



Universiteit Leiden

## Master Thesis:

---

# Securitization of migration in the Netherlands:

---

*An analysis of the extent to which refugees are 'securitized' as potential terrorists in political speech acts in the Netherlands between October 2014 and March 2017.*



**Irene Gerritsen**, 1117297.

Msc Crisis and Security Management - Leiden University

Supervisor: Dr. B.W. Schuurman

Second reader: Dr. P.G.M. Aarten

## Abstract

The theory of securitization is central in this thesis. This theory argues that a certain topic such as migration becomes securitized through securitizing moves. Speech acts are an example of securitizing moves. Those speech acts are held by a securitizing actor, in this case a politician. I will research speech acts held about migration in this thesis. Migration and the increased influx of refugees are considered one of the most important recent policy challenges for governments in Europe. The refugee influx of especially Syrian and Iraqi nationals towards the European Union and the Netherlands has increased in the past five years. In this period, refugees were linked to security issues and were increasingly painted as a potential security threat. The statement of ISIS in October 2014, in which it encourages its fighters to join the refugees in order to execute terrorist attacks in Europe, contributed to this development. From that moment on, the debate regarding refugees became more focussed on security.

I will analyse to what extent the increased influx of refugees has been securitized in the Dutch political context in this thesis. This has resulted in the following research question: *To what extent has the increased influx of Syrian and Iraqi nationals to the European Union been securitized in the Netherlands by the responsible ministers in the period between October 2014 and March 2017?* I will address this research question in the conclusion based on an analysis of sampled speech acts of the different responsible ministers (Prime Minister Rutte, minister of Foreign Affairs Koenders, minister of Defence Hennis-Plasschaert and the various ministers of Justice and Security active in that period).

The analysis of the speech acts has led towards the conclusion that no securitizing moves were made in these sampled speech acts. The speech acts did not attempt to describe these migrants as an existential threat to the Netherlands and did not require emergency measures to be implemented. The speech acts were mostly of an informative nature. Within the speech acts, the issue of migration was somewhat politicized, in the sense it was placed and framed inside the political arena and outside the regular domains of communication regarding this subject such as regular updates from the migration services like the Immigration and Naturalisation Service (IND).

The conclusion of this thesis that no securitizing moves were made in the speech acts, causes some doubts regarding the applicability of the securitization theory. The securitization theory is somewhat outdated and it is questioned in the conclusion whether it is still applicable in present times in the Netherlands. Securitization of migration remains problematic, since migration does not pose an existential threat to the state, which is required for an issue to be securitized.

# Table of Contents

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Tables</i>	5
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>6</b>
1.1 <i>Introduction to the research subject</i>	6
1.2 <i>Research question</i>	8
1.2.1 <i>Selection of the case study</i>	8
1.3 <i>Relevance</i>	9
1.3.1 <i>Scientific relevance</i>	9
1.3.2 <i>Societal relevance</i>	10
1.4 <i>Definitions of relevant concepts</i>	11
1.5 <i>Research design</i>	12
1.5.1 <i>Type of design</i>	12
1.5.2 <i>Sampling</i>	12
1.5.3 <i>Limits of the research design</i>	13
1.6 <i>Operationalisation</i>	14
1.7 <i>Methods</i>	14
1.7.1 <i>Data collection</i>	15
1.7.2 <i>Data exploitation</i>	16
1.8 <i>Reading guide</i>	16
<b>2. Theoretical framework</b>	<b>17</b>
2.1 <i>Introduction</i>	17
2.2 <i>Securitization theory</i>	18
2.2.1 <i>The social construction of security and the widening of security studies</i>	18
2.2.2 <i>Securitizing actor</i>	20
2.2.3 <i>Power of problem definition</i>	21
2.3 <i>Speech acts as securitizing moves</i>	21
2.3.1 <i>Illocutionary acts</i>	23
2.4 <i>Influence on the security agenda</i>	24
2.4.1 <i>Framing and agenda setting</i>	25
2.4.2 <i>Prioritizing security issues</i>	25
2.4.3 <i>New policies and more funds</i>	25
2.5 <i>Securitization of migration</i>	26
2.6 <i>Conclusion</i>	28
<b>3. Case study of the Netherlands</b>	<b>29</b>
3.1 <i>Introduction</i>	29
3.2 <i>Societal context</i>	29
3.2.1 <i>Refugee influx into Europe and the Netherlands</i>	29
3.2.2 <i>Rise of ISIS and involvement of foreign fighters and home-grown terrorists</i>	31
3.2.3 <i>Increase of terrorist attacks in Europe</i>	32
3.3 <i>Political context</i>	33
3.3.1 <i>Dutch political system</i>	33
3.3.2 <i>Role of speech acts in the Dutch context</i>	35
3.4 <i>Conclusion</i>	35
<b>4. Analysis of speech acts</b>	<b>37</b>
4.1 <i>Introduction</i>	37
4.2 <i>Analysis of the speech acts</i>	37
4.2.1 <i>Speech acts by Prime- Minister Rutte</i>	39
4.2.2 <i>Speech acts by minister Koenders of Foreign Affairs</i>	41

4.2.3 Speech acts by minister Hennis-Plasschaert of Defence	42
4.2.4 Speech by the ministers of Justice and Security	43
4.3 <i>Specific themes within the different speech acts</i>	44
4.4 <i>Conclusion</i>	46
<b>5. Conclusion</b>	<b>47</b>
5.1 <i>Introduction</i>	47
5.2 <i>Addressing the research question</i>	47
5.3 <i>Discussion of the results in a broader perspective</i>	49
5.4 <i>Reflections on securitization theory</i>	51
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>55</b>
<i>Books</i>	55
<i>Articles</i>	56
<i>Electronic sources</i>	57
<b>Attachments</b>	<b>62</b>
1. <i>List of analysed speech acts</i>	62
2. <i>Code book of the speech acts analysis</i>	63

## List of Tables

### Tables

- Table 1. Operationalisation of key concepts. 15
- Table 2. Division of speech acts per ministry. 16
- Table 3. Overview of asylum applications between Oct 2014 – March 2017 and share of Syrian and Iraqi nationals in the European Union. 31
- Table 4. Overview of asylum applications between Oct 2014 and March 2017 and share of Syrian and Iraqi nationals in the Netherlands. 32
- Table 5. Overview of illocutionary acts in sampled speech acts. 40

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Introduction to the research subject

The number of asylum applicants and refugees travelling to the European Union (EU) has increased considerably in the past five years. The biggest group of asylum applicants consisted of Syrian and Iraqi refugees fleeing the civil war in their home countries (Frontex, 2016). The increased influx of those refugees is a factor creating tensions in European society. Migration can cause several potential negative results and dangers.

The terrorism threat is one example of the negative results of migration, which will be analysed in this research. The potential terrorist threat can be exaggerated by some politicians for their own political means or goals. The increased terrorist attacks on European soil were executed predominantly by Jihadist extremists. In addition, ISIS (Islamic State in Iraq and Syria) has claimed responsibility for those attacks. These tensions increased after the 6<sup>th</sup> of October 2014, when ISIS specifically called upon their fighters to enter the refugee flow towards the European Union to execute attacks there.

This call marked the start of a societal and political debate about the potential security risks of refugees entering Europe (Redactie Buitenland Volkskrant, 2014). Parts of the European society started to view refugees as potential terrorists. The potential security risks and the discussions about refugees have also been noticed in the Netherlands. This caused a societal debate regarding the status of attitude towards refugees. In 2015, new and emergency refugee shelters had to be placed at several locations in the Netherlands due to the influx. Not all Dutch municipalities were in favour of this governmental decision to provide shelter to ‘those potentially dangerous refugees’ in their cities. In this debate, refugees were increasingly portrayed as a security issue. (Redactie Binnenland Nieuwsuur, 2015).

Refugees can however not automatically be considered as a terrorist threat. In the period between October 2014 and March 2017, 33 attacks were planned in Europe, of which 30 were completed. In 4 of those attacks the perpetrators were in total 7 Syrian/Iraqi nationals who entered the European Union with the refugee flow (Europol, 2017; Europol, 2016; Europol, 2015). This is rather limited if taken into account that in the same period nearly a million Syrian and Iraqi refugees entered the European Union (Frontex, 2016, p. 47). These facts prove there is a terrorist threat caused by the flow of refugees, but this is rather limited.

In this thesis, I will analyse whether this threat is also politically constructed and maybe even exaggerated by Dutch politicians.

I will use the securitization theory, to analyse this development of the construction of a threat. The aim of the securitization theory is to explain how security issues such as the fear for refugees can be socially constructed. The theory identifies actors who can influence the construction of a security issue. Those are predominantly the government and media (Buzan et al, 1998). I will focus on the government's role on the construction of a security issue. The construction of a security issue often occurs through a securitizing speech act. The securitization theory is earlier applied in academia to the subject of migration. Before writing this thesis, I have read the works of Huysmans (2006) and Bourbeau (2011). They both argue that migration is a securitized subject. Especially after the events of 9/11, immigration has become more securitized and border controls have become stricter within the western world.

Securitization of migration is an often-researched topic in the academic debate and especially within the domain of security studies. Although it is often researched, a case study of a particular process of securitization has not been done yet. This is a gap in the existing literature of securitization. A theory testing case study of the Securitization theory has not been researched before on the Dutch national level. Therefore, this thesis could add towards the existing literature to securitization and especially to the literature regarding migration. In this thesis, I will analyse whether the securitization theory from 1998 is applicable to the most recent flow of refugees towards Europe. In this perspective, securitization has been less extensively researched. This gap makes this thesis relevant.

In this thesis, I will examine to what extent the Dutch government has influenced the securitization of migration. I will study how and if the Dutch responsible ministers have securitized this societal debate through their speech acts. In this analysis, I will look into the used wordings or methods of framing in their speech acts. In addition, I will analyse if those speech acts led towards a societal debate and contributed to the securitization of refugees entering the European Union and the Netherlands. The context of the debate will be explained in chapter 3. To address the question, I will study in chapter 4 speech acts by the responsible ministers. I have chosen for a speech act analysis, since speech acts are

considered important securitizing acts within the Securitization theory. This methodology will be explained in depth in paragraph 1.7 of this chapter.

This research regarding the securitization theory is scientifically relevant, because the theory is considered suitable for the Western world, including the Netherlands. It has not been tested on the Dutch national level before. Therefore, this thesis could contribute towards the debate regarding the applicability of the securitization theory in the current days and in the case of the Netherlands. The thesis will also be relevant for society, since the public debate about this topic has created tensions between groups in society and has had security consequences for the refugees themselves. This thesis will be relevant because it gives an insight of the potential influence of the government upon this topic which could result in tensions in society and the public debate.

## 1.2 Research question

The central research question of this thesis is the following:

*To what extent has the increased influx of Syrian and Iraqi nationals to the European Union been securitized in the Netherlands by the responsible ministers in the period between October 2014 and March 2017?*

This research question is an explanatory and **theory testing** type of research question. The aim of the research question is to test the hypothesis to what extent the securitization theory is applicable to the Dutch political context regarding migration.

### 1.2.1 Selection of the case study

I have selected this case study to test in the Dutch political context to what extent the refugees are securitized by framed as potential terrorists. I have selected this particular time frame because of the timing of two events. The start of this time frame is marked by the start of the public debate on refugees as potential terrorists. This started in October 2014 when IS announced that they would send terrorists among the refugee flow towards Europe to execute attacks (Redactie Buitenland Volkskrant, 2014). The societal debate is still ongoing, but the end of the period selected for analysis is marked by the official end of the governing period of Rutte II in March 2017. The elections were held on March 15<sup>th</sup> 2017 and in the months after that a new government was to be formed. The government of Rutte II became officially



‘outgoing’ until November 2017 when the new government Rutte III was sworn in. The period between March and November 2017 is not included because a list of topics was declared controversial by the majority of the members of the House of Representatives. This means that these topics could not be discussed in parliamentary meetings with the outgoing ministers, because of the ongoing negotiations for the new government. The list of controversial subjects includes migration and refugee policies (Tweede Kamer, 2017a).

The actors within the case study have been selected due to their relationship with the policy-making area (the ministers) and their executive powers. I have selected the ministers of Defence, Foreign Affairs, Security and Justice and the Prime-Minister because they are responsible for all migration policies and related policies. The minister of Defence is responsible for the border control. The minister of Foreign Affairs is responsible for the relations with other countries in the region and international cooperation regarding migration. The minister of Justice and Security is responsible together with the state secretary of Justice and Security for the domestic migration and asylum policies. The Prime Minister is co-responsible for all executed policies by his government (Rijksoverheid, 2017a, Rijksoverheid, 2017b, Ministerie van Defensie, 2017, Politiek & Parlement, 2017). Other potential actors are excluded such as the political leaders of parties in the Houses of Parliament and the heads of the responsible secret services (MIVD and AIVD) and NCTV and National Police. Those actors are important for the debate within the country but not for the execution or decision-making regarding new policies (NCTV, 2017a).

## 1.3 Relevance

### 1.3.1 Scientific relevance

Securitization is an often-used academic theory in the fields of security studies and international relations. The basis of the securitization theory is the link between the securitizing move and speech acts. A securitizing move is *an action like holding a speech acts what causes securitization if the audience accepts it as such* (Buzan et al, 1998, p. 25). The fact that speech acts are seen as a securitizing move or a way to pursue securitization is important for this research. This argues that securitization can be constructed by holding a speech act. This link between securitization and speech acts is acknowledged by different scholars such as Abrahamsen (2005), Ardaou & van Munster (2012) and Ceccorulli (2010).

Most articles regarding securitization focus on either the American or the British context (Abrahamsen, 2005).

Prins (2014) is one of the few who has researched the Dutch political context. She has written about the local aspects of securitization and the role of mayors. This thesis focusses on the national aspects of securitization. In addition, it zooms into a specific subject of speech acts; framing of refugees towards potential terrorists and its consequences for the security agenda. This is a relevant addition for the existing literature on framing and securitization through speech acts because it analyses securitization of migration on the national level. With this thesis, I can add empirical evidence of potential political influence or involvement in the process of securitization in the Netherlands and an example how speech act analysis can be used in securitization research. It can contribute to the academic discussion about the securitization theory and it can add to address the question whether the securitization theory is still applicable.

Since 2001, migrants and refugees are increasingly considered as a threat to the sovereignty and identity of Western liberal democracies (McDonald, 2008; p. 567) and are being securitized (Huysmans, 2006, Bourbeau, 2011). According to McDonald (2008), migration is an applicable empirical case study for the securitization framework. This makes the case of this thesis relevant for research. In this thesis, I will research to what extent securitization of migration has occurred in the Dutch political context on the national level. With this thesis, I cannot make claims about the validity for the entire scope of the theory, but I will research to what extent it is applicable to this Dutch situation specified in topic and time. In the conclusion, I will be able to discuss the broader debate regarding the securitization of migration and how this process takes place.

