# CRIMINALIZING REFUGEES

## A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Narratives on Forced Migration



Universiteit Leiden

*A thesis submitted to the*
*Faculty of Humanities at Leiden University*
*in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree*
*Master of Arts in International Relations*

*Pope, L.E.*
*S2067692*

*January 2019*

*Supervisor: Prof. Dr. K. Smith*
*Word Count: ~15,187*

# Table of Contents

# Chapter 1: Introduction

---

"Australia's Guantanamo?" a BBC headline from June 2015 questions, acutely late to condemn the offshore detention centers where the Australian government has been housing refugees in for decades.[1] After the increased presence of refugees fleeing from Syria in the 2010s however, the Australian government finally found themselves under scrutiny by the international community for their severe refugee policies. Further inspection of the pervasiveness of refugee mistreatment in the 21st century leads one to wonder: How did we get here? What mechanisms have made it possible for such brutal treatment of already vulnerable persons? Aren't the leaders of especially prosperous nations obliged by international treaties to aid such people fleeing from conflict?

In assessing the negative reception of refugees in the West in the 21st century, it is important to examine how forced migration issues are framed in public discourse as well as how the label of "refugee" has come to take on an identity far-stretched from its original definition. Political discourse and the public narrative surrounding people who are forced to migrate from their ancestral homes toward safer and more peaceful countries have become increasingly inflammatory over time. For many years, assumptions of identity and intention have been opposed on to these vulnerable groups of people by the powerful. The culmination of this can be seen in the normative "refugee narrative" which dominates global politics in the 21st century especially in Western decision-making. Perceptions of refugees has shifted from one not only of legality to illegality but even more extremely from someone who is a strong and "courageous defector" of oppression toward one who is either an illegal invader or is desperate and hopeless.[2]

The inflammatory discourse used by politicians of powerful nations around issues of forced migration generally and refugees specifically, is arguably the cornerstone of how the Global North maintains the status quo of the historically exploitative relationship with the Global South.[3] Through covert rhetoric of particular governments, the criminalization of an otherwise

---

[1] Donnison, Jon, "Manus Island: Australia's Guantanamo?", BBC News, 12 June 2015.
[2] Cohen, Gerard Daniel, 'The Battle of the Refugees' and 'Who is a refugee?' *in In War's Wake: Europe's Displaced Persons in the Postwar Order*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
[3] The choice to use the terms Global North/South in this paper is purposeful but not without issue. A wealth of debate exists on the pros and cons of the use of these terms in academia today. Bluntly, the term "Global South" looks to cluster the 'poorer parts of the world' thus problematically homogenizing countries with vastly diverse

internationally recognized legal right to flee conflict and seek asylum in a safer country has allowed the otherwise inhumane treatment of people to become socially acceptable and even codified into Western laws and policies. Remarkably inhumane treatment can be seen in the case of Australia's strict refugee policies and offshore detention centers which have been discreetly maintained in various places throughout islands in the South Pacific. Squalid living conditions, years-long limbo of bureaucracy, detention centers mirroring prison conditions, dangerous journeys, and [youth] self-immolation protests, have all become new norms perpetuated by the cognitive dissonance that Western leaders project through narratives and policies both domestically and internationally. An increased wave of migration in the 21st century is forcing the global political community to rethink identity and citizenship while adapting to the transnational power shift globalization has brought.[4] Arguably countries in the Global North, such as Australia, have reinvigorated Orientalist discourse pointed at refugee populations to strengthen their own nationalist identity in opposition to the essentialized refugee. An influential and capable country such as Australia shutting its borders, decreasing its international cooperation, and actively encouraging European and American leaders to follow suit, has only exacerbated the refugee "crisis" in the most vulnerable positions, namely Southern Europe and Northern                                                                                          Africa.[5]

## *1.1 Problematizing Australia's Role in the "Crisis"*

In 2012, laws were passed making it impossible for anyone arriving by boat (colloquially termed "boat people") to have a legal claim to asylum in Australia. This was said to act as a deterrence measure to disincentivize the people-smuggling market operating in neighboring nations, while mostly targeted at controlling migration flows from Syria and Yemen through Indonesia. This

socio-economic and political landscapes. Therefore, the terms are used to distinguish the general divisions of economic prosperity as commonly understood in academic writing. Two distinctions should be kept in mind, however: (1) Kloss (2017), reminds us that, "The Global South is not an entity that exists *per se* but has to be understood as something that is created, imagined… [and] recreated by the ever-changing and never fixed status positions of social actors and institutions." Meanwhile, (2) Prashad's (2012: 52) optimistic outlook claims that upon closer examination, "The 'Global South' comes to refer to this concatenation of protests against the theft of the commons, against the theft of human dignity and rights [of the colonial era], against the undermining of the democratic institutions, and the promises of modernity [therefore, the 'Global South' is a] world of protest, a whirlwind of creative activity."

[4] Giddens, Anthony, *Runaway World*, (New York, NY: Routledge, 1999).
[5] Polakow-Suransky, Sasha, "How Europe's far right fell in love with Australia's immigration policy", The Guardian, 12 Oct. 2017.

policy was also touted as a moral undertaking to keep vulnerable people from making the dangerous ocean crossing. Australia's territory, Christmas Island, has been vulnerable to this type of migration termed "people-smuggling" as it lies closer to Indonesia than any mainland Australian city at just roughly 400 kilometers from the Indonesian island, Java. Historically, asylum seekers from a variety of different countries have made their way to Java with the ambition for eventually reaching the Australian island territory and make asylum claims. In 2012, Australia held those who continued arriving anyway in offshore detention centers (deemed euphemistically, "regional processing centers") in Manus Island, Papua New Guinea, as well as the independent island nation of Nauru, in such conditions that are said to be reminiscent of Guantanamo Bay.[6] To contextualize these numbers: Nauru has a population of 10,000 and while playing host to 1,159 asylum-seekers and refugees, it had the third highest proportion of refugees per capita in the world in 2016.[7] Simultaneously, Australia dramatically reduced the number of refugees it would officially resettle from the United Nations High Commissioner of Refugees (UNHCR) by 70,000 people per year.[8] This is significant as Australia does not accept refugees from its own "processing centers" for resettlement.[9] Former Prime Minister, Tony Abbott, notably delivered a speech blaming intakes of refugees as responsible for "stagnant wages, unaffordable housing, and clogged infrastructure" throughout Australia.[10] However, Mansouri and Leach trace Australia's familiar exclusionist political climate to at least the rise of the right-wing, populist One Nation political party in the 1990s.[11],[12] The "acceptable" number of refugees that would be granted asylum was (and is still) based on economic benefit analyses which claim to have found the ideal balance of immigrants for propping up the Australian economy.[13] Furthermore, these reports are the basis on which Australia contributes to their share of responsibility in international resettlement agreements. Peter Dutton, Minister for Immigration

---

[6] Amnesty International, "Island of Despair: Australia's "Processing" of Refugees on Nauru," (London: Amnesty International, 2016).

[7] Doherty, Ben and Helen Davidson, "Self-Immolation: Desperate Protests against Australia's Detention Regime," The Guardian, 3 May 2016.

[8] Refugee Council of Australia, *Department of Immigration and Border Protection's Annual Report 2015-16,* (2 May 2016).

[9] Ibid.

[10] Fernando, Gavin, "Opinion: The Big Problems with Tony Abbott's Immigration", NewsComAu, 21 Feb. 2018.

[11] Mansouri, Fethi and Michael Leach, "The Evolution of the Temporary Protection Visa Regime in Australia," *in International Migration vol. 47.2,* (Oxford, etc.: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2008), 102.

[12] Due to the conciseness of this paper, the complication of Australia's history of being a settler society on Aboriginal land is not explored further in this context, though the nuances and complexity of this history/relationship would be interesting and key for future in-depth research on Australian identity and empire.

[13] Mansouri and Leach, *"The Evolution of the Temporary Protection Visa Regime in Australia,".*

and Border Protection at the time, often publicly claimed victory for halting the drowning deaths as a humanitarian triumph and ultimate success of the new policies (pointedly entitled, Operation Sovereign Borders). However, during 2015-16, Australia granted a mere 17,555 refugee and humanitarian visas at the same time that the world was witnessing one of the largest displacements and movements of people in modern history.[14] One could argue that a byproduct of these stringent Australian policies did not keep anyone safe, but simply forced those displaced people to flee en mass towards European and Mediterranean countries (particularly Lebanon, Turkey, Greece, and Italy) instead—straining an already stressed region. Thus, one statistic explains the impact in 2015, showing that one million forced migrants arrived in Europe via the Mediterranean Sea with almost 4,000 estimated to have drowned.[15]

## *1.2 Research & Outline*

As discussed previously, in their more modern perception, refugee persons are often conflated with being "illegal" invaders or opportunistic economic migrants, thus demanding a closer examination.[16] To better understand how this view on forced migration has become so prevalent, it is important to understand the power of language and its effects on how people act and think. The narratives and policy discussions around who is a "worthy" migrant in Western politics broadly, can be discerned as strategically crafted so that forced migration issues continue to be divorced from the larger geopolitical, historically asymmetric relationship between the Global North and South, of which should be taken into account more sincerely in considering responses to immigration by recipient countries.[17] Rhetoric and discourse are not just symbolically *representative* of particular ideologies in the world but are argued in constructivist literature to be *constitutive* of reality due to the immense power of storytelling in society. The purpose of the following research is to examine the role that political rhetoric (as a form of narrativizing/storytelling) has played in the process of criminalizing refugees and moreover, of forced migrants as "illegal invaders". Therefore, the following research aims to answer: **To what**

---

[14] Refugee Council of Australia, *Department of Immigration and Border Protection's Annual Report 2015-16.*

[15] Clayton, Jonathan and Hereward Holland; ed. Tim Gaynor, "Over One Million Sea Arrivals Reach Europe in 2015", (UNHCR, 30 December 2015).

[16] Betts, Alexander, "International Relations and Forced Migration" *in The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 60.

[17] Samiei, Mohammad, "Neo-Orientalism? The relationship between the West and Islam in our globalized world", *in Third World Quarterly, vol. 31.7,* (2010), 1148.

**extent can the criminalization of refugees be contributed to political discourse?** Utilizing the case study of Australia's handling of (mostly Muslim Syrian) refugees around 2011-15— as illustrated by speeches made by the former Prime Minister, Tony Abbott—the following will seek to understand the broader impacts of political rhetoric and how the narrative surrounding forced migration in the West has changed over time, tracing the mechanisms which have led to the criminalization of such persons.

The second chapter will provide the foundation of analysis for examining the posed question with a literature review on the concept of forced migration and refugees in International Relations (IR). The first debate will analyze the increasingly securitized way migration issues are discussed including the effects of globalization on forced migration. The second debate will highlight a constructivist framework for understanding the less-tangible ways in which reality is constructed and understood in social and political realms. Finally, the third argument presented will explore the [poststructuralist] postcolonial critique of how Orientalist rhetoric is reproduced in the modern day to perpetuate global power imbalances, seeking comparisons with the political rhetoric in focus.

The third chapter will hold the analysis of two speeches by former Australian Prime Minister, Tony Abbott: The Address to the Second Annual Margaret Thatcher Institute (MTI) in London in October 2015 (Appendix A) and the National Security Address in Canberra in February 2015 (Appendix B). Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) will be used to analyze these speeches, ultimately aiming to deconstruct the power relations embedded within them. This research aims to contribute to the existing literature by critically evaluating this case as emblematic of historically imbalanced power relations are played out in the arena of international politics today through rhetoric, specifically in the context of how political discourse has led to the criminalization of refugees and the action of seeking asylum, thus challenging the existing                                    international                                    framework.

## 1.3 Theory, Methodology & Limitations

This research will utilize an interdisciplinary approach, borrowing developments from the fields of Postcolonial, Political Science and Philosophy, Anthropology and Linguistic Studies, in efforts to obtain a more nuanced, holistic understanding of the underlying power relations

embedded in political rhetoric. However, at its core this research will be situated mainly in the field of International Relations, specifically within the constructivist theoretical framework. Constructivism argues that the social world (society, political reality, and identities) is crafted through shared ideas rather than being naturally occurring or rigidly fixed.[18] Thus, constructivist theorists place a great amount of agency and power in individuals' ability to create the world around them, of which is key to examining political discourse. Discourse and language are argued to be integral components of constructing reality, as Michel Foucault keenly describes a discourse as, "...a linguistic system which orders states and concepts."[19] Social philosopher Gillian Rose supports this sentiment, explaining that discourse refers to statements which "structure the way a thing is thought" and therefore the way one may act on the basis of that thinking.[20] CDA provides the tools for analyzing the proposed qualitative case study of the Australian context to contribute to the wealth of research around the "refugee crisis" of 2015. It will be argued that though geographically distinct from much of the impact and flows of migrants around 2015, the actions and direct policy recommendations offered by the Australian government exacerbated problematic narratives around refugee issues and the crisis overall, further overwhelming the Mediterranean region.

The limitations of this research stem from the lack of complementary field research data due to the limited timeframe of writing as well as the absence of funding for such research. While it is possible to perform speech analysis through video recordings and transcripts, the following analysis would only benefit from additional primary resources such as interviews to obtain a more complete picture of how the political addresses were received by others for example. Primary sources are therefore limited in this case. The interest, insight, and contextual understanding, of the local perspective on this topic are informed by the author's brief time living in Sydney, Australia, from March 2016-January 2017 (not for research purposes).

---

[18] Van der Pijl, Kees, "Hermeneutics, Weber, Constructivism" in *A Survey of Global Political Economy vol. 2.1*. (Centre For Global Political Economy: University of Sussex, 2009), 88.
[19] Hansen, L. "Poststructuralism", *in Baylis, Smith & Owens (Eds.) The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations (6th ed.),* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).
[20] Rose, Gillian, *Visual Methodologies,* (Los Angeles: Sage, 2016), 136.

## *1.4 Background: Tracing the Image of Refugees Over Time*

To more fully grasp and the role of forced migration and refugee persons in today's global politics, it is necessary to analyze the background and context of their origins as a concrete political concept as it is used today. In the Postwar era, the codification of "refugee" as a legal status made such movements of people accepted legally as well as its burdens and responsibilities to be taken on beyond the moral imperatives of select nations.[21] The United Nations General Assembly of 1948 established the first international document to codify the universal right to asylum.[22] Article 14 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) states, "Everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution."[23] Shortly after, the 1951 Geneva Convention document, *Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees,* codified a "refugee" as "someone who is unable or unwilling to return to their country of origin owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion."[24] Cohen explains that a key challenge for the Western Allies at this time was the "identification of 'true' and 'false' refugees" thus, anti-fascist standards were the main criteria used to distinguish genuine refugees from "usurpers of [Displaced Persons] status" from 1945-47.[25] Already in this explanation, it is possible to see the ideological Western underpinnings of how refugees were understood and situated as a legal entity.

Refugee status and forced migration issues as they are understood in the European-American psyche were founded on the image of a courageous defector, connoting a specific and restricted group of "politically conscious 'freedom fighters'" first, against the Nazi regime and then, against the Soviet Union.[26] This narrative persisted until the 1980/90s, at which time it shifted greatly. Bleiker and Johnson use the production of images to trace the transformation of the refugee narrative in the West importantly, in what Bleiker deems illustrative of the "aesthetic turn in international political theory."[27] Johnson points out that initially in the early 1950s,

---

[21] Loescher, Gil, *Beyond Charity: International Cooperation and the Global Refugee Crisis: A Twentieth Century Fund Book*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

[22] Mayblin, Lucy, "Colonialism, Decolonisation, and the Right to be Human: Britain and the 1951 Geneva Convention on the Status of Refugees" in *Journal of Historical Sociology* vol. 27.3, (John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.), 424.

[23] UNHCR, "Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees", UNHCR Communications and Public Information Service: Geneva, Switzerland, 1951, 14.

[24] Ibid.

[25] Cohen, *"Who is a Refugee?"*, 27.

[26] Cohen, *"Who is a Refugee?"*, 27.

