New Labour, New Britain: A Critical Analysis of Rhetoric, Securitization, and Politicization of Immigration

by

Kayla McCrary

A Thesis Submitted In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in International Affairs

Middle Tennessee State University

May 2021

Thesis Committee:

Dr. Andrei Korobkov

Dr. John Maynor

Dr. David Carleton

ABSTRACT

Throughout the last decade, the United Kingdom has undergone significant political, social, and cultural changes. In the last few years, British politics has become increasingly divided, with the 2016 membership of the European Union referendum revealing deep chasms within the electorate, social classes, and political ideologies. One common theme throughout British politics and history has been the notion of identity and belonging. Immigration to Britain has consistently ranked as a top issue and priority. This contradiction is inherent to the "cold feet" position argued by this thesis. This thesis utilizes the securitization theory to analyze the impacts of rhetoric, political communication, and policy implications of immigration. An overview of a timeline of British history of key moments of immigration legislation reveals a pattern of restrictive measures, as well as some points of welcoming and openness. This overview leads to a case study analysis of the New Labour administration under Prime Minster Tony Blair, which oversaw significant transformative changes to the British immigration system and the multiculturalism of the country. This analysis covers a profile of New Labour and key important legislation. Following this, a chapter dedicated the securitization of immigration under New Labour shows that there are multiple actors involved in the process: the New Labour government, the British media, and the unelected political groups or figures such as fringe single issue anti-immigrant parties. Attention is given to the role of politicization and criminalization of immigration under New Labour, as well as the influences of the age of globalization and War on Terror on immigration policies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Britain's "cold feet" toward immigration has been studied for decades across various disciplines, with the impact of migration flows to the United Kingdom (UK) stirring various responses politically and socially.

Since 1901, the United Kingdom's immigration policies were shaped by internal and external events. Throughout history, external factors such as war, famine, crumbling empires, and lack of economic opportunities pushed migrants toward the UK, whereas labor opportunities and a liberalized democracy supplied an alluring pull. However, it can be argued that the tug-of-war between Britain and its relationship with immigration resulted in restrictive measures, heightened securitization, and negative rhetoric. In modern day, between 2001 and 2016, immigration was often named as Britain's most important and salient political issue (Migration Observatory, 2020). A large body of literature surrounding immigration and its related concepts emerged from the questions Britain has been asking itself throughout history: who is British? What does that mean? What does that mean for everyone else?

These abstract questions transferred into the political arena, and as a result, a series of changes to immigration policies aimed to solidify the notions of nationality and citizenship, as well as the rights given to people who fall into those categories. Those who are excluded from these groups are also part of the debate. Particularly, non-EU migrants, refugees and asylum seekers, and illegal or irregular migrants are considered parts of the out-groups. With an increasingly growing number of visible

"out-group" migrants in Britain, it is undeniable that the "us" and "them" categories are bolstered by narratives surrounding immigration as a consistent political process.

The impacts of these categorizations have legal and political implications, especially in a post-9/11 securitized world. Since the radical Islamist terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 in the United States and the 7/7 London bombings in 2005, the UK expanded its security apparatus to combat and prevent threats, gather intelligence, and coordinate with other countries and the European Union (EU). Heightened attention to out-groups, such as migrants from the Middle East, in political spheres and the British media has often been associated with the rise of negative rhetoric and fringe political groups. Moreover, the link between immigration and security risk has been made in mainstream politics and the media.

At the same time, the acceptance of immigration and migrants in British society has been marked by the political competitiveness of pro-immigration groups and political parties, as well as membership of the European Union, which notably allows for its citizens to move fluidly amongst member states with few restrictions. In the 2016 referendum on European Union membership, the build up to the vote was undoubtedly rooted in responses to high impact political issues such as immigration, the "refugee crisis" stemming from the EU's handling of thousands of daily arrivals of refugees and asylum seekers to its borders, and the notion of sovereignty (i.e. the ability for the UK to control its borders without EU regulation or stipulation).