### 1.3.2 Societal relevance

The societal relevance of this thesis is related to the public debate regarding the influx of refugees to the Netherlands. Since 2012, the number of refugees arriving in the Netherlands has increased due to conflicts in Syria, Northern Africa and other parts of the broader region. Because of a high influx, the societal tensions have become sharper. Some groups within Dutch society are in favour of providing shelter for those in need, while other groups and individuals are more reluctant to provide shelter and argue that there is no room for them in

the Netherlands. In December 2015, these tensions and unrest resulted in irregularities during a town hall meeting in Geldermalsen concerning the opening of a refugee shelter in the municipality. Around 200 citizens became very violent to the police which resulted in a conflict (Redactie Binnenland NOS, 2015). Another prominent theme in the public debate became the fear for some refugees to be potential terrorists (Rosman, 2015; Albers, 2015; Redactie Binnenland NOS, 2016; Paternotte 2016). It was argued that IS and Al Qaeda would profit from the refugee flow towards Europe and send terrorists to attack European citizens (Europol, 2017, p.6-7).

#### 1.4 Definitions of relevant concepts

I will briefly explain some key concepts of this thesis, in order to better comprehend the scope and the concepts mentioned in the introduction chapter. In chapter 2, these theoretical concepts will be explained in more detail.

This thesis focusses on a specific theory: the securitization theory. This theory explains the development and social construction of a security issue. The theory argues that security topics can be constructed and that securitized issues will automatically lead towards prioritisation and agenda setting by political actors, because the issue is securitized (Buzan et al, 1998, p. 208). In the public debate regarding security issues, methods of framing are often used. These methods of framing and the power of problem definition are related to the theory of securitization. But what is security? In this thesis, I will use the short version of the definition of Baldwin (1997) for security: *'a low probability of damage to acquired values'* (Baldwin, 1997, p.13). In chapter 2, I will discuss the argument of Baldwin (1997) about security in more detail.

The subject of the selected speech acts is migration and refugee flows towards the European Union. International migration is defined in this thesis as: *'crossing frontiers which separate one of the world's approximately 200 countries from another and migration means taking up residence for a certain minimum of time'* (Castles, 2000 p. 270). In the context of this thesis, I will focus on the flow of migrants and refugees from outside the European Union, entering the European Union or the Netherlands. Refugees are according to the International Organization for migration (IOM): *'persons who, owing to a well-founded fear of persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political*

*opinions, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail themselves of the protection of that country'* (IOM, 2017).

In the public debate, refugees are sometimes feared as potential terrorists. Terrorist offences are not easily defined and scholars do not agree upon a common definition. I have chosen to use the European Union's definition in this thesis because it is inclusive on the one hand and specific enough on the other hand. Terrorist offences are: '*acts committed with the aim of 'seriously intimidating a population', 'unduly compelling a government or international organisation to perform or abstain from performing any act', or 'seriously destabilising or destroying the fundamental political, constitutional, economic or social structures of a country or an international organisation'*' (Council Framework Decision 2002/475/JHA, 2002).

## 1.5 Research design

### 1.5.1 Type of design

The type of design is a **holistic single case study design** (Baxter & Jack, 2008, p. 550; Yin, 1994). This means that the single case study is taken within an existing context of all political speech acts. Within that context, the units of analysis are speech acts held by different Dutch ministers between October 2014 and March 2017 and those will be analysed in chapter 4. This design is chosen because, by analysing a single case study, it provides the best opportunity and most in depth analysis to address the research question, since I focus on a specific case within a broader context of political speech acts. The units of observation are the speech acts analysed the document analysis. In this holistic single case study, I will use qualitative research methods to address the research question.

### 1.5.2 Sampling

The type of sampling used in this design is **purposive** sampling. This means that the researcher purposively selects the sample based on the theoretical framework (Marshall, 1996, p. 523; Seawright & Gerring, 2008 p. 294). This is type of sampling is chosen because politicians tend to give many speeches throughout the year, and many these speeches will fall out of the scope of this research, so random sampling would not work. All speeches are available via the website [www.government.nl](http://www.government.nl). This is the total population, from this population a sample is taken. To establish a solid sample, different characteristics are set. The

sample needs to be large enough that more speeches will be unlikely to give you a different result, but at the same time rich enough to include speeches from each year and actor. (Bazerman, 2004). The characteristics for the sample are: **timeframe** (explained in 1.2.1), **actor** holding the speech act (explained in 1.2.1), **subject** of the speech act (framing refugees as potential terrorists or relating migration to terrorism in the speech act), a limit to the **word count** of the speech at 5.000 words and the availability of the **written** text of the speech (both for feasibility reasons). The selected samples of speech acts and can be found in attachment 1 of this thesis.

### 1.5.3 Limits of the research design

The research contains a single case study. This causes that the results will not be representative for all different political speech acts in all different contexts, such as political speech acts in other countries than the Netherlands, or by other actors giving the speech acts than politicians. The '**external validity**' is one of the pitfalls this single case study design. External validity is the extent to which the results of the research can be used for a generalisation in different contexts. The external validity is improved by the researcher, because more than one political actor within the Netherlands is considered. Four different responsible ministers are included together with an analysis of the speech acts. Another potential limit of this research design would be a coding bias. Since the biggest share of the analysis will be done using document analysis, most documents will be coded manually. When coding manually, there is always the risk of entering a coding bias. I have developed a coding structure to overcome this, with a description for a code which can be used in a particular situation. This coding structure can be found in attachment 2.

**Internal validity** is the extent to which the causal conclusion is sufficiently made while the systematic error or 'bias' is minimized. Triangulation of methods is often used to increase the internal validity. By using a single method for a single case, there are limits to the research and it might even result in an interpretation bias. To double check your findings, it is relevant to use different methods to your single case study analysis (Baxter & Jack, 2008). The speech act analysis is chosen based on the basis within literature that it would be the dominant method for securitization (Buzan et al., 1998, pp. 25, 31-33, 40). In addition, I will use some newspaper articles and policy documents to establish the context in which the speech acts are given by the different political leaders. Due to feasibility reasons, I have chosen to only

analyse the speech acts given on ‘public’ occasions and I have chosen not to include the debates of the different ministers in Parliament. Another reason is that they cannot be considered speech acts but are debates.

## 1.6 Operationalisation

In this table below, the operationalisation of the most important concepts of the research are explained. In the theoretical framework, I will explain more in depth certain theoretical definitions and their operationalisations.

**Table 1. Operationalisation of key concepts**

Concepts	Definition	Empirical Indicator	Source
<b>Securitization</b>	Securitization can be defined as the positioning through speech acts (usually by a political leader) of a particular issue as a threat to survival (McDonald, 2008, p. 566). The intersubjective establishment of an existential threat with saliency sufficient to have substantial political effects (Buzan et al, 1998, p. 25)	“When an issue is securitized, it means that the issue is presented as an existential threat requiring emergency measures and justifying actions outside the normal bounds of political procedure” (Buzan, 1997, p. 14).	-Buzan (1997) -Buzan et al. (1998) -McDonald (2008)
<b>Securitization of refugees as potential terrorists</b>	“Where a securitizing actor designates a threat to a specified referent object and declares an existential threat. The issue becomes part of what is security.” (Waever, 2000, p. 251).	When there is an increased representation of refugees and asylum seekers as threatening the sovereignty and identity of the nation-states affected (McDonald, 2008, p. 567).	-Waever (2000) -McDonald (2008)
<b>Political speech acts</b>	Speech acts made by politicians, mostly political leaders as securitizing moves, that became actions of securitization through audience consent (McDonald, 2008, p. 565).	Each speech act consists of - locutionary acts (making a sound while speaking) - illocutionary acts (words having a different motivation for the public) - perlocutionary act (what are the consequences of the speech act) (Collavin, 2011 p. 62).	-Collavin (2011) - McDonald (2008)
<b>Illocutionary acts</b>	Making a speech involves different actions. One of these actions is the illocutionary act. This means that within the speech act not all words have the same motivation behind (Vuori, 2008; Collavin, 2011).	Illocutionary speech acts can be divided in 5 different types: - Assertive acts - Directive acts - Commissive acts - Expressive active - Declaratory acts (Vuori, 2008, p. 74).	-Vuori (2008)

## 1.7 Methods

The main method of this thesis is document analysis. The document analysis consists of a linguistic analysis. This linguistic analysis focusses on the selected sample of speech acts while using categorisation of illocutionary acts as developed by Austin & Searle.

Illocutionary acts are the motivation behind the wording of a specific sentence. Words can be used in to activate the listener in different ways. There are five different types of illocutionary acts. Those differ from information sharing, influencing the surroundings of the speaker him

or herself, expressing an opinion or trying to get the listener to commit or do something. In addition, I will analyse the content of the speech acts as well to determine the different themes addressed and if securitizing language was used.

I will not include an additional discourse analysis focussed on the portrayal of refugees in the media like newspapers or TV programs. A discourse analysis based upon media would have contributed to the strength of this thesis. Due to feasibility reasons, I had to choose between the political securitizing actor and the media securitizing actor. I have chosen for the political actor since this actor has the most direct influence on the political decision-making in the Netherlands and therefore is theoretically the most powerful securitizing actor in the process of securitization of migration.

### 1.7.1 Data collection

I will analyse a sample of different speech acts meeting the following characteristics: timeframe, selected actor, selected subject, limited word count and the availability of the written text. The speech acts can be found on the website [www.government.nl](http://www.government.nl). On this website, you can search for different government documents, where you can narrow down your search to a certain time period, certain ministry, certain type of document and a specific key word used in the document. I have reviewed how many speeches were held in total for each responsible minister. Secondly, I have put in key words: refugee(s), refugee flow, terror and terrorism in both Dutch and English. This resulted in several hits. For each hit I reviewed if the words were mentioned. This resulted in the selection, which will be the sample of analysis further in the research.

Regarding the Ministry of General Affairs, the sampled speeches do not only consist of general speech acts, but also include two different categories. Those categories only exist for speech acts of the ministry of general affairs. Those are: the statements of the Prime Minister during a press conference after a meeting of the ministers (each Friday) and those are the statements of the King (Troonrede) during Prinsjesdag. Those statements are written by the Prime-Minister and are only read out by the King, but are not influenced or designed by him in any way. I have chosen to include these categories as well, because in practice they can be considered speech acts. They are only considered a different category because their position in the documentation system of the government.

**Table 2. Division of speech acts per ministry**

<b>Minister</b>	<b>Number of speeches in total</b>	<b>Number of speeches in the selection</b>
General Affairs/Rutte	181	10
Foreign Affairs/Koenders	76	4
Defence/ Hennis	37	4
Justice and Security /Variable	31	2

### 1.7.2 Data exploitation

The document analysis of the speech acts will be done by using the linguistic analysis as developed by Austin & Searle on illocutionary acts. The different sentences within the speech act will be coded into different types of illocutionary acts (motivations or reasons of the speaker behind a certain sentence) as explained in Vuori (2008): assertive, commissive, directive, declaratory and expressive acts. The coding software of Nvivo will be used for a method of category/axial encoding. This means that the different parts of the speech act will be labelled with a certain code which will be placed in different main codes or categories. Together this will result in a ‘coding tree’ with an overview the used codes and the related text fragments to that code. This code tree makes it easier to develop a storyline and to analyse the results and to come to a well-structured conclusion (’t Hart e.a., 2009; Hay, 2010; Baarda e.a., 2005). The coding of the illocutionary acts will be combined with coding regarding the content of the speeches, in order to review what has been said by different actors about the topic in the speeches. Therefore, several content related codes are incorporated in the analysis. The coding tree is attached in attachment 2.

### 1.8 Reading guide

This thesis consists of five chapters. Before the start of the analysis, chapter 2 presents the theoretical framework of this research. This theoretical framework outlines the securitization theory, together with specific theories regarding speech act theory and linguistic analysis and theories specifically addressing the topic of the securitization of migration. Chapter 3 explains the context of the case study and addresses both the societal debate as well as the political background of making speech acts in the Netherlands. This chapter is relevant to understand the case study and to be able to interpret the results of the analysis. In chapter 4, the analysis of the twenty sampled speech acts will be carried out. The analysis will focus on the illocutionary acts and dominant themes. The thesis will end with chapter 5 consisting of the conclusion. In the conclusion, the research question will be addressed and the results of chapter 4 will put in a broader context. Lastly, some recommendations for future research will be given.



## 2. Theoretical framework

### 2.1 Introduction

This thesis is utilizing a combination of different theories to address its research question. In this chapter, these theories will be explained and outlined. The main theory in this research is the securitization theory. This theory explains the development of the social construction of security topic by speech acts. The Securitization theory was developed by Buzan, de Wilde & Waever, also named the Copenhagen School in 1998.

In this theory two concepts are central, which will be used in this thesis. One of the concepts is the securitizing actor, the actor who performs securitization and turns a subject or a discussion into a matter of security. This actor can be a political actor, such as the responsible ministers for migration and security policies (Buzan et al, 1998; p. 31). Bourbeau (2011) explains why political actors are very suitable for securitization. These politicians have the power to define security and have influence on the decision- and policy-making process regarding security issues (Bourbeau, 2011, pp .3-4; Buzan et al., 1998, pp. 31-33, 40). Secondly, the securitizing move (how the securitization will take place) centres around the 'speech act' (Buzan et al, 1998, pp. 32-33). In this chapter, the process of securitization of the topic of migration in particular will be further explained with theories of Huysmans (2006) and Bourbeau (2011). Lastly, I will use the speech act theory of Vuori (2008), Austin & Searle as explained in Collavin (2011) and Vanderveken (2001) who has determined different meanings between wordings in a speech act, also named illocutionary acts.

The theoretical framework is important for the deductive nature of this research. The specific focus is on the construction of a certain security issue by the usage of speech acts. The securitization theory argues the relationship between securitizing moves such as speech acts and the power of problem definition by speech acts (Leonard, 2010; Vuori, 2008; Kelstrup, 2004). In this thesis, I will apply this theory of securitization to the Dutch case study and I will analyse to what extent securitization takes place.

The theories of this chapter together form the analytical framework of my thesis. Therefore they must be first clearly explained before they can be used to carry-out the analysis. I need to explain the role, function and content of the securitization theory in order to be able to test it in my analysis on the selected case study.

## 2.2 Securitization theory

### 2.2.1 The social construction of security and the widening of security studies

The Copenhagen School, consisting of Buzan, Waever & de Wilde, developed the theory of securitization (McSweeney, 1996). The securitization theory argues that any public issue is and can be located on the spectrum from non-politicized, to politicized to securitized. When the issue falls into the last category this means that *'the issue is presented as an existential threat, requiring emergency measures and justifying actions outside the normal bounds of political procedure'* (Buzan et al, 1998, p. 24). This is a rather limited and strict definition of the securitization school. The existential threat is a result of the former military focus in the Cold War period (Bigo, 2002, 73). The application in practice is however, much broader. Huysmans (2006) argues in his book that the meaning of the existential threat is different. It is not the physical survival of the political unit, but it is about the functional integrity and the independent identity (Huysmans, 2006, p. 61).