[27] Bleiker, Roland, *Aesthetics and World Politics*, (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 18.

refugee stories focused on, "...white, often male bodies [depicted as] heroic, determined and have a personal identity and individual story," while also being political agents who were "bravely fleeing" threats such as Communism.[28] This particular assumption speaks to the prioritization of those new migrants who would help to maintain or even strengthen Western order and hegemony. Through examining the photo archives of the UNHCR, Johnson traces the transformation of the refugee narrative and identity as correlated to the geographical focus shifting from Europe to those forcibly migrating from Asia and Africa. This has led to the narrative of what defines a refugee which is pervasive in the 21st century: a victim who is poverty-stricken, fleeing violence and war from a failed state—ultimately helpless and distinctive "Others".[29] Examining these photo archives offers an incredibly insightful view into how refugees have been perceived over the year. Therefore, it is an important task in examining responsibility, as the UNHCR has taken on an authoritarian role in the protection and resettlement of refugees, a concept that will be examined further through the Australian case study.[30] The foundation of the UNHCR principles for granting asylum that is still used today can thus be traced back to these Anglo-European origins of the Postwar era. Through the production and distribution of these images by such authorities as the UNHCR rose the *myth of difference* via this narrative transformation. The later narrative eliminated individual identity of the refugee and highlighted these communities as having, "differences in education and skill levels [which] underscored fears that newly arrived refugees would/could not contribute to society thus inevitably would become "unacceptable economic burdens."[31] The myth of difference narrative has prevailed for decades, disenfranchising those who are forced to migrate, marking them as an inherent threat to Western order and culture, and criminalizing the very act of seeking asylum.

## *1.5 Defining Terms*

With both the purposeful and subtle mechanisms of language and rhetoric being examined in this paper, it is important to clearly define the terminology that will be utilized throughout. While aiming to deconstruct dominant narratives, it is arguably inevitable that such academic writing

---

[28] Johnson, Heather L., "Refugees" *in Roland Bleiker (ed.) Visual Global Politics*, (London, etc.: Routledge, 2018), 245.
[29] Ibid.
[30] Refugee Council of Australia, *Department of Immigration and Border Protection's Annual Report 2015-16.*
[31] Johnson, *"Refugees"*, 248.

will find it necessary to use the commonly accepted terminology to challenge the problematic nature embedded within it. Thus, the following will outline the intended usage of certain terms.

### *1.5.1 Refugees & Forced Migration /Migrant*

Firstly, this paper aims to *break down* the essentializing of refugees that political rhetoric has created, not perpetuate it. The specific group of refugees being examined will be identified more clearly through the case study and though this study aims to provide valid inferences on the issue of criminalizing of refugees generally, this does not assume all situations and people in the position of forcibly migrating to be homogenous. Due to the conciseness of this paper, this analysis will not be able to thoroughly address the problematic "privileging" of certain groups of refugees over others, of which an entire thesis could be written alone.

Ali Nobil Ahmad notes that the broad term "migration" is technically value-free but is rarely used in reference to the "desirable" circulation of diplomats, entrepreneurs, and highly skilled workers, but inherently refers to mobility that is *problematic*.[32] Ahmad notes that utilizing the term *migration* thus, "already signals the need for control" and in public discourse, "it is often raced and classed."[33] This is evident by the ways in which migration studies ignore the huge population shifts that occurred before the modern era for example, and even more dramatically discounts the colonial era when immense numbers of Europeans "populated entire swatches of the globe."[34],[35] It is in this pointed analysis that the scope of the following research lies: in analyzing the mechanisms and processes which allow these assumptions and blindnesses to function. Therefore, when necessary, the specification of the *forced* nature of certain migration issues will be emphasized. Similarly, the more neutral term of "mobility" should be kept in mind as a more precise way of describing the population shifts being politicized in public discourse.[36]

---

[32] Ahmad, Ali Nobil, "The terms migration, flight, asylum and some others" in *The Oranges in Europe Taste Better*, (Berlin, Germany: Heinrich-Böll Stiftung, 2018), 12.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Ibid.

[35] Abu-Lughod, Janet, *Before European Hegemony*, (New York etc.: Oxford University Press, 1989).

[36] Ahmad, *"The terms migration, flight, asylum and some others"*, 12.

### *1.5.2 Neo-Orientalism & Other Postcolonialisms*

Postcolonialism is largely associated with the study of culture and identity, attempting to deconstruct hegemonic narratives.[37] The work of notable postcolonial theorist, Frantz Fanon, is arguably the classical authority on dissecting power relations between "Colonizer" and "Colonized".[38] For the purposes of this paper, the broadened terms of "Oppressor" and "Oppressed" will be used in efforts to abstractly apply Fanon's theories as well as for contemporary relevance to the relationships being examined. Hereafter for purposes of conciseness, the Oppressor will refer to the exploitative Global North and the Oppressed as those of the exploited Global South. Postcolonial and feminist IR scholar, Lily Ling, lays the foundation or this broadening, describing the less explicit but vitally significant use of post-colonialist vocabulary in analyzing power relationships today. Ling describes one outcome of globalization discourse as the denial of "cultural, social, emotional, and psychological underpinnings of global relations" due to its focus on progressive economic integration.[39] Ling notes this denial of these less-tangible elements of such relationship reproduces "residual Self/Other (Oppressor/Oppressed) exclusions" which are more subtly maintained in today's language of "neutrality, efficiency, and universality" of Western preference.[40] While useful for examining the systemic nature of the power relations between the Global North and South in focus, it should be noted that the very term of "postcolonial" can be seen as a contradiction in itself; scholars such as Ella Shohat point out that "postcolonial" is never truly "post-" as in such analyses the colonial is understood to necessarily live on.[41] This is an important distinction to keep in mind when considering the usefulness of such poststructuralist theories alongside those of dominant IR. Shohat notes this as part of various "turns" in recent theory when considering the positionality of such analyses as, "Assumed within postcolonial/literary/cultural studies are the various structuralist and poststructuralist "turns" including: linguistic, discursive, and cultural.[42]

---

[37] Childs, Peter, and R.J. Patrick Williams, *An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theory*, (Harlow: Longman, 1997).

[38] Ibid.

[39] Ling, L.H.M, *Postcolonial International Relations: Conquest and Desire between Asia and the West,* (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 81.

[40] Ibid.

[41] Shohat, Ella, *On the Arab-Jew, Palestine, and Other Displacements: Selected Writings of Ella Shohat*, (Pluto Press, 2017), 195.

[42] Ibid.

The complementary concept of *neo-Orientalism* will also be a key guiding concept for this research. Samiei also draws on Said's text which states, "The vast corpus of Orientalism [in its classical understanding] was to legitimize and promote Western superiority and dominance by inventing the ideology of the West-and-Islam dualism."[43] This is argued to be reproduced today in what is termed neo-Orientalism, finding the most important particularity to be that it ignores local and specific distinctions but instead attempts "to portray a homogenous Islamist terrorist enemy."[44] This concept most closely relates to the "Othering" of Syrian refugees in focus, not just of the Global South in general.

### *1.5.3 The "Crisis"*

While this paper aims to explore the importance of language and narrative and its effects on reality, the following analysis purposely excludes using the term "crisis" in describing the events that occurred around 2015 in relation to the substantial populations flows and mobility of migrants globally. Conflating this movement of people with a "crisis" necessarily presumes "difficulty or danger" thus one must challenge the excessive usage of the term in public discourse.[45] Arguably, this isolated element greatly contributes to the power imbalance being examined. Therefore, in aiming to be neutral in the analysis, this paper will refer to the event which is known in the mainstream consciousness as the "refugee crisis" of 2015 rather as a *situation* or *event* where possible.

---

[43] Samiei, *"Neo-Orientalism? The relationship between the West and Islam in our globalized world"*, 1146.
[44] Ibid., 1149.
[45] Ahmad, *"The terms migration, flight, asylum and some others"*, 12.

# Chapter 2: Literature Review

## 2.1 Refugees in International Relations & the Securitization of

Loscher argues that refugee policy analysis incorporates many of the most basic issues of international political analysis, combining elements of: international and domestic policy-making, recognition and implementation of human rights standards, adherence to international legal norms, the role of transnational forces, social and political conflict, the role of ideology and ethnic groups, and the consideration of economic developments, amongst others.[46] In IR literature, refugee persons are argued to be created by the political actions of sovereign states though have consequences that go beyond those sovereign borders, thus protecting them challenges the normative understanding of the power of the modern nation-state and its sovereignty.[47] By this definition alone, refugee issues have either implicitly or explicitly been a topic of concern of states in relation to protecting their borders and sovereignty. However, refugee issues are gaining importance and priority in the global political agenda because of the increasingly connected nature of the world is likewise increasing the rate and access to mobility for all. Loescher supports this sentiment, arguing that the importance and gravity of refugees in all aspects of international relations are only further likely to increase in the foreseeable future.[48] Loescher similarly predicts an increase in the trend of states aiming to protect their sovereignty by "strictly controlling the entry of foreigners".[49] Furthermore, the securitization of refugee issues has arguably allowed for the criminalization of refugees over time, as was traced in chapter one. In practice, criminalization has meant any combination of: rejection of resettlement/protection based on "insufficient" claims, being housed/confined to camps or detention centers, rough or abusive physical/emotional treatment, lack of medical care or supplies for basic healthful living, limited food/water, to name a few. There is an emphasis in IR scholarship on this being a prevalent trend in regard to refugee persons specifically, though it is also possible to notice how most migration issues are being conflated in this way with political

---

[46] Loescher, Gil, *Refugees and International Relations,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 8.
[47] Ibid.
[48] Ibid.
[49] Ibid.

rhetoric blurring the public's understanding of "legal" and "illegal" migration flows, as will be examined in the following analysis.[50]

As mentioned briefly, looking at refugees as its own area of focus rather than a cause or effect of other global political events is highly contested within the field of IR. Some scholars argue that it is often more appropriate to focus on *processes* of migration in and from conflict and that in defending Refugee and Forced Migration Studies as a separate field, there is a risk that scholars are legitimizing labels that are, "deliberately constructed to exclude and to disempower."[51] Keeping this in mind, the following research will aim to contribute to the existing scholarship by refocusing the refugee as a person who is for the time, having the status of "refugee", rather than this being the sole identifier of the person. This will be attempted through breaking down the oppressive homogeneity of the "Other" as seen in political discourse. In the *Review of International Studies Journal*, Bradley argues in favor of the focus and magnification on refugee issues in critiquing Arendt's definition of refugee studies as having too narrow a focus of refugee persons as stateless beings.[52] Bradley argues that future and nuanced examinations of refugee issues should instead seek to at a minimum, contextualize the Refugee as a dynamic political actor in global politics.[53] Specifically *forced* migration in all its manifestations, make it necessary to examine the implications of the shift in the global order that globalization is bringing to the mobility of people and shifts in power in the 21st century—a recurring theme within the constructivist literature.

### 2.1.1 The Impacts of Globalization

The forced movement of great numbers of people (whether overt in the case of war/human rights abuses or subtler in the case of systemic poverty and extreme climate changing certain geographies) is having a major impact on almost every element of society in the globalized world. Samiei explains that although there are disagreements in scholarship on how exactly to define globalization, "...most contemporary social analyses show a consensus about some basic

---

[50] Through Loescher's prediction, it is possible to question whether there will be a distinction between forced and economic migration in the context of "criminalizing" mobility after all, or if the exclusion and control of foreigners will more explicitly be based on another marker such as race/ethnicity/class. Moreover, has this already happened?

[51] Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Elena, Gil Loescher, Katy Long and Nando Signona, *The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 4.

[52] Bradley, M., "Rethinking refugeehood: statelessness, repatriation, and refugee agency", *in Review of International Studies vol. 40.1,* (2014), 103.

[53] Ibid.

rudiments of the concept; among them are *deterritorialization* and the growth of *interconnectedness*" in various sectors.[54] As noted by Anthony Giddens, points of contention within the understanding of the impacts of globalization is in that key evaluations are mainly regarded solely in economic terms. Giddens clarifies that this is a mistake as globalization is *"political, technological and cultural, as well as* economic"[55] thus, the less-tangible factors must be examined closely and with careful nuance. Didier Bigo argues that the securitization of migration issues has been an inevitable outcome of globalization more broadly because of the ways in which the increasingly freer flow of technology, goods, economy, and people, has encroached on the monopoly of power the State classically had.[56] The free market economy and increasing complexity of the global financial system has left primarily one sole function to the State: controlling the physical, territorial boundaries of the nation.[57] The shifting narrative about migration over time mirrors the shift from the power of *government* to the mechanisms of *governance*; shifting the concern of Power onto the *behavior* of individuals rather than on the structures and systems those individuals act in.[58] On the changing dynamics around migration issues in recent decades, Huysmans argues that at least since the 1980s, "the political construction of migration" has increasingly focused on its destabilizing effects and moreover, the impending dangers it has for public order.[59]

## *2.1.2 Criminalizing Refugees*

Founded on the neoliberal principles of the Postwar era, "refugee status" has had a salient history of determining who is a "legitimate" refugee or "worthy" migrant and who is not.[60] The prevalent description of *forced* migrants as *illegal* migrants is highly contentious since it would appear to criminalize those who have no choice but to migrate; likewise, it has been recognized and accepted in international law as technically not committing any crimes simply by doing so.[61]

---

[54] Samiei, *"Neo-Orientalism? The relationship between the West and Islam in our globalized world"*, 1148.
[55] Giddens, *Runaway World*.
[56] Bigo, Didier, "Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease", *in Alternatives: Global, Local, Political, vol. 27.1*, (2002).
[57] Ibid., 66.
[58] Ibid.
[59] Huysmans, J., "The European Union and the Securitization of Migration", *in the Journal of Common Market Studies vol. 38.5,* (2000).
[60] Cohen, *"Who is a Refugee?".*
[61] Scheel, Stephan and Vicki Squire, "Forced Migrants as 'Illegal' Migrants", *in The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 188.

The concept of forced migration is more easily understood by the public of those fleeing war zones and less so of those deemed "economic" opportunists as political rhetoric often conflate them as.[62]

The international community has a well-established commitment to the legal nature of the asylum-seeking process. In legitimating refugee persons, Scheel and Squire clarify the status of "refugee" implies one escaping "a series of factors such as political persecution, ethnic conflict, inequitable access to natural resources, declining living conditions, and chronic and pervasive human rights abuses [which marks] a *limited agency* on the part of those migrating."[63] This common international legal understanding grants refugees the relief of the burden of the helplessness in their legal situation. Scheel and Squire highlight the problematic nature of this discourse by citing Article 31 of the Geneva Convention which specifies that, "The Contracting States shall not impose penalties [on refugees] on account of their illegal entry or presence."[64] Evidently, there has been a well-established agreement in the international community that refugees are not invaders, opportunistic or acting illegally, solely by their seeking asylum. Bigo explains that Western politicians of every political leaning have sought to securitize immigration through the "correlation of successful speech acts" and the mobilization they create for and against certain groups of people.[65] Bigo argues that the perception of illegality and securitization of migration is thus, a "transversal political technology" utilized as a tool of governance (or further, the *governmentality* of), coordinated by a variety of institutions in order to capitalize on the feeling of *unease* which permeates the neoliberal consciousness, so as to affirm the role of existing government as providers of protection and security as well as to mask some of their failures elsewhere.[66] This dynamic of constant unease is prevalent and underscores much of the dominant narrative around refugees. It will be argued that the consistent feeling of unease which is a necessary tool of neoliberalism is constructed hugely through political discourse, stoking fear of the amorphous "Other". Migration is one area which this feeling of "unease" gets

---

[62] Though there is an argument to be made about the less obvious, more institutionalized violence of poverty and exploited natural resources that the Global South is subjected to, in part due to globalization. Obiezu (2008: xix) argues in this sense, "The worst forms of suffering are considered to be the exploitation and oppression imposed on innocent people, the near extinction of culture/identity of marginalized groups by their fellow human beings via unjust institutional policies, and reckless [resource extraction and] destruction of ecology."

[63] Scheel and Squire, *"Forced Migrants as 'Illegal' Migrants"*, 188.

[64] Ibid.

[65] Bigo, *"Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease."*

[66] Ibid.

metaphorically dumped, as seen through the problematic blurring of legal, illegal, economic and forced migration in public discourse, as will be examined specifically in the Australian context below.