Acceptance and support for migrants, refugees, asylum seekers, and other immigrant groups is notably characteristic of left-leaning political groups in the UK, such as the Labour Party, the Liberal Democrats, the Scottish National Party, and the Green Party, amongst others. Thus, it is important to note that there is a sizable pro-immigrant and pro-immigration side to the debate in Britain. As will be outlined in

the following sections, this thesis focuses on the critics of immigration and the observable processes utilized in political spheres to assert a relationship between "security risk" and "immigration/immigrant."

1.1 RESEARCH PURPOSE

This thesis aims to explore some of the abstract questions the UK is facing in the age of heightened globalization, securitization, and political polarization. Following the all out from a hotly contested referendum on membership of the EU, the UK has undoubtedly faced several major political obstacles in repairing the division in its citizenry. The lens through which British politics and social attitudes will be explored is the "securitization theory" as articulated primarily by critical security scholars Ole Wæver and Barry Buzan of the Copenhagen School (Buzan, 1998). Securitization theory, broadly put, looks at the processes through which a threat becomes associated with security, such as through a "speech act" which aims to convince the audience of existential threat and the need for extraordinary measures to address it. The next chapter will discuss at length the theoretical basis of this approach.

The purpose of this thesis is to engage with theoretical approaches in International Security Studies as applied to both historical and modern political processes. Extensive research into the historical migration patterns to Britain is provided in *Chapter III: Historical Overview*. Beginning with foundational immigration controls enacted in 1905, the timeline of relevant, key policies follows major historical events such as movement of refugees from external conflicts, the onset of total war, and economic conditions. This timeline also considers important historical context deemed influential in the social attitudes related to immigration.

These attitudes relate to wartime paranoia, economic anxieties, and race or political characteristics. To bolster the discussion of political and social reactions to legislation or its enactment, this section utilized newspaper achieves to uncover dialogue and advertisements. The chapter covers the periods 1905 to the start of World War I, the interwar period, World War II, post-WWII, and the build up to the New Labour government in the 2000s.

1.2 SCOPE

The research emphasis is placed on the case study of the New Labour administration (1997-2010) led primarily by Prime Minister Tony Blair. This administration was chosen due to its immigration policy legacy. Blair's administration oversaw over ten major systemic and political changes to immigration, heightened securitization processes after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in the United States and the July 7, 2005 terrorist attack in London, increased challenges with refugee and asylum seekers attempting entry into the UK, participation in the wars in the Middle East, domestic social issues such as crime and poverty, and significant economic issues stemming from financial crises domestically and abroad. Membership of the EU also brought increased pressures to lead internationally, although domestic politics were often at odds with European goals. The New Labour years were transformative for British politics.

Simultaneously, worldwide globalization brought increased communication, travel, shared cultures, technology, and integration to a scale unlike ever before. A decade has passed since Blair left office; the effects of this stretch of leadership have been seen up to this critical juncture of Britain. Immigration has become entrenched as foremost a security issue, followed closely as an economic concern. Subsequent

political parties running after the New Labour years have included immigration in campaign manifestos as part of the discussion on security, and most notably, patterns surround mass movement of migrants such as refugees and asylum-seekers than compared to economic migrants such as EU citizens or highly skilled non-EU immigrants.

Moreover, this period of the "post-9/11 world" is often cited as the birth of the modern security apparatus, with the US and UK expanding their capabilities. For these reasons, the case study of the New Labour administration provides ample opportunity to apply the "securitization theory" lens to three major components impacting British politics: 1) legislation – immigration policies and the way in which it is crafted within executive bodies; 2) media – the influence of the British media is notorious and undoubtedly highly salient for its impact on political and social attitudes related to immigration; 3) political and social groups – the securitization process needs both the authority and the audience, and in this context, these groups have significant influence on how migrants are viewed within the realm of identity, community, and the legal and political spheres.

1.3 RELEVANCE

The relevance of this research stems first from the major questions Britain faces regarding its political future. It is not alone in this fork in the road; several other major Western societies are facing similar debates regarding the future of immigration. The recent presidency of Donald Trump in the United States reflected a twist of solidarity between the US and the UK, as the two countries underwent periods of diverging from the political and social status quos. The maverick Trump and the close victory of the "Leave" campaign (leave the EU as reflected in the

referendum's "leave" or "remain" voting options) also reflect two countries "split down the middle" with the dichotomy of the "right" and "left" sides of the spectrum finding little middle ground on which to rest. Immigration, chiefly migration from the "global south" and irregular migration, stands as one of the most obvious talking points for both sides of the aisle. However, over the years, immigration has become seemingly synonymous with security matters. In this view, immigration is a risky business, but it is a business, nonetheless. The economic benefits of immigration open opportunities, but these policies, as evidenced throughout history, are often revoked, altered, or highly stipulated.