The basis of this idea behind the Securitization theory originates from the field of social constructivism. Social constructivism can be explained as: the construction of a certain issue based on rather subjective components rather than solely objective facts. Social constructivism means in this context that threats are not solely constructed based on the potential risk, but are also influenced by other actors than the objective risk itself such as public, media and politicians with an intersubjective understanding of security and insecurity (Huysmans, 2002, pp. 42-44). Social constructivism is at the heart of securitization. In the following paragraph the securitization theory will be compared to two broader schools of thought. Those schools of thought are: traditional security studies (TSS) and critical security studies (CSS). Although, the securitization has contributed to those schools of thought, there are important differences.

These studies are positioned and compared on two scales. One scale consists of the topic of social relations varying between constructivist and objectivist. The other scale consists of the topic of security varying between constructivist and objectivist. TSS is mostly objectivist regarding security threats and social relations. TSS is focussed on what the actual threats are and how these threats are being managed by the different authorities. CSS is in contrast mostly constructivist. CSS argues within an emancipatory approach regarding social relations, that all regularities can be broken and that there are no solid and strict rules in a

social world. But on the issue of security, CSS is less constructivist than on social relations. CSS is regarding security more a traditional player and focusses on the objectivist concept of security and is focussed on threats. The theory of securitization is rather constructivist in the area of security, but less constructivist in the area of social relations. In the security domain, the securitization theory argues that security issues are based on acts of securitization. In the domain of social relations, the securitization theory is less constructivist. The securitization theory argues that those are not completely constructed and are not a product of human action. Therefore, the securitization theory combines constructivist and objectivist aspects of both CSS and TSS (Buzan et al., 1998, pp. 203-205).

The construction of a threat or security risk can be done by different actors. Examples of those actors the public, media but also politicians (both ministers as well as elected officials (Buzan et al, 1998, pp 31-34). The focus of social constructivism in this thesis is on political constructivism. This means that the construction of a specific subject as a threat can be used within the frame of a politician. The aim of political constructivism is two-fold: either prioritizing an issue which needs more attention, or political motivations and potential electoral wins as a result of a certain framing of a particular issue (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 204). I would add that in most cases of securitized issues such as the inclusion of cyber security, environmental security, migration, there is already a certain threat present and the social construction process is more about the (political) framing or the exaggeration of this particular threat.

In the post-9/11 context, security topics have become more dominant in politics and the public debate. More policy issues have become considered as security issues (Hansen & Nissenbaum, pp.1158-1159). Environmental security and cyber security are examples of topics which became included in the security domain. The inclusion of topics within the field of security studies, is often referred to as the widening of security studies (McDonald, 2008, p. 563). The Securitization theory explains this process of widening: as '*the discursive construction of a particular issue as a security threat*' (McDonald, 2008, p. 563). Not all topics which are transferred into security topics are merely caused by a discursive construction. A discursive construction is: uttering or rambling the word security which than would lead towards the construction of a security issue. This is not the case in the widening process of securitization, most topics are related to a certain threat.

After the Cold War, the Western society needed a broader understanding on security and broader than the existing focus on traditional military threats. With the lack of a sufficient conflict and violent threats in the world, the security discipline started to focus on other threats outside the common and traditional sphere. This resulted in the widening and the deepening of security studies. The deepening is about the involvement of more actors such as international and non-state actors. The widening is about the inclusion of more topics and threats within the security domain (COT, 2007). An example of a new threat incorporated in the security domain is environmental security, but also cyber security became a threat in the same period (Trombetta, 2008, pp. 585–586; Hansen & Nissenbaum, 2009, p 1155-1156). Those topics are posing a significant threat. But those topics are also partly constructed as security topics due to the need of a broader understanding of security (COT, 2007).

### 2.2.2 Securitizing actor

The securitization theory does not differentiate in the levels of securitization. It only distinguishes different concepts within a spectrum. Those are: non-politicization, politicization, securitization and de-securitization. When an issue has reached the securitization phase, the securitization theory does not provide a basis how to distinguish if an issue is strongly or weakly securitized (Bourbeau, 2011, p. 3). However, this nuance whether an issue is strongly or weakly securitized, is important to make. For the operationalisation of this aspect in my thesis, I will look at the number of securitizing moves made in the speech acts.

The securitizing actor can have an influence the perception of a security issue. *‘When such an actor uses a rhetoric of existential threat and thereby takes an issue out of what under those conditions is normal politics we have a case of securitization’* (Buzan et al, 1998, pp. 24-25). The perception of a certain security topic can be influenced by framing (Huysmans, 2006, pp. 22-24). *Security framing is a rhetorical device designed to stimulate action* (Huysmans, 2006, p. 22). Security framing can in addition contribute towards the distribution of fear and trust (Huysmans, 2006, p. 51). In paragraph 2.4, I will explain the consequences of security framing in more detail.

There are two different securitizing actors; political and media agents. In this thesis, I will focus on the political agent of securitization. Political speech acts are often combined with

media analysis in empirical research about the practice of securitization. I have chosen to focus on one of the two securitizing agents for reasons of feasibility. I have selected the political agent instead of the media agent, because the classical securitization theory as established by Buzan, de Wilde and Waever (1998) argues that the political securitizing agent has the most influence on the process of securitization and the outcome itself (Bourbeau, 2011, p. 3-5). Other factors of influence such as context, changes in domestic and international audiences over time, are left outside the scope of this research due to feasibility reasons. In addition, the period of research is much shorter than similar studies on securitization so domestic audiences have not changed that much within the research period itself and should not be incorporated in the framework. In chapter 3, I will address the context of the case study including the societal debate regarding the issue of migration and refugees within the European Union to incorporate the domestic context in another way in this research.

### 2.2.3 Power of problem definition

Any social phenomenon could be framed as a security threat, because of the process of the widening of security studies. This is the power of problem definition. By presenting a social phenomenon as a security threat, it often becomes justified to demand specific instruments, or mobilize certain funds within the security domain. A successful act of securitization facilitates a wide range of newly implemented security actors (Buzan et al, 1998; Prins, 2014). Problem definition is important in the process of policy making. When an issue becomes a public security problem, the struggle over priority and solutions starts within the policy-making domain (Prins, 2014, pp. 21-22). Securitization is often used to analyse different topics: like foreign policy behaviour of states (Abrahamsen, 2005), the construction of transnational crime (Emmers, 2003) and challenges posed by terrorism (Buzan, 2006) (McDonald, 2008, p. 565).

### 2.3 Speech acts as securitizing moves

Speech acts are central to the practices of securitization, as they are key to the social construction of security as securitizing moves. The definition of a securitizing move is: *positioning certain issues through speech acts (usually by a political leader) of a particular issue as a threat to survival which in turn (with the consent of relevant constituency) enables*

*emergency measures and the suspension of normal politics regarding this issue* (McDonald, 2008, p. 567).

Within the securitization literature a speech act is the following: *'a form of linguistic representation that positioned a particular issue as an existential threat'* (McDonald, 2008, p. 566). In the book of Buzan et al (1998), speech acts are taken one step further and are considered as securitizing moves: *causing securitization if the audience accepts it as such* (Buzan et al, 1998, p. 25). The exclusive role of speech acts as securitizing moves is contested in the academic debate. While the Copenhagen school argues that issues can become security issues solely through the language of speech acts, McDonald (2008) argues for a broader perspective. He argues that language is not the only method of communication, other methods such as images should also be included. In addition, he explains that physical actions and bureaucratic practices that can contribute to securitization are excluded as well (McDonald, 2008, p. 568; Bigo, 2002). I do recognize this narrow focus of the Copenhagen School, but I will apply it in the original focus to this thesis to be able to test the theory itself.

In the research of the securitization school the influence of speech acts is central. A speech act is often referred to as the discursive and communicative aspect of securitization (Ceccorulli, 2010, pp. 492-493). Not each security speech act saying the word 'security' falls under the scope of a security speech act. The speech act must fulfil three conditions; (1) it must be about the designation of a certain existential threat. (2) This threat would require emergency action or other special measures. (3) Lastly, this needs to be followed by an accepting significant audience. Not in all security speech acts, the word security or security references are explicitly mentioned (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 27). In the analysis of chapter 4, these conditions will be used. For the condition regarding the audience, it is complicated to determine whether the audience was accepting or not. I will argue that the audience was accepting, until the contrary is proven by for example upheaval in the media and contradicting statements.

Each speech act consists of three different aspects; the discursive aspect, the communicative aspect and the aspect of the act itself. The discursive aspect consists of the analysis of the discourse caused by the speech act and how the linguistics tend to influence the discourse of wording regarding the security topic. The communicative aspect focusses on the effects of

speech acts on their audiences and the outward orientation of the speech act. Lastly, the act itself is considered as a moment of rupture, a political decision to break with the normal rules and instituted normality (Huysmans, 2011, pp. 371-374). '*Speaking security is a decision to rupture a situation with certain calculable consequences for others*' (Huysmans, 2011, p. 373). In this thesis, I will mostly focus on the discursive aspect of speech acts by analysing the usage of linguistics and how certain wordings contribute towards the security understanding of migration.

Building on this discursive aspect of speech acts, Buzan et al. (1998) argue that the result of a securitizing move/speech act could lead towards certain influences on the security agenda such as new policies and more funding because of the move itself (Buzan et al, 1998). In short, the importance of speech acts is related to what Huysmans calls their decisional nature; speech acts *that take a situation from non-security into security* (Huysmans, 2011, p. 380). Speech acts are thus transforming moves that transform a topic towards a security topic.

### 2.3.1 Illocutionary acts

In addition to the securitization theory, the theory of Austin & Searle on illocutionary acts will be used for the discourse and data analysis of the political speech acts. This linguistic theory builds further on the securitization framework and adds to the discussion. In short, they analyse the different layers of political speech acts, where words in speech acts can have different meanings (Vuori, 2008, p. 66). The theory of Austin & Searle explains speech acts as having different aims within the speech itself; locutionary acts (literally what is being said), illocutionary acts (the meaning of the speaker is different than the wording), perlocutionary acts (the consequences of the speech act). In this thesis, I will focus on the last two, what wording is used, what motivations can be discovered when analysing the speech act and what the consequences of the speech act are. I will look into framing. Framing is often used in speech acts. Framing is the usage of specific wording and language to contribute towards a certain positioning within the topic or frame. The wording and language help with the positioning and perspective on the topic as a security issue.

There are five different illocutionary acts identified by Vanderveken (2001) and those are later incorporated by Vuori (2008). Those five illocutionary acts are the following: assertive act, expressive act, commissive act, directive act and declaratory act. All those acts are

different points the speaker can make during a speech act. This categorisation of illocutionary speech acts will be used when analysing complex security speech acts (Vuori, 2008, 74).

1. The **assertive** act consists of the distribution of information and informing the public about a certain issue. It is used in statements, explanations and assertions. An example of an assertive act is when the speaker explains the current threat posed by foreign fighters to the Netherlands based upon facts and intelligence.
2. The **expressive** act consists of expressing the speaker's opinion regarding the matter towards the audience. It is used in apologies, thanks and congratulations. An example of an expressive act is when the speaker expresses its feelings regarding the last terrorist attack.
3. The **commissive** act aims to commit the listener towards a certain goal related to the issue. It is used in vows, threats and guarantees. An example of a commissive act is when the speaker commits him/herself to do something in the future about the influx of migrants.
4. The **directive** act takes it one step further than the commissive act, because apart from committing to a specific goal, the directive act needs the listener to actually do something. It is used in directives, orders, requests and commands. An example of a directive act is: when the speaker wants the listener to include and accept refugees in society as long as they abide by the rules.
5. The **declaratory** act consists of the speaker tending to influence its surroundings and the world around him/herself and the issue. It is used in declaring war, pronouncing wedlock and adjourning a meeting. An example of a declaratory act is: the world is a dangerous place, full of threats posed by migrants, refugees and criminals all trying to enter the European Union (Vanderveken, 2001, p.2; Vuori, 2008, p. 74).

## 2.4 Influence on the security agenda

An important result of the securitization theory is influence on the security agenda. If securitization took place in this case study of securitization of migration, it could have led to influence of the security agenda in the Netherlands. I have outlined the different ways in which a securitization process can influence the security agenda, to show what the potential results of a process of securitizing can potentially be. This can be done in four different areas; agenda setting of the security issue, prioritizing the security issue, developing new policies related to the security issue and acquiring more funds or investments for the security issue



(Buzan et al, 1998, p. 24, 29, 73, 208; Prins, 2014, p. 68, 279-280; Broeders & Hampshire, 2013, p. 1206).

#### 2.4.1 Framing and agenda setting

Securitization can be considered as a form of framing. It positions the issue within the security frame and puts forward relevant actors and tools (Prins, 2014 p. 66). By qualifying a matter as a security issue, it has strong implications for the policy-makers (Zedner, 2003). Security is often combined with offensive security language and linked to topics such as cyber security, terrorism, migration, drugs and crime. This security language is not just an instrument of describing threatening events, it can be used as a method of social construction to change the perception of a certain issue (Huysmans, 2006, p. 147).

#### 2.4.2 Prioritizing security issues

Securitization can lead towards the prioritisation of security issues. As a result of a successful process of securitization an issue is prioritized on the security agenda. Or as Buzan et al. (1998) state: *'Since security is about priority, it is about elevating issues to absolute priority. And if an issue has not pushed almost all other issues aside, it has not been fully securitized'* (Buzan, et al., 1998; p. 176). This is also related to the rhetoric of securitization and the urgency of the threat. Securitization argues that if the issue is not prioritised and addressed, the issue might cause damages and threats to survival of the state (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 25-26).

#### 2.4.3 New policies and more funds

Securitization can also lead towards the development and need for new policies and more available funds for the topic itself. The development of new policies is often related to the necessity and urgency of the topic. Prioritized topics need new solutions in order to be solved (Buzan et al, 1998, p. 208). An example of a securitized topic which has resulted in increases of investments and the development of new policies, is the topic of immigration. Since the attacks of 9/11 this has resulted in increasing investments made in border control and border control techniques at airports. Biometric borders, automatic checkpoints are more of these technological issues have increased under the aim of securitization. Some argue that these measures are solely influenced by the process of securitization. Others are more critical and consider this a spill-over effect of the importance and necessity to improve the immigration

security measures and the debate of securitization and the prioritisation of the topic due to the political momentum (Broeders & Hampshire, 2013, pp. 1201-1206). When securitization takes place, new policies and more funds can be a result. In this case study of securitization of migration in the Netherlands, I will first determine to what extent it takes place, and if it takes place whether it has led towards practices like those described in this paragraph.

## 2.5 Securitization of migration

A commonly securitized issue is migration. Several authors have written about the migration-security nexus and how migration has become such a politicized and securitized topic (Ceccorulli, 2010; Broeders & Hampshire, 2013; Balzacq et al., 2016 p. 508; Bourbeau, 2011; Huysmans, 2006). Ceccorulli (2010) writes in her article about the construction of the securitization of migration. Security issues are usually constructed based on their threat to security, possible solutions and available technologies. Migration is often framed as a security issue, because it is an unpredictable cross-border issue, bringing external and internal security together. The first securitization process of migration starts in Europe together with the Schengen agreement. The Schengen area was created with a free internal space for flows within the European internal market. Therefore, the external borders needed protection for internal security. This resulted in freedom and security for the European citizens. But as a result, the Schengen borders needed to be better protected with measures against potentially substantial waves of illegal migration. Often used words within the discourse of the securitization debate of migration are: protection, challenge, massive and uncontrolled flows (Ceccorulli, 2010, pp. 493-496).