## 2.2 Imagining Communities & Constructing Social Spaces

Creating structure for an orderly society and then keeping that order is one of the basic functions of government, thus it is obvious why politicians latch onto these narratives that create the feeling of stability and rationality or to craft certain "norms" about what constitutes national identity, values, and citizenship. Key to the constructivist framework, Kees Van der Pijl explains that the idea that society itself lacks an "inherent, knowable logic" arguing that it is only possible to be aware of a framework of meaning from within the same place it has been derived.[67] Thus, political rhetoric can be understood as one such way of managing the chaos of society and imprinting a sense of rationality in the world. Renowned IR scholar, Bertrand Badie, claims that through political discourses, state power seeks to, "...reduce the ways by which particularist identities are formed, [as they] hinder the state's claim of a monopoly over authority."[68] Homogenizing identities and dehumanizing those who threaten a powerful state's sovereignty is one goal of harsh public discourses and inflammatory rhetoric used by political leaders. Therefore, an "us versus them" narrative functions mainly to increase and legitimize existing state power. Badie argues that a byproduct of globalization and the current political order is the problematic universalization and imposition of the Western civil society model, which has ultimately strengthened the concept of transnationalism, encouraging mobility of persons, goods, and ideas.[69] Furthermore, Badie's analyses explain the ways in which political discourse works is by artificially creating social spaces and categories which structure society.[70] Therefore, this paper will attempt to illustrate how political discourse functions as a tool in the interest of those (especially politicians) seeking to maintain power and order.

The mechanisms underlying the construction of the "Other" can be best understood through such key theoretical concepts in IR as Agamben's *spaces of exception* and Foucault's

---

[67] Van der Pijl, *"Hermeneutics, Weber, Constructivism",* 100.

[68] Badie, Bertrand, *The Imported State: The Westernization of the Political Order*, (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1992), 84.

[69] Ibid.

[70] Ibid.

*heterotopia*. Spaces of exception refer to "extraterritorial enclavic spaces where the juridical order is suspended, and where arbitrary power is exercised and justified as exceptional political interventions either temporarily or permanently."[71] The concept of heterotopia similarly refers to certain spaces (whether institutional, cultural or discursive) which have layers of hidden or embedded meaning.[72] Historically, spaces of exception have been geographically tucked into the peripheries of society or far away from the eyes of the masses—such places were not emphasized as noble or as sites of pride, but hushed away, as if their view would knowingly ignite critique. However, these extra-judicial spaces are not always distinct or literal geographic areas, but today are acted out through societal norms which function to create covert social caste systems. This concept will be illustrated through the analysis of the refugee as the "Other". Arguably, this is possible as spaces of exception are rather increasingly allocated to certain creeds, classes, ideologies or ethnicities. Geographically more obviously, however, this concept can be recognized in Abbott's offshore detention or "processing" centers for asylum-seekers, evidenced in the case of Manus Island and Nauru.[73]

The identity label constructed by the problematic refugee narrative has led to the criminalization of forced migration, persisting in the creation of amorphous social realities dictating who is and is not included, legal, or welcome, in Western society. Arguably, this has been dictated by perceived norms and values that prop up Western order and power, a claim which will be supported in the Australian context through the below analysis. The "othering" of such forced migrants is argued to be the most modern manifestation of "othering" which illustrates a necessary mechanism that perpetuates the current neoliberal order.[74] This is prominently seen through the way politicians such as Abbott frame migration issues—often reproducing historically embedded oppressive notions of power and identity. Bigo supports this, arguing that useful confrontations of such discourse cannot be accomplished through ideological challenges but rather, through challenging the very conditions under which this "authority of truth" is granted.[75] In this particular discourse, anti-immigration proponents craft the idea that the

---

[71] Minca, Claudio, "Space of Exception" *in V. L. Packard's The International Encyclopedia of Geography: People, the Earth, Environment and Technology,* (Malden, Mass. and Oxford: Emerald Publishing Limited, 2016).

[72] Foucault, Michel, "Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias", *in Architecture/Mouvement/Continuite, translated by Jay Miskowiec,* (1984).

[73] Amnesty International, *"Island of Despair: Australia's 'Processing' of Refugees on Nauru."*

[74] Childs and Williams, *An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theory.*

[75] Bigo, *"Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease", 66.*

immigrant is an inherent "outsider, inside the State",[76] then consistently reinforce this idea aiming to engineer an easily identifiable "other" to focus societal feelings of unease or opposition upon.[77]

## 2.3 Neo-Orientalism & Postcolonial Relations

While classical IR theory (situated in realism or liberalism) can be sufficient for understanding the basics of Australian immigration policies around 2015, a poststructuralist framework is useful for critically evaluating the more nuanced power relations/imbalances embedded within them. On one hand, some academics today argue that Said's classical text *Orientalism* (which identifies such power imbalances and oppressive relationship between the Global North and South) is out of date due to the emergence since of a globally connected communications system as well as "the development of a form of global sociology."[78] On the other hand, however, Samiei notes opposing scholarship,

> ...holds that, although many preconditions which were responsible for the crystallization of the Orientalist discourse are no longer in place, it would be naive to think that the old patterns of human history and destiny which had shaped the West-and-Islam dualism have simply been removed. Far from it: they have been reconstituted, redeployed, redistributed in a globalized framework and have shaped a new paradigm which can be called 'neo-Orientalism'.[79]

Samiei keenly shows global power imbalances today as not merely a new or unique issue to deal with, but a transformation of oppression already witnessed in history—one that simply operates more covertly than to the titled Colonial Era.

One method of domination and assertion of power of an Oppressor onto the Oppressed is through the act of imposing a particular identity upon them—a concept which is crucial to understand when analyzing discourse.[80] The imposition of identity or certain narratives can be

---

[76] Bigo, *"Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease", 66.*

[77] This sentiment is very strongly supported by scholarship on post-9/11 narratives, a concept which (due to the conciseness of this paper) is not able to be explored in more depth. Post-9/11 narratives very strongly position the Muslim as an inherent danger, echoing the sentiment of danger being both inside and outside the State. (See Doran & Girard, 2008; Mueller & Steward, 2012; El-Khairy, 2010).

[78] Samiei, *"Neo-Orientalism? The relationship between the West and Islam in our globalized world"*, 1148.

[79] Ibid.

[80] Childs and Williams, *An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theory*.

understood as a form of subconscious or psychological violence because in order for the Oppressed to free themselves from their oppression, it has been argued, they will internalize these narratives. This internalization occurs through the attempt to imitate the Oppressor and their worldviews as much as possible as a coping mechanism, ultimately performing an identity which has been deliberately constructed to subordinate.[81] Said's theory is vital in understanding cultural and political discourses perpetuated by Western dominance which work to shape the "Other" specifically in the context of the West's relationship with the Middle East.[82] Said explains that when discourses generate particular representations of the world, these representations become acceptable and are then reinforced both purposefully by the Oppressor and subconsciously by the Oppressed.[83] Bhabha supports this in his analysis of how the Oppressed/Oppressor relationship functions, concluding that there is a mutual dependence as the construction of the Oppressor's identity is hinged *directly in opposition* to the "Other".[84] Dussel agrees that the current international order is perpetuated by an "us versus them" narrative explaining the hierarchy of, "Modernity appears when Europe affirms itself as the "center" of a World History that it inaugurates; the "periphery" that surrounds this is consequently part of its own self-definition."[85]

The historical foundations of the dichotomies of core/periphery or Global North/South aid in explaining why a nation such as Australia would work so thoroughly to disempower and even criminalize asylum-seekers coming from the Global South, constantly seeking to validate and reinforce the legitimacy of their own claims of a Christian, Anglo-European identity. Lake and Reynolds explain that racial and ethnic exclusion has been vital in crafting the legitimacy of the modern [Westphalian] nation-state. Historically exemplified, despite the colonial era between 1850 and 1930 having been the "most intensive period of migration in human history"[86] one would be hard-pressed to discover a colonist who identified as an "immigrant" in this context. In this example, it is possible to glimpse the deeply embedded nature which Anglo-European society has in constructing different norms and preferences for themselves in juxtaposition to the "Other". In this case, it is for their own mobility in the world as opposed to those they

---

[81] Childs and Williams, *An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theory*.
[82] Shohat, *On the Arab-Jew, Palestine, and Other Displacements: Selected Writings of Ella Shohat*, 195.
[83] Said, *Orientalism*.
[84] Bhabha, Homi, *The Location of Culture*, (London etc.: Routledge, 1996), 43.
[85] Dussel, Enrique, *Eurocentrism and Modernity (Introduction to the Frankfurt Lectures) vol. 20.3,* (1993), 65.
[86] Lake, Marilyn and Henry Reynolds, "Introduction", *in Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

"conquered", ruled over, exploited or enslaved. Though ideas of race and ethnicity have evolved somewhat since the 19th century, the parallels with migration in the 21st century are striking, which is why the poststructuralist framework is vital and complementary to debates in IR on forced migration today. The following analysis of Abbott's rhetoric will try to prove this through demonstrating that the criminalization of refugees can best be analyzed through this postcolonial lens; most importantly examining power relations, identity, and oppression, with cognizance of the systemic and historical embeddedness of inequity.

# Chapter 3: Mapping Themes & Speech Analysis

In analyzing the two noted speeches by Tony Abbott through the lens of Critical Discourse Analysis, the following chapter will aim to expose the hypothesized patterns of neo-Orientalist rhetoric embedded within Abbott's domestic and internationally projected discourses. CDA analyzes, "…both the meaning constituted from semiological events and the components of what makes it up",[87] looking on both macro- and micro- levels to deconstruct meaning and examine power relations with the objective to address inequality and injustice.[88] Abbott's statements have been categorized into three themes (or discourse strands) which encompass the ideas which fall under the broader recurring motifs of: civilization, conquest, and Christianity. These were chosen after a coding analysis as the most prevalent themes expressed in the texts, then further sorted into sub-categories to be explored in greater depth.

The two specific speeches by the former Australian Prime Minister were chosen for a few reasons. Together they illustrate a cross-section of typical international and domestic discourse put forward by many anti-immigration politicians during the 2015 refugee situation. Thus, Abbott typifies a specific conservative character in politics in the 2015 era which makes his statements interesting to analyze further as to how these lesser-examined politicians reinforce dominant hegemonic narratives. Though Abbott is named as a Liberal party representative in Australia, in his own words he equates his values and positions to that of Thatcherism. Thatcherism is arguably the epitome of neoliberal conservatism, evidenced by its championing trickle-down economics, rejecting strong government regulations, and the welfare state altogether.[89] Also, both speeches represent moments in time which attracted harsh media attention for their brazenness; in London Abbott sought to make direct policy recommendations to European leaders, contributing to the growing "fortress Europe" attitude, while in Canberra the National Security Address exemplified the securitization positioning which wove migration issues, terrorism, and national security, together as if they were one in the same. The bulk of the

---

[87] Titscher, Stefan, Michael Meyer, Ruth Wodak and Eva Vetter, *Methods of text and discourse analysis* (translated by Bryan Jenner), (London: Sage, 2000).
[88] Thies, Cameron G. "A pragmatic guide to qualitative historical analysis in the study of international relations", *in International Studies Perspectives, vol. 3.4*, (2002).
[89] Jackson, Ben, "Currents of Neoliberalism: British Political Ideologies and the New Right, c.1955-1979", *in The English Historical Review, vol. 131.551*, (2016).

narrative analysis will be built upon the examination of the MTI Address (see Appendix A) and will be supported by more closely examining how this narrative gets reinforced through different linguistic and rhetorical mechanisms in Abbott's National Security Address (see Appendix B). While much of the National Security Address begins by informing the public of certain securitizing measures the Administration has put in place, the speech ultimately becomes a condemnation of refugees and migrants.

The motifs presented are categories which statements have been sorted into to illustrate the underlying elements that culminate in the larger narrative being examined. The first component of this narrative comes from invoking the historical dominance of the "prosperous Western civilization" which creates stark absolutes of the good, modern, and advanced Global North, in opposition the bad, traditional, and "lacking" Global South. The valorization of domination in the form of "conquests" that a nation is tied to can be understood through this sentiment, therefore, it will be explored as the second component of the overarching narrative. The third vital component is the consistent assertion of Christianity or Christian values. This religious element is interwoven throughout the entire project but can be regarded as distinctly problematic when Christian values are conflated *as* Western values and therefore as a justification for certain political actions. This narrative also draws upon examples from outside of the Judeo-Christian belief system to make claims on the ways in which certain peoples are somehow inherently different in culture and worldviews. These claims are argued to create not only diametrically opposed categorizations of "us" and "them", but hierarchies of progressiveness and "backwardness" which greatly influence social and political reality.

### *3.1 Civilization*

> *"Parliamentary democracy and the rule of law…freedom broadening slowly down from precedent to precedent...the notion of civilization as a trust between the living, the dead and the yet-to-be-born: this [is] the heritage...to preserve and strengthen."[90]*

Two specific elements combine to reinforce the distinctive hierarchy which works to support the narrative which posits the progress of the Global North as more valuable and "right" than any other. These elements can be regarded as (1) the values promoted by neoliberalism and (2) the implicit stories wrapped up in the stories of the "prosperous Western civilization". In his speeches, Abbott invokes the unchallenged dominance of Western civilization remarkably subtle in some instances and more explicitly in others; both the implicit and overt will be analyzed further.

Ling explains the hierarchy and progress alluded to by Abbott's assertion of "Western prosperity" can be seen paralleled throughout history (specifically in the context of colonialism) or even as blatantly synonymous with the "Imperial Western Self versus the Evil Oriental Other" narrative. This is prevalent throughout various facets of Orientalist discourse, which problematically favors the model of Western society and values as the pinnacle of all human accomplishment.[91] Ling points to illustrative historical groupings such as the dichotomies of "civilization/barbarity" and "law and order/insurrection and chaos" narratives to extend the abstraction of this theme.[92] These groupings exemplify the ever-pervasive *modernization* rhetoric which establishes Western society as the model in which all progressive, forward motion of human civilization aims meanwhile, anyone not fitting into this mold is assumed to be incomplete or misguided.

### *3.1.1 Neoliberalism*

Utilizing conservative neoliberal values as a justification for anti-immigration policies is a tactic that Abbott relies heavily upon during his speech at the MTI. It is a tactic that has been shared, replicated (and infamously *improved* upon) globally. The neoliberal values Abbott leans on are greatly criticized by postcolonial scholars due to the inequality and exploitation that persists—

---

[90] "Transcript: Tony Abbott's Controversial Speech at the Margaret Thatcher Lecture," *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 28 Oct. 2015.
[91] Ling, *Postcolonial International Relations: Conquest and Desire between Asia and the West, 91.*
[92] Ibid.

despite their perceived progressiveness. Abbott engages in the dichotomizing of "militant Islam" with the "prosperous West" subtly asserting that the West is not that—militant nor violent—an implication that is incredibly misleading and will be explored in greater depth throughout. The very definition of *who's* militancy and violence is legitimate that Abbott and his contemporaries draw upon lies in the dominant neoliberal framework, which grants legitimate use of force and violence only to the State.[93] Relying on the unchallenged, state-centric framework in this way instills in the psyche of audiences not only the misleading and fearful idea that all Islam is violent, but also acts a steady subtle reinforcement that anything outside of the current neoliberal order is inherently bad, backward, and to be feared. Again, this serves a dual purpose to legitimize the State's own current power structures while pinning Islam and the West as polar opposites.

