useful for examining the use of different kinds of symbols and latent meanings in communication (ibid.).

Furthermore, when analysing the content of communication, Bryman differentiates between ‘apparent’ and ‘latent’ content (2012:289). Focusing on examining both apparent and latent content opens up possibilities to gain a deeper understanding of what is communicated through meanings that are both explicitly and implicitly articulated. This undoubtedly adds interpretative elements to the quantitative data and provides a useful perspective for the thesis at hand. Furthermore, content analysis appears in different forms and with a variety of possible foci, and is thereby a somewhat flexible method. Depending on the unit of analysis that is chosen, the emphasis can, for instance, be on specific words (by counting words), or on more general themes (looking for overarching ideas) (Bryman 2012:289, 295). The cumulated data is assigned to different, pre-determined categories of the unit of analysis, after which the results can be analysed.

The flexibility of content analysis is made use of and built into a framework that is seen to work best for the subject of analysis. At this point it seems plausible to re-state the research questions:

How are migrants and refugees, and migration and asylum, portrayed in news reports and images published in Helsingin Sanomat in connection to mixed migration from North Africa to Southern Europe?

How are migrants and refugees as persons and actors portrayed? How are official state actors portrayed?

Is migration and asylum framed from the perspective of human security or national security?

To be able to answer these questions on the basis of the chosen material, the present thesis will loosely structure around frames, utilise words and phrases as units of analysis and qualitatively analyse the migrants' and refugees' perspectives. It will also use qualitative content analysis to identify dominant patterns in news photographs

As the theory section illuminated, focusing solely on speech acts, or linguistics, leaves a lot of central processes out of security framing, and thus results in a limited understanding of how insecurities are constructed. However, to examine several different processes of security framing is not possible within the limited scope of the present thesis. Since the object of research is media portrayals of migrants and refugees, namely newspaper articles, it will necessarily focus on language. However, instead of focusing on threat definitions as such, the material will be scrutinised with a more loose framing approach.

In this context frames are defined loosely as frames of reference. Simply put, if an issue is talked about in reference to or within a context of, for instance, security, it is situated into a security frame. More generally, frames can be understood as elements that organise information and perception and thereby structure the social world (D'Angelo & Kuypers 2010:5-6). Furthermore, if the media portrays an issue in a specific way, or from a specific perspective, it is likely to affect the readers' conceptions of the issue. Moreover, frames are often seen as latent, i.e. not explicitly articulated (D'Angelo & Kuypers 2010:6). As it is the aim of the analysis to look at both apparent and latent content, together with images and the meanings conveyed through them, frames are seen as useful in structuring the research.

Indeed, as previously mentioned, the research focuses on how the analysed news reports have been framed—are they talked about in a security frame, or a humanitarian frame? This question setting is partly informed by Huysmans' argumentation on insecurity framing and competing insecurities, which have been elaborated in the theory section. Furthermore, by answering the more specific questions on how migrants and refugees, and migration and

asylum, are portrayed, it is believed to also illuminate which security frame is prioritised. This is done by creating different categories, which the articles and images can be coded into.

The categories for coding are predetermined, which makes content analysis a systematic and repeatable approach (Bryman 2012:289). According to Bryman, the predetermined categories make the method more objective than many others (ibid.). However, these predetermined categories are influenced by underlying assumptions and hypotheses, and thus arguably less objective. As the present research seeks to reveal dominant patterns in the portrayals of not only migrants and refugees, but also the larger phenomena of migratory movements and asylum, the categories and units of analysis are informed by previous research on the matter as described in this thesis' background and theory sections.

Moreover, the categories are also informed by the following hypotheses:

- 1) While migrants and refugees might not be represented as 'existential threats', they are situated in a security frame.
- 2) Migrants and refugees are portrayed as passive and juxtaposed to authorities of receiving countries.
- 3) Migrants and refugees are portrayed as a uniform and impersonal mass.
- 4) The security concern is highlighted over the humanitarian concern.

Thus, in order to detect patterns of portrayals, different categories for coding have been developed as follows.

To answer how people crossing the Mediterranean are described, a primary interest is in terminology. Namely, is the type of migrant (e.g. refugee) specified, or are people described un-specifically. This category is motivated by the often confused terminology regarding migration and is seen to shed light on how migrants and refugees are portrayed.

Further, as Pietikäinen has put forth, verbs play a significant role in assigning agents passive or active. Thus verbs related to migrants actions, and authorities' actions are two categories. Also, as Horsti suggests, migrants and refugees are often either framed as a

threat or a victim. As this significantly affects the portrayal of the people, negative/threat related portrayals is one category, and victimhood another.

Categories of Analysis:

unspecific status – specific status – negative/threat – victimhood
agency: migrant/refugee – agency: authority

The unit of analysis is words and groups of words. They are counted once per article, which means that if an article uses, for instance, the word ‘migrant’ four, ten, or fifteen times, it is recorded as one. Each word is put into a table, and at the end the identical words are counted together in order to detect patterns. Furthermore, in addition to the quantitative data, the extensive reports (2-5 pages) will be looked at in more detail through qualitative interpretation.

To answer how migration and asylum are described, following categories have been chosen. As Huysmans’ and Pietikäinen put forth, migration is often portrayed through metaphors and numbers. Therefore, metaphors are one category, and numbers (divided into arrived, rescued, survived and drowned or missing) one. Furthermore, to see how the numbers are treated, it is seen fit to have one category, which counts different types of increases and developments in the numbers. Lastly, as the aim is to identify if migration is talked about in a security frame, negative and/or threatening portrayals form the last category.

Categories of Analysis:

metaphors – numbers (a, r, s, d) – increases/developments – negative/threatening

The analysis happens according to the same system as the previous.

Since media involves both text and images, images are included in the research too. As the combination of both forms ideas and images in readers’ and viewers’ heads, it is seen as necessary to investigate both to gain a ‘fuller’ understanding of dominant portrayals.

Next, images are examined by looking at factors with an emphasising effect. According to Bleiker et al., if an individual is portrayed, if facial features are visible, or if big unidentifiable groups are depicted affects one's conception of the phenomenon (2013:405). Thus, those are the three first categories. Also, it is interesting to look at to which extent deaths are portrayed, and therefore that serves as one category.

Categories of Analysis:

individual – facial features – big groups – deaths

After the quantitative analysis, dominant patterns will be identified qualitatively. Finally, the method includes a strong interpretative element. It is seen that the material can be understood and analysed much better with a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods. The data produced through the quantitative analysis not only informs in itself, but it is also used to support the more qualitative approach.

5. Analysis

First of all, the amount and type of articles published on an issue can already shed light on how it is portrayed in the media. For instance, if it is only reported on in short two-paragraph news stories, it is bound to give a generalised view, whereas if it is a longer news story, it is likely to go into more detail and thereby give a broader view of the issue.