Huysmans (2006) provides examples how migration is framed as a threat with the capacity of destruction. Firstly, migrants are often not portrayed as individuals with different needs and opinions but as a massive collective force (Huysmans, 2006, p. 58). A massive force of united people is earlier to be feared than a diverse group of people. Secondly migrants are portrayed as having a destructive influence: the numbers of influx and cultural differences. With a sudden influx of migrants, the labour market of a certain country could be destabilized and lead towards civil unrest. The cultural differences could result in unrest as well and lead towards issues of political legitimacy. Those two reasons are related to the existence of the political unit itself, but that is not the biggest fear of most citizens. It is often related according to Huysmans (2006) to the fear that it would affect their future or daily life. Most

fear resulting from migrants and refugees is that they would introduce new values and practices into society, which would change the established community and the existing life patterns.

In addition to this argument, governments have a desire to control their state and especially the demographics and economics of the state like the labour force. Illegal migration represents a challenge to the functional integrity of the state and therefore their control of wealth. The last reason why migration is often securitized is because the threat and fear do create unity within the existing community (Huysmans, 2006, pp. 47-51; Bigo, 2002, p. 65). The security framing used in this matter are the following: *distributing fear and trust (1)*, *administering of inclusion and exclusion (2)* and *institution of alienation and predisposition towards violence (3)* (Huysmans, 2006, p.51). The last strategy which is used against migrants is to enhance border controls and to make it more difficult for migrants to enter a country or a territory. These measures cause that the distance is being sustained between the existing society and the external immigrants (Huysmans, 2006, p. 55).

Within the Dutch political debate, it is sometimes argued that migration poses threat to the state. Examples of mainstream Dutch politicians who recently argued that migrants are a threat to the welfare system, and traditions and culture are: Mark Rutte (VVD), Halbe Zijlstra (VVD) and Sybrand van Haersma Buma (CDA) (Hoedeman & van Soest, 2017; Redactie NU.nl, 2015; Korteweg, 2017). These mainstream politicians argue that migrants position a threat to the state and its society but not that migrants are threatening the existence of the state itself. An existential threat is one step further than a general threat. But it is a necessary step for the process of securitization.

In the case study, the securitization or framing of migration focusses on how refugees are not only securitized but are also framed as potential terrorists. The framing of refugees as potential terrorists originates from the higher influx of refugees from Iraq and Syria. The intelligence services suspect that among those refugees, there are also potential terrorists from Iraq and Syria as part of IS are travelling on the same routes. In chapter 3, I will address this specific issue and discuss in depth the potential dangers this flow of migrants poses to the European Union and in this case, the Netherlands in particular (Europol, 2017, p.6, 22-24; NCTV, 2016, p. 3-4). Although there is potentially a threat as a result of migration,

governments might frame or exaggerate the nature of the threat towards an existential threat to the state, like is done in earlier cases of securitization of migration. Whether this influx of refugees has been portrayed as an existential threat to the Netherlands, will to be determined in the analysis of chapter 4.

## 2.6 Conclusion

Together, these theories form the basis for the analysis that is to follow. The securitization theory directs us towards the securitizing actor, politics and the securitizing act, speech acts (Buzan, et al, 1998). These speech acts and related linguistic analysis by Vuori (2008) and Vanderveken (2001) will be used within the coding analysis of the speech acts in chapter 4. The context of the discussion of securitization of migration is explained by the theories of Huysmans (2006) and Bourbeau (2011). Together they argue that securitization of migration often has occurred and that this is a relevant subject for research. It also explains why migration is seen as such a particular threat. Migration threatens not directly the existence of the state, but it potentially threatens the identity and the tradition of the state by the influx of newcomers. In the next chapter, I look into more detail in this discussion about the securitization of migration and even the potential threats caused by migration such as terrorism and the risk for terrorist attacks.

## 3. Case study of the Netherlands

### 3.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the context of the Dutch case study will be explained. The first part of this chapter consists of the discussion of the refugee influx and the caused societal debate. I will focus on the public debate and numbers regarding the influx of refugees. It will also consist of a discussion about the increase of terrorist attacks and the rise of ISIS and the involvement of foreign fighters and home-grown terrorists. In the second part of this chapter, the Dutch political system, the division of roles, methods of policy making and its traditions regarding speech acts will be discussed. Together, the societal and governmental explanations will provide the necessary context for the analysis of chapter 4.

As a result of the higher influx of refugees and the number of terrorist attacks, refugees were increasingly feared and portrayed as a risk within the Netherlands but also in the broader context of Europe (Bakker & Obbema, 2015). These tensions were addressed by both the media as well as politicians. The politicians discussed the influx of refugees and how the government would handle the emergency shelters provided for refugees (Redactie Binnenland Nieuwsuur, 2015). Several politicians addressed the recent terrorist attacks in Europe such as in Paris, Brussels and Berlin, declared ISIS as an enemy and informed the public about the taken security measures as a result of the threat level (Financieel Dagblad, 2015). The government has in times of crisis and civil unrest a guiding and informing role. Via speeches, statements in Parliament and letters to Parliament the public was being informed and directed by the government.

### 3.2 Societal context

#### 3.2.1 Refugee influx into Europe and the Netherlands

As a result of the increase of refugees towards Europe and the Netherlands, tensions started to show within European societies. This was caused by different factors such as the humanitarian situation on the Southern and Eastern borders of the European Union. As a result of the crowded refugee routes over sea, there were casualties while crossing the Mediterranean Sea. At the routes over land, persons were stopped at the European Union's Eastern borders (Redactie Buitenland Volkskrant, 2015). The visibility of the influx caused discussions, tensions and fear. Most migrants at the European borders faced despair and

hopelessness. When the migration flow moved from the European external borders to the borders inside the Union, several European Union member states threatened or actually did re-impose border controls within the Schengen Area (where normally all border controls have been diminished). This can be considered a process of re-bordering, when the earlier diminished borders are being re-installed (Hakli, 2008; Aas, 2007). All these measures were taken in order to check the flow of migrants. Examples of countries with such imposed border controls were: Germany, Czech Republic, Austria, Slovakia and Hungary (Redactie Algemeen Dagblad, 2016).

These circumstances and measures in Europe caused tensions in the Netherlands as well. In the research period between October 2014 and March 2017, there was the peak of the so-called migration crisis in Europe. Table 3 shows an overview of the asylum applications in that period. At the moment of the peak by the end of 2015, over 1.200.000 asylum applications were submitted to the European Union (Eurostat, 2016). In this entire period, a total of 2.812.875 migrants entered the European borders, of those migrants 1.025.560 were Syrian and Iraqi nationals. That is a share of 36.5%. This means that more than a third of the asylum applications in Europe consisted of Syrian and Iraqi nationals (Eurostat, 2017a, Eurostat, 2015, p. 3, Eurostat, 2017b, p.3).

**Table 3. Overview of asylum applications between Oct 2014 and March 2017 and share of Syrian and Iraqi nationals in the European Union.**

	<b>First time asylum application in the European Union in total</b>	<b>Syrian/Iraqi nationals</b>
2014 Q4	184.200	46.330
2015 (entire year)	1.257.610	484.320
2016 (entire year)	1.206.510	461.960
2017 Q1	164.555	32.950
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.812.875</b>	<b>1.025.560</b>

(Sources: Eurostat, 2017a, Eurostat, 2017b, Eurostat, 2015).

The situation in the Netherlands is similar to the situation in the European Union. Table 4 shows an overview of the asylum applicants in the period between 2014 and 2017. The figures of the Dutch Integration and Naturalisation Service (IND) show that Syrians and Iraqi nationals constitute a big share of the total of asylum applicants of 107.228, with exactly 51.000 Syrian and Iraqi nationals. They form a share of 47,6% of the total asylum applicants,

which is higher than the European Union average of 36.5% (IND, 2015, p.4; IND, 2016, p.4; IND, 2017a, IND, 2017b, p.4).

**Table 4. Overview of asylum applications between Oct 2014 and March 2017 and share of Syrian and Iraqi nationals in the Netherlands.**

	<b>Asylum applicants in the Netherlands</b>	<b>Syrian/Iraqi nationals</b>
2014 Q4	7.265	3.607
2015 (entire year)	58.880	31.160
2016 (entire year)	31.642	11.770
2017 Q1	9.441	4.463
<b>Total</b>	<b>107.228</b>	<b>51.000</b>

(Sources: IND, 2015; IND, 2016; IND, 2017a, IND, 2017b)

As a result of the increase of asylum applications in 2015, new shelters needed to be provided for those within the process of applying for asylum. Different emergency locations in all parts of the Netherlands were established. This has caused tensions and unrest within society as a result of the earlier established violent or hostile attitude towards the incoming migrants (Redactie Binnenland Nieuwsuur, 2015). Bakker & Obbema (2015) did research for the newspaper Volkskrant regarding the support for refugees within Dutch society. They concluded that there was hardly any support to let more refugees enter the Netherlands, only 24% of the Dutch population was in favour of this policy. And 45% of the population argued that less refugees should enter the Netherlands (Bakker & Obbema, 2015).

### 3.2.2 Rise of ISIS and involvement of foreign fighters and home-grown terrorists

In the same period between October 2014 and March 2017, ISIS developed itself as a state and terrorist organization. The rise of ISIS has partly caused the refugee flow from Syrian and Iraqi nationals, but it has also caused directly and indirectly the number of terrorist attacks executed on European soil. The Islamic State in Syria and Iraq was first declared in the summer of 2014 in Raqqa in northern Syria. The terrorist organization claimed from that moment on also to be a state in parts of the territories of Syria and Iraq. Its influence and control would only increase in 2015 and the first part of 2016. Recently, IS lost most of its territories in Syria and Iraq. They were fought by the Syrian regime and the Kurds in Syria, but also by the international coalition of the willing consisting of several Western and Arab countries fighting ISIS. Parallel to the developments in the Middle East, ISIS pointed towards

Europe as one of the biggest enemies, in particular the countries fighting ISIS (BBC News, 2017; Roelants, 2017).

In the conflict in Syria, an increasing number of foreign fighters became involved. Foreign fighters are individuals who joined the conflict in Syria from other countries. Many foreign fighters were originally from Northern African countries, but approximately 5.000 European Union citizens have travelled in 2015 from Europe to Syria to join the fight against the Assad regime (RTL Nieuws, 2015). ISIS recruited them via social media and jihadist propaganda to join the fight. In addition to the foreign fighters, there are also home-grown posing a risk as a result of the propaganda of ISIS. Home-grown terrorists are individuals who are radicalised in their home country and remained there. They are often in some way inspired by ISIS or are in contact with ISIS. These home-grown terrorists and foreign fighters became increasingly important for ISIS, because the fight in Syria and Iraq became more complicated. The next battlefield of ISIS has become Europe. As a result of the threats of ISIS, many Europeans feared that ISIS would execute more terrorist attacks (AIVD, 2014, pp. 6-7, 17-19, 24; NCTV, 2017b, pp. 2-5).

### 3.2.3 Increase of terrorist attacks in Europe

One of the ways in which ISIS used their foreign fighters and home-grown terrorists was to inspire them to execute terrorist attacks in the European Union (NCTV, 2017b pp. 4-5). In 2016, 22 terrorist attacks were executed in Western countries with a suspicion or proof of a jihadist motive. Not in all cases the suspect or perpetrator was in contact with or was coordinated by ISIS, sometimes they were merely inspired by ISIS. The total number of jihadist terrorist attacks in the period of analysis was 33 planned attacks of which 30 were actually executed. In four of these attacks between October 2014 and March 2015 Iraqi and Syrian nationals were among the perpetrators. The other attacks were predominantly executed by so-called 'lone wolves' (individuals operating on their own, with no connection to a certain network), home-grown terrorists or returning foreign fighters with a European/North African background (Europol, 2017; Europol, 2016; Europol, 2015). The intelligence agencies are evident on the threat posed by ISIS. There is a substantial risk on terrorist attacks by Europe as a result of radicalisation/coordination/inspiration by ISIS. But the link between migrants and refugees from Iraq and Syria perpetrating the attacks is limited, however some of them do pose a potential terrorist threat (NCTV, 2017b).



Most of the attacks were executed by home grown terrorists (Europol, 2017; AIVD, 2017). Also, propaganda of ISIS caused unrest in European societies. The propaganda machine of ISIS has used with messages targeted towards ISIS sympathisers such as: *'brothers and sisters, try to use any means possible to pursue terrorist attacks in countries who are part of the coalition against ISIS'* (AIVD, 2017). The response by politicians, governments, institutions and media was to securitize this topic of the refugee flow and migration in a broader perspective and to frame refugees as the potential terrorists of the future (Redactie Volkskrant, 2016).

### 3.3 Political context

This paragraph highlights the political context of the Dutch case study. This is necessary to enable the analysis of speech acts. Each governmental system is different, and the Dutch multi-party system has its own characteristics, also with regard to speech acts, media attention and debating styles.

#### 3.3.1 Dutch political system

The role of the ministers within the Dutch political system is like other political systems predominantly focused on policy-making and executing policies. The ministers are controlled by both Houses of Parliament, the Second Chamber (House of Representatives) and the First Chamber (Senate). Unlike other political systems, in the Netherlands often at least two different political parties are necessary for a majority in government. This means that the government often consists of two or more political parties. In the period of this case study, two parties were cooperating the government; the conservative liberals (VVD) and the social democrats (PvdA). Together these two parties had a majority of seats in the House of Representatives during their elected period. After the Parliamentary election in March 2017, a new combination of political parties has to be formed in order to establish a government. Governments in the Netherlands are established for the elected period of the members of the House of Representatives, which is four years (Tweede Kamer, 2017b; Politiek & Parlement, 2017a).

#### *Division of tasks by ministers*

The selected ministers for the speech act analysis are all partly responsible for either migration, terrorism or security policies. The first minister, is the minister of Justice and

Security. This minister was responsible, together with his State Secretary for the immigration and asylum policies in the Netherlands. They were also responsible for security policies and terrorism. Part of the Ministry of Justice and Security is the National Coordinator for Security and Counterterrorism (NCTV). This special unit is responsible for counterterrorism policies. There were various ministers of Justice and Security during this period of two and a half years due to various scandals. The ministers were the following; minister Opstelten, minister Blok, minister van der Steur, again followed by minister Blok. All these ministers at the ministry of Justice and Security were members of the VVD (Rijksoverheid, 2017b, NCTV, 2017a).

In addition, the minister of Defence Hennis-Plasschaert (VVD) is selected. She was responsible for the border control and the military missions abroad such as Frontex missions on EU borders (Ministerie van Defensie, 2017). Frontex is the European agency for border management. Different member states can contribute in the Frontex missions which are being organised on the European level. The minister of Foreign Affairs Koenders (PvdA) is selected due to his responsibility for the foreign policies, European cooperation on migration and on terrorism. The duties of the minister of Foreign Affairs are less practical than those of the minister of Defence, and are more of a strategic nature (Rijksoverheid, 2017a). Lastly, the Prime Minister Rutte (VVD), or the minister of General Affairs is included. He is responsible for the overall result and he represents the Netherlands on the international and European level (Politiek & Parlement, 2017b).