Abbott goes on to stoke fears in his contemporaries and supporters that if a combined offensive military attack is not taken to combat the actors causing the conflicts that are leading to the influx in forced migration, then the Other will beat them to it. Relying on historical precedent he states, "...as Thatcher so clearly understood over the Falklands: those who won't use decisive force, where needed, end up being dictated to by those who will."[94] This is problematic for many reasons, but in focus here is the idea that taking care of the migrant situation can (and should) be handled with the same strategies—moreover, the same aggression or force. At this moment, Abbott is either unable or unwilling to separate the fighting in Syria from the people affected by that fighting thus being forced to flee as refugees. This is a common problem embedded within the refugee narrative from 2015. At its core, this blurring of government, rebels, and civilians, goes against the principles of the commitments made by Western nations to refugees as outlined in chapter one. It is lazy and problematic for Western governments to shut people out simply because they are victims of circumstance, being from or living in a place, which has been affected by conflict. Further still, this dichotomous allocation of the West being "good" and everyone else being "bad" (regardless of civilian status, for example) perpetuates the idea that Western prosperity is an isolated and deserved phenomenon, without any relationship or responsibility to the rest of the global community—further perpetuating the idea that Western prosperity is an anomaly which was built solely out of honest "hard work". This pervasive

---

[93] Masquelier, *Critique and Resistance in a Neoliberal Age: Towards a Narrative of Emancipation*.
[94] *"Transcript: Tony Abbott's Controversial Speech at the Margaret Thatcher Lecture"*.

positioning erases the complex history, interaction, and imperialist relationship, of the Global North with much of the refugee-producing Global South.

The foundation of neoliberal values is laid out in the epitomizing quote from Abbott's speech headlining this chapter. The reliance on economic ideology to tackle a social, human issue such as refugee policies is one critique of neoliberalism generally.[95] Abbott expresses a common neoliberal conservative mentality which relies on the unchallenged supremacy of the [current] state system. It is perhaps obvious that those holding power and benefitting from such a structure would hardly seek to challenge it. However, in dealing with unprecedented emerging global issues, one could argue that the parameters of existing legal frameworks need to be updated to match the realities of the current century. This is true especially in the framework of refugee rights. As traced previously, it can be argued that the scope of policies and practices on the institutional level plays an authoritarian role in dictating who qualifies as a "legitimate" refugee and not. One could point to many aspects solely in the byproducts of globalization which has changed the landscape of the international community to simply begin illuminating the ways in which policies from the 1950s do not suit the current realities of international relations. Through the authority of these old documents, this legitimation process ultimately deems certain people "worthy" or not of protection and assistance. This dictating function is then qualified by refugee-receiving countries such as Australia, which keeps the cycle of institutional preferences and exclusionary practices going. In the case of Abbott's Australia, this process was reinforced and legitimated on the national level in the case of "Operation Sovereign Borders" which is evidenced by his administration's acceptance of a small number of refugees only through the UNHCR system.[96] Similarly, Abbott's administration continuously refused to process asylum applications of those living in the detention camps they established on the remote islands of Nauru and Manus. As of writing in December 2018, a number of people are still living in these camps, with at least 42 children having been born while in detention, which is not what one would assume Abbott meant in his romanticizing, "...the notion of civilization [as] a trust between the living...and the yet to be born."[97],[98] Following up,, Abbott explains that the will of

---

[95] Masquelier, Charles, *Critique and Resistance in a Neoliberal Age: Towards a Narrative of Emancipation*, (London: Palgrave Macmillan Ltd., 2017), 19.

[96] Refugee Council of Australia, *Department of Immigration and Border Protection's Annual Report 2015-16.*

[97] *"Transcript: Tony Abbott's Controversial Speech at the Margaret Thatcher Lecture".*

[98] Amin, Mridula and Isabella Kwai, "The Nauru Experience: Zero-Tolerance Immigration and Suicidal Children", New York Times, 05 Nov. 2018.

the people, democracy or the rule of law is truthfully not his greatest concern citing, "It was about getting things done. It wasn't about achieving consensus; it was about doing the right thing."[99] Beginning to shine through in this statement is the invocation of a higher moral authority on the part of Abbott—a subtly deceiving element that will be explored in greater detail in the accompanying sections. It is remarkable to see the Australian Prime Minister making such a claim and furthermore, offering the direction for his contemporaries to follow suit in this endeavor—to ignore the democratic values which most Western countries are enshrined upon to urgently "get things done" rather than obtain consensus. This relates to the previously explored securitization process of refugee matters that has covertly occurred in the 21st century. Such States have elevated migration and refugee issues to an extraordinary level of danger/importance, which has garnered permission for certain extra-judicial decisions and questionable policies in the name of national security.

### 3.1.2 Precarious Prosperity

In Abbott's speech at the MTI Address, he explicitly asserts the strength of "Western civilization" as a justification for political action multiple times. Firstly, Abbott himself presupposes some inherent danger of an amorphous group of refugees by labeling them to his audience as a "nation-changing, culture-shifting" population that must be managed.[100] Embedded in this simple statement, it is possible to witness the beginnings of the dehumanization process which contributes to distinguishing who is "worthy" or not of protection and assistance.[101] There is an air of disdain in his statement, as though the refugee situation is another annoyance for the West to *manage*. Abbott goes on to directly call on European leaders to recapture the ethos of Thatcherism by, "...managing [these] population transfers [by] winning the fight in Syria and Iraq...and *asserting Western civilization* against the challenge of militant Islam."[102] Homogenizing the entire Islamic faith as "militant" is arguably tired rhetoric, lacking nuance and repeatedly proven false in the statistical actualities of terrorism and violence today, yet is nonetheless an important element of the speech to draw attention to. The repetitive conflation of Islam with militancy/violence and moreover, the ease in which certain political leaders do so, has

---

[99] *"Transcript: Tony Abbott's Controversial Speech at the Margaret Thatcher Lecture".*
[100] Ibid.
[101] Cohen, *"Who is a Refugee?".*
[102] *"Transcript: Tony Abbott's Controversial Speech at the Margaret Thatcher Lecture".*

only become acceptable due to the steady hammering that conservative leaders like Abbott have done throughout the 21st century and should not be ignored in continuing analyses.

A constant imaginary of the Western agenda, the dualities of "modern progress" and "backward tradition" are omnipresent in the relationship between the Global North and South. The "prosperous" West continues to see itself as the pinnacle of progress and as the template for the future of all societies, with development and modernity expected to be crafted in its image. These qualities are expressed in almost every facet of the modern refugee narrative. For a moment in the MTI Address, Abbott drifts from the demonizing of individual migrants to comment on his perceived anarchical nature of the entirety of their societies. He lets his opinion on non-Western nations be known stating, "...the Syrian conflict escalated, extended into Iraq, and metastasized into the *ungoverned spaces* of Libya, Yemen, Nigeria, and Afghanistan."[103] Brought forward here is the immensely problematic issue of what constitutes an "ungoverned space" or a failed state—a whole library of scholarship dissecting the neo-Oriental nature of such a claim.[104],[105] Ultimately, Abbott here engages in an action postcolonial scholars greatly criticize—the idea that a nation or people operating outside the confines of Western order/preference means that they are politically empty or in this case, completely "ungoverned". This premise alludes to a prevalent narrative in the Western ethos, which deems anyone/anyplace of the Global South as without a coherent order, let alone history, worth mentioning before its interaction with the West. Furthermore, these narratives disregard the worthiness of their place within the international community with any alternative to Western-style order as subpar. In this construction, the West is strengthened as prosperous, progressive, and thus more advanced, than the anarchical Other. Abbott goes on to reinforce the backwardness of the Global South and the Islamic world, deeming its "allure across the globe" as "perverse".[106] Consistent in the refugee narrative is the blurring of the distinction between jihadist dissident groups and all the Islamic world. Evidently, this instills a certain degree of reasonable fear and skepticism for those people listening and trusting in Abbott (and his contemporaries) to be acting in their interest. The pervasiveness of this lack of distinction between people who practice Islam and "militant Islamists" is the core of what has led to the passive public permission for Abbott's administration

---

[103] *"Transcript: Tony Abbott's Controversial Speech at the Margaret Thatcher Lecture".*
[104] Call, Charles T., "The Fallacy of the 'Failed State'", *in Third World Quarterly, vol. 29.8,* (2008).
[105] Newman, Edward, "Failed States and International Order: Constructing a Post-Westphalian World", *in Contemporary Security Policy, vol. 30.3,* (2009), 424.
[106] *"Transcript: Tony Abbott's Controversial Speech at the Margaret Thatcher Lecture".*

to lock innocent refugee men, women, and children, on islands isolated in the South Pacific for years on end as deterrence measures rather than to help those same people find safety and protection.

In another claim leaning on the isolated idea of Western prosperity, Abbott asserts, "Our moral obligation is to receive people fleeing for their lives. It is not to provide permanent residency to anyone and everyone *who would rather live in a prosperous Western country* than their own."[107] This argument has been parroted by conservative leaders everywhere seeking to shirk the responsibilities their countries already made per the UDHR; this sentiment conflates forced migrants as economic migrants. Even further, however, a statement such as this equates both forced and economic migrants as *opportunistic* rather than necessary or in some cases desperate. Abbott's claim is ultimately used as a justification for sending refugees back to the country they technically first arrived in, which is almost always simply a neighboring country(as most forced migrants naturally flee by foot, car or small boat, however, that first country most often does not have the resources to provide for that refugee population.[108] This has meant that the first arrival country may be a degree safer than the one the refugees fled from, but places the burden of responsibility on those "unlucky" to be nearest to conflict and the instability of others' politics. For this reason, at this time eighty percent of refugees were residing in just ten countries, of which nine of those do not fit the "prosperous Western" model Abbott defends.[109] This strain has been evidenced in the 2015 situation particularly in Turkey and Lebanon. Abbott's statement similarly invokes the acceptance of refugees as simply a moral obligation on part of the receiving countries like Australia. Here the complexities of relying on "morality" in the political landscape starts to be woven into the conversation around how and why the nations of the Global North should manage the refugee situation both inside their own borders and beyond. Abbott's alluding to a moral obligation provokes the questions of: Who's morals? Where do these morals emanate from? It is argued that on one hand, morals are religiously or culturally-loaded while on the other, something like a country's *values* can be more secular or

---

[107] *Transcript: Tony Abbott's Controversial Speech at the Margaret Thatcher Lecture".*
[108] Phillips, Melissa and Kathrine Starup, "Protection Challenges of Mobility", *in Forced Migration Review, vol. 47*, (2014).
[109] UNHCR, *Report: Mid-Year Trends 2016*, 2017, Geneva, Switzerland: UNHCR, 9.

politically-loaded.[110] For this reason, the distinction of the morality Abbott is claiming to represent is significant and will be explored further.

In the National Security Address Abbott justifies, "Not only has Australia suffered at the hands of terrorists—but so have Canada, France, Denmark, Iraq, Egypt, Libya, Nigeria, Japan, Jordan, the United Kingdom, and the United States." As an analytical tool, CDA prompts us to look at structure and form in textual analysis and while this is difficult in the context of a speech rather than formal documents, for example, this statement by Abbott is incredibly illustrative of how the writing form is used as a narrative tool; in this case used to position Australian morality along specific partisan lines. This statement carries out the continued task of folding Australia's importance into the global community—those who are in the amorphous and ongoing "fight against terror"—meanwhile, equating its struggles to the extremes of the rest of the hegemonic Global North. However, in structural analysis it is possible to see the ordering of those countries in a certain order to achieve a specific goal. Abbott starts his list of compatriots with Canada and France, then folds in countries like Egypt and Libya (of whom would also be the "Other" in this grouping) and caps off the list with the United Kingdom and the United States. This tool, called the serial-position effect, establishes the natural tendency of people to remember the first and last items in a list the best, while the middle items the worst.[111] This is a common tactic in speech writing generally and is utilized by Abbott in this instance to allude to a grand scale of the fight against terrorism but at the same time, bookending this assertion with the countries they would prefer to be associated more closely with. The scale of the threat is increased by lengthening the list in number, including the countries that do not fit in with the dominant narrative such as Iraq or Nigeria by attempting to brush their significance subtly away by sandwiching them in between the countries France and the United States. This is a common element of the narrative which exaggerates the effects of forced migration on Western countries while simultaneously discrediting the factual evidence that the countries hosting the most refugee populations are indeed also those with limited resources in the Global South.

---

[110] Obiezu, Emeka Christian, *Towards a Politics of Compassion: Socio-political dimensions of Christian responses to suffering*, (Bloomington, IN: AuthorHouse, 2008).
[111] Pashler, Harold (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Mind, vol. 1*, (Sage Reference, 2013).

## *3.2 Conquest*

*"[Thatcher] refused to accept the post-war consensus that Britain's great days were over...she was convinced that the world was more likely to prosper if Britain was a serious country with a global role rather than just another province in the united states of Europe."[112]*

Two methods of "conquest" can be seen in today's political rhetoric which parallel Orientalist colonialisms that promote the idea of a divine right to continue conquering the world. The first method of conquest can be understood as a conquest of nature or physical territory. This fits more in line with a classical theoretical school of thought on man's ambition to control the anarchical nature of the world.[113] The second method of conquest can be understood as a psychological, temporal project or a *conquest of the mind*. It is less overt and alludes to more of a psychological undertaking in which the Oppressor dictates how the Other should be seen, and therefore, how they should be treated. Both methods, however, are inextricably intertwined. Foucault's conceptions of *biopower* and *governmentality* are useful tools to understand this ethos as covert mechanisms which are employed to influence the way people live; these mechanisms influence people to operate within the realm or confines of a society ordered in a way that the state prefers. Political rhetoric is thus one way to demonize and dehumanize groups of "Others" so that the general population subtly begins to agree with certain political actions – in this case, to gain support for anti-immigration policies. This is evidently necessary for a democratic country where the leadership needs the permission from the people to engage in ways which go directly against its codified values. This narrativizing can be done in many ways, aiming to tap into the collective psyches of the people and embed itself in norms and values. When examining the narrativizing of political rhetoric it is arguably useful to look to other forms of explicit storytelling as emblematic of societal norms and values of a moment in time. Ling draws on recurring literary characterizations to prove how oppressive Orientalist stereotypes are reproduced for modern context. Ling explains:

> One enduring source of Self/Other relations for Asia and the West comes from that ultimate, fictional fiend, Dr. Fu Manchu. Highly intelligent, sophisticated, and seemingly unstoppable, [he] represents an archetypical (local) Oriental Other who,

---

[112] *"Transcript: Tony Abbott's Controversial Speech at the Margaret Thatcher Lecture"*.

[113] However, Ling, amongst others, also argue that much of this "inherent human need" to tame the natural world is similarly a product of Christian teachings/values, not inherently of human biology.

despite his education and worldliness, stands incorrigibly outside of and against the (global) Western Self – yet seemingly so tantalizingly within reach.[114]

Ling writes that globalization has reproduced Orientalist characterizations of oppressive power imbalances as it, "...grants all the power, agency, and dynamism previously given to the Western colonial man [to the domineering West, meanwhile relegating] the passivity and invisibility of the feminized, native Other," to the local.[115] This gendered, stereotyping aspect of Orientalist rhetoric can be seen in the construction of the amorphous Refugee as the "Oriental Other". This typecasting places autonomy and agency in those who embody an idealized, masculinized Anglo-image standing for the logical, strong side of humanity. On the other hand, the subordinated Other is seen as being crafted in the image of someone embodying an intrinsic cunning nature and inevitable weakness, thus equating that Other to an antiquated feminine or emotional nature (therefore, lacking logic). Ling, amongst others, draws on recurring stereotypes utilized in fictional Western portrayals of Asian characters and society to illustrate this point, arguing for the usefulness of utilizing fiction "as an analytical map to track the hidden cultural narratives of globalization" that are prevalent in political rhetoric surrounding the assumed identities of forced migrants.[116]

### *3.2.1 Of Nature & Mind*

Across both speeches, Abbott blatantly disregards the imbalance and historical context of the relationship between the Anglo-Global North and the Global South, romanticizing old racisms as though the figures or events referenced are a part of some greater, unchallenged European golden age. In the MTI Address, Abbott goes on to reference his time as a young student at Oxford University in England to recall the spirit of one of the most notable racist icons in history, Enoch Powell, to remind modern Britons that though he is Australian, they have a shared history and culture. These ties are of great importance to the overall reinforcement of the Anglo-identity and anti-immigration rhetoric overall. To achieve these ends, Abbott recalls sharing the experience of the British perception of the Argentine Falklands War. He recalls, "...the shock Britons felt at the Argentine invasion...On the Falklands, [Thatcher] did not see an Argentine grievance to be

---

[114] Ling, *Postcolonial International Relations: Conquest and Desire between Asia and the West,* 82.
[115] Ibid.
[116] Ibid.

negotiated but a monstrous violation of British sovereignty."[117] To anyone not in the immediate glow of British hegemony, this statement can be read as extraordinarily short-sighted and even as a racist "dog whistle" to the like-minded leaders of his audience. Dissecting the power relations embedded in such a statement is perhaps obvious: In one swift narrative which rewrote the realities of its imperial history, Abbott crafts an unchallenged strength and legacy of the British empire. His imagination simultaneously erases the experiences and agency of the vast web of those oppressed by European imperialism directly and indirectly. In this attempt, he builds his narrative's foundation on a legacy which has been tested before, won despite the challenges, and will (in his eyes) undoubtedly win again.