Articles on migratory movements in the Central Mediterranean were published in *Helsingin Sanomat* as follows. 18 articles and 18 photographs were published in 2013, whereas in 2014, 23 articles and 15 photographs were published. In 2013, seven articles were published in the 'Briefly' ('Lyhyesti') news section and generally consisted of two short paragraphs. In 2014, twelve reports were in that section. Next, medium length articles taking up less space than a whole page appeared seven times in 2013, and nine times in 2014. Lastly, longer reports, generally two to five pages long, appeared four times in 2013, and two times in 2014. Thus, while the balance was more even with articles published in 2013, in 2014 over half of the articles were only brief news reports. Here, one might also add, that since the number of migrants and refugees started increasing in June/July 2013, the first article on the issue was published on 31 May in 2013, whereas the first one in 2014 was published on 3 January. This does not only reflect the real-life developments, but also, regarding the aforementioned numbers, points to a slow stagnation in reporting space for the phenomenon.

5.1. Portrayal of Migrants and Refugees

The central question of the present thesis is: how are migrants and refugees portrayed? Having set categories based on previous research, theoretical perspectives and hypotheses, the aim was to understand how the people at the centre of migration and asylum are portrayed in the media. By coding the articles into these categories, general patterns could be detected.

Firstly, the mixed terminology that is often used when referring to different kinds of migration has been addressed at an earlier stage of this thesis. In *Helsingin Sanomat*, one

article on mixed migration in the Mediterranean addressed terminology and provided definitions for a migrant, an asylum seeker and a refugee (Kovanen 2013). While asylum seekers and refugees were seen as their own ‘categories’, migrant was defined as an umbrella term covering both forced and voluntary migration. Accordingly, it is not surprising that people (crossing the Mediterranean) were predominantly called migrants, without further specification (32 articles). The second most common term was ‘pyrkijä’ (15), which translates to a person who tries or aspires to get into somewhere. ‘Somewhere’ was in most cases a general ‘country’ or Europe, and it was also used specifically as Italy. Other common names were passenger (8), sea-crosser (3) and incomer (4). Thus, definitions of people are reduced to what they are doing (e.g. crossing a border).

Interestingly, more specific definitions were rather rare. Of those, refugee was used the most, sometimes also referring to boat refugees (6, 4). Only in three articles was a person called asylum seeker or immigrant, and only once an undocumented migrant. Especially the use of immigrant in this context seems a little odd, as by definition immigrants are people who permanently live in another country than their own and therefore it is arguably an inaccurate and misleading term to use in the context of mixed migration in the Mediterranean.

Furthermore, undoubtedly also the fact that little is known about with which specific motivations and backgrounds every individual crosses the Mediterranean affects that terminology is used quite randomly. However, for instance, the use of the words migrant and refugee interchangeably is arguably unjustified. Indeed, in many articles people are called both migrant and refugee without any distinctions made. To exemplify, one article reported that “as many as 75 *migrants* are feared to have drowned after a *refugee* boat capsized” (Suni 2014, emphases added, own translation)³. While ‘migrant’ might serve as an umbrella term, it arguably should not replace the word refugee, as that can distort the conceptions around the latter term. Arguably, as refugees are some of the most vulnerable people in the world, their distress should not be generalised into migrant. Calling a person who is fleeing from serious threats a migrant, or ‘a person who tries or aspires to get into Europe’, does not do justice to the fact that they are a person who has been *forced* to leave. While a refugee is also a migrant, a migrant is not necessarily a refugee.

³ Jopa 75 siirtolaisen pelätään hukkuneen pakolaislautan kaaduttua. (Suni 2014)

As mentioned earlier, individuals have different reasons for moving. However, when one considers, for instance, Syrians or Eritreans moving, they are almost without exception people *fleeing* from their home countries. Syria's ongoing civil war and Eritrea's repressive dictatorship are seen as very legitimate grounds for asylum, and most who apply for it do indeed also get it. Then, to talk about Syrian or Eritrean *migrants*, what is predominant in the analysed articles, does not seem reasonable. Not only that, it is likely to affect perception and treatment of refugees. As Phillips has argued, voluntary migrants are often associated with negative stereotypes (2014). While that in itself is discriminating, the fact that around half of the people who cross the Mediterranean are refugees together with the use of generalised language, assigns thus the negative stereotypes to all those crossing, also refugees.

Indeed, also in the news coverage of *Helsingin Sanomat* migrants and refugees are linked to negative stereotypes, threats and illegality. For instance, as previously mentioned, asylum seekers are sometimes linked to a conception that they 'come to Europe and exploit welfare systems' (Karyotis 2011). In HS, this conception can be strengthened by reports saying that the asylum seekers 'kill time' or 'just hang out'. Crucially, at the same time the articles do not tell that in most cases, asylum seekers cannot do much else at least in the first few months of their stay as they can not get work permits. Then, asylum seekers are indeed portrayed according to the negative stereotype that is often assigned to them, mainly because readers are left to themselves to figure out why asylum seekers are 'killing time'.

Furthermore, phrases like "They come on rickety wooden boats, under cover of darkness" or "Gendarmes with riot shields in hand follow as men, women and children get onto a bus" arguably link migrants and refugees to danger (Huhtanen 2013b, own translations)⁴. The former makes them sound like 'up to no good' people and the latter, while merely describing the actual situation, the lack of any reasoning for the riot shields makes the people getting on the bus seem like potentially violent, and thus, dangerous.

In addition, (while only on two occasions and in cited text) refugees and migrants are directly linked to crime. This, even if done once or twice, is one of those connections that

⁴ He tulevat kiikkerillä puuveneillä, pimeän turvin.; Santarmit seuraavat mellakkakilvet käsissään, kun miehiä ja naisia lapsineen nousee bussiin. (Huhtanen 2013b)

are strong enough to be remembered, especially with the already existing connections established after 9/11, as Huysmans has argued (2006:4).

‘In addition to people fleeing from some threat there are almost always people in the group who are on the move for economic motivations. *A certain marginal group is criminal material and an even more marginal group are potentially terrorists*’, says Ilkka Laitinen. (Hannula 2014b, emphasis added, own translation)⁵

It does not matter how marginal the groups might be, but they are present and the security threat embodied in them is linked specifically to mixed migration in the Mediterranean. What is more, along the lines with Huysmans’ arguments, the linkage between ‘potential’ terrorism and migration is an easy one to accept for the audience, since such linkages have been made before. Thus, also mixed migration as an existential security threat comes to life.

To go further, in other words the quote says that potentially any migrant could be a terrorist. However, potentially *any person in the world* could be a terrorist. Importantly, that is not addressed here. It is not said any human is a potential terrorist, no, it is said that any migrant is a potential terrorist. Thereby it connects specifically migrants to terrorism. While it is said that the chances are small, they are still there. That linkage, together with the context that it can be embedded in, is one way in which security framing works. Importantly, this linkage can bring to life extremely harmful stereotypes, or perceived threats, which are difficult to deconstruct. It potentially also affects policies regarding migration and asylum.