Moreover, this thesis aims to use theoretical grounding from international security studies to examine both politics and history. Relevance of securitization theory to students of International Security is obvious: it is arguably one of the most accessible theories for students attempting to engage with course material. Processes of securitization seem clear in the age of the Internet. Modern scholarship utilizing securitization theory is starting to analyze the usage of telecommunications, social media, and visual communication in the securitization and speech act processes. Therefore, this thesis is aiming to build from theoretical foundation by engaging with research in this area in several different ways.

Particularly, this analysis will look at the New Labour administration due to its strong fit contextually for 1) the emergence of the post-9/11 security state; 2) issues with immigration stemming from refugee/asylum seeker flows; 3) issues with immigration and political responsibilities from membership of the European Union; 4) emergence of accessible Internet and telecommunications leading to the development of the media "spin doctoring" method to highly craft narratives.

1.4 METHODOLOGY & FRAMEWORK

This thesis relies on historic and modern primary sources, as well as scholarship from a variety of academic disciplines. The interdisciplinary nature of international affairs lends itself to rich opportunities to engage with various sorts of data and information. This thesis utilized scholarly research from international relations and political science, communication studies, history, legal studies, migration studies, and sociology.

Chapter III, which focuses on the historic background of immigration legislation in Britain, relies on scholarly research into the legislative legacies and historical events. Additionally, this thesis utilized the British Newspaper Archive as a source for historic communications via newspapers, a leading method of information dissemination in Britain. These passages taken from the BNA's database are gleaned from millions of available newspapers scanned into the online database by the British Library.

The parameters for the research were 1) published in Great Britain, narrowed to England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland context depending; 2) published between 1905-1950s, context depending, and narrowed for certain sections; 3) key word searches for specific legislation, e.g. "1905 Aliens Act" or "Aliens Act" with narrowed publication timeline. With the explosion of printed material available in the 19th century, Britain's newspaper publishing industry expanded dramatically. With

this considered, there are often newspapers that are aimed at specific audiences (social status, geographic location, political affiliations, languages, etc.) or have explicit political bias; this context is taken into consideration in the research process.

The following chapter will explain the theoretical framework of this project in detail. The framework of this research is based on the securitization theory, expanded to include emerging research in political communication. Primary sources considered in this regard include political speeches given by leading figures of major political parties, social media posts by major political groups or leaders, and party manifestos and political, agenda-setting statements. The following chapter details an extensive literature review of scholarly research in securitization theory – how it is applied to cases, as well as how it can be understood in new, adaptive contexts. These areas include political communication and visual communication (social media, television, Internet, movies, etc.).

1.5 LIMITATIONS & CLARIFICATIONS

In security studies, students are mostly limited to information passed down by scholars and professionals in the field; it is difficult to do "field work" in security studies, as the nature of the work is often highly skilled, classified, private or selective, or learned many years after the fact. This thesis relies on historic information, as well as the accounts of professionals, political insiders, and scholars who have years of expertise. In essence, this project's aim is to carry theory into practice despite limitations of studentship.

Additionally, the scope of this project may seemingly present immigration as wholly contested within British politics; however, this is far from the truth. This project focuses on the tug-of-war in the political consciousness in Britain – there are

those who were supportive of immigration or against certain legislations. Yet, due to the nature of this thesis, it is difficult to include every vantage point within these highly nuanced immigration debates or securitization processes. Additionally, the aim of this research is not to take a stance on immigration, nor does it aim to argue whether securitization is a positive or negative influence.