### *Methods of policy making*

The ministers develop the most legislation and execute legislation and policies on the national level. For new legislation, ministers need majority voting from both houses of Parliament. New legislation is often announced in a letter to Parliament and later discussed in a debate in the House of Representatives. Other letters to Parliament contain updates regarding the execution of current policies and legislation and are an important way to inform both houses of Parliament. Sometimes these updates are requested by the Parliament in a debate or letter and in other cases the Ministry itself has decided to inform the Parliament on a regular basis. In addition, members of Parliament have the right to ask the ministers all questions regarding their policies. This is often done within the scheduled debates with the

minister in question or this is done by writing a letter. The answers are mostly given in writing or in the second term of the debate (Rijksoverheid, 2017c; Tweede Kamer, 2017c).

### 3.3.2 Role of speech acts in the Dutch context

There are different moments when Dutch ministers communicate to the public. Their main method of communication is often via press statements sent out by their press officers. In addition, the ministers debate in both houses of Parliament and those debates are a matter of public record. Visitors can attend the debates, follow the debates online or read the verbatim reports made. In addition, Dutch ministers communicate with the Houses of Parliament during the policy and legislation making processes. All those communications and letters to Parliament are part of the public record. Moreover, Dutch ministers attend a range of public events, depending on their policy portfolio and responsibilities. At those public events, ministers often give a speech in which they discuss their views on policies and developments. Lastly, Dutch ministers are often interviewed on TV and Radio like in news programs or talk shows. Nearly all these events are prepared in advance by the spokespersons and press officers, who have prepared suitable wordings and statements to say. Those statements need to be suitable for the public, but also need to be in coordination with the policies and earlier speeches made by the minister (Rijksoverheid, 2017d). Most of the speech acts I will analyse in chapter 4 are either held on an international or domestic conference or as a press statement.

The actual influence of speech acts on the Dutch public debate has not yet been studied. However, one can argue that in addition to political speech acts, the discussion of such an event by different media (TV, Radio, Newspaper) has an important impact on the public opinion (Bourbeau, 2011, pp. 94-96). The speech acts of the Prime Minister gain the most attention. Other speech acts are sometimes covered in news articles or different types of media, but it is also possible that they are not covered at all. In the analysis, I will focus on the speech acts itself and analyse them separate from the discussion of the media of this topic. This choice is based on the securitization theory and the strength of politics as a securitizing actor (Bourbeau, 2011; pp-3-5; Buzan et al., 1998, pp. 146-147).

### 3.4 Conclusion

The Dutch political system and the societal debate are important parts of the context to consider during the analysis of the speech acts. The societal debate regarding refugees and

terrorism has created significant tensions in society. Especially the increasing influx in numbers of refugees and the increase in terrorist attacks have been detrimental in this regard. The number of refugees which has participated in terrorist attacks was rather low. Therefore, in practice the threat proves to be smaller than it is often portrayed. The number of Syrian and Iraqi nationals within the refugee flow is rather high, but the number of those participating in the execution of terrorist attacks is rather exceptional. The Dutch political system is a multiparty system. Therefore, Dutch politicians need to work together and have to make compromises as of their position in a multiparty government. Speeches are often made within Parliament but also on other occasions. Those speeches are often not written by the ministers themselves but by the speech writers or spokes persons. Speech acts are just one form of communication, debates in Parliament are also official forms of communication by the ministers.

## 4. Analysis of speech acts

### 4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the different speech acts will be analysed. The results of this analysis will be presented in this chapter together with a short interpretation. The more in-depth interpretation will follow in chapter 5, together with the discussion on what this means for the main research question.

For the speech act analysis, the description of illocutionary acts by Vuori (2008) and VanderVeken (2001) will be used. In addition, the content of the speech acts and the usage of securitizing language will be analysed. Within this analysis, three important conditions of the speech act will be taken into account: (1) the designation of a certain existential threat, (2) the requirement of emergency action or necessity of special measures and (3) the accepting significant audience of the speech act (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 24). In the analysis, I will focus on the discursive aspect of the speech act and I will focus to what extent tries the author to convince the public about the securitized threat.

### 4.2 Analysis of the speech acts

The analysis of the speech acts started with the sampling and selection of the speech acts. I have selected speech acts meeting certain requirements such as the time period, the actor giving the speech acts but also the usage of keywords within the speech act. This resulted in 20 sampled speech acts out of a total of 251 archived speech acts. The speech acts were retrieved from the archives of the national government in the selected time period. The speech acts were held at different occasions: differentiating from press statements to international conferences. Half of the speech acts were held or written by the Prime Minister Rutte (10 speech acts), the other speech acts were held by minister Koenders of Foreign Affairs (4), the minister of Defence, Hennis-Plasschaert (4) and the ministers of Justice and Security (2).

The analysis of the speech acts is two-fold. Firstly, I will focus on the linguistic analysis and the illocutionary acts behind the wordings. Secondly, I will focus on the content of the speech act and the usage of wordings and the announcement of new policies, investments and measures. In attachment 2 the code book is laid out together with the results of the analysis. It

consists of numbers of the amount of references and speech acts coded with a specific code. This analysis was done by using the qualitative analysis program Nvivo.

In table 5, I have made an overview of all the different coded illocutionary acts mentioned within the speech acts. I have labelled sentences of the speech acts within the software as a certain type of act (like for example the assertive act). I have sorted these speech acts based upon actor and I have added up the numbers of acts used by specific ministers. This has resulted in table 5 which gives an overview of the illocutionary acts and how they are used by the different ministers. I have analysed the fragments and the context of the fragments before labelling them as a specific speech act. The fragments usually consist out of two up to five sentences all arguing the same substantive point. I have labelled such a fragment as a speech act in cases when the fragment was convincing and has met the description of the act as layed out in the theory of Austin & Searle in the works of Vanderveken (2001) and Vuori (2008) as explained in paragraph 2.3.1.

I will provide an example of labelling a fragment of a speech act as an illocutionary act is the following. Minister Hennis of Defence held speech act 16, in which a clear commissive act is mentioned: *As the Dutch Defence minister, I will commit myself to achieving real progress on these matters. This commitment is fuelled in part by my earlier experiences in for example Latvia. The importance of never taking anything for granted, is now even more evident than before. As I said: the zone of peace and stability that we have built in Europe is at stake. So we need to do everything in our power to maintain it* (Speech act 16, 2016). This fragment is labelled as a commissive act because in the act itself the author/speaker commits herself to the certain goal to maintain stability and peace in Europe. Other fragments are labelled with illocutionary codes in the same way as this fragment has been labelled.

When considering the division of illocutionary acts in table 5, one must take into account the length of the speech act and the number of included speech acts. These factors have a direct influence on the number of coded speech acts. The numbers are absolute and not relative based upon the number of speech acts sampled of a certain actor. Also, in longer speech acts, more illocutionary acts can potentially be used. I did include this short overview of table 5 to provide an insight what the division of illocutionary acts is and by which ministers the acts have been used.

**Table 5 Overview of illocutionary acts in sampled speech acts**

<b>Illocutionary acts</b>	<b>Speech acts by Min Pres Rutte (10)</b>	<b>Speech acts by Min FA Koenders (4)</b>	<b>Speech acts by Min Def Hennis (4)</b>	<b>Speech acts by Min J&amp;V (2)</b>	<b>Total of acts within the speech acts</b>
Assertive act	23	11	6	2	42
Commissive act	8	13	12	5	38
Declaratory act	12	8	4	2	26
Directive act	4	5	5	2	16
Expressive Act	10	4	3	3	20

#### 4.2.1 Speech acts by Prime- Minister Rutte

The speech acts by the Prime Minister fall in three different sub-categories. Firstly, there are two special speech acts held by the King, but they are written by the Prime Minister. This is the Kings Speech or the Troonrede (translated). Those are held by the king at the opening of the Parliamentary year. The aim of the Kings speech is to announce new policies of the government, but also to look back at the last Parliamentary year. This speech act is live broadcasted on national television. Secondly, there are speech acts included of the weekly press conferences held by the Prime Minister. After each ministerial meeting on Fridays, the Prime Minister gives a speech act to the Parliamentary press to update them the news and decisions taken. Those speech acts are also live broadcasted on national television. Lastly there is one general speech act held by the Prime Minister in the European Parliament in Strasbourg, in which the Prime Minister addresses the topic of refugees and security.

During parts of the research period, the Netherlands was chairing the presidency of the Council of the European Union. During the Dutch presidency, the Dutch Prime Minister worked together with the German Chancellor, Merkel to reduce and manage the refugee flow towards the European Union. They were the initiators of the EU-Turkey agreement to decrease the influx of Syrian migrants via Turkey. This so-called Eastern Mediterranean route was effectively closed for new entries. In the press statements after the ministerial meetings, the Prime Minister often addresses the progress of the deal and the most recent numbers of influx. These statements are often rather technical and informative. In these statements, his securitizing addresses are limited.

### *Illocutionary acts*

The Prime Minister mostly uses assertive acts (23) in his speech acts (10). In the assertive acts, the speaker informs the audience regarding policies and facts. The use of those informing acts corresponds to the informing role of the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister is responsible for the communication of government policies. Some of the assertive speech acts are about informing about the procedures and process of managing the refugee flow in Turkey and Libya (Speech acts 2,3,4 & 5, 2016). Most of these assertive acts are used in the press conferences, when the Prime Minister has an informing and updating role for the public. He argues in these acts for example that the two biggest challenges for the Dutch European Union presidency are the jihadists and the refugee flow (Speech act 7, 2015).

Prime Minister Rutte also often uses declaratory acts (12) in the ten speeches analysed. In those declaratory acts, he tends to influence his surroundings. The content of these declaratory acts is mostly focussed on the establishment of the EU-Turkey agreement. He describes how he, Turkey and the other European partners are committed to limit the refugee flow towards Europe and how they established the agreement. He argues how important and necessary the agreement with Turkey is and how relevant it is that both countries continue to work together on limiting the refugee flow towards Europe (Speech act 4, 2016).

The usage of his commissive acts is rather limited. In the King's speech at the opening of the Parliamentary year, he does use a commissive act. He explains how committed he is to work on an open Dutch society. The Prime Minister argues that everyone is welcome, unless they respect the democratic values and duties as laid out in the constitution (Speech act 9, 2016). Indirectly the Prime Minister argues in this commissive act that violence, disrespect and intimidation will not be tolerated. He refers here to the tensions created in European societies by incidents with refugees in several European cities like Keulen in Germany regarding violence and sexual assaults (Leijendekker, 2016).

The selected speech acts of the Prime Minister do not meet the requirements of a securitizing speech act. Firstly, the Prime Minister does not establish an existential threat. He does argue that the refugee flow has to be limited, but he underlines this argument for pragmatic reasons. He does not claim that migrants present an existential threat to the Netherlands or to the European Union. An example of his arguments of the speech acts about the threat posed by



the refugee flow is: *the refugee flow towards Europe has increased due to instability in countries around the borders of Europe. This flow needs to be limited to stop the humanitarian drama happening* (Speech act 8, 2015). He does explain some measures to limit and control the influx of refugees. These measures can to some extent be argued emergency measures such as the emergency shelter mentioned in speech act 7. But he but does not argue for exceptional and different than normal politics. The last characteristic of the accepting audience is complicated and hard to determine. I would argue that the (political) reactions on his speech act were limited, so the audience was accepting. These speeches did not lead towards protests or manifestations.

#### 4.2.2 Speech acts by minister Koenders of Foreign Affairs

The selected speech acts of minister Koenders of Foreign Affairs were held at different occasions when he acted as a Minister of Foreign Affairs. Those are the following occasions: the high-level migration meeting in the annual meeting week of the UN, a seminar about the rule of law, a meeting of European Union ambassadors and the opening of the yearly 'Africa' day. These occasions were not all public events in the sense that any individual could be present, but the events were publicly announced within his public calendar at the website of the Dutch government.

##### *Illocutionary acts*

Minister Koenders has mostly used the commissive speech acts (13) within his four speech acts. Commissive acts are acts in which the speaker commits him or herself to a certain goal or cause. In his different speeches, the minister of Foreign Affairs commits himself or the Dutch government in several ways to do something about a certain cause. Together with showing his commitment, he combines commitment with assertive acts informing the audience about the Dutch perspective but also on current policy developments. An example of such a commissive act is (translated): *'the events in Keulen and other places in Europe, have clearly influenced the European debate regarding migration... We should not keep refugees out because they would not suit in Europe based on their culture and or religion and we should therefore work together to hold individuals accountable to their actions'* (Speech act 12, 2016). In this commissive act, he discusses how the refugee flow and incidents have caused tensions in the European society. The minister commits himself to look for a solution and to not let such issues cause a divide within different groups in society. In his declaratory acts (8), the minister tends to influence his surroundings. He mostly discusses the importance

for European cooperation and how together with the European Union we can face security challenges such as terrorism and migration (Speech act 13, 2016). In addition, he addresses how Europe should also work together with the African continent in order to ensure border management and control to check migration (Speech act, 14, 2015).

The speech acts of minister Koenders do not meet the characteristics for a securitizing speech act. Minister Koenders does not portray the refugees or the refugee flow as an existential threat to the Netherlands, nor does he announce emergency measures. He argues that we should address the problem of the influx of refugees. But the influx should not be treated with securitizing measures or moves. Koenders argues that we should not exaggerate the fear, but that we should address the concerns present. Regarding the audience, I could argue that the speech acts have not faced major critiques. The audience might be accepting of the speech act, the other two (most important) criteria for a securitizing speech act are not met.

#### 4.2.3 Speech acts by minister Hennis-Plasschaert of Defence

The four selected speech acts of minister Hennis-Plasschaert are held at different public occasions. These occasions are the following: The Future Force Conference in 2017, the Chatam House Conference in 2017, European Security and Defence seminar in 2016 and the Distinguished Speaker Series in 2015. These events are all English spoken events, so the selected speeches are in English. These events are announced publicly, but the audiences did not consist of the general public. All of these audiences are not domestically focused but internationally focussed (Speech acts 15,16,17 & 18, 2017).

#### *Illocutionary acts*

Most illocutionary acts used by minister Hennis-Plasschaert of Defence are commissive acts. Those acts are used in order to explain the Dutch position regarding a certain topic or to address its importance for the Netherlands and the commitment to deal with the issue. Specifically, she often argues for the need for more Defence cooperation on a European level and other forms of cooperation on international issues such as terrorism and migration. An example of such a commissive act is: *We cannot afford to turn our backs against the fires burning around the world: .... on the inhumanity of terrorism, on the sectarian violence and collapsing states resulting in uncontrollable refugee flows, illegal immigration and international crime* (Speech act 18, 2015). In this act the minister commits herself, in presence of the audience, to address the different threats (portrayed as fires around the world)

such as uncontrollable refugee flows and inhumanity of terrorism. Minister Hennis establishes the refugee crisis as a certain threat, but not as an existential threat to the Netherlands. In addition, she does not call for the need of emergency measures, she only argues in speech act 18 that the issues should be addressed.