Abbott repeatedly reminds his audience of the ways in which the British ethos has been historically hinged on the ideas of exceptionalism and conquest, as noted in the quotation headlining this section. The history of conquest that Britain revels in can thusly be seen as its *crowning glory*. Therefore, the ethos of "conquest" can be seen not simply as a moment in the collective Commonwealth past, but a mechanism which it needs to continue surviving. Arguably, this is one of many reasons why the refugee situation of 2015 was raised to the platform of an exceptional "crisis" to be urgently managed or *securitized* in political agendas. The need to have a common enemy to rally against and then defeat is a prevalent theme throughout the combined histories of the Global North in particular.[118] It is evident that the abnormal influx of refugees was captured by the imaginations of politicians and demonized as the common enemy of the era. Abbott roots his presumptuous authority to give direct advice to European leaders based on his explicit claim that his government "conquered" the refugee situation in their own backyard. He states clearly, "Australia is the only country that has successfully defeated [the refugee problem] – twice."[119] This authority claimed is equated again to Thatcher's response to the Argentine invasion and further used to advocate for more European leaders to use the same tactics in the amount of force and [inhumane] deterrence measures. The "mission accomplished" attitude of conquering the refugee situation on Australia's shores is utilized by Abbott to prove his legitimacy and establish some track-record of success to follow. Abbott stokes fears that if an offensive military attack is not taken by the leaders of affected Europe, then their opposition will.

---

[117] *"Transcript: Tony Abbott's Controversial Speech at the Margaret Thatcher Lecture"*.

[118] While the idea of creating community around a "common enemy" is not solely a Western one, critics like Ling and Abu-Lughod specifically note the more fluid, collectivist mindset that much of the Global South based their communities on before the imposition of the Westphalian state system.

[119] *"Transcript: Tony Abbott's Controversial Speech at the Margaret Thatcher Lecture"*.

He states, "...as Margaret Thatcher so clearly understood over the Falklands: those who won't use decisive force, where needed, end up being dictated to by those who will."[120] In focus problematically, is the idea that the Australian (or European) governments are fighting an equal foe and the only options are starkly opposed: either conquer or be conquered. At this moment Abbott refers to launching attacks on Syria to attack the refugee problem from its place of origin. However, in examining who is genuinely affected by this rhetoric, it appears Abbott is unable to separate the fighting in Syria from the people affected by the fighting, thus being forced to flee as refugees. This is a common problem embedded within the refugee narrative from 2015, which equates all Muslims – or in this case all people from Syria – as militant and thus, a force to fight against. At its core, this blurring of government, rebel fighters, and civilians, goes against the principles of the commitments made by Western nations to refugees as outlined in chapter one. These dichotomous categorizations of good/bad lack critical evaluation or nuance perpetuate the idea that Western prosperity has been cultivated in isolation, erasing history and responsibility for many centuries of meddling in much of the Global South's political landscape. This short-sightedness is exemplified by Abbott's claim that, "Naturally, the safety and prosperity that exists almost uniquely in Western countries is an irresistible magnet. These blessings are not the accidents of history but the product of values painstakingly discerned and refined, and of practices carefully cultivated and reinforced over hundreds of years."[121] While weaving together elements of all three sub-themes being examined, the problematic blindness which perpetuates the notion that Western prosperity has been an isolated ahistorical endeavor is emphasized in this one blatant statement. The "accidents of history" which allowed for the West to dominate while the Global South navigated what was left in its wake, are now deemed those unstable, ungoverned, and "backward" nations, who produce refugees. The complete exoneration of the lasting impacts of the European imperialism is common in debates about [forced] migration in the 21st century but is rarely so explicitly put forward as Abbott has done in his MTI Address.

### 3.2.2 The Mechanisms Within

Repetition is not a complex rhetorical tool; however, Abbott and his contemporaries have proven it to be incredibly effective in carrying out their anti-immigration aims. It has already been

---

[120] *"Transcript: Tony Abbott's Controversial Speech at the Margaret Thatcher Lecture".*
[121] Ibid.

argued that the steady hammering of this refugee narrative is what has contributed to its normalization. Upon closer examination, it is possible to see how this has been done through the more minute repetition of specific ideas. In the National Security Address, not only are the repetition of ideas present, but the repetition of specific phrasings is used to embed Australian morality as superior to the barbaric "Other". Two specific phrasings stand out from this Address, building onto the identity and legitimacy of conquest as outlined previously.

Remarkably, the casual (yet purposeful) way in which Abbott nicknames the terrorist organization in question as a/the "death cult", stands out from the pool of normative security policies and jargon in his National Security Address. Abbott uses the term "death cult" presumably to reference Daesh or the Islamic State (as he mentions quite often as his focus in comparable contexts), but at this time does not specify which jihadist or terrorist organization he is condemning. He groups all of those who do not fit into the standard preferred neoliberal order as a homogenous danger. "Death cult" as a nickname for a vague violent group of "Others" out in the world is used eight distinct times throughout this Address though only once in the MTI Address. The nickname can be seen most often used in combination with the word "Islamist" or when referring to anything about Syria or Iraq. Arguably, Abbott has a habit of relegating these entire countries as one homogenous terrorist training ground; the fluidity in which Abbott calls Islamists and rebel groups as "death cults" begins to take on a cartoonish quality the more it is repeated. The repetition normalizes the association and deepens the passive association between Islam, terrorism, and the imagination of "death cults", presumably meant to instill fear in his audience. The cartoonish mysticism is reinforced as Abbott tells the audience that he has seen his fellow Australians "succumb to the lure" of these death cults.[122] This phrasing makes it appear that there is an illogical trance compelling those who give credence to the Islamic worldview, again homogenizing the entire culture and religion as participating in this cultish behavior. It is made to be cartoonish or otherworldly at the least, in order to dehumanize the people that they are imposing their extrajudicial security measures on and closing their borders to. This is arguably a necessary piece of the psychological project presented here as the *conquest of mind.* In this National Security Address, Abbott reveals to the public all the "security measures" his administration has swiftly taken. Many of these measures, however, can be understood as

---

[122] "Transcript: National Security Statement: Tony Abbott flags crackdown on Australians involved in terrorism," *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 23 Feb. 2015.

infringing on the established freedoms and rights to privacy of citizens. The measures being enacted read eerily similar to the infamous Patriot Act, signed into legislation in the United States by President George W. Bush in 2001, prefacing the surveillance and securitized state that would be increasingly enacted throughout the War on Terror. Abbott cites the actions already being taken by his administration as,

> The Data Retention Bill...is the vital next step in giving our agencies the tools they need to keep Australia safe. Access to metadata is the common element to most successful counter-terrorism investigations...Today, I am releasing the Counter-Terrorism review…[which finds] that we face a new, long-term era of heightened terrorism threat, with a much more significant 'homegrown' element…[It recommends] strengthening our counter-terrorism strategy...The government will...act as quickly as possible...ensure returning foreign fighters are prosecuted or closely monitored...appoint a National Counter-Terrorism Coordinator…[develop amendments] so that we can revoke or suspend Australian citizenship in the case of dual nationals...enforcing our strengthened terrorism advocacy laws.

It has been argued that Abbott's alarmist rhetoric has conflated immigrants broadly as the Other and the Other as an omnipresent threat both to Australian security and identity. Abbott's argued urgent need to act in the face of this extraordinary security threat has allowed for the disintegration of actual codified democratic values which he and his contemporaries claim is at stake by accepting refugees into their society. Furthermore, it has produced a state which can extrajudicially surveil and prosecute anyone it claims is a threat without due process. The mechanisms which enabled Bush's Guantanamo and Abbott's Nauru and Manus Islands to come to fruition can be understood as more closely related than not.

## *3.3 Christian Values*

> *"Yet the worse the times and the higher the stakes, the less matters can be left in the 'too hard' [to confront] basket… [Western nations] need the confidence to stand up for ourselves and for the universal decencies of mankind, lest the world rapidly become a much worse place."[123]*

In a nation such as Australia whose laws and constitution enshrines religious freedom and is ultimately a secular State, the invocation of Christian values as the basis for its stable society is problematic for a variety of both obvious and complex reasons. Leaning on Christian values as standard has been key in past Orientalist discourse and persists today even though most nations in the Global North are codified as secular.[124] Asserting religion into the debate on how to manage the refugee situation is arguably the most visceral and emotionally manipulative of all. It relies on provoking deeply embedded historical dichotomies of "us versus them" into the modern-day political arena where it otherwise would not be relevant. Two significant connections can be drawn from the Christian assertions made by Abbott and traced throughout the dominant refugee narrative, including (1) the invocation of an obvious moral hierarchy, and (2) the use of prophetic language as a call to action.

A notable radical critic of Christianity in politics and culture, René Girard, explains the significance of religious values and apocalyptic narratives in international relations. Though Girard's own critics (such as Gardner) claim he expresses "Catholicity as the true bearer of the 'idea' or 'meaning' of Europe" (thus perhaps contributing to the narrative being examined in this paper) his critical dissections of Christianity in Western politics are a fruitful resource for analyzing morality and apocalyptic rhetoric.[125] Based on a reflection of the shift in rhetoric in the post-9/11 world, Girard aptly predicted the shift from ideological to cultural/religious differences in the West's focus on a common enemy.[126] This has increasingly manifested in pitting Christianity as diametrically opposed to Islam, therefore the population which follows Islam as inherently incompatible with the West. The prophetic, apocalyptic underpinnings of these religions are significant, Girard argues, as both Christianity and Islam outline conflicting

---

[123] *"Transcript: Tony Abbott's Controversial Speech at the Margaret Thatcher Lecture".*

[124] McIntyre, Andrew, "The Secular West and the Dangerous Quest for Meaning", *in the Institute of Public Affairs Review*, (March 2002): 18-19.

[125] Gardner, Stephen L., "René Girard's Apocalyptic Critique or Historical Reason: Limiting Politics to Make Way for Faith", *in Contagion: Journal of Violence, Mimesis, and Culture, vol. 18,* (Michigan SUP, 2011.

[126] Doran, R. and Girard, R, "Apocalyptic Thinking after 9/11: An Interview with René Girard", *in SubStance, vol. 37.1(115): Cultural Theory after 9/11: Terror, Religion, Media,* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008): 28.

legitimations of the relationships (or balance) between divinity, humanity, and violence.[127] Through the increasing importance of these oppositions, it is clearer to see *why* politicians so readily and swiftly equate Western values as synonymous with Christian values. Arguably, neoliberal values have been closely modeled on Christian values from the start and the conflict on such vital issues as violence and the very role of humans in the world challenges the very legitimacy of the hegemonic Western order. The political discourse in question is one example of *how* exactly this becomes an effective tool for division in the modern era.

### 3.3.1 Apocryphal Language

Religiously-charged inflammatory descriptors anchored throughout Abbott's MTI Address allude to the refugee narrative as an undertaking of biblical proportions. One could argue the incendiary language used by Abbott is solely an attempt at the dramatic. However, it is also possible to see Abbott's language as purposefully *apocalyptic* as Christian vernacular would understand it. Abbott begins by invoking intentional signifiers such as "*catastrophic*" to describe the effects of the impending refugee situation. The apocalyptic rhetoric continues throughout, utilizing descriptors/signifiers relegating problems of refugee flows are "*wicked*" similarly claiming that, "...all countries that say 'anyone who gets here can stay here' are...*in peril*".[128] Rich descriptors such as these attempt to appeal to audiences as if their dealing with atypical flows of forced migrants is some prophetic situation wherein the people (believers) must respond to the call to action and defend the purity (holiness) of their civilization against invaders. Again, this draws parallels between the biblical prophecy of end-of-the-world times to help reinforce the "missionary calling" or justification for defending their identity and society as outlined previously. The vision being crafted here deepens the divide between the established apparent "Christian West" and "Islamic Middle East" homogenizing both as essentially each other's opposite and equating this moment in history as extraordinary or even as the markers of the beginning of a Holy War. This type of emotional manipulation not only justifies Abbott's fortress-mentality toward protecting Australia's borders but deepens the divide in society socially, exaggerating intangible cultural differences to an uncompromising degree.

---

[127] Doran and Girard, *"Apocalyptic Thinking after 9/11: An Interview with René Girard",* 28.
[128] *"Transcript: Tony Abbott's Controversial Speech at the Margaret Thatcher Lecture".*

Abbott warns dealing with the flows of migrants, "...will require some force...massive logistics and expense. It will gnaw at [their] consciences—yet it is the only way to prevent a *tide of humanity* surging through Europe and quite possibly changing it forever."[129] The imagery brought forth by equating refugees to a "tide of humanity" is visceral. Plausibly, it invokes the most colloquially well-known prophetic warnings: that of floods.[130] On one hand, the imagery of a great "tide" is enough to instill fear in the sheer scale and destruction it implies. On the other hand, one widely-accepted interpretation of the greatest biblical flood story of all, Noah's Ark, speaks to the idea that the people facing the flood were being divinely tested as a moral awakening.[131] This visceral imagery again weaves together the moral calling brought forth to Western nations facing this dilemma or "tide" of migrants. By drawing parallels with this imaginary, Abbott strips the refugee situation of its substantive political weight and forces it into a narrative equivalent to these slated biblical proportions therefore excluding nuanced conversations about political cooperation and responsibility. One could go a step further and argue that the Christian response proposed by leaders like Abbott has been so strong and seen as a truly great test of Western strength to hold against the shift that globalization and migration have been bringing to international order due to the biblical relationship between the Great Flood and Christian prophecy. Cohn argues that one of the oldest and most commonly agreed upon elements across Judeo-Christian bible interpretations is that the Flood was presented as, "...in a sense prefiguring the End of Time," prefacing of the return of Christ.[132] Thus, rather than facing the refugee situation from a place of necessary international cooperation, Christian proponents like Abbott hijacked the narrative for their personal gain to further monopolize their own power.