What is more, migrants and refugees are linked to illegality in 12 of the analysed articles. In seven articles their actions, i.e. crossing an international border, are seen as illegal (5), or unauthorised (2). In five articles persons themselves are described as illegal (4), or unauthorised (1). Ten of the articles were published in 2014, which means that nearly half of that year’s articles linked illegality to mixed migration. Many international organisations and, for instance, the Associated Press have policies on not using the term ‘illegal’ in

⁵ ‘Joukossa on melkein aina jotain uhkaa pakenevien ihmisten lisäksi niitä, jotka ovat liikkeellä taloudellisella motivaatiolla. Tietty marginaaliryhmä on rikollista ainesta ja vielä marginaalisempi porukka mahdollisesti terroristeja’, sanoo Ilkka Laitinen. (Hannula 2014b)

reference to migrants and/or refugees, as it is deemed as dehumanising and arbitrary (PICUM 2014).

Importantly, as previously alluded to, with strict visa regulations there are practically no legal ways for migrants and refugees to enter European countries. One might then argue that by linking migrants and refugees to illegality and thus criminality, they are put into a security frame. The negative labels portray them as threatening, which in part justify and make possible the restrictive policies that prevent them to get to Europe through legal ways. Even if migrants and refugees are dying at the EU's borders (because of those very policies), their human rights can be disregarded since they are criminalised and dehumanised. Or, at least it seems like their human rights are not a priority. Indeed, Huysmans addresses this extensively and argues that attributing negative labels to people affects how people are viewed and treated, and in this case, quite literally strengthens their exclusion (2006:24).

Additionally, only six articles referred to migrants and refugees as victims. While victimhood can be portrayed in many different ways, only the word 'victim' was focused on in the coding of the material. If one regards the amount of deaths that were portrayed in numbers (61), it seems unthinkable that migrants and refugees are only six times explicitly portrayed as victims of the boat accidents. Here, not general victimhood, but becoming a victim of a boat accident, is considered.

On the other hand, some articles also bring migrants and refugees into a more humane and personal light. In one report, which focuses on the island of Lampedusa, which due to its location is one of the main places of arrival, represents the inhabitants of the island opposed to sentiments elaborated in the previous chapters. Indeed, the article states: "on Lampedusa people do not talk about illegal migrants, but people in distress", and "nobody thinks the incomers should be stopped" (Huhtanen 2013b, own translations)⁶. This sort of focus on people as individuals deserving human dignity is fairly rare in the scrutinised articles. While most of them are brief 'routine reports', also many of the longer reports fail to bring afore the human side of the issue. There are only six more in depth news stories, of which

⁶ Lampedusalla ei puhuta laittomista siirtolaisista, vaan hädässä olevista ihmisistä.; [...] kenenkään mielestä tulikoita ei pidä estää. (Huhtanen 2013b)

only three either tell the stories of individuals, or include their accounts. In the shorter articles only a handful of migrants have a voice.

In connection, the agency of migrants is now looked at. This is done by analysing action words (verbs) assigned to refugees and migrants in the articles. According to the data, migrants and refugees most often drowned (24) or died (16). In 13 articles they were rescued (by someone), or and in 11 they arrived. Other common verbs were ‘try to reach (Europe)’ (8), ‘cross’ (7), ‘flee’ (7) and ‘come’ (6). Thus, while the majority of actions were passive, there were also a lot of active ones (arrive, cross, come). Because what migrants and refugees are doing is in itself very active—many of them have travelled for months or even years. Horsti argued that while the action is in itself active, the media often portrays it either in a passive way or if active, then through negative agency. While drowning and dying are arguably passive actions, many verbs were in a passive form. In total 29 articles included passive verbs, e.g. ‘they were rescued’ and ‘they were brought’. However, while Horsti’s argument proves true in that most of the portrayals are passive, the active words are not negative as such.

Of course, one might see arriving, crossing and coming to be ‘intrusive’ actions, and see them as negative especially if they are done in hundreds and thousands. However, as agency as such they are not negative. More outshining is the passivity of migrants and refugees. As Pietikäinen argued, the allocation of agency also allocates power and powerlessness. By looking at the three most frequent actions, it seems quite clear who has the power and who has none. Similarly, verbs divide actors into active and passive ones when opposed to each other. In all articles it is predominantly officials (e.g. Italy, Italy’s navy) who are active and migrants and refugees who are passive. Furthermore, the opposition between the to be helped (or, rescued) passive agent and helping active agent is evident in most articles and through repetition the contrast becomes very clear. While most such examples were in the form of ‘Italy’s navy rescued migrants’, some articles portrayed migrants and refugees as intentionally passive: “They expect Italians to come to meet them and safely bring them to their destination” (Hannula 2014b, own translation)⁷.

⁷ He odottavat italialaisten tulevan vastaan ja vievän turvallisesti määränpäähän. (Hannula 2014b)

Importantly, some of the verbs that were least frequent highlight the impersonal accounts in the articles: hope, worry, ask, want. However, not only through verbs are migrants and refugees portrayed as passive. By not including their accounts and perspectives, and by not shedding light on the diversity and individuality of people, they are arguably rendered passive and silenced. While reading the articles, it seems like they do not even exist. They drown and die, but nobody seems to mourn for them, or remember what kind of person they were, what hopes they had, or why they left on the journey. Not only do these stories drown with people, they are (at least not in this data set) also not given any room, even if there would be someone to tell the story. Arguably, it is exactly these accounts that are needed to ensure a humanitarian response to the issue.

Furthermore, personal stories and perspectives are important to evoke empathy and compassion as opposed to fear and danger. In order to desecuritize, or re-humanise, migrants and refugees this is essential. While underrepresented, there are personalised accounts in a few articles. One story follows a Nigerian man's journey from Nigeria, through Libya and Italy to Germany. While it opens up the man's story, his reasons for moving and plans remain vague. Another story focuses on Lampedusa and migrants and refugees there. It tells the story of two Eritrean men, their reasons for moving and further plans. "I left so I could live", says Yonas (Huhtanen 2013b, own translation)⁸. It also presents two Eritrean siblings who want to continue to Jordan to their father. Further, it is the only article that expresses refugees' distress and frustration. Five men from Syria are on a hunger strike, because instead of being stuck at the reception centre they want to be able to help their families who are still in Syria. "I fled war, so I would not have to kill anybody. And where did I end up? Prison.", says Ayham al Sady" (Huhtanen 2013b, own translation)⁹.

Arguably, as soon as a face is put on migrants and refugees, as soon as they and their lives are personalised, the humanitarian tragedy unfolding in the Mediterranean becomes much more clear. If the human suffering is put into an individual instead of numbers, one can at

⁸ Lähdin, jotta minun olisi mahdollista elää. (Huhtanen 2013b)

⁹ 'Pakenin sota, jotta en joutuisi tappamaan ketään. Ja mihin jouduin? Vankilaan', Ayham al Sady jatkaa. (Huhtanen 2013b)

least remotely relate to the person and feel empathy. That in mind, there is only one (1) article that through two written accounts brings forth individual or personal human suffering (at least from the perspective of the present thesis' author).