The minister sometimes uses the assertive (6) and directive acts (5). The assertive acts mostly address the audience with informative information such as: *‘with the unravelling of the Arab Spring, it is impossible to deny the huge impact of circumstances in that part of the world. This unravelling has resulted in a resurgent terrorist threat, endemic violence throughout the region, and growing refugee flows towards Europe’* (Speech act 16, 2017). In this act, the minister explains what has caused the situation in the Middle East and later in Europe itself. The directive acts are mostly focussed on the cooperation on the European and international level to address threats and security policies. Directive acts are acts in which the speaker commits him or herself and tries to influence the audience towards a certain direction. In the speech acts of minister Hennis, she tries to direct audiences (e.g. representatives of other countries) towards European or international defence cooperation. In those speech acts she tries to convince the audience to join her common efforts to address security challenges within a united setting (Speech acts 16, 17, 2016). Concluding on the speech acts of minister Hennis of Defence, I can argue that the speech acts did not meet the securitizing speech acts characteristics and that no securitizing language was used during the speech acts.

#### 4.2.4 Speech by the ministers of Justice and Security

The two selected speech acts of the Ministry of Justice and Security were held by the ministers van der Steur and Opstelten. The first speech was held after the terrorist attacks in Paris in November 2015. The other speech was as part of the Cleveringa lecture in 2014. Both speeches were public speeches and the speech of minister van der Steur was held in the Essalam Moske in Rotterdam a few days after the attack. Both of these audiences were domestically focussed.

#### *Illocutionary acts*

The illocutionary acts in those two speeches in total are limited. This is due to the limited length of the first speech and the broadened scope of the second speech. However, both speeches address relevant and significant issues. In both speeches commissive acts were most often used. Examples of such commissive acts are (translated): *‘But protecting the Dutch*

*society against hatred, extremism and violence, cannot be done by the government alone. The whole Dutch population is needed. You are needed. We have to value our freedom together'* (Speech act 19, 2015). Both ministers discuss the need to protect the society together against hatred and jihadism. They discuss that Muslims and Mosques are needed in order to send the message to ISIS and other extremist groups. In addition, they discuss that Dutch traditions need to be preserved and that freedom is important. Jihadist behaviour will not be tolerated. The concept of identity is often discussed, together with security risks and threats for the Netherlands. Both ministers do fear how the situation in the Netherlands is being threatened by terrorists, and not only the physical safety, also the fear for ISIS influence via the internet and the influence on Dutch daily life. In both of their speeches limited attention is paid to the migration flow towards the Netherlands and the connection is not clearly made (Speech acts, 19 & 20). Although this threat to the Netherlands has been established, neither one of the ministers argue this is an existential threat needing emergency measures, therefore these speech acts are not securitizing speech acts.

#### 4.3 Specific themes within the different speech acts

I have discussed the different settings and occasions of speech acts. After this an analysis for the illocutionary acts followed. In this paragraph, I will discuss relevant themes and their relationship to securitization.

The **threat for the Netherlands** is a dominant and relevant theme in the speech acts. In fifteen out of twenty speech acts this threat is mentioned. This threat for the Netherlands is a little bit diverse; it differs from international terrorism and jihadism related to ISIS, to increasing migration flows to Europe and instability on the Southern and Eastern borders of the Union. Regarding the refugee or migration flow, it is often argued by Prime Minister Rutte that the numbers of influx are too high and need to be limited (Speech acts 3,4,5, 6 2016). Rutte explains the influx of the refugee flow as: *I understand that this creates tensions and worries within the society, because you see the developments happening towards your country which are not desirable or controllable but do happen* (Speech act 7, 2015).

A theme what I expected to be important was if **refugees were portrayed as potential terrorists**. Unlike what was expected based on the societal debate and the political discussions, the speech acts did not really address the potential threat and danger refugees

could pose as potential terrorists. Minister Koenders mentions this in his speech about the broader context of the rule of law and the refugee crisis the link between refugees and terrorism. Minister Koenders of Foreign Affairs states in his speech that: *terrorism and migration flows are related and that it is necessary to screen migrants for contributions to terrorism in order to keep Europe safe*. He underlines that *border controls are important especially in times of crisis* (Speech act 12, 2016). Apart from this note, refugees are mostly linked to uncontrollable numbers of influx and the need to decrease the number of refugees entering Europe and not to terrorism. This increase of refugees causes according to the speech acts both humanitarian (risky border crossings and number of casualties) as well as feasibility concerns (border control and providing shelter) (Speech act 8, 11, 12 & 18, 2017).

The **need for new policies and measures** and **new measures proposed** such as border control are mentioned in ten different speech acts. Prime Minister Rutte argues in speech act 8 in 2015 that *new measures and instruments are needed in order to control and manage the refugee flow*. He argues that *existing measures are not sufficient enough to deal with this humanitarian drama and the high numbers* (Speech act 8, 2015). In both speeches of the King (Speech act 2 and 3) in 2016 and 2015 extra money has been reserved for security and defence. Those are considered necessary in such an instable world. The necessity for more investments is argued by both Prime Minister Rutte (speech act 1, 2016) as well as minister Hennis (speech act 17, 2016). The need for new measures mostly focusses on a comprehensive approach consisting of cooperation of different member states within and outside the European Union. All four ministers underline that cooperation in times of crisis is important in order to solve the security issues. In fifteen different speech acts is the importance or mentioning of European cooperation addressed.

Regarding the **feelings of insecurity** and **tensions in society**, the speeches are more diverse. Not all ministers mention these themes. The feelings of insecurity and tensions within society have in all cases to do with either ISIS and the threat for terrorist attacks in Europe or more specifically in the Netherlands (Speech act 14 & 17, 2017), or the influx in numbers of refugees which seems not be controllable by governments themselves (Speech act 7,8 & 12, 2017). The tensions discuss the integration process in Europe and the Netherlands in particular. They discuss how different groups in society would react to newcomers and how important it is to integrate and not to assimilate (Speech act 12, 2016).

#### 4.4 Conclusion

Within the speeches studied for this thesis, the most-used illocutionary acts were assertive and commissive acts. The speech acts in the Netherlands have a predominantly informing nature and are an important way to inform the public and the audience. In addition, the speech acts are used to show commitment to the case, policy, solution or cooperation and that they will contribute towards the process of policy-making and improvement in the future. Regarding the content of the speech acts, I can conclude that migration and refugees are considered a threat for the Netherlands. Refugees are not often linked to jihadism or potential terrorist attacks. Only in one speech this connection is mentioned in relation to the necessity of 'extra' checks on migrants at the European borders regarding terrorism (Speech act 12, 2016). In addition, the fact that new policies are needed, is often argued. However, the need for more investments however is limited. Most of these measures focus on how to control and check the borders and how to decrease the number of refugees and not to counter the threat the refugees pose as terrorists.

Considering the conditions of a securitizing speech act, all ministers have discussed the threats posed by terrorism or even migration. The threats established are not portrayed as an existential threat to the Netherlands on a physical level nor on a functional level. This is however the most important condition for a securitizing speech act. Emergency measures are the second condition for a securitizing speech act. The measures discussed in the speech acts are not emergency measures requiring exceptional politics or not normal behaviour. The ministers do not aim for emergency measures, but they aim that the security issues are addressed quickly and comprehensively. The last condition is the requirement of an accepting audience. The audience needs to be accepting the speech and does not protest against the positioned frame or securitizing move. In this case no securitization takes place within the speech acts, which makes it hard for the audience not to be accepting. The conditions of a securitizing speech act are not met. This means that no securitizing moves have been made by the ministers in their speech acts. What this means for the broader perspective of this research will be discussed in the conclusion chapter.

## 5. Conclusion

### 5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the results of the analysis of chapter 4 will be discussed in relation to the research question. I will reflect upon the broader research and I will discuss what the outcomes mean for the theoretical discourse of securitization. I will discuss what the consequences of these results are for the broader scientific and societal debate on securitization of migration. Lastly, I will discuss specific suggestions for further research and how these suggestions might be relevant and important to execute to improve the scientific and societal debate.

### 5.2 Addressing the research question

The research question posed in paragraph 1.2 was:

*To what extent has the increased influx of Syrian and Iraqi nationals to the European Union been securitized in the Netherlands by the responsible ministers in the period between October 2014 and March 2017?*

I have analysed twenty speech acts about the increased influx of Syrian and Iraqi nationals to the European Union by the responsible Dutch ministers in the Netherlands between October 2014 and March 2017. In their speeches, they have used a very limited degree of securitizing language or the logic of exception. The logic of exception means that exceptional policies and practices are legitimized in the presence of a security threat. The speech acts were not securitized and have only been politicized to a certain limited extent (Bourbeau, 2011, pp. 131).

The fact that the speech acts were not securitizing can also be concluded based upon the theoretically developed requirements for a securitizing speech act by Buzan et al. (1998). The speech acts did discuss migrants or the migration flow as an existential threat to the Netherlands or Europe. A certain threat was established but none of them mentioned this threat would be existential to the state. The establishment of an existential threat is a requirement for securitization. In addition, this existential threat should require emergency measures which should be implemented during extra ordinary politics. In this case of the Dutch ministers, they discussed the necessity of new measures to address the increasing influx, but not emergency measures requiring different than normal politics and different or

crisis methods of decision-making. The last requirement of a securitizing speech act is an accepting audience. This is the requirement which is complicated to assess. I argue since those speech acts have not resulted in protests online or offline and that no major contradicting news have appeared in the media, that the audience has been accepting. However, this is not relevant since the most important conditions of the speech act, the existential threat and emergency measures have not been met.

The issue of the migration flow was not securitized, but merely politicized as an issue of importance that needed to be addressed in the European context with the cooperation of different European Union member states. The **politicization of migration** was part of the topic of my thesis. The research question was focussed to what extent securitization of migration took place. However, politicization of migration is relevant in this conclusion. The politicization of migration refers in this context to: *'the process of taking an issue out of restricted networks and bringing the issue into the public arena'* (Bourbeau, 2011, p. 130; Huysmans, 2006, pp. 89-90). Politicization of migration can both be positive as well as negative. Positive politicization of migration would be to frame migrants for their positive contributions to their new country, negative politicization would be the results of migration on the welfare states and social problems from large migrant groups. Politicization can lead towards securitization, but once an issue is politicized, it is not necessarily securitized (Bourbeau, 2011, pp. 42-44).

The politicization process and the securitization process are different but are certainly interlinked to another (Bourbeau, 2011, p. 133). Politicization took place, because the issue of migration was in this case study taken out of the restricted networks. And the issue was brought to the public arena by discussing the issue in speech acts. Mostly negative politicization of migrants was used. Especially in relationship to high numbers of influx, migrants were framed as potential security threat, and blamed to cause tensions within the society (Speech act 9, 2016). Another issue, which was addressed in this context, is the issue of identity. The identity and social norms of the refugees are different than those in Europe, which might cause problems or tensions within society (Speech act 12, 2016).



### 5.3 Discussion of the results in a broader perspective

In this paragraph, I will put the research and the addressing of the research question into a perspective of the broader research and ongoing academic and public debate about the securitization of migration.

In the speech acts analysed, no securitizing moves were made according to the official definitions of the securitization theory. Most definitions are strictly and narrow formulated within the securitization theory (Buzan et al, 1998). In the works of McDonald (2008) and Bigo (2002), securitizing speech acts were critically discussed. Both these authors argue that speech acts should not be considered the **only securitizing moves**. They argued that is a far too narrow approach to research securitization. Bigo (2002) argues in particular in his work that bureaucratic practices and physical action also could lead towards securitization and not solely through language of a speech act. This could be an argument why the speech acts of the ministers were not securitizing. Other actors could be included to research the process of securitization, which could have changed the outcomes of the research. This also argues that it is possible that securitization took place in the Netherlands regarding this topic, but that it took place outside the set framework by the securitization theory as applied in this thesis.

Another strict part of the definition of securitization is the **absolutist approach** towards prioritisation within the securitization theory. The securitization theory argues that if the issue is not prioritised and addressed by politicians, the issue might cause damages and threats to survival of the state (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 25-26). I think there is a need to nuance this argued 'absolutism' of securitization, because I do not consider only 100% absolute and prioritized issues a fully and successfully securitized topic. This is not feasible in practice, because politics are always about more issues at the same and different issues are prioritized in order to rule a country.

As earlier mentioned, a securitizing move requires the establishment of an **existential threat**. This has been strictly defined by Buzan et al (1998) on p. 43. In this case study, this can prove to be somewhat problematic. The subject of the speech acts was migration and the refugee influx. This subject has been considered a securitized topic before according to Huysmans (2006) and Bourbeau (2011). However, their definition of an existential threat is somewhat broader than the definition of the Copenhagen School. The threat does not

necessarily need to be physically oriented, but can also be rather functional to threaten the identity of the state (Huysmans, 2006). This definition is problematic, because it is too broad and too many policy topics can be then considered securitized topics. The established definition of the existential threat is threatening the existence of a certain state and not the functioning of the state. I consider the existential threat as an important criterion of the securitization theory. I understand how threats not solely danger the physical existence of the state and also the functional integrity. But I think the definition should be applied to cases as it is originally developed and not to be broadened towards functional integrity. If you broaden the definition too much, the range of securitized issues becomes too broad. The statement that an issue is securitized has been inflated and means nothing anymore.

Migration is portrayed as a threat, but not as a threat to the existence of the state by the regular politicians. Only the extreme edge of the Dutch political spectrum considers refugees an existential threat (Hoofdredactie Financieel Dagblad, 2017; Wilders, 2017). Considering migration as an existential threat proves problematic since the accepted and common politicians never portray migration as such. In the sampled speech acts no securitizing moves were made. This can be caused by different factors. The **wrong (political) actors** could have been selected for the analysis. The current political actors are representing the nuanced 'middle' of the political spectrum. With the selection of different political actors representing the edges of the political spectrum, the conclusion might have been different. To what extent radical political parties contribute more towards securitization than regular political parties has not been researched in depth. But Özerim (2013) argues in his article that the rise of radical right parties has influenced the debate regarding the securitization of migration.

However, the choice for these political actors was based on the theory of securitization to choose the actors with significant political influence and who were elected officials. And the selected ministers were falling under the scope of this definition. (Buzan et al, 1998, pp 31-34). could argue that in the Netherlands the process of influence and securitization is different, since most wordings are inexplicit and nuanced and that more politicians with more 'extreme' opinions should have been included. The politicians in government have to cooperate with one another in order to obtain the majority and cannot divert too much on their earlier made statements regarding migration (Breeman et al, 2009, p.2).

Another factor could be the **sampling of the speech acts**. The sample of the speech acts is made by a selection of different criteria on the total population of speech acts. Some of these speech acts do include speeches for elite audiences, such as members of Parliament or Ambassadors. A limited amount of the speech acts is held for mass audiences. The effect on the public opinion is different from mass audiences than those from elite audiences. Although migration is a public issue, mass audiences are mostly influenced by securitization (Bourbeau, 2011, p. 99-100, pp. 122-123).