### 3.3.2 On Morality

It is evident that the invocation of Christian values is a tactic which Abbott relies heavily upon crafting his anti-immigration narrative that has criminalized refugees. "Cultural differences" are a most commonly cited reason for arguing against Western nations taking in refugees, as though people who are forcibly migrating would inherently clash with and co-opt the culture of the

---

[129] *"Transcript: Tony Abbott's Controversial Speech at the Margaret Thatcher Lecture".*
[130] Cohn, Norman, *Noah's Flood: The Genesis Story in Western Thought*, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1996), 23.
[131] Ibid.
[132] Ibid.

receiving country.[133] In the MTI Address, Abbott stokes this fire stating,

> Implicitly or explicitly, the imperative to 'love your neighbor as you love yourself' is at the heart of every Western polity...It's what makes us *decent* and *humane* countries as well as prosperous ones, but right now this wholesome instinct is leading much of Europe into catastrophic error.[134]

While this statement most explicitly invokes biblical Christian teachings (with a direct quote from bible passage Mark 12:31) it also naturally implicitly says its inverse. This is a tactic also often used by Abbott and his contemporaries to covertly craft the dualities of the "us versus them" narrative. Therefore, along with the dichotomous mindset showed, this statement simply implies: if Western societies abide by the framework of Christian values, then everyone else must not. The effort here can be understood as crafting a normative understanding which asserts the idea that the West is so inherently distinct from all Others, it would be an explosive demolition of their culture to incorporate those Others into Western society. The first underlying connection equivalently implicates that those who are part of the non-West cannot be that—decent or humane—according to his own personal standards. This implicit understanding lays the foundation for the way Abbott pins his own (and his administration's) morality as inherently greater and more legitimate than the Other's. Further, this assertion warps with a Christian understanding of the world wherein average well-intentioned people are called to missionary work through some divine calling. This "moral imperative" has acted as the core justification of many Western interventions and policies in both the recent and distant past. Abbott exclaims, "There was a *moral dimension* and an *intellectual clarity* that made [Thatcher] a hero,"[135] again reinforcing the historical combination of ultimate morality and logic of Western action. He asserts small reminders of this Christian foundation by condemning the European situation as having been caused by "*misguided altruism*" meanwhile stopping boat arrivals and restoring border security as the "only truly *compassionate* thing to do".[136] Arguably, these bombastic assertions seek to temper the consciousnesses of anyone listening who may otherwise be a moderate in the case of managing the refugee situation—able see the humanity in the people

---

[133] Postelnicescu, Claudia, "Europe's New Identity: The refugee crisis and the rise of nationalism", *in Europe's Journal of Psychology, vol. 12.2,* (2016).
[134] *"Transcript: Tony Abbott's Controversial Speech at the Margaret Thatcher Lecture".*
[135] Ibid.
[136] Ibid.

affected, but leaning toward a conservative solution—and appeal to their Christian morality, turning them into missionaries for such a cause as the Abbott Administration's deterrence measures. Abbott closes warning, "...*justice tempered by mercy* is an exacting ideal, as too much mercy for some necessarily undermines justice for all." Combining some elements of neoliberalism with the Christian ethos of "mercy", Abbott justifies the Australian unwillingness to accept refugees as a noble action in pursuit of greater good. In *Towards a Politics of Compassion*, Obiezu notes that "mercy is a feeling often misconstrued as compassion" deducing that "mercy carries the connotation of superiority and subordination and is often situated in wrongdoing."[137] Abbott thus, appeals to the already-intensifying idea of "fortress Europe" which claims that there are not possibly enough capacities, resources or mercy, for the Western community to help the millions of refugees fleeing today.[138] This is perhaps the most egregious assertion of all. Not only does Abbott put a full stop on a conversation about *how* to manage the situation, but he also goes beyond his own jurisdiction and reverts it back to a hard-lined contrast of should Europe help or not. Furthermore, his moral justification for these inhumane detention policies makes it appear that the situation is beyond his control, as though restricted to unwillingly maintain the inhumane asylum policies, as though suffering on some level is an inevitable condition of humanity.

In his addresses both domestic and international, Abbott relies often on the inherent "decency" that the West (and its values) holds. Abbott parrots himself in his National Security Address stating first, "...we will not let our enemies exploit our decency," going on to plead, "we cannot allow bad people to use our good nature against us."[139] This has been argued as problematic because of the way in which Abbott utilizes these assertions, implicitly excluding the Global South from being decent or good-natured. The addresses weave together democratic, neoliberal, and Christian values, as one conglomeration of "decency" and moral hierarchy that Western nations base their actions and policies on. In the National Security Address, Abbott proves this with an emphasis on decent versus barbaric religious values stating,

> We have seen on our TV screens and in our newspapers the evidence of the new dark age that has settled over much of Syria and Iraq. We have seen the beheadings, the mass executions, the crucifixions and the sexual slavery in the name of religion.

---

[137] Obiezu, *Towards a Politics of Compassion: Socio-political dimensions of Christian responses to suffering*, 21.
[138] Crawley, Heaven, "Introduction: Europe – fortress or refuge?", *in Forced Migration Review, vol. 23*, (2005).
[139] *"Transcript: National Security Statement: Tony Abbott flags crackdown on Australians involved in terrorism."*

> There is no grievance here that can be addressed; there is no cause here that can be satisfied; it is the demand to submit—or die.[140]

In this statement, it is possible to see the patterns of combining religious and visceral imagery that is used across domestic and international audiences to invoke fear and ascertain barbarism on behalf of this "Other". This statement was used in part as justification for some new invasive security measures as well as breaking down of privacy and due-process laws. The dehumanization process through narrativizing is obvious in this case: Abbott lays the foundation for the idea that the extrajudicial security measures are necessary in the face of such an inhumane evil. His own administration's inhumane policies (such as the offshore "processing centers") are justified somehow as fighting "evil with evil" or an extra strong hand in the face of dissidence which goes beyond acceptable tactics of violence and war. This justification culminates in vilifying the entire religion which they are said to perform these acts in its name. Abbott comments back and forth between security and refugee policies, making the logic of managing either indistinguishable. Abbott uses his own presumptions and observations to make grand sweeping narratives about this entire group of people. The political and social implications are immense: the public receiving these messages increasingly start to accept this as a truthful reality being painted through his consistent plot lines, meanwhile his contemporaries see what he calls "success" in managing the situation with an iron grip and are increasingly convinced this is a viable method for maintaining order, power, and control. The demonization of certain groups of people through religious and cultural attacks rules out any chance for logical rebuttal; these soft-power social issues are less-tangible, less-easily quantifiable, and rely heavily on an emotional pull.[141] Abbott and his contemporaries have tapped into this and filled that emotional narrative with fear.

---

[140] *"Transcript: Tony Abbott's Controversial Speech at the Margaret Thatcher Lecture"*.

[141] Hayes, Jarrod, "Reclaiming Constructivism: Identity and the Practice of the Study of International Relations" *in American Political Science Association,* (Georgia Institute of Technology, 2017), 91.

# Chapter 4: Discussion & Conclusion

In the preceding analysis, three main themes were explored in efforts to dissect the historically embedded motifs of "othering" present within former Australian Prime Minister, Tony Abbott's, discourse surrounding refugee issues in 2015. It has been shown that these themes (given the umbrella terms: Civilization, Conquest, and Christianity), are difficult to disentangle because they are incredibly interwoven and somewhat dependent upon each other. Furthermore, Abbott's discourse is important to examine as it is emblematic of the overarching refugee narrative prevalent throughout much of the Global North during this time; narratives such as Abbott's have contributed to the securitized way refugee issues are managed, having covertly led to the criminalization refugee persons and the asylum-seeking process overall despite international legal precedents. This examination was shown predominantly in the discourse analysis of Abbott's MTI Address (Appendix A). Furthermore, the analysis of the rhetorical mechanisms and the linguistic tools used in Abbott's speechwriting intended to complement the discursive analysis by showing the consistency of his pointed rhetoric across audiences and at various moments in time. These rhetorical tools were most identifiable in his National Security Address (Appendix B). It has been argued that these motifs and mechanisms are not new nor unique—the narrative which perpetuates the hierarchy of Western hegemony over the Global South is recycled rhetoric with roots in Orientalist discourse and imperialist relationships.[142] Arguably, this is a positive insight for those looking to challenge such rhetoric and any controversial policies that have emerged from it due to the breadth of existing research and growing relevance of the topic.

Due to the unique and interdisciplinary nature of her work, this study has drawn greatly from the writings of postcolonial scholar, Lily Ling, to explore the posed research question. Ling's work uses less-tangible soft-power concepts such as language and cultural practices (i.e. spirituality, traditions, and literature) to prove the power of storytelling in IR, critically examining hegemonic narratives and proposing alternative ways to restructure global relations and power more broadly. Within these analyses is a challenging of what constitutes IR theory and moreover, where future researchers should and could be looking for fresh insights into

---

[142] Samiei, "*Neo-Orientalism? The relationship between the West and Islam in our globalized world*".

global relations beyond the confines of typical academia. Ling sharply sums up an overarching critique crucial to this paper and postcolonial developments overall, refined to the claim that: *Englishness [and the Anglo-Christian identity] has been constructed primarily through its relationship with others*.[143] The exclusionary nature of this relationship is summed up by cultural theorist Stuart Hall quoted by Ling (1997: 21) who explains this is because Englishness presumes, "...when you know what everybody else is, then *you are what they are not*. Identity is always...a structured representation which only achieves its positive through the narrow eye of the negative."[144] This can be understood as the crux of the *why* behind the increasingly inflammatory refugee narrative, of which is contributing to the political "fortress" mentality that caught traction across many Western nations around 2015, resulting in refugee persons being treated as criminals or "illegal invaders".[145] Ling's work reminds critics that this general mentality is embedded specifically in Western values and order (historically as well as today) by juxtaposing an abundance of research on alternative Global South traditions/relations to demonstrate alternative worldviews. Ling, amongst others, has concluded much of these lesser-examined relations have engrained societal makeups which can be understood more closely to that of *interdependence* and *collectivism* rather than exclusion, especially when dealing with foreign groups or opposing ideologies.[146],[147] Thus, this paper has sought to complement Ling's existing research and the constructivist literature by illustrating how the dichotomous nature of the current neoliberal order and the "us versus them" narrative are fully [Western] constructs. Thus, in utilizing a constructivist framework, it can be understood that these constructs are likewise capable of being dismantled to create space for new narratives which suit the modern realities of forced migration specifically, as well as serve a more progressive and equitable political landscape overall.

On a more challenging note: Though the analysis presented has sought to challenge the pervasive imbalance in power that has allowed Western politicians to criminalize refugees simply through their discourse, it also aims to challenge "whiteness" or the Anglo-Christian identity/ positionality in academia and politics more broadly. At the forefront of much dynamic

---

[143] Ling, *Postcolonial International Relations: Conquest and Desire between Asia and the West,* 88.
[144] Ibid.
[145] Crawley, *"Introduction: Europe – fortress or refuge?".*
[146] Ling, *Postcolonial International Relations: Conquest and Desire between Asia and the West.*
[147] Qin, Yaqing, "A Relational Theory of World Politics" *in International Studies Review*, (Oxford University Press, 2016).

constructivist and especially postcolonial scholarship today, is the goal of refocusing IR theorizing (that which is situated predominantly in Europe and North America) to examine itself and white/hegemonic self-representation, preferences, and the more covert mechanisms of domination—which is long overdue. The projection of the "white sense of self" noted by social and cultural anthropologist Gloria Wekker, arguably comes from the privilege of the Global North being able to tell their own story, rather than is often the case of the Global South—that someone else speaks for you.[148],[149],[150] This is a pervasive issue in IR theorizing and the issue of "who speaks for whom" should be challenged often and critically.[151] Thus, the ability to craft another's narrative is a remarkably effective tool for reinforcing hegemonic power and sustaining this centuries-long project of imperialist domination. Wekker's cross-examination of identity, culture, and power, is one example of why such an interdisciplinary approach is necessary to not just this paper but to academic research altogether.

This paper has argued that the *how* of the ways in which "Englishness" (positioned as the oppressive Global North) functions has been carried out effectively and covertly through carefully crafted discourse. This discourse is first put forward by politicians then reproduced through social norms and values resulting in what can be understood, in this case, as the criminalization of refugee persons. Inflammatory political rhetoric has morphed the foci of debates in global politics about responsibility, international legal norms/frameworks, and capacities/resources to protect refugees, into rather one about seemingly incompatible or exclusive dichotomies of identity, culture, and religion, between the Global North and South. The strength of narrative in sculpting international relations largely fits into the central framework of constructivist theory.[152] Politicians use this purposefully crafted discourse to strengthen their own power—as a tool of governmentality and keeping order in the short-term. However, over the long-term, these narratives have more sinister effects in strengthening the

---

[148] Wekker's notable book *White Innocence* provides a radical "ethnography of dominant white self-representation" in the Dutch context, but contends to strongly suspect that with national variations, similar configurations are "operative in other international settings that have an imperial history" (2016: 2).

[149] Wekker, Gloria, *White Innocence: Paradoxes of Colonialism and Race*, (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2016).

[150] Nigerian novelist, Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie, eloquently embraces this idea as "The Danger of a Single Story".

[151] Smith, Karen, "Has Africa Got Anything to Say? African Contributions to the Theoretical Development of International Relations", *in The Round Table, vol. 98(402)*, (Routledge, June 2009).

[152] Hayes, *"Reclaiming Constructivism: Identity and the Practice of the Study of International Relations",* 91.

hegemonic power of the Global North. These careful narratives have reinforced historically inequitable relationships and craft new spheres of influence, or covert spaces of exception, which oppress the targeted population of refugees—demonizing arguably the most vulnerable and disempowered group in modern history as the inescapable Other.

It can be said that it is easier to challenge the dominant order when looking at it through this lens of constructed narratives. To be able to dissect the layers which contribute to the reallocation of oppression in the 21st century (what Wekker deems the "return of the repressed"[153]), to understand its historical relevance and how exactly politicians can utilize such discourses, makes the task of challenging it piece by piece less formidable. The mechanisms which have transformed refugees into "illegal invaders" and criminalized the action of seeking asylum are rooted in well-established and thoroughly investigated narratives of systemic oppression. The all-too-common reactions of "denial, disavowal, and elusiveness"[154] from the public, academics, and policy-makers alike, contribute to the cyclical nature of reproducing these imperialist power inequities. Without challenging these systems and holding politicians accountable for perpetuating such power imbalances, it is impossible to accurately theorize about global relations without blindness, nor is it possible to create equitable policies that reflect the current realities of the globalized world in either domestic or international spheres.[155]

---

[153] Hayes, *"Reclaiming Constructivism: Identity and the Practice of the Study of International Relations",* 91.
[154] Ibid.
[155] This is arguably relevant in further debates on global mobility including updating refugee policies to reflect unprecedented conditions of the 21st century, such as "climate" refugees or the protection/assistance of Internally Displaced Peoples (IDPs), both of which are pressing issues in global politics that the existing international legal frameworks could not have predicted and currently do not address.

# Chapter 5: Appendices

---

*Appendix A: Address at the Margaret Thatcher Institute by Tony Abbott, London, 27 October 2015[156]*

I am both honoured and humbled to give this lecture in memory of Margaret Thatcher, who revived the "great" in Great Britain and whose leadership was the gold standard to which so many others have subsequently aspired.

She was, indeed, the longest serving British prime minister since Walpole; but she was so much more than just an election-winner. A "mind-the-shop" conservative she most emphatically was not. She didn't just respond to events; she shaped them; and, in so doing, she changed Britain and she changed the world. It's true that the world she helped to create: of rising prosperity almost everywhere driven by freer markets; of declining international tension under benign American leadership; and of increasing democratic pluralism inspired by the collapse of communism, now seems a fading dream – but we, her admirers, are here to improve things not to lament them.

Obviously, the defeat of Stephen Harper's government in Canada is a bitter blow – but he changed his country for the better and he proved that conservatives can win elections not once but three times running. In this audience, some may be disappointed that my own prime ministership in Australia lasted two years after removing Labor from office – but as Lord Melbourne is supposed to have said "to be the Queen's first minister (even) for three months is a damn fine thing".

Set against the decisive victory of the Cameron government here – helped by Lynton Crosby – and John Key's third straight win in New Zealand, recent developments are hardly the eclipse of conservatism, more the ebb and flow of politics. The lesson of Margaret Thatcher's life is that strong leaders can make a difference; that what's impossible today may be almost inevitable tomorrow; and that optimism is always justified while good people are prepared to "have a go", as we say in Australia.

I was a student, at Oxford, at the time of the Falklands War. I recall the shock Britons felt at the Argentine invasion and their visceral determination to reverse it. I remember thrilling to Enoch Powell's parliamentary admonition that, by her response, the "iron lady's" true mettle would soon be judged – because I sensed that she would not let us down. And I now know, courtesy of Charles Moore's splendid biography, how the response could so easily have been hand-wringing and impotent appeals to the United Nations had Mrs. T not seized upon a military plan brought to her by a relatively junior officer. That was the essence of her greatness: on the things that mattered, she refused to believe that nothing could be done and would work relentlessly to set things right.

She believed in Britain – in its history, in its institutions and in its values – and, by acting on her beliefs, she helped others to believe as well. She refused to accept the post-war consensus that Britain's great days were over. She instinctively rejected government-knows-best approaches to running the economy and to managing society. And she was convinced that the world was more likely to prosper if Britain was a serious country with a global role rather than just another province in the united states of Europe. She inherited a Britain that was in rapid economic and strategic decline; and left it the most dynamic economy in Europe, and the United States' principal global ally.

---

[156] "Transcript: Tony Abbott's Controversial Speech at the Margaret Thatcher Lecture," *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 28 Oct. 2015.