One family's father had rescued his nine-month-old girl by balancing her on top of his chest. He could not at the same time help his son, who drowned in front of the parents' eyes. The family was in the water for around an hour. (Similä 2013b, own translation)¹⁰

Malta's navy's commander Russel Caruana rescued 143 people out of the water. 'I have been on these kinds of assignments for over ten years, but this was one of the hardest operations for me' [...] 'There were a lot of people in the water who were floating motionlessly.' (Similä 2013b, own translation)¹¹

Importantly, while human suffering should not be exploited, the humanitarian tragedy in the Mediterranean should arguably be highlighted more, as it is one that can be avoided through policy changes.

Next, the portrayal of migrants and refugees in photographs published together with the analysed articles will be scrutinised. As has been established, images are a form of communication. By detecting dominant recurrent patterns in the images it is believed to enrich the thus far through written texts established portrayal of migrants and refugees.

There are interesting contrasts between the images published in 2013 opposed to 2014. In 2013, four images were of an individual, whereas in 2014 there were two. In 8 out of 11 photographs depicting migrants and refugees the facial features were visible, whereas the number was 9 out of 14 in 2014. Thus, most a clear majority of photographs show facial features, which makes people on the photographs more relatable (Bleiker et al. 2013:405).

¹⁰ Erään perheen isä oli pelastanut yhdeksän kuukauden ikäisen tyttärensä kannatteleamalla tätä rintansa päällä. Hän ei voinut samaan aikaan auttaa poikaansa, joka hukkuu vanhempien silmien edessä. (Similä 2013b)

¹¹ Maltan laivaston komentajakapteeni Russel Caruana pelasti vedestä 143 ihmistä. 'Olen ollut tällaisissa tehtävissä yli kymmenen vuoden ajan, mutta tämä oli minulle yksi vaikeimmista operaatioista' [...] 'Vedessä oli paljon ihmisiä, jotka kelluivat paikallaan liikkumatta.' (Similä 2013b)

There were two notable differences in the published photographs. In 2013, three photographs depicted covered bodies in either body bags or coffins, and one depicted an unconscious man being transported into an ambulance. No deaths or injuries, i.e. physical suffering, were depicted in photographs published in 2014. This is especially interesting since there were more deaths in the Mediterranean in 2014 than 2013. By portraying the deaths, photographs send a strong message and one would think there to be also pictures at least pointing to deaths. In 2014, four photographs were of big groups (over 15 people) of unidentifiable people. In 2013, in all photographs of living migrants at least some people's facial features were visible. While this goes hand in hand with the increasing number of people crossing the Mediterranean, it also contributes towards firstly, impersonalisation of the issue and secondly, creates the image of masses of people arriving.

Furthermore, there were some dominant patterns detected in several photographs. Firstly, three pictures are centred on children. One picture depicts two rescue workers carrying two toddlers from a ship. One picture is of an under ten-year-old girl, looking straight into the camera, who is surrounded by rescue workers. Another one shows the face of a girl with teary eyes. These are all quite powerful, as the children are without their parents. They also serve as a reminder of the diversity of the mixed migration movement, and evoke empathy.

Secondly, rescue workers with full protection gear (white overall, face mask, gloves) stand out against migrants and refugees. Four pictures show rescue workers in full protection gear, one with only masks and gloves. This makes them seem very distanced from migrants and refugees. On the other hand, in one picture two men with full protection gear are cradling two toddlers, which narrows the distance a little bit.

Thirdly, there are three pictures depicting bodies. One picture shows four body bags on a beach with one police guarding them. The second picture depicts a long row of body bags in a port with rescue workers standing around them. The third picture shows two coffins, 1 big coffin and 1 little coffin with a row of officials in front of them. Interesting in these pictures is, that there is always an official next to the bodies. On one hand it looks comforting, as the bodies are not abandoned. On the other hand, somehow it puts forth questions of responsibility pointed towards the officials. Regarding the portrayals of dead people, it is interesting that no pictures hinting towards or portraying deaths were published

in 2014. On the other hand, there is a tendency in Western media in general to not depict dead bodies.

5.2. Portrayal of Migration and Asylum

This section analyses the data retrieved from looking at how the phenomenon of migration and asylum is portrayed. It necessarily also portrays the people involved in it, as without them the phenomenon would not exist.

First of all, when describing the mixed migration movement in the Mediterranean, 142 numbers were used: 35 describing arrivals, 41 describing rescues, 2 describing survivors, 61 describing drowned or missing people, 3 describing people with unknown fates. The predomination of numbers hints to the phenomenon not only being described with the help of numbers, but importantly, also understood through numbers. Indeed, Huysmans has argued that numbers can serve as a tool to make the amount of people seem as overwhelming to the host countries' capacity, and thus feed into the process of securitisation. Numbers can also dehumanise, as numbers create the image of anonymous threatening masses (Bleiker et al. 2013:411).

In order to visualise the previous, the following shows all the numbers mentioned at least once in the analysed articles. Not every number is an individual case, i.e. some of the numbers are recounting similar and recent events. Furthermore, some of them are yearly figures, while some are specific to one accident at sea. The numbers include reports on arrivals, rescues, survivors, deaths and unknown cases. No other representation is as recurrent as numbers, which leads one to argue that migrants and refugees are predominantly reduced to numbers. While undoubtedly limited space for reporting presupposes generalisations into bigger pictures, it does not really affect the effects the predominance of numbers has on the reader. What is more, the individuals behind these numbers do repeatedly not come to the fore. Therefore, readers can understand the issue as numbers, and increases in numbers, instead of individual human beings.

45, 2000, 1500, 12500, 1000, *thousands*, 61000, 30000, 15000, 30100, 32000, 32000, 39000, *thousands*, 39000, 700, *thousands*, 45000, 13000, 63000, *thousands*, 2000, 43000, 63000, *thousand*, 2156, *thousand*, *thousands*, *hundreds*, 130000, 118000, 60000, 165000, 130000, 75000, 102, 700, 18, 155, 143, 56, 290, 73, 80, 700, 16000, 200, 233, *thousand*, 823, 233, 1123, 273, 323, 10134, 2000, *thousands*, 4000, 600, 60000, 60000, 27, 70000, 2600, 350, *hundreds*, 2700, 93000, 16, 75, 9, 36, 150000, 150000, 900, 691, *hundred*, 120, *thousand*, 6, *hundreds*, 300, 500, 2, 300, 300, 300, *thousands*, 211, 300, 50, *tens*, 200,180, 170, 300, 33, 300, *hundreds*, 33, 400, 30, 350, *hundreds*, 400, 25000, *thousands*, 300, 25000, 300, 500, 400, 366, 17000, 20000, 20000, 300, 700, 700, *seven*, 366, 200, 20000, 36, 42, *hundreds of thousands*, 30, 500, *tens*, 75, 6, *hundreds*, 200, 500, 200, 3000, 3000, 3000, 10000, 2500, 300, 3000.