Another issue might be that the **research period** of this thesis is rather short. It is limited to a period of two and a half years. Due to feasibility reasons and no media securitizing agents were included. A critique on this research can be that the results might be different, if the research period was extended and if other factors were included. Bourbeau (2011) did a more extensive research on the securitization of migration. In this extensive research, he compared the securitization of migration in both Canada and France. For this research, he analysed 3.500 speech acts of both countries during a period of sixteen years, between 1989 and 2005. He combined this speech act analysis with a discourse analysis of 900 editorials of different newspapers and sixteen expert interviews (Bourbeau, 2011, pp. 3-5). His results were somewhat similar. He argues in his conclusion that however the logic of exception was often used and strong politicized speeches about migration were held, but no securitizing moves were made in both countries (Bourbeau, 2011, pp. 130-131).

#### 5.4 Reflections on securitization theory

The fact that securitizing moves did not take place in the Dutch case study, leaves me wondering whether the framework of the securitization theory is applicable to the Netherlands. Of course, this thesis research was a relatively small exercise in comparison to the works of for example Bourbeau (2011), but it shows that in this short time period, securitizing moves did not take place. This might have something to do with the Dutch political system that requires multi party cooperation in government, but might also have something to do with the subject of the speech acts, migration. Like Bourbeau (2011) argues in his research regarding the securitization of migration, no securitizing moves were made. There was only the politicization of the subject itself. It therefore is complicated to argue bigger influence on the academic debate. Merely, I could argue that existential threats regarding securitization of migration might prove problematic in different case studies when using the official definitions.

Another factor is that the original **securitization theory might be outdated**. It dates from 1998. The theory is nearly twenty years old. This might prove problematic, because it questions to what extent this theory is still applicable in practice. The theory is applied in this thesis to one case. But this case study draws doubt upon the central assumption of the securitization theory, that existential threat is necessary for securitization. In the last twenty years, a lot has changed within the domain of security studies and in society. Especially how we portray existential threats. Since the Cold War, existential military threats have become rare. More functional threats have been on the rise within the domains of cyber security and environmental security for example (Buzan et al, 1998; Hansen & Nissenbaum, 2009). One could argue that existential threats have become rare and that the process of securitization itself has lead towards the outdatedness of the securitization theory. By the inclusion of more topics into the security domain, the security domain has become blurred according to me. Not all of these topics meet the central and original definitions of the securitization theory anymore. Those definitions of securitization were rather strict on issues like the absolute prioritisation of security topics and the need for an existential threat calling for emergency measures. I would argue that because more topics have become securitized, it makes the securitization school somewhat outdated and less applicable. The ongoing process of including security topics has changed the field of security studies (McDonald, 2008, p. 580).

Although the securitization theory is already twenty years old, it is still used in academic research, like the works of Bourbeau (2011) and Huysmans & Squire (2009). In addition, the **subject of migration has changed** since the development of the securitization theory in the 1990s. Different exogenous shocks have occurred. Those shocks have influenced the societal debate regarding the issue. Those shocks are the refugee crisis in the 90s, to the events of 9/11 and the current refugee crisis towards Europe. These changes in the debate regarding migration can influence the perspective on the potential threats (Bourbeau, 2011, p. 46). In this same period of twenty years, other developments have changed the world and also the politics of influence by the **rise of the Internet**. Since the 1990s the internet has become increasingly used and especially over the last five years the usage of social media has grown. The development of social media, and the raise of influencers but also online reach has grown. More people can be influenced by movies, posts and pictures. In this way, social media could potentially play a role within the process of securitization and not only via original speech acts.

For **future research**, I would recommend extending this research on the securitization of migration by including more political agents such as the extreme right political parties, since their remarks often go further within the securitization debate. In addition, I would recommend including media agents as well, since the role of the media is different than the political agents. It would be interesting to see how the Dutch newspapers discuss migration and if it is being pushed as the main topic. This would contribute towards the existing literature since media agents are also important in the process of securitization (Bourbeau, 2011, Buzan et al., 1998). Apart from the addition of different actors, a longer time period would be good suggestion for a new research. When the period of analysis is longer, more speech acts can be analysed. These suggestions are interesting to research and have not been earlier executed in the Netherlands and would add to the academic relevance.

Concluding I would argue that this research has been an interesting start of researching securitization of migration in the Netherlands. By pursuing this recent case study of potential securitization of migration, the theory of securitization was applied in a rather recent context, the period between 2014 and 2017 in the Netherlands. Although this research consisted of merely one case study, the results did question one of the central assumptions of the securitization theory. The fact that speech acts contribute towards the process of securitization and that migration is considered a solid topic for securitization. In this research, this proves somewhat problematic. If you apply the strictly defined original theory to the recent context of the migration influx to Europe, migration does not pose the required existential threat. This threat is however necessary for the topic to become securitized. No securitizing moves were made within the sampled speech acts. And it is unlikely that the politicians of the middle of the political spectrum will contribute to securitization of the migration influx by arguing for an existential threat and the need emergency measures in the nearby future in the Netherlands.

This research leaves us with the question whether this important theory for security studies is still applicable to recent developments in the Western world. More research and a speech act analysis are needed to address this question properly. Based on this single case study no big conclusions can be drawn yet regarding the theory itself. This research does open the room for the discussion to debate what makes a topic a security topic and whether an existential threat is necessary to become a security topic at all. I would contribute to this debate that the

value of a security topic should not be broadened too much to prevent inflation of security topics from happening.

## Bibliography

### Books

Baarda, D.B., M.P.M. de Goede & J. Teunissen (2005). Basisboek kwalitatief onderzoek: Handleiding voor het opzetten en uitvoeren van kwalitatief onderzoek (2<sup>e</sup> ed). *Stenfert Kroese*: Houten.

Bazerman, C. (2004), Chapter 11: Speech acts, genres and activity systems. How texts organize activity and people, pp. 309-339. in: Bazerman, C. & P Prior (2004) *What Writing Does and how it does it*. *Routledge*: London.

Bourbeau, P. (2011), *The Securitization of migration: a study of movement and order*. *Routledge*: London.

Buzan, B., O. Waever & J. de Wilde (1998), *Security: a new framework for Analysis*. Lynne Reiner Publishers: Boulder, CO.

Hakli, J. (2008) Re-bordering spaces. In: *The SAGE handbook of Political Geography* by Cox, Murray & Robinson. *Sage Publishing*: Los Angeles.

Hart, H. 't, H. Boeije & J. Hox (2009), *Onderzoeksmethoden* (8<sup>e</sup> ed). *Boom Lemma Uitgevers*: Den Haag.

Hay, I. (2010), *Qualitative research methods in human geography* (3<sup>e</sup> ed). *Oxford University Press*: Donn Mills, ON.

Huysmans, J. & V. Squire (2009), "Migration and Security", *Handbook of Security Studies*. *Routledge*: London.

Huysmans, J. (2006), *The politics of insecurity: Fear, migration and asylum in the EU*. *Routledge*: London.

Kelstrup, M. (2004), 'Globalisation and societal insecurity: the securitization of terrorism and competing strategies for global governance' in Stefano Guzzini and Dietrich Jung eds. *Contemporary Security Analysis and Copenhagen peace research*. *Routledge*: London.

Prins, R. (2014), *Safety first: how local processes of securitization have affected the position and role of Dutch mayors*. *Eleven International Publishing*: Portland.

Yin (1994), *Case study research: Design and methods*, 2<sup>th</sup> edition. *Sage Publishing*: Thousand Oaks.

Waever, O. (2000) p. 251 in: Kelstrup, M. (2004), 'Globalisation and societal insecurity: the securitization of terrorism and competing strategies for global governance' in Stefano Guzzini and Dietrich Jung eds. *Contemporary Security Analysis and Copenhagen peace research*. *Routledge*: London.

## Articles

- Aas, K. F. (2007) Analysing a World in Motion: Global flows meet 'criminology of the other', *Theoretical Criminology*, 11(2), pp. 283-303.
- Abrahamsen, R. (2005), Blairs Africa: the politics of securitization and fear. *Alternatives* 30(1), pp. 55-80.
- Ardau, C. & R. van Munster (2012), The securitization of catastrophic events: trauma, enactment and preparedness exercises. *Alternatives: global, local, political* 37(3), pp. 227-239.
- Baldwin, D.A (1997), The Concept of Security. *Review of International Studies* 23(1) pp. 5-26.
- Balzacq, T., S. Leonard, J. Ruzicka (2016), 'Securitization' revisited: theory and cases. *International Relations* 30(4), pp. 494-531.
- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The qualitative report* 13(4), pp. 544-559.
- Bigo, D. (2002), Security and immigration: Toward a critique of the governmentality of unease. *Alternatives* (27)1), pp. 63-92.
- Breeman, G., D. Lowerly, C. Poppelaars, S. Resodihardjo, A. Timmermans & J. de Vries (2009), Political attention in a coalition system: Analysing Queen's speeches in the Netherlands 1945-2007. *Acta Politica* 44(1), pp. 1-27.
- Broeders, D. & J. Hampshire (2013) 'Dreaming of Seamless Borders: ICTs and the Pre-Emptive Governance of Mobility in Europe', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 39(8), pp. 1201-1218.
- Castles, S. (2000), International migration at the beginning of the twenty-first century: global trends and issues. *International Social Science Journal*, 52 (165), pp. 269-281.
- Ceccorulli, M. (2010), Security and migration: the development of the Eastern dimension. *European Security* 19(3), pp. 491-510.
- Collavin, E. (2011). 13. Speech acts. *Foundations of Pragmatics*, 1, 373.
- COT (2007) *Notions of Security. Shifting Concepts and Perspectives*. Deliverable 1, Work package 2 'Citizens and governance in a knowledge-based society'
- Hansen, L. & Nissenbaum, H. (2009). Digital disaster, cyber security, and the Copenhagen School. *International studies quarterly* 53(4), pp. 1155-1175.
- Huysmans, J. (2011), What's in an act? On security speech acts and little security nothings. *Security Dialogue* 42(4-5), pp. 371-383.



- Huysmans, J. (2002), Defining social constructivism in security studies: the normative dilemma of writing security. *Alternatives* 27(1), pp. 41-62.
- Leonard, S. (2010), EU border security and migration into the European Union: Frontex and securitisation through practices. *European Security* 19(2), pp. 231-254.
- Marshall, M. (1996), Sampling for qualitative research. *Family Practice* 13(6), pp. 522-526.
- McDonald, M. (2008), Securitization and the construction of security. *European Journal of International Relations* 14(4), pp. 563-587.
- McSweeney, B. (1996), Identity and security: Buzan and the Copenhagen School. *Review of International Studies* 22(1), pp. 81-93.
- Özerim, M. G. (2013), European radical right parties as actors in securitization of migration. In *Proceedings of World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology* 7(8), pp. 2196-2200.
- Trombetta, M. (2008), Environmental security and climate change: analysing the discourse. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 21(4), pp. 585-602.
- Seawright, J. & Gerring, J. (2008). Case selection techniques in case study research: A menu of qualitative and quantitative options. *Political Research Quarterly* 61(2), pp. 294-308.
- Vanderveken, D. (2001). Universal grammar and speech act theory. *Essays in speech act theory*, 77 (25), pp. 25-62.
- Vuori, J. (2008), Illocutionary logic and strands of securitization: applying the theory of securitization to the study of Non-democratic political orders. *European Journal of International Relations* 14(1), pp. 65-99.
- Zedner, L. (2003), The concept of security: an agenda for comparative analysis. *Legal Studies* 23(1), pp. 153-175.

### Electronic sources

- Albers, J. (2015), In Vrij Nederland: 'Er ligt een verkeerde focus op vluchtelingen'. <https://www.vn.nl/er-dreigt-een-verkeerde-focus-op-vluchtelingen/>. Consulted November 19<sup>th</sup> 2017.
- AIVD (2017), Aangestuurde, gestimuleerde en geïnspireerde aanslagen. <https://www.aivd.nl/onderwerpen/terrorisme/dreiging/aangestuurde-gestimuleerde-en-geinspireerde-aanslagen>. Consulted October 13<sup>th</sup> 2017.
- AIVD (2014), Transformatie van het jihadisme in Nederland. <https://www.aivd.nl/publicaties/publicaties/2014/06/30/transformatie-van-het-jihadisme-in-nederland>. Consulted November 23<sup>rd</sup> 2017.

Bakker, M. & F. Obbema (2015), In Volkskrant: Geen draagvlak voor ‘meer vluchtelingen’. <https://www.volkskrant.nl/buitenland/geen-draagvlak-voor-meer-vluchtelingen~a4121474/>. Consulted November 21<sup>st</sup> 2017.

BBC News (2017), Islamic State and the crisis in Iraq and Syria in maps. <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-27838034>. Consulted November 23<sup>rd</sup> 2017.

Council of Ministers (2002), Council Framework Decision of 13 June 2002 on combatting terrorism (2002/475 JHA). <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32002F0475&from=EN>. Consulted November 15<sup>th</sup> 2017.

Europol (2017), Terrorism Situation and Trend Report European Union. <https://www.europol.europa.eu/tesat/2017/>. Consulted October 13<sup>th</sup> 2017.

Europol (2016), Terrorism Situation and Trend Report European Union. <https://www.europol.europa.eu/activities-services/main-reports/european-union-terrorism-situation-and-trend-report-te-sat-2016>. Consulted November 19<sup>th</sup> 2017.

Europol (2015), European Union Terrorism situation and trend report. <https://www.europol.europa.eu/activities-services/main-reports/european-union-terrorism-situation-and-trend-report-2015>. Consulted November 19<sup>th</sup> 2017.

Eurostat (2017a), Asylum and first time asylum applicants in the EU. <http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/submitViewTableAction.do>. Consulted November 21<sup>st</sup> 2017.

Eurostat (2017b), Asylum Report Statistics Explained. <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/6049358/7005580/Asylum+Quarterly+Report+Q1+2017.pdf/94c64b2c-39ec-4228-a47f-1877c19070ad>. Consulted November 21<sup>st</sup> 2017.

Eurostat (2016), Eurostat News Release: Asylum in the EU member states. <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/2995521/7203832/3-04032016-AP-EN.pdf/>. Consulted September 29<sup>th</sup> 2017.

Eurostat (2015), Asylum Quarterly Report Statistics Explained. [http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/6049358/7005580/Q1\\_2015\\_SE+article.pdf/c7904337-30b8-4e60-9292-8789266199db](http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/6049358/7005580/Q1_2015_SE+article.pdf/c7904337-30b8-4e60-9292-8789266199db). Consulted November 21<sup>st</sup> 2017.

Financieel Dagblad (2015), Rutte: Nederland is in oorlog met ISIS. <https://fd.nl/economie-politiek/1127351/rutte-grensbewaking-aangescherpt>. Consulted November 26<sup>th</sup> 2017.

Frontex (2016), Annual Risk Analysis 2016. [http://frontex.europa.eu/assets/Publications/Risk\\_Analysis/Annula\\_Risk\\_Analysis\\_2016.pdf](http://frontex.europa.eu/assets/Publications/Risk_Analysis/Annula_Risk_Analysis_2016.pdf). Consulted September 29<sup>th</sup> 2017.