On Soviet missiles aimed at Europe, she did not see nuclear annihilation to be averted at all cost but an evil empire to be shown that aggression would not pay. On the Falklands, she did not see an Argentine grievance to be negotiated but a monstrous violation of British sovereignty. On council houses, she did not see a government service but a neglected asset that would better be looked after by owner-occupiers taking pride in their own homes. She didn't see unions protecting workers so much as bullying their employers into bankruptcy. She didn't see state-owned enterprises as "national champions" so much as an endless                                    burden                                    on                                    taxpayers.

There was a moral dimension and an intellectual clarity that made her a hero to liberal-conservatives everywhere, rather than simply another successful politician. To Thatcher, the prime ministership wasn't about holding office; it was about getting things done. It wasn't about achieving consensus; it was about doing                              the                              right                              thing.

It's usually presumptuous to invoke the glorious dead in support of current policy – but your invitation to give this lecture suggests there was at least a hint of Thatcher about my government in Australia: stopping the flow of illegal immigrant boats because a country that can't control its borders starts to lose control of itself; the repeal of the carbon tax that was socialism masquerading as environmentalism; budget repair so that within five years, the Australian government will once again be living within its means; the free trade agreements with our biggest markets to increase competition and make it fairer; the royal commission into corrupt union bosses; an even stronger alliance with the United States and a readiness to call out Russia        for        the        shooting        down        of        a        civilian        airliner.

But, like all driven people, Margaret Thatcher was more interested in the next problem than the last one. Today, we best honour her life and legacy by bringing the same tough-mindedness to the problems of our time that she brought to the problems of hers. Parliamentary democracy and the rule of law; "freedom broadening slowly down from precedent to precedent"; the notion of civilization as a trust between the living, the dead and the yet-to-be-born: this was the heritage she'd been elected to preserve and strengthen. Her focus – were she still with us – would be the things of most consequence: managing the nation-changing, culture-shifting population transfers now impacting on Europe; winning the fight in Syria and Iraq which is helping to drive them; and asserting Western civilization against the challenge of militant                                                                                            Islam.

Naturally, the safety and prosperity that exists almost uniquely in Western countries is an irresistible magnet. These blessings are not the accidents of history but the product of values painstakingly discerned and refined, and of practices carefully cultivated and reinforced over hundreds of years. Implicitly or explicitly, the imperative to "love your neighbour as you love yourself" is at the heart of every Western polity. It expresses itself in laws protecting workers, in strong social security safety nets, and in the readiness to take in refugees. It's what makes us decent and humane countries as well as prosperous ones, but – right now – this wholesome instinct is leading much of Europe into catastrophic error.

All countries that say "anyone who gets here can stay here" are now in peril, given the scale of the population movements that are starting to be seen. There are tens – perhaps hundreds – of millions of people, living in poverty and danger who might readily seek to enter a Western country if the opportunity is there. Who could blame them? Yet no country or continent can open its borders to all comers without fundamentally weakening itself. This is the risk that the countries of Europe now run through misguided altruism.

On a somewhat smaller scale, Australia has faced the same predicament and overcome it. The first wave of illegal arrivals to Australia peaked at 4000 people a year, back in 2001, before the Howard government first stopped the boats: by processing illegal arrivals offshore; by denying them permanent residency; and

in a handful of cases, by turning illegal immigrant boats back to Indonesia. The second wave of illegal boat people was running at the rate of 50,000 a year – and rising fast – by July 2013, when the Rudd government belatedly reversed its opposition to offshore processing; and then my government started turning boats around, even using orange lifeboats when people smugglers deliberately scuttled their vessels.

It's now 18 months since a single illegal boat has made it to Australia. The immigration detention centres have-all-but-closed; budget costs peaking at $4 billion a year have ended; and – best of all – there are no more deaths at sea. That's why stopping the boats and restoring border security is the only truly compassionate thing to do. Because Australia once more has secure borders and because it's the Australian government rather than people smugglers that now controls our refugee intake, there was massive public support for my government's decision, just last month, to resettle 12,000 members of persecuted minorities from the Syrian conflict – per capita, the biggest resettlement contribution that any country has made.

Now, while prime minister, I was loath to give public advice to other countries whose situations are different; but because people smuggling is a global problem, and because Australia is the only country that has successfully defeated it – twice, under conservative governments – our experience should be studied. In Europe, as with Australia, people claiming asylum – invariably – have crossed not one border but many; and are no longer fleeing in fear but are contracting in hope with people smugglers. However desperate, almost by definition, they are economic migrants because they had already escaped persecution when they decided to move again.

Our moral obligation is to receive people fleeing for their lives. It's not to provide permanent residency to anyone and everyone who would rather live in a prosperous Western country than their own. That's why the countries of Europe, while absolutely obliged to support the countries neighbouring the Syrian conflict, are more-than-entitled to control their borders against those who are no longer fleeing a conflict but seeking a better life. This means turning boats around, for people coming by sea. It means denying entry at the border, for people with no legal right to come; and it means establishing camps for people who currently have nowhere to go.

It will require some force; it will require massive logistics and expense; it will gnaw at our consciences – yet it is the only way to prevent a tide of humanity surging through Europe and quite possibly changing it forever. We are rediscovering the hard way that justice tempered by mercy is an exacting ideal as too much mercy for some necessarily undermines justice for all. The Australian experience proves that the only way to dissuade people seeking to come from afar is not to let them in. Working with other countries and with international agencies is important but the only way to stop people trying to gain entry is firmly and unambiguously to deny it – out of the moral duty to protect one's own people and to stamp out people smuggling. So, it is good that Europe has now deployed naval vessels to intercept people smuggling boats in the Mediterranean – but as long as they are taking passengers aboard rather than turning boats around and sending them back, it is a facilitator rather than a deterrent.

Some years ago, before the Syrian conflict escalated; extended into Iraq; and metastasized into the ungoverned spaces of Libya, Yemen, Nigeria and Afghanistan, I got into trouble for urging caution in a fight that was "baddies versus baddies". Now that a quarter of a million people have been killed, seven million people are internally displaced, and four million people are destitute outside its borders and considering coming to Europe, the Syrian conflict is too big and too ramifying not to be everyone's problem. The rise of Daesh has turned it into a fight between bad and worse: the Assad regime whose brutality is the Islamic State death cult's chief local recruiter; and a caliphate seeking to export its apocalyptic version of Islam right around the world. Given the sheer scale of the horror unfolding in Syria, Iraq and everywhere Daesh gains a foothold – the beheadings, the crucifixions, the mass

executions, the hurling off high buildings, the sexual slavery – and its perverse allure across the globe, it's striking how little has been done to address this problem at its source. The United States and its allies, including Britain and Australia, have launched airstrikes against this would-be terrorist empire. We've helped to contain its advance in Iraq but we haven't defeated it because it can't be defeated without more effective local forces on the ground.

Everyone should recoil from an escalating air campaign, perhaps with Western special forces on the ground as well as trainers, in a part of the world that's such a witches' brew of danger and complexity and where nothing ever has a happy ending – yet as Margaret Thatcher so clearly understood over the Falklands: those that won't use decisive force, where needed, end up being dictated to by those who will. Of course, no American or British or Australian parent should face bereavement in a fight far away – but what is the alternative? Leaving anywhere, even Syria, to the collective determination of Russia, Iran and Daesh should be too horrible to contemplate. That's why it's a pity that the recent UN leaders' week summit was solely about countering violent extremism – which everyone agrees involves working with Muslim communities – and not about dealing much more effectively with the caliphate that's now the most potent inspiration for it.

Of course, the challenge of militant Islam needs more than a military solution – but people do have to be protected against potential genocide. Of course, you can't arrest your way to social harmony – but homegrown terrorism does need a strong security response. Of course, the overwhelming majority of Muslims don't support terrorism – but many still think that death should be the punishment for apostasy. Of course, the true meaning of Islam is a matter for Muslims to resolve – but everyone has a duty to support and protect those decent, humane Muslims who accept cultural diversity. Looking around the globe, it's many years since problems have seemed so daunting and solutions less clear. Yet the worse the times and the higher the stakes, the less matters can be left in the too hard basket. More than ever, Western countries need the self-confidence to stand up for ourselves and for the universal decencies of mankind lest the world rapidly become a much worse place.

Like the countries of Europe, Australia struggles to come to terms with the local terrorism that Daesh has inspired. Like you, we are trying to contain Daesh from the air while waiting for a Syrian strategy to emerge. But unlike you, we have at least solved one of the wicked problems now afflicting Europe: we have secured our own borders. All of us, then, must ponder Margaret Thatcher's example while we wait to see who might claim her mantle. Good values, clear analysis, and a do-able plan, in our day as in hers, are the essentials of the strong leadership the world needs.

## *Appendix B: National Security Address by Tony Abbott, Canberra, 23 February 2015[157]*

Today, I want to speak to you about keeping our country safe. I want to speak to you about the threat that we face; the work done already to keep you as safe as we humanly can; and the things still needed to prevent further terrorist attacks. Today, my colleagues and I are joined by representatives of the Australian Federal Police, the Australian Defence Force, ASIO and agencies like Crimtrac – which helps police and other law enforcement bodies share information.

The men and women in this room are on the frontline of Australia's fight against terror. There is no greater responsibility – on me – on the government – than keeping you safe. This is the responsibility that's discharged by the men and women in this room. We know that these are testing times for everyone here – and for everyone sworn to protect democratic freedoms.

The terrorist threat is rising at home and abroad – and it's becoming harder to combat. We have seen on our TV screens and in our newspapers the evidence of the new dark age that has settled over much of Syria and Iraq. We have seen the beheadings, the mass executions, the crucifixions and the sexual slavery in the name of religion. There is no grievance here that can be addressed; there is no cause here that can be satisfied; it is the demand to submit—or die.

We have seen our fellow Australians – people born and bred to live and let live – succumb to the lure of this death cult. We have heard the exhortations of their so-called caliphate to kill all or any of the unbelievers. And we know that this message of the most primitive savagery is being spread through the most sophisticated technology. By any measure, the threat to Australia is worsening. The number of foreign fighters is up. The number of known sympathisers and supporters of extremism is up. The number of potential home grown terrorists is rising. The number of serious investigations continues to increase.

During 2014, the government consulted with our experts – many of whom are in this room today; we talked with our allies; and we worked with the opposition, to improve Australia's preparedness for any eventuality. Last September, the National Terrorist Threat level was lifted to high, which means a terrorist attack is likely. Critics said we were exaggerating. But since then, we have witnessed the frenzied attack on two police officers in Melbourne and the horror of the Martin Place siege. Twenty people have been arrested and charged as a result of six counter-terrorism operations conducted around Australia. That's one third of all the terrorism-related arrests since 2001 – within the space of just six months.

The judgment to lift the Threat Level was correct. In proclaiming a caliphate, the Islamist death-cult has declared war on the world. Not only has Australia suffered at the hands of terrorists – but so have Canada, France, Denmark, Iraq, Egypt, Libya, Nigeria, Japan, Jordan, the United Kingdom and the United States. We have seen the tactics of terrorists evolve. In the decade after 9/11, our agencies disrupted elaborate conspiracies to attack our electricity supplies, the Grand Final at the MCG and the Holsworthy Army Barracks in Sydney. Now, in addition to the larger scale, more complex plots that typified the post 9/11 world, such as the atrocities in Bali and London, sick individuals are acting on the caliphate's instruction to seize people at random and kill them. Today's terrorism requires little more than a camera-phone, a knife and a victim. These lone actor attacks are not new, but they pose a unique set of problems. All too often, alienated and unhappy people brood quietly. Feeling persecuted and looking for meaning, they self-radicalize online. Then they plan attacks which require little preparation, training or capability. The short

---

[157] "Transcript: National Security Statement: Tony Abbott flags crackdown on Australians involved in terrorism," *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 23 Feb. 2015.

lead time from the moment they decide they are going to strike, and then actually undertake the attack, makes it hard to disrupt their activities.

Police do not have the luxury to wait and watch. They apply their best judgement – and they do so, fully aware that armchair critics, will find fault. Still, police act because they have enough facts to make an informed judgement. Some of these raids may not result in prosecution. But frankly, I'd rather lose a case, than lose a life. The protection of life must always rank ahead of the prospects of a successful prosecution. The arrest of two men in Sydney earlier this month, who'd already recorded a pre-attack message, is just one example of how quickly a threat can develop. I should add that without our Foreign Fighters legislation, it is highly unlikely that these arrests could have been made.

This new terrorist environment is uniquely shaped by the way that extremist ideologies can now spread online. Every single day, the Islamist death cult and its supporters churn out up to 100,000 social media messages in a variety of languages. Often, they are slick and well produced. That's the contagion that's infecting people, grooming them for terrorism. Already at least 110 Australians have travelled overseas to join the death cult in Iraq and Syria. At least 20 of them, so far, are dead. Even if the flow of foreign fighters to Syria and Iraq stopped today, there's an Australian cohort of hardened jihadists who are intent on radicalising and influencing others. The number of Australians with hands-on terrorist experience is now several times larger than those who trained earlier in Afghanistan and Pakistan. Of that group, two-thirds became involved in terrorist activity back here in Australia.

The signs are ominous. ASIO currently has over 400 high-priority counter-terrorism investigations. That's more than double the number a year ago. We are not alone in facing such challenges. The same phenomenon is evident across Europe, in the United States and in South-East Asia. Many of those involved in anti-Western attacks in Indonesia over the last decade are now being released from prison— some neither reformed nor rehabilitated. Australian and Indonesian agencies will continue to work closely together to tackle extremists – because it is in both our interests to do so.

In Australia and elsewhere, the threat of terrorism has become a terrible fact of life that government must do all in its power to counter. So far, this is what we have done. Within weeks of taking office, I asked the Attorney-General to develop a government response to foreign fighters. Last August, the government invested $630 million in a range of new counter-terrorism measures. This funding gives our security agencies the resources they asked for to combat home-grown terrorism and to help prevent Australians participating in terrorism overseas.

The effect of these new measures has already been felt:
* Counter-Terrorism Teams now operate at all eight major international airports;
* Sixty-two additional biometric screening gates are being fast tracked for passengers at airports to detect and deal with people leaving on false passports;
* Forty-nine extra AFP members are working in Sydney, Melbourne and Canberra on the Foreign Fighter threat;
* Seven new financial analysts have been engaged to help crack down on terrorist financing;
* A new "violent jihadist network mapping unit" in ASIO has been created to improve intelligence agencies' understanding of the threat facing Australia;
* A Foreign Fighters Task Force has been established in the Australian Crime Commission with access to the commission's coercive powers; and
* Last Thursday, the Attorney-General announced a series of measures designed to combat terrorist propaganda online.
* We have legislated to cancel the welfare payments of individuals assessed to be a threat to security. This is not window dressing – as of last September, 55 of the 57 Australian extremists then fighting with

terrorist      groups      in      Syria      and      Iraq      had      been      on      welfare.

We have made it easier to ban terrorist organisations which promote and encourage terrorist acts. We have strengthened the offences of training with, recruiting for and funding terrorist organisations. We have made it easier to prosecute foreign fighters by making it illegal to travel to a declared area overseas. Last December, we proscribed travel to Syria's Al Raqqa province – where the death cult is based – without a legitimate purpose. We are now looking at listing Mosul district in Ninawa Province, in Iraq, which the death cult also controls. And we have given ASIO the further power to request an Australian passport be suspended, pending further security assessment—that's happened eight times so far.

This year, we will consider what further legislation is needed to combat terrorism and keep Australians safe. But we cannot do it alone. The government is working with local communities to counter violent extremism. I acknowledge the readiness of parents, siblings and community leaders to let the police know about people they think are falling under the death cult's spell. Our law enforcement agencies could not operate without their help. I acknowledge the cooperation the Commonwealth enjoys with all States and Territories on counter-terrorism issues. That cooperation was highlighted by the Martin Place siege.

Yesterday, Premier Mike Baird and I released the Martin Place Siege Joint Commonwealth—New South Wales Review. What we learnt from that Review was that there were no major failings of intelligence or process in the lead up to Martin Place. Everyone did their job as required by law. But now, there's more to do. It's clear that in too many instances the threshold for action was set too high – and the only beneficiary of that was the Martin Place murderer himself.