Furthermore, the numbers were not always exact amounts, but often described with ‘over’, ‘approximately’ or ‘as many as’. Additionally, instead of exact numbers or estimates, hundreds, and thousands were frequently talked about. This, while not necessarily distorting the exact amount by much, gives a picture of huge amounts of people.

In addition, increases and developments to previous years were recurring. For instance: ‘Every year thousands drown’; ‘thousands arrived in the course of 24 hours’; ‘the amount doubled’; ‘almost tripled’; ‘ten times more’; ‘four times more’; ‘more than ever before’; ‘record high’; ‘the flow does not seem to stop’; ‘the amount has exploded’. This easily gives the reader an image of masses of people arriving ever day, with the amounts increasing exponentially the whole time. Having said that, the mixed migrant movement is not put into a larger context of the world’s refugee movement, for instance.

Furthermore, metaphors were used to describe the phenomenon. The most common was ‘migrant flow’, which appeared in seven articles. Further, in one case, the migrant flow was *targeted* at Europe. The migrant flow, or stream, was also not about to ‘dry up’. One cited text talked of ‘the flood from Africa’, and one article was titled ‘the south’s avalanche’. Metaphors hinting to a natural force make the amount of people seem uncontrollable and threatening.

The phenomenon was also portrayed negatively quite frequently. Seven articles talked about the migrant problem, four of the migrant burden (of which one was ‘immoderate’), two of the migrant question, two of the migrant pressure, and one of illegal migration. This not only portrays migration and asylum in a negative light, it importantly refers to the

people as well. Individual migrants and refugees become portrayed as burdens and problems. ‘Burden’ and ‘pressure’ also hint to some outside force, which creates a ‘problem’. The Central Mediterranean sea route is also described by metaphors: graveyard, the route of death and migrant highway. The first two remind of the harsh reality of the amount of people drowning on the way, while the latter points to a very high amount of ‘traffic’.

Regarding describing mixed migration in numbers and by metaphors, if, for instance, combined with a photograph of a boat with a large group of unidentifiable people, it can create an exaggerated conception of the phenomenon. All in all, the predominance of numbers and inflated numbers (e.g. thousands) makes it difficult to remember that behind those numbers there are individuals. Especially when reporting deaths, a number 366 feels big, but arguably does in its effects not compare to a photograph depicting four body bags.

5.3. Security Framing of Migration and Asylum

As suggested previously, international borders are generally areas where security frames (national security) clash with humanitarian frames (human rights), usually to the disadvantage of the latter. Indeed, borders as institutions are essentially undemocratic, exclusionary and discriminatory (see e.g. Balibar 2004). As the present thesis seeks to shed light on this very dichotomy and examine its realisation in the case of mixed migration in the Mediterranean, it has asked how migrants and refugees, and migration and asylum, are portrayed in a Finnish newspaper. The previous sections have analysed exactly these issues, and with the help of those considerations and conclusions drawn from the results of the analysis, this section links these considerations to the theoretical aspects of security discussed earlier on.

As securitisation theory suggests, securitisation happens through a speech act, in which something is explicitly and convincingly portrayed as an existential threat, real or perceived. Further, migratory movements have often been seen as threatening ‘societal security’, i.e. the unity of a host community. The results of the analysis suggest linguistic securitisation to happen quite rarely in the articles, but it still happens. By defining migrants and refugees or their actions as ‘illegal’, they are criminalised and dehumanised,

i.e. presented as threatening. While it is an inaccurate term, it is convincing because borders are traditionally and effectively seen as security-borders, and therefore someone who is 'illegal', or 'illegally' crosses a border which simultaneously defines the borders of security for its citizens, can easily be seen as an existential threat. Thus, as Huysmans has argued, as borders and security are deeply interconnected, crossing a border without going through border control, infringes the state's control not only over its security, but also its people.

Moreover, in one case mixed migration in the Mediterranean is explicitly linked to crime and terrorism. While it is said in the article that the risk is small, terrorism in general (especially in the current European political climate) is viewed as an existential threat to Europeans. Here, Huysmans' argument of insecurity framing as a facilitator between insecurities is useful. Although migration is already linked to insecurity, by linking it to terrorism its level of insecurity is arguably heightened.

Furthermore, Huysmans has addressed the fact that migrants and refugees are often seen as mainly 'cultural threats', who are "portrayed as endangering a collective way of life that defines a community of people" (2006:46). In the analysed articles, culture or religion is not mentioned once. However, almost without exception the nationalities or origin of the migrants and refugees is indicated. In the few cases that it is not, it is said that 'nationalities were not made public'. In a few cases origins of people are generalised to 'African'. Therefore, one might argue that origin and ethnicity are used in defining the phenomenon. It is numbers and origins that are mentioned most frequently as definitions. While these categories help understanding the phenomenon, it undoubtedly also generalises the phenomenon and thus ignores the individual and encourages negative stereotypes.

Next, security framing holds that for something to become understood as a security concern, it does not have to be explicitly defined as an existential threat. As it stresses social and political processes in framing insecurities, an issue only has to be discussed within a security setting, and it can consequently become understood as a security concern (Huysmans 2006:3). In other words, the context that the issue is embedded in plays a crucial role. Arguably, the mere existence of border control and restrictive entry is a domain of insecurity and thus undocumented migration and asylum happens and is understood within a security setting. The presence and agency of Italy's navy, coast guard and other officials as the controlling and 'receiving' parties also implies insecurity.

Furthermore, images of masked rescue workers in protective gear communicate insecurity. Indeed, mixed migration is arguably put into a security frame by evoking specific perceptions through the use of security language, agents and images (Huysmans 2006:24).

What is more, Huysmans' idea of competing insecurities within the politics of insecurity is of interest in the present case. Namely, the competition over whether or not migration is or should be framed in a human security or national security context is central. In the analysed articles it is portrayed from both perspectives, which creates a fragile balance, which has potential tilting drastically to either side. Arguably, while mixed migration is not portrayed as an existential threat as such, it is associated with 'enough' insecurities that it is not seen as an urgent humanitarian catastrophe either. While the humanitarian perspective is emphasised in many articles, talking of a 'tragedy', 'disgraceful graveyard', and communicating the people's distress through a few personal stories, in most articles numbers, metaphors and negative attributes make the amount of migrants and refugees crossing the Mediterranean seem uncontrolled, which supports the security perspective.

As elaborated on before, Huysmans argues that portraying migrants as a security threat is equal to their exclusion (2006:57). He goes further to suggest, that it also becomes justified to 'eliminate' that threat—extreme measures to overcome an existential threat. Here, one might suggest, that because migrants and refugees are framed as a security concern, saving their lives becomes less of a priority. For instance, Britain pulling out of the rescue operations, because they only 'tempt more migrants to cross the sea' reflects this kind of thinking in which human life becomes less of a concern than security.