Hoedeman, J. & H. van Soest (2017), In het Algemeen Dagblad: Rutte: ‘Normaal doen is de norm die we uitdragen’. <https://www.ad.nl/nieuws/normaal-doen-is-de-norm-die-we-moeten-uitdragen~a4fbbb0a/>. Consulted November 27<sup>th</sup> 2017.

Hoofredactie Financieel Dagblad (2017), Wilders misbruikt vluchtelingencrisis. <https://fd.nl/economie-politiek/1119229/wilders-misbruikt-vluchtelingencrisis>. Consulted December 6th 2017.

IND (2017a), Asylum trends in 2017. <https://ind.nl/en/about-ind/figures-and-publications/Pages/Asylum-Trends.aspx>. Consulted November 21<sup>st</sup> 2017.

IND (2017b), Asylum Trends. Monthly report on asylum applications in the Netherlands: October 2017. [https://ind.nl/Documents/AT\\_October\\_2017.pdf](https://ind.nl/Documents/AT_October_2017.pdf). Consulted November 21st 2017.

IND (2016), Asylum trends. Monthly report on asylum applications in the Netherlands: December 2016. [https://ind.nl/en/Documents/AT\\_December\\_2016.pdf](https://ind.nl/en/Documents/AT_December_2016.pdf). Consulted November 21<sup>st</sup> 2017.

IND (2015), Asylum Trends. Monthly report on asylum applications in the Netherlands: February 2015. [https://ind.nl/en/Documents/AT\\_February\\_2015.pdf](https://ind.nl/en/Documents/AT_February_2015.pdf). Consulted November 21st 2017.

IOM (2017), Key Migration Terms. <https://www.iom.int/key-migration-terms>. Consulted November 15<sup>th</sup> 2017.

Korteweg, A. (2017), In Volkskrant: Sybrand Buma in HJ Schoo lezing: ‘onze traditie en cultuur mogen we niet laten verwateren’. <https://www.volkskrant.nl/politiek/sybrand-buma-in-hj-schoo-lezing-onze-traditie-en-cultuur-mogen-we-niet-laten-verwateren~a4514939/>. Consulted November 27<sup>th</sup> 2017.

Leijendekker, M. (2016), In NRC: ‘Vluchtelingen randden vrouwen aan in Keulen’. <https://www.nrc.nl/nieuws/2016/09/06/vluchtelingen-randden-vrouwen-aan-in-keulen-4159632-a1520067>. Consulted November 29th 2017.

Ministerie van Defensie (2017), Grenstoezicht. <https://www.defensie.nl/onderwerpen/taken-in-nederland/grenstoezicht>. Consulted November 16th 2017.

NCTV (2017a), Organisatie NCTV. <https://www.nctv.nl/organisatie/>. Consulted November 16<sup>th</sup> 2017.

NCTV (2017b), Dreigingsbeeld terrorisme Nederland 44: April 2017. [https://www.nctv.nl/binaries/DTN44%20Samenvatting%206%20april%202017\\_tcm31-254139.pdf](https://www.nctv.nl/binaries/DTN44%20Samenvatting%206%20april%202017_tcm31-254139.pdf). Consulted November 23rd 2017.

NCTV (2016), Dreigingsbeeld Terrorisme Nederland 43: November 2016. [https://www.nctv.nl/binaries/DTN43\\_samenvatting\\_opgemaakt%20def\\_tcm31-214349.pdf](https://www.nctv.nl/binaries/DTN43_samenvatting_opgemaakt%20def_tcm31-214349.pdf). Consulted November 20<sup>th</sup> 2017.

Paternotte, B. (2016), PEW: Europeanen bang dat vluchtelingen terrorisme aanwakkeren en banen afpakken. <http://nieuws.tpo.nl/2016/07/12/europeanen-denken-vluchtelingen-banen-afpakken-en-terrorisme-aanwakkeren/>. Consulted November 19<sup>th</sup> 2017.

Politiek & Parlement (2017a), Kabinet Rutte II (2015-2017).  
[https://www.parlement.com/id/vj47glycfix9/kabinet\\_rutte\\_ii\\_2012](https://www.parlement.com/id/vj47glycfix9/kabinet_rutte_ii_2012). Consulted November 16<sup>th</sup> 2017.

Politiek & Parlement (2017b), Minister-President.  
[https://www.parlement.com/id/vh8lnhrogvvn/minister\\_president](https://www.parlement.com/id/vh8lnhrogvvn/minister_president). Consulted November 23<sup>rd</sup> 2017.

Redactie Algemeen Dagblad (2016), Domino effect bij invoeren grenscontroles in Europa.  
<https://www.ad.nl/buitenland/domino-effect-bij-invoeren-grenscontroles-in-europa~a9adfc2c/>. Consulted November 21<sup>st</sup> 2017.

Redactie Binnenland Nieuwsuur (2015), Bezorgdheid om draagvlak opvang vluchtelingen.  
<https://nos.nl/nieuwsuur/artikel/2061750-bezorgdheid-om-draagvlak-opvang-vluchtelingen.html>. Consulted November 21<sup>st</sup> 2017.

Redactie Binnenland NOS (2016), Terroristen onder vluchtelingen? ‘Goed mogelijk, maar wel omslachtig’.  
<https://nos.nl/artikel/2109714-terroristen-onder-vluchtelingen-goed-mogelijk-maar-wel-omslachtig.html>. Consulted November 19<sup>th</sup> 2017.

Redactie Binnenland NOS (2015), Waarschuwingsschoten en gewonden bij onrust in Geldermalsen.  
<https://nos.nl/artikel/2075657-waarschuwingsschoten-en-gewonden-bij-onrust-in-geldermalsen.html>. Consulted September 30<sup>th</sup> 2017.

Redactie Buitenland Volkskrant (2015), Fort Europa ‘dit jaar 750 duizend migranten voor Duitsland’.  
<https://www.volkskrant.nl/buitenland/fort-europa-dit-jaar-750-duizend-migranten-voor-duitsland~a4124414/>. Consulted November 21<sup>st</sup> 2017.

Redactie Buitenland Volkskrant (2014), IS stuurt terroristen als asielzoekers naar het westen.  
<https://www.volkskrant.nl/buitenland/-is-stuurt-terroristen-als-asielzoekers-naar-westen~a3763145/>. Consulted November 1<sup>st</sup> 2017.

Redactie NU.nl (2015), Zijlstra noemt asielzoekers bedreiging welvaart.  
<https://www.nu.nl/politiek/4142501/zijlstra-noemt-asielzoekers-bedreiging-welvaart.html>. Consulted November 27<sup>th</sup> 2017.

Redactie Volkskrant (2016), Europol waarschuwt voor grootschalige aanslagen IS tegen Europese burgers.  
<https://www.volkskrant.nl/buitenland/europol-waarschuwt-voor-grootschalige-aanslagen-is-tegen-europese-burgers~a4231844/>. Consulted October 13<sup>th</sup> 2017.

Rijksoverheid (2017a), Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken: Internationale vrede en veiligheid.  
<https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/internationale-vrede-en-veiligheid>. Consulted November 16<sup>th</sup> 2017.

Rijksoverheid (2017b), Ministerie van Justitie en Veiligheid.  
<https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/ministeries/ministerie-van-justitie-en-veiligheid>. Consulted November 16<sup>th</sup> 2017.

Rijksoverheid (2017c), Hoe komt een wet tot stand?  
<https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/wetgeving/hoe-komt-een-wet-tot-stand>. Consulted November 23<sup>rd</sup> 2017.

Rijksoverheid (2017d), Uitgangspunten overheidscommunicatie.  
<https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten/richtlijnen/2010/12/09/uitgangspunten-overheidscommunicatie>. Consulted November 23<sup>rd</sup> 2017.

Roelants, C. (2016), In NRC Handelsblad: Hoe Islamitische Staat opstond en weer ondergaat.  
<https://www.nrc.nl/nieuws/2017/04/04/kijken-hoe-islamitische-staat-opstond-en-weer-ondergaat-a1552739>. Consulted November 23<sup>rd</sup> 2017.

Rosman, C. (2015), In Algemeen Dagblad: Halen we met asielzoekers een Paard van Troje binnen?  
<https://www.ad.nl/buitenland/halen-we-met-asielzoekers-een-paard-van-troje-binnen~aa521577/>. Consulted November 19<sup>th</sup> 2017.

RTL Nieuws (2015), Europol: 5000 Syriegangers bedreigen veiligheid Europa.  
<https://www.rtlnieuws.nl/nieuws/buitenland/europol-5000-syriegangers-bedreigen-veiligheid-europa>. Consulted December 19<sup>th</sup> 2017.

Schmid, A.P. (2016), Links between terrorism and migration: an exploration. ICCT research paper.  
<https://www.icct.nl/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Alex-P.-Schmid-Links-between-Terrorism-and-Migration-1.pdf>. Consulted November 19<sup>th</sup> 2017.

Tweede Kamer (2017a), Controversiële onderwerpen.  
[https://www.tweedekamer.nl/debat\\_en\\_vergadering/uitgelicht/controversiële-onderwerpen](https://www.tweedekamer.nl/debat_en_vergadering/uitgelicht/controversiële-onderwerpen). Consulted November 1<sup>st</sup> 2017.

Tweede Kamer (2017b), Het Kabinet.  
[https://www.tweedekamer.nl/zo\\_werkt\\_de\\_kamer/de\\_nederlandse\\_democratie/het\\_kabinet](https://www.tweedekamer.nl/zo_werkt_de_kamer/de_nederlandse_democratie/het_kabinet). Consulted November 16<sup>th</sup> 2017.

Tweede Kamer (2017c), Vragenrecht.  
[https://www.tweedekamer.nl/zo\\_werkt\\_de\\_kamer/de\\_nederlandse\\_democratie/taken\\_en\\_rechten/vragenrecht](https://www.tweedekamer.nl/zo_werkt_de_kamer/de_nederlandse_democratie/taken_en_rechten/vragenrecht). Consulted November 23<sup>rd</sup> 2017.

Wilders, G. (2017), ‘Het Europa dat wij willen’, Speech Geert Wilders op de Ambrosetti Conferentie.  
<https://www.pvv.nl/36-fj-related/geert-wilders/9601-heteuropadatwijwillen.html>. Consulted December 6<sup>th</sup> 2017.

## Attachments

### 1. List of analysed speech acts

Period: October 6th 2014 – March 15th 2017

In total **251** speeches were held. After a selection around **20** speech acts remained for analysis.

#### **Ministry of General Affairs (Rutte) (1)**

1. Speech act by Prime Minister Rutte in the European Parliament 05-07-2016

#### **King Speeches (2)**

2. Kings speech 2016 by King Willem-Alexander 20-09-2016
3. Kings speech 2015 by King Willem-Alexander 15-09-2015

#### **Press statements after the Ministerial meeting (7)**

4. Press statements after the Ministerial meeting 09-09-2016
5. Press statements after the Ministerial meeting 08-07-2016
6. Press statements after the Ministerial meeting 11-03-2016
7. Press statements after the Ministerial meeting 04-03-2016
8. Press statements after the Ministerial meeting 12-02-2016
9. Press statements after the Ministerial meeting 30-10-2015
10. Press statements after the Ministerial meeting 04-09-2015

#### **Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Koenders) (4)**

11. Speech act by minister Koenders at the high-level UN migration meeting 19-09-2016
12. Speech act by minister Koenders at the seminar of the rule of law 02-02-2016
13. Speech act by minister Koenders at the EU Ambassadors conference 25-11-2016
14. Speech act by Minister Koenders at the opening of the day for Africa 07-11-2016

#### **Ministry of Defence (Hennis) (4)**

15. Speech act by minister Hennis-Plasschaert at the Future Force Conference 21-02-2017
16. Speech act by minister Hennis-Plasschaert at the Chatam House conference 17-03-2016
17. Speech act by minister Hennis-Plasschaert at the seminar 'Europe's security and Defence: whats next? 11-03-2016
18. Speech act by minister Hennis-Plasschaert at the Distinguished Speakers Series of The Hague Institute for Global Justice 03-06-2015

#### **Ministry of Justice and Security (Blok, van der Steur, Opstelten) (2)**

19. Speech act by minister van der Steur after the Paris attacks 16-11-2015
20. Speech act by minister Opstelten at the Cleveringa lecture 24-11-2014

## 2. Code book of the speech acts analysis

In the qualitative analysis program, NVIVO I worked with different codes. This resulted in the following codebook for the speech act analysis.

Main code	Sub code	Nr. of Sources	Nr. of references	Description/ coding words
<b>General Information</b>	Date	20	20	Date of the speech
	Year	20	20	Year of the speech
	Occasion	20	20	Occasion of the speech
<b>Minister</b>	AZ Prime Minister Rutte	10	10	Name of the Prime Minister as the author of the speech
	BZ minister Koenders	4	4	Name of the minister of Foreign Affairs as the author of the speech
	DEF minister Hennis - Plasschaert	4	4	Name of the minister of Defence as the author of the speech
	J&V 1. minister Opstelten	1	1	Name of the minister of Justice & Security as the author of the speech
	J&V 2. minister van der Steur	1	1	Name of the minister of Justice & Security as the author of the speech
	J&V 3. minister Blok	0	0	Name of the minister of Justice & Security as the author of the speech
<b>Illocutionary acts</b>	Assertive act	17	42	Distributing information and informing the public, explaining a situation
	Commissive act	14	38	Listener needs to commit to something
	Directive act	13	16	Listener needs to do something
	Declaratory act	14	26	Influencing to have an impact on the world and its surroundings
	Expressive act	15	20	Expressing the opinion
<b>Measures</b>	Border controls	12	20	More border controls by the government to ensure security
	More investments	2	2	More investments of the government necessary
	Need for new policies	10	23	New policies necessary for the government to address security issues
	New division of tasks	3	3	New tasks necessary for the government

<b>Cooperation</b>	European Cooperation	15	39	European cooperation on security, defence, migration
	International cooperation	7	17	International cooperation on security, defence, migration
<b>Migration and refugees</b>	Dutch integration policies	3	7	Integration policies in the Netherlands
	Emergence of refugees in numbers	4	6	Increasing numbers of refugees
	Migratory routes	2	3	Description of migratory routes, migrants use
	Refugee and Migration policies	10	18	Refugee and migration policies on the national or international level
	Refugee flows towards Europe	7	13	Refugee flows towards Europe/European Union
	Urgence of refugee crisis and problems	2	3	Urgency of refugee crisis and related problems to refugees
<b>Terrorism</b>	ISIS- ISIL – Daesh - IS	8	14	Terrorist organization originated in Iraq and Syria
	Risks for terrorist attacks	3	4	Risk for terrorist attacks in Europe/Netherlands
	Terrorism policy	14	19	Policies to combat or counter terrorism
<b>Security</b>	Threat for the Netherlands	15	30	Threat or security risk for the Netherlands
	Feelings of insecurity	5	5	Feelings of insecurity, unsafe
	Identity	5	17	Identity, basic values and rules
	Tensions in the society	4	9	Tensions in society as a result of a security issue
	Security risk	7	16	Security risk for society
	Security policy	9	17	Policies to ensure or improve security