Another consideration of the limitations of this project and securitization broadly is the viewpoint of the securitized. Securitization has been applied to abstract and broad threats such as “climate change” or “terrorism,” and in these cases, the actors are not pinned down as neatly as “natural gas companies” or “the Islamic State.” Immigration as a security issue thus involves hundreds of millions of people who move across borders or have settled in a state different than their country of origin. The narrowing down of the threat group, such as the “illegal immigrant” or the “Syrian refugee” thus gives some grounds for understanding the target of the securitization process. Knowing how securitization tangibly impacts these groups is an area of study that would be suggestible for academics, governments, think-tanks and non-governmental organizations who have the capabilities to conduct such research. In this regard, research for this project has uncovered that there have been studies looking into the impacts of punitive governmental practices such as detainment or deportation. Specifically, the case of the Windrush generation shows that there are real, tangible impacts of securitization and the resulting extraordinary measures that are taken; this will be a point of further discussion in ensuing chapters.

1.6 KEY TERMS DEFINED

In this thesis, several key words related to immigration are used seemingly interchangeably, especially due to the interdisciplinary nature of the source materials.

However, there are important distinctions to be made. Within this project, the following definitions are utilized for these key terms:

Alien Enemy & Friend: An individual who owes allegiance (nationality) to a hostile power during wartime was considered an alien enemy; foreign residents of allies or neutral countries were considered alien friends.

Asylum Seeker, Asylee, Asylum: All terms relate to the legal concept of "asylum." Asylum is legal protection and a status granted by a state to someone who has left their home state due to fear or persecution, etc. and is being hosted within the state as an asylee or asylum seeker (awaiting decision or application). According to the UNHCR, asylum is a form of protection which allows an individual to remain in the host state instead of being removed (deported) to a country where he or she fears persecution or harm.

Globalization: Globalization is a combination of internationalized, multi-dimensional processes which impact economics, politics, culture, and social patterns. These interwoven relationships, resulting in differing consequences and effects, affect everyone "in innumerable ways, some small and some large" (Ferguson & Mansbach, 2012). These linkages form the processes of globalization, which, according to (Steger, 2013). have four main dimensions: economic, political, cultural, and ecological. Joseph Nye refers to globalization as "worldwide networks of interdependence" accompanied by increasing gaps between the rich and poor.

Immigration: Immigration is defined by the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) as "a process by which non-nationals move into a country for the process of settlement." Immigrant has connotations of long-term stay (Spencer, 2011).

International Migrant: As defined by the United Nations, this is someone who changes their country of residence for at least a year so that their destination effectively becomes their country of usual residence. Unlike immigrant, it encompasses those whose movement is relatively temporary or circular (moving on or back home) (Spencer, 2011).

Irregular Migration: Irregular migration includes movement of persons outside the law, regulations, and international agreements governing entry or exit. Sometimes interchangeable with "illegal migration," especially considering the context or connotation in which the term is being evoked.

Migrant: Whether the term migrant refers to foreign nationals (non-citizens) or the foreign born depends on the data available. UK data (where it exists) is generally on the foreign born (thus including UK citizens born abroad). While migrant can refer to all those born abroad, it is used in common parlance to refer to those who have relatively recently arrived (Spencer, 2011).

Migration: This is "a process of moving, either across an international border or within a state" the term "encompassing any kind of movement of people, whatever its length, composition and causes" (Spencer, 2011).

Refugee: Three bodies of international law relate to the refugee: refugee law, humanitarian law, and human rights law. According to the 1951 Refugee Convention, a major source of the refugee law, a refuge can be legally defined as "someone who is unable or unwilling to return to their country of origin owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular

social group, or political opinion." Humanitarian and human rights law address the terms impacting a refugee's claim for protection, including but not limited to dangers of returning individuals to countries that commit (related also to the principle of non-refoulment) or condone grave violations of human rights. A refugee claims the right to protection via asylum in the host country, as determined by international law and facilitated by governments or international organizations and NGOs.

1.7 STRUCTURE

This project is organized into five chapters. This introductory chapter is followed by a review of literature on the theoretical groundings for this thesis. The theoretical chapter covers a variety of scholarly articles and books from a range of disciplines. The sections outlined cover securitization theory, political communication, and visual communication. These three sections form the basis upon which the critical analysis of this thesis operates.

Chapter III discusses the historical timeline leading to the