Furthermore, similarly to Horsti's arguments, one is tempted to suggest that it is because the phenomenon is portrayed in such an impersonal way that national security is prioritised over human life. Portraying migrants as humans and showing their human suffering would arguably evoke a more humanitarian perspective and response. If the human tragedy would be personalised, it might shift the balance of seeing mixed migration in the Mediterranean as less of a threat to seeing it as more of normal human behaviour. To repeat, Huysmans, referring to migrants, sums this up very fittingly: "Their different motives, family background, and social circumstances are silenced and skewed to make them representatives of a collective force endangering welfare provisions, everyday security of citizens, the moral fabric of society, etc." (2006:56).

In addition, both securitisation and security framing hold that a political community is constructed into being by opposing it to a threat from the outside. Indeed, many articles mention the EU's external borders and Europe as the place where migrants and refugees are coming to. One might argue, that this constructs European, and especially, Italian unity. Securitisation presupposes divisions between insiders and outsiders, but so does the mere existence of borders and border control. When referring to EU's external borders, and migrants and refugees trying to reach Europe, a unified EU and Europe are thereby created.

What is more, to go back to Huysmans' argument on the questionable differentiation between 'useful' and 'useless' migrants (2006:48-9), thirteen of the analysed articles portray migration and asylum as a problem, burden or pressure. Importantly, the host societies, e.g. Italy, or the EU member countries, are together bearing and sharing the 'burden'. Thereby a coherent society is brought into being, in which problems only occur when they come from the outside (Huysmans 2006:49).

6. Conclusions

In sum, the thesis at hand set out to examine portrayals of migrants and refugees, and migration and asylum, in the Finnish newspaper *Helsingin Sanomat*. By analysing portrayals of articles and accompanying photographs published in 2013 and 2014 regarding mixed migration in the Central Mediterranean, with the help of a content analysis, it sought to determine whether the people and the phenomena were framed as a security concern or a humanitarian concern. After providing an overview of terminology and developments of migration and asylum in the Central Mediterranean, the thesis looked at previous research on the media portrayals of migrants and refugees. The theoretical discussion was centred on securitisation theory and especially Jef Huysmans' ideas of the politics of insecurity and the framing of insecurity. Huysmans take on the securitisation of migration is the theoretical corner stone of the thesis. Furthermore, while playing a more modest role in the research as a whole, the relation between visual communication and security was touched upon.

By creating categories for coding the articles based on previous research and hypotheses, the research was able to give insights on dominant patterns regarding media portrayals of the issue. Three out of the four hypotheses presented in the 'Method' chapter were proven true based on the material. However, there were also a lot of examples countering the hypotheses, and thus the hypotheses were not fulfilled as expected. Initially it was thought that the security and threat aspect would be highlighted much more and instead, the articles were more neutral than expected (which in itself is positive).

While migrants and refugees were not represented as existential threats, they were strongly situated in a security frame. Their status was not specified, which resulted in also refugees being assigned negative stereotypes that are common when portraying undocumented migrants. Migrants and refugees were linked to illegality in many articles, which situated them most explicitly in the security frame. Furthermore, migrants and refugees were portrayed as passive and juxtaposed to the active authorities of receiving countries. This was also depicted in the analysed images. This was also the most commonly assigned attribute—passivity. Importantly, the migrants and refugees were given very little space to express their point of view.

Through the excessive use of numbers and metaphors, migrants and refugees were portrayed as a uniform, unidentifiable and impersonal mass, which is 'ever increasing'. Furthermore, migration and asylum were described in negative terms. These put together highlighted the security frame especially strongly.

The not fully confirmed hypothesis suggested that the security concern is highlighted over the humanitarian concern. Taking into account the quantitative data and a more qualitative analysis of the material, it was established that both the security frame and humanitarian frame are frequently used to report on the issue. However, the security frame was seen to have been portrayed more powerfully. Only a few articles had portrayals of individuals and explicitly depicted people's distress. On the other hand a lot of photographs depicted individuals or pointed towards the many deaths, especially so in articles published in 2013. In contrast, most articles described the phenomenon with numbers, pointed to strong increases in the numbers and portrayed the situation negatively. Also, linkages to illegality and even terrorism made the security frame weightier. However, it was argued that the balance between the two frames has potential to tip to either side depending on different developments, as both frames are recurrent. Indeed, the analysis showed that the relation between national security and human security is incredibly complex and deeply entrenched.

Importantly, the results and analysis showed that there is a lack of personalised portrayals in the scrutinised newspaper articles. Since being able to see a human face instead of a number on all the suffering has stronger effects on the reader and is likely to evoke a humanitarian instead of a security perspective, it is pivotal to highlight the absence of such accounts. Indeed, the thesis as whole has argued for a more humanitarian perspective on the issue.

It goes without saying that the present thesis remains limited due to its scope. Importantly, it was limited in area (Central Mediterranean), material (newspaper articles of Helsingin Sanomat from 2013-2014), and focus (language, photographs). Thus, there is a lot of room for suggestions for further research. Firstly, different media on the subject, such as documentaries and other moving images, could be analysed as they arguably are more personalised accounts on the issue and bring migrants and refugees closer to the viewer.

Secondly, the institutional and technical processes that securitise migration (e.g. Frontex) would be a very important subject of scrutiny, as those processes are firstly practical and thus more reliable to analyse than portrayals, and secondly are the continuum of portrayals. In other words, one might be able to detect some impacts that portrayals and security framing have had on policy. On the other hand, it could also be the case that in fact those practices have fed portrayals.

Lastly, a more elaborate version of the research conducted in this thesis would be intriguing as well. Comparing, for instance, media coverage in three European countries that are in different situations regarding migration and asylum would be interesting. How is it portrayed in the Italian media? What about in Sweden, which is one of the EU's biggest recipients of refugees and migrants? And Finland, which has very little migrants and refugees? This kind of comparative research could give insights on difference of portrayal, which are highly likely.

All in all, this is indeed a pressing subject that needs further research and highlighting. Only by emphasising the need for a personalised portrayal of the issue is it possible to convince people that the threat lies not in migrants or refugees, but in ignoring their rights.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

News articles published in Helsingin Sanomat in 2013:

Helin, S. & Rönkä, R. (2013) "Suomi lähettää Lampedusalle valvontalentokoneen."

Helsingin Sanomat. 16.10.2013. News article.

Helsingin Sanomat 21.08.2013 "Italiaan saapui 24 tunnissa tuhat siirtolaista." News article.

Helsingin Sanomat 08.09.2013 "Italian rannikolta pelastettiin yli 700 venepakolaista."

News article.

Helsingin Sanomat 05.10.2013 "Myrskyinen sää keskeytti etsinnät Italian rannikolla."

News article.

Helsingin Sanomat 06.10.2013 "Rannikkovartiostoa syytettiin hitaudesta Italiassa." News article.

Helsingin Sanomat 08.10.2013 "Hukkuneiden etsinnät jatkuivat Italian rannikolla." News article.

Helsingin Sanomat 09.10.2013 "EU-komissaari vaatii lisää partioita Välimerelle." News article.