For too long, we have given those who might be a threat to our country the benefit of the doubt. The perpetrator was given the benefit of the doubt when he applied for a visa. He was given the benefit of the doubt for residency and citizenship. He was given the benefit of the doubt at Centrelink. He was given the benefit of the doubt when he applied for legal aid. And in the courts, there has been bail, when there should have been jail. This report marks a line in the sand.

There is always a trade-off between the rights of an individual and the safety of the community. We will never sacrifice our freedoms in order to defend them – but we will not let our enemies exploit our decency either. If Immigration and Border Protection faces a choice to let-in or keep out people with security questions over them – we should choose to keep them out. If there is a choice between latitude for suspects or more powers to police and security agencies – more often, we should choose to support our agencies. And if we can stop hate-preachers from grooming gullible young people for terrorism, we should. We have already made a start on removing the benefit of the doubt for people who are taking advantage of us. We've introduced legislation to refuse a protection visa to people who destroy evidence of their identity. And the same applies if you present a bogus document. This Bill is currently stalled in the Senate. It's reasonable. It's in our country's interest. And I call on all senators to support it.

The government's Data Retention Bill – currently being reviewed by the Parliament – is the vital next step in giving our agencies the tools they need to keep Australia safe. Access to metadata is the common element to most successful counter-terrorism investigations. It's essential in fighting most major crimes, including the most abhorrent of all – crimes against children. Again, I call on Parliament to support this important legislation. We need to give our agencies these powers to protect our community.

Today, I am releasing the Counter Terrorism review that the government commissioned last August. The review finds that we face a new, long-term era of heightened terrorism threat, with a much more significant 'homegrown' element. While the review did not recommend major structural changes, it did recommend strengthening our counter-terrorism strategy and improving our cooperation with at-risk communities. The government will carefully consider the findings and act as quickly as possible. In fact,

some recommendations have already been acted upon: We will ensure returning foreign fighters are prosecuted or closely monitored using strengthened control orders. We will appoint a National Counter Terrorism Coordinator. We want to bring the same drive, focus and results to our counter-terrorism efforts that worked so well in Operation Sovereign Borders and Operation Bring Them Home. Over recent months, I spent many hours listening to Australians from all walks of life.

Clearly, people are anxious about the national security threats we face. Many are angry because all too often the threat comes from someone who has enjoyed the hospitality and generosity of the Australian people. When it comes to someone like the Martin Place murderer, people feel like we have been taken for mugs. Australian citizenship is an extraordinary privilege that should involve a solemn and lifelong commitment to Australia. People who come to this country are free to live as they choose – provided they don't steal that same freedom from others. We are one of the most diverse nations on earth – and celebrating that is at the heart of what it means to be Australian. We are a country built on immigration and are much the richer for it. Always, Australia will continue to welcome people who want to make this country their home. We will help them and support them to settle in. But this is not a one-way street. Those who come here must be as open and accepting of their adopted country, as we are of them. Those who live here must be as tolerant of others as we are of them. No one should live in our country while denying our values and rejecting the very idea of a free and open society. It's worth recalling the citizenship pledge that all of us have been encouraged to recite: 'I pledge my commitment to Australia and its people; whose democratic beliefs I share; whose rights and liberties I respect; and whose laws I will uphold and obey.' This has to mean something. Especially now that we face a homegrown threat from people who do reject our values.

Today, I am announcing that the government will look at new measures to strengthen immigration laws, as well as new options for dealing with Australian citizens who are involved in terrorism. We cannot allow bad people to use our good nature against us. The government will develop amendments to the Australian Citizenship Act so that we can revoke or suspend Australian citizenship in the case of dual nationals. It has long been the case that people who fight against Australia forfeit their citizenship. Australians who take up arms with terrorist groups, especially while Australian military personnel are engaged in Afghanistan and Iraq, have sided against their country and should be treated accordingly. For Australian nationals, we are examining suspending some of the privileges of citizenship for individuals involved in terrorism. Those could include restricting the ability to leave or return to Australia, and access to consular services overseas, as well as access to welfare payments.

We will also clamp down on those organisations that incite religious or racial hatred. No-one should make excuses for Islamist fanatics in the Middle East or their imitators here in Australia. For a long time, successive governments have been concerned about organisations that breed hatred, and sometimes incite violence. Organisations and individuals blatantly spreading discord and division – such as Hizb ut-Tahrir – should not do so with impunity. Today, I can confirm that the government will be taking action against hate preachers. This includes enforcing our strengthened terrorism advocacy laws. It includes new programmes to challenge terrorist propaganda and to provide alternative online material based on Australian values. And it will include stronger prohibitions on vilifying, intimidating or inciting hatred. These changes should empower community members to directly challenge terrorist propaganda.

I've often heard Western leaders describe Islam as a 'religion of peace'. I wish more Muslim leaders would say that more often and mean it. I have often cited Prime Minister Najib of Malaysia, who has described the Islamist death cult as 'against God, against Islam and against our common humanity'. In January, President al Sisi told the imams at Egypt's al Azhar university that Islam needed a 'religious revolution' to sweep away centuries of false thinking. Everybody, including Muslim community leaders, needs to speak up clearly because, no matter what the grievance, violence against innocents must surely be a blasphemy against all religion.

I can't promise that terrorist atrocities won't ever again take place on Australian soil. But let me give you this assurance: My government will never underestimate the threat. We will make the difficult decisions that must be taken to keep you and your family safe. We have the best national security agencies and the best police forces in the world. Our agencies are working together. All levels of government are working together. We are doing our duty. That is what you have a right to expect – and to demand of me and of us.

# Chapter 6: Bibliography

Abu-Lughod, Janet, *Before European Hegemony*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Ahmad, Ali Nobil, "The terms migration, flight, asylum and some others" in *The Oranges in Europe Taste Better*, Publication Series on Democracy, Heinrich-Böll Stiftung, Berlin, Germany: 12-18.

Amin, Mridula and Isabella Kwai, "The Nauru Experience: Zero-Tolerance Immigration and Suicidal Children", New York Times, 05 Nov. 2018:

https://www.nytimes.com/2018/11/05/world/australia/nauru-island-asylum-refugees-children-suicide.html.

Amnesty International, *Island of Despair: Australia's "Processing" of Refugees on Nauru,* London: Amnesty International, 2016.

Betts, Alexander, "International Relations and Forced Migration" *in The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies,* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Bhabha, Homi, *The Location of Culture*, London etc.: Routledge, 1996.

Bigo, Didier, "Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease", *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 27-1 (2002): 63-92.

Bleiker, Roland, *Aesthetics and World Politics*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Borgstrom, Bengt-Erik, "Power Structure and Political Speech" *in Man, New Series, vol. 17.2,* Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, 1982: 313-327.

Bradley, M., "Rethinking refugeehood: statelessness, repatriation, and refugee agency", *Review of International Studies, 40-1,* (2014): 101-123.

Call, Charles T., "The Fallacy of the 'Failed State'", *in Third World Quarterly, vol. 29.8*, (2008): 1491-1507.

Childs, Peter, and R.J. Patrick Williams, *An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theory*, Harlow: Longman, 1997.

Clayton, Jonathan and Hereward Holland; ed. Tim Gaynor, "Over One Million Sea Arrivals Reach Europe in 2015", UNHCR, 30 December 2015.

Cohen, Gerard Daniel, 'The Battle of the Refugees' and 'Who is a refugee?' *in In War's Wake: Europe's Displaced Persons in the Postwar Order*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011: 13-34, 35-57.

Cohn, Norman, *Noah's Flood: The Genesis Story in Western Thought*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1996: 23.

Crawley, Heaven, "Introduction: Europe – fortress or refuge?", *in Forced Migration Review, vol. 23*, 2005: 14-16.

Diken, Bülent and Carsten Bagge Lausten, *The Culture of Exception: Sociology Facing the Camp*, London: Routledge, 2005.

Dussel, Enrique, *Eurocentrism and Modernity (Introduction to the Frankfurt Lectures), vol. 20.3,* 1993.

Donnison, Jon, "Manus Island: Australia's Guantanamo?", BBC News, 12 June 2015: https://www.bbc.com/news/world-australia-33113223.

Doran, R. and Girard, R, "Apocalyptic Thinking after 9/11: An Interview with René Girard", *in SubStance, vol. 37.1, Issue 115: Cultural Theory after 9/11: Terror, Religion, Media,* Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008: 20-32.

Doherty, Ben and Helen Davidson, "Self-Immolation: Desperate Protests against Australia's Detention Regime," The Guardian, 3 May 2016:

https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2016/may/03/asylum-seekers-set-themselves-alight-nauru/.

El-Khairy, Assem Omar, "Snowflakes on a Scarred Knuckle: The Biopolitics of the 'War on Terror' through Steve McQueen's *Hunger* and Kathryn Bigelow's *The Hurt Locker*", *in Millennium: Journal of International Studies, vol. 39.1*, Sage, 2010: 187-191.

Elie, Jerome, "Histories of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies" in *The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies,* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Fernando, Gavin*, "Opinion: The Big Problems with Tony Abbott's Immigration",* NewsComAu, 21 Feb. 2018: www.news.com.au/national/politics/the-big-problems-with-tony-abbotts-call-to-slash-immigration/news-story/ee2d9cbab8b2386988123ccbf4d7d14d.

Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Elena; Gil Loescher, Katy Long and Nando Signona, *The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies,* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Foucault, Michel, "Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias", *in Architecture/ Mouvement/ Continuite, translated by Jay Miskowiec*, 1984.

Foucault, Michel, "The Subject and Power" *in Dreyfus HL and Rabinow P (eds.) Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983: 208-226.

Gardner, Stephen L., "René Girard's Apocalyptic Critique or Historical Reason: Limiting Politics to Make Way for Faith", *in Contagion: Journal of Violence, Mimesis, and Culture, vol. 18,* Michigan SUP, 2011: 1-22.

Giddens, Anthony, *Runaway World*, New York, NY: Routledge, 1999.

Hansen, L. "Poststructuralism" *in Baylis, Smith & Owens (Eds.) The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations (6th ed.),* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014: 169-183.

Hayes, Jarrod, "Reclaiming Constructivism: Identity and the Practice of the Study of International Relations" *in American Political Science Association,* Georgia Institute of Technology, 2017: 89-92.

Huysmans, J., The European Union and the Securitization of Migration, in the *Journal of Common Market Studies, vol. 38.5*, 2000:751-777.

Jackson, Ben, "Currents of Neoliberalism: British Political Ideologies and the New Right, c.1955-1979", *in The English Historical Review, vol. 131.551*, 2016: 823-850.

Johnson, Heather L., "Refugees" *in Roland Bleiker (ed.) Visual Global Politics*, London, etc.: Routledge, 2018:244-250.

Kloss, Theres Sinah, "The Global South as Subversive Practice: Challenges and Potentials of a Heuristic Concept", *in The Global South Journal, vol. 11.2*, Indiana University Press, 2017: 1-17.

Lake, Marilyn and Henry Reynolds, "Introduction", *in Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008: 1-9, 23-30.

Ling, L.H.M, *Postcolonial International Relations: Conquest and Desire between Asia and the West,* New York: Palgrave,, 2002.

Loescher, Gil, *Beyond Charity: International Cooperation and the Global Refugee Crisis: A Twentieth Century Fund Book*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Loescher, Gil, *Refugees and International Relations,* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Masquelier, Charles, *Critique and Resistance in a Neoliberal Age: Towards a Narrative of Emancipation*, London: Palgrave Macmillan Ltd., 2017.

Mansouri, Fethi and Michael Leach, "The Evolution of the Temporary Protection Visa Regime in Australia," *in International Migration, vol. 47.2,* Oxford, etc.: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2008: 101-126.

Mayblin, Lucy, "Colonialism, Decolonisation, and the Right to be Human: Britain and the 1951 Geneva Convention on the Status of Refugees" in *Journal of Historical Sociology, vol. 27.3*, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.: 423-441.

McIntyre, Andrew, "The Secular West and the Dangerous Quest for Meaning", *in the Institute of Public Affairs Review*, March 2002: 18-19.

Minca, Claudio, "Space of Exception" *in V. L. Packard's The International Encyclopedia of Geography: People, the Earth, Environment and Technology,* Malden, Mass. and Oxford: Emerald Publishing Limited, 2016.

Mishra, Vijay and Bob Hodge, "What Was Postcolonialism?", *in New Literary History, vol.36.3,* Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005: 375-402.

Mueller, John and Mark G. Stewart, "The Terrorism Delusion: America's Overwrought Response to September 11", *in International Security, vol. 37.1*, 2012: 81-110.

Newman, Edward, "Failed States and International Order: Constructing a Post-Westphalian World", *in Contemporary Security Policy, vol. 30.3*, 2009: 421-433.

Nye, Joseph S. and Robert O. Keohane. "Transnational Relations and World Politics: An Introduction", *International Organization* 25.3, 1971: 329-349.

Obiezu, Emeka Christian, *Towards a Politics of Compassion: Socio-political dimensions of Christian responses to suffering*, Bloomington, IN: AuthorHouse, 2008.

Pashler, Harold (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Mind*, *vol. 1,* Sage Reference, 2013.

Phillips, Melissa and Kathrine Starup, "Protection Challenges of Mobility", *in Forced Migration Review, vol. 47*, 2014: 28-30.

Polakow-Suransky, Sasha, "How Europe's far right fell in love with Australia's immigration policy", *The Guardian*, 12 Oct. 2017: https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/oct/12/how-europes-far-right-fell-in-love-with-australias-immigration-policy.

Postelnicescu, Claudia, "Europe's New Identity: The refugee crisis and the rise of nationalism", *in Europe's Journal of Psychology, vol. 12.2,* 2016: 203-209.

Prashad, Vijay, "Dream history of the Global South", *in Interface: a journal for and about social movements, vol. 4.1,* 2012: 43-53.

Qin, Yaqing, "A Relational Theory of World Politics" *in International Studies Review*, Oxford University Press, 2016: 33-47.

Refugee Council of Australia, *Department of Immigration and Border Protection's Annual Report 2015-16,* 2 May 2016: https://www.refugeecouncil.org.au/resources/publications-external/dibp-annual-report-2015-16/.

Rose, Gillian, *Visual Methodologies,* Los Angeles: Sage, 2016.

Said, Edward, *Orientalism*, New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.

Samiei, Mohammad, "Neo-Orientalism? The relationship between the West and Islam in our globalized world," *in Third World Quarterly, vol. 31.7*, 2010: 1145-1160.

Shohat, Ella, *On the Arab-Jew, Palestine, and Other Displacements: Selected Writings of Ella Shohat*, Pluto Press, 2017.

Smith, Karen, "Has Africa Got Anything to Say? African Contributions to the Theoretical Development of International Relations", *in The Round Table, vol. 98(402)*, Routledge, June 2009: 269-284.

Titscher, Stefan; Michael Meyer; Ruth Wodak & Eva Vetter (eds.), *Methods of text and discourse analysis* (Bryan Jenner, trans.), London: Sage, 2000.

Thies, Cameron G. "A pragmatic guide to qualitative historical analysis in the study of International Relations", *in International Studies Perspectives, vol. 3.4,* 2002: 351-372.

"Transcript: Tony Abbott's Controversial Speech at the Margaret Thatcher Lecture," *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 28 Oct. 2015: www.smh.com.au/politics/federal/transcript-tony-abbotts-controversial-speech-at-the-margaret-thatcher-lecture-20151028-gkkg6p.html.

"Transcript: National Security Statement: Tony Abbott flags crackdown on Australians involved in terrorism," *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 23 Feb. 2015: https://www.smh.com.au/politics/federal/national-security-statement-tony-abbott-flags-crackdown-on-australians-involved-in-terrorism-20150223-13m4ze.html.

UNHCR, "Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees", Geneva, Switzerland: UNHCR Communications and Public Information Service, 1951.

UNHCR, *Report: Mid-Year Trends 2016*, 2017, Geneva, Switzerland: UNHCR.

Van der Pijl, Kees, "Hermeneutics, Weber, Constructivism" *in A Survey of Global Political Economy, vol. 2.1,* Centre For Global Political Economy: University of Sussex, 2009: 88-113.

Wekker, Gloria, *White Innocence: Paradoxes of Colonialism and Race*, Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2016.