Helsingin Sanomat 11.11.2013 "Italia pidätti Välimeren ihmissalakuljettajia." News article.

Huhtanen, A-M. (2013a) "Lento yli julman meren." Helsingin Sanomat. 07.11.2013. News article.

Huhtanen, A-M. (2013b) "Tosielämän selviytyjät." Helsingin Sanomat. 10.11.2013. News article.

Kerola, P. (2013) "Saksa syyttää Italiaa siirtolaisten lähettamisestä." Helsingin Sanomat. 31.05.2013. News article.

Kovanen, I. (2013) "Apu kaikkooa hukkuvilta." Helsingin Sanomat. 11.08.2013. News article.

Kähkönen, V. (2013a) "Välimerestä tuli häpeällinen hautausmaa." Helsingin Sanomat. 19.10.2013. Pallon liikkeet column.

Kähkönen, V. (2013b) "Lähes 700 siirtolaista pelastettiin Välimerestä." Helsingin Sanomat. 26.10.2013. News article.

Similä, V. (2013a) "Yli 50 siirtolaisen pelätään hukkuneen Välimereen." Helsingin Sanomat. 12.10.2013. News article.

Similä, V. (2013b) "'Välimerestä on tulossa hautausmaa'." Helsingin Sanomat. 13.10.2013. News article.

Tikkala, H. & Jokinen, R. (2013) "Siirtolaisten tragedia jatkuu." Helsingin Sanomat 04.10.2013. News article.

Vähäsarja, I. (2013) "Suomi varautuu avustamaan Välimeren rajavalvontaa." Helsingin Sanomat. 14.10.2013. News article.

News articles published in Helsingin Sanomat in 2014:

Hannula, T. (2014a) "Yli tuhat siirtolaista selvisi meren ja aidan yli." Helsingin Sanomat. 19.03.2014. News article.

Hannula, T. (2014b) "Siirtolaisia saapuu Eurooppaan ennätystahtia." Helsingin Sanomat. 09.07.2014. News article.

Helsingin Sanomat 03.01.2014 “Italia pelasti yli 200 ihmistä Välimerestä.” News article.

Helsingin Sanomat 04.01.2014 “Yli tuhat siirtolaista pelastettiin Italian rannikolta.” News article.

Helsingin Sanomat 29.01.2014 “Välimeren yli tulleiden siirtolaisten määrä kasvoi.” News article.

Helsingin Sanomat 07.02.2014 “Yli tuhat pyrki Italiaan täysissä kumiveneissä.” News article.

Helsingin Sanomat 21.03.2014 “Italia pidätti ihmissalakuljettajia.” News article.

Helsingin Sanomat 22.03.2014 “Välimerestä pelastettu tuhansia.” News article.

Helsingin Sanomat 01.07.2014 “Pakolaislaivasta löytyi Välimerellä 30 kuollutta.” News article.

Helsingin Sanomat 19.07.2014 “Italiaan virtaa lisää siirtolaisia.” News article.

Helsingin Sanomat 20.07.2014 “Välimereltä löydettiin kuolleita siirtolaisia.” News article.

Helsingin Sanomat 05.08.2014 “Italian laivasto pelasti yli 2 700 maahanpyrkijää.” News article.

Helsingin Sanomat 16.09.2014 “Salakuljettajien epäillään hukuttaneen satoja.” News article.

Helsingin Sanomat 30.09.2014 “Yli 3 000 siirtolaista hukkunut tänä vuonna Välimerellä.” News article.

Helsingin Sanomat 29.10.2014 “Britannia jättää Välimeren-operaatiot.” News article.

Helsingin Sanomat 16.11.2014 “Yli 900 ihmistä pelastettiin Välimerestä.” News article.

Helsingin Sanomat 23.11.2014 “Välimerellä pelastettiin 700 siirtolaista.” News article.

Kovanen, I. (2014) “Välimeri on ylittäjille entistä turvattomampi.” Helsingin Sanomat. 05.11.2014. News article.

Lipsanen, J. (2014) “Lähes 200:n pelättiin hukkuneen Välimerellä.” Helsingin Sanomat 23.08.2014 News article.

Rajamäki, T. (2014) “Perjantain pakeni pohjoiseen.” Helsingin Sanomat. 10.10.2014. News article.

Similä, V. (2014) “Ainakin 36 siirtolaista hukkui Libyan rannikolla.” Helsingin Sanomat. 12.05.2014. News article.

Suni, H. (2014) “Kymmenien pakolaisten pelätään hukkuneen Välimerellä.” Helsingin Sanomat. 03.07.2014. News article.

Tuohinen, P. (2014) “YK varoittaa: Eurooppaan tulevien venepakolaisten määrä on ‘hälyttävä’.” Helsingin Sanomat. 04.10.2014. News article.

Other primary sources:

Al Hussein, Z. R. (2014) *Specific protection challenges affecting migrants at sea and how global community could better respond to their plight. UNHCR Dialogue on Protection Challenges Theme: Protection at sea.* Statement by Mr. Zeid Al Hussein, United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. Web: <<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=15399&LangID=E>> Viewed: 06.01.2015.

- Avramopoulos, D. (2015) *Recent human smuggling incidents in the Mediterranean*. European Parliament Plenary Debate. Press Release Database. European Commission. Web: <http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-15-3262_en.htm> Viewed: 20.01.2015.
- Brenner, Y. (2014) "EU launches Operation Mos Maiorum". *Al Jazeera*. 13 October 2014. Web: <<http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2014/10/eu-launches-operation-track-down-migrants-2014101214057473720.html>> Viewed: 10.12.2014.
- Brian, T. & Laczko, F. (2014) *Fatal Journeys: Tracking Lives Lost during Migration*. International Organization for Migration.
- Esthimer, M. (2014) "Top 10 of 2014 – Issue #1: World Confronts Largest Humanitarian Crisis since WWII". *Migration Information Source*. Migration Policy Institute. Web: <<http://migrationpolicy.org/article/top-10-2014-issue-1-world-confronts-largest-humanitarian-crisis-wwii>> Viewed: 15.01.2015.
- Frontex (2014) *Frontex Publishes Annual Risk Analysis 2014*. Web: <<http://frontex.europa.eu/news/frontex-publishes-annual-risk-analysis-2014-wc71Jn>> Viewed: 20.01.2015.
- HRW, Human Rights Watch (2014) *EU: Act to Save Lives at Sea*. Justice and Home Affairs Council Meeting in Luxembourg. 8 October 2014. Web: <<http://www.hrw.org/news/2014/10/08/eu-act-save-lives-sea>> Viewed: 16.12.2014.
- IOM, International Organization for Migration (2004) *Glossary on Migration*. International Migration Law. Web: <http://www.iom.int/jahia/webdav/site/myjahiasite/shared/shared/mainsite/published_docs/serial_publications/Glossary_eng.pdf> Viewed: 16.12.2014.
- Perussuomalaiset (2015) *Perussuomalaisten Maahanmuuttoliittinen Ohjelma 2015*. Web: <http://www.perussuomalaiset.fi/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/ps-maahanmuuttoliittinen_ohjelma_2015_v3.pdf> Viewed: 20.02.2015.

PICUM (2014) “Why ‘Undocumented’ or ‘Irregular’? Why Not ‘Illegal’?”. *Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants*. Web: <http://picum.org/picum.org/uploads/file_/TerminologyLeaflet_reprint_FINAL.pdf> Viewed: 03.01.2015.

Regional Mixed Migration Secretariat (2014a) *What is Mixed Migration*. Web: <<http://www.regionalmms.org/index.php?id=60>> Viewed: 16.12.2014.

Regional Mixed Migration Secretariat (2014b) *Going West: contemporary mixed migration trends from the Horn of Africa to Libya & Europe*. Web: <http://www.regionalmms.org/fileadmin/content/rmms_publications/Going_West_migration_trends_Libya__Europe_final.pdf> Viewed: 16.12.2014.

Suomen Uutiset (2014) “Ovatko vastaanottokeskukset terroristien lomakohteita?”. 25 September 2014. Web: <<http://www.suomenuutiset.fi/ovatko-vastaanottokeskukset-terroristien-lomakohteita/>> Viewed: 01.02.2015.

Travis, A. (2014) “UK axes support for Mediterranean migrant rescue operation”. *The Guardian*. 27 October 2014. Web: <<http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2014/oct/27/uk-mediterranean-migrant-rescue-plan>> Viewed: 03.01.2015.

UNHCR (2014a) *World Refugee Day: Global forced displacement tops 50 million for first time in post-World War II era*. Web: <<http://www.unhcr.org/53a155bc6.html>> Viewed: 11.02.2015.

UNHCR (2014b) *So Close Yet so far from Safety*. Central Mediterranean Sea Initiative. Web: <<http://www.unhcr.org/542c07e39.html>> Viewed: 15.02.2015.

UNHCR (2014c) *Refugee Protection and Mixed Migration*. Web: <<http://www.unhcr.org/pages/4a16aac66.html>> Viewed: 03.01.2015.

Literature

- Balibar, É. (2004) *We, the People of Europe? Reflections on Transnational Citizenship*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Balzacq, T. (2011) *Securitization Theory: How security problems emerge and dissolve*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Benhabib, S. (2004) *The Rights of Others. Aliens, Residents and Citizens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bjarnesen, J. (2014) "Refugees or migrants?". *The Nordic Africa Institute*. Web: <<http://www.nai.uu.se/news/articles/2014/06/27/104657/>> Viewed: 04.01.2015.
- Booth, K. (Ed.) (2005) *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*. Lynne Rienner: Boulder & London.
- Bryman, A. (2012) *Social Research Methods* (4th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Buzan, B., Wæver, O. & de Wilde, J. (1998) *Security: A New Framework For Analysis*. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Campbell, D. & Shapiro, M. J. (2007) "Guest Editors' Introduction". Special Issue on Securitization, Militarization and Visual Culture in the Worlds of Post-9/11. *Security Dialogue*. 38(2):131-137.
- D'Angelo, P. & Kuypers, J. A. (2010) *Doing News Framing Analysis: Empirical and Theoretical Perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Esses, V. M., Medianu, S. & Lawson, A. S. (2013) "Uncertainty, Threat, and the Role of the Media in Promoting the Dehumanization of Immigrants and Refugees". *Journal of Social Issues*. 69(3):518-536.

- Floyd, R. (2011) "Can securitization theory be used in normative analysis? Towards a just securitization theory". *Security Dialogue*. 42(4-5): 427-439.
- Guild, E. (2009) *Security and Migration in the 21st Century*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hansen, L. (2011) "Theorizing the image for Security Studies: Visual securitization and the Muhammad Cartoon Crisis". *European Journal of International Relations*. 17(1):51-74.
- Heck, A. & Schlag, G. (2013) "Securitizing images: The female body and the war in Afghanistan". *European Journal of International Relations*. 19(4): 891-913.
- Horsti, K. (2009) "Kyllä Suomeen yksi nainen mahtuu! Turvapaikanhakijat uhreina ja uhkana suomalaisessa julkisuudessa" in Keskinen, S. & A. Rastas, S. Tuori (eds). *En ole rasisti, mutta...Maahanmuutosta, monikulttuurisuudesta ja kritiikistä*. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Huysmans, J. (2006) *The Politics of Insecurity: Fear, migration and asylum in the EU*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Karyotis, G. (2011) "The Fallacy of Securitizing Migration: Elite Rationality and Unintended Consequences" in Lazaridis, G. (ed). *Security, Insecurity and Migration in Europe*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Lazaridis, G. (2011) *Security, Insecurity and Migration in Europe*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Léonard, S. (2011) *FRONTEX and the Securitization of Migrants through Practices*. Migration Working Group Seminar. European University Institutes.
- Mitchell, WJT (1994) *Picture Theory: Essays on Verbal and Visual Representation*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Moses, J. W. & Knutsen, T. L. (2007) *Ways of Knowing – Competing Methodologies in Social and Political Research*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Peoples, C. & Vaughan-Williams, N. (2010) *Critical Security Studies: An Introduction*. London & New York: Routledge.

Phillips, M. (2014) "The effect of negative labelling – Why are we still talking about 'migrants'?" *Migrants At Sea*. Web: <<http://migrantsatsea.org/2014/07/01/guest-post-the-effect-of-negative-labelling-why-are-we-still-talking-about-migrants/>> Viewed: 01.02.2015.

Phillips, M. (2015) "Mediterranean crossings: tackling the challenge of protection at sea", *Regional Mixed Migration Secretariat*. 2 February 2015. Web: <http://www.regionalmms.org/index.php?id=44&tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=308&cHash=f969f6dbe57663accd167cfa9f02ccc6> Viewed: 13.02.2015.

Pietikäinen, S. (2002) "Etniset vähemmistöt uutisissa – käsitteitä ja aikaisempien tutkimusten kertomaa" in Raittila, P. (ed) *Etnisyys ja rasismi journalismissa*. Tampere: Tampere University Press.

Ribas-Mateos, N. (2011) "Security and Insecurity at the Border: Notes from the Mexican-US Border when Considering the Mediterranean" in Lazaridis, G. (ed). *Security, Insecurity and Migration in Europe*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Sil, R. & Katzenstein, P. J. (2010) *Beyond Paradigms: Analytic Eclecticism in the Study of World Politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Smith, M. (2010) *International Security. Politics, Policies, Prospects*. Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sontag, S. (2002) "Looking at War". *The New Yorker*. 9 December 2002:82-98.

Vultee, F. (2011) "Securitization as a media frame: what happens when the media 'speak security'" in Balzacq, T. (ed). *Securitization Theory: How security problems emerge and dissolve*. London & New York: Routledge.

Williams, M. C. (2003) "Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics". *International Studies Quarterly*. 47(4): 511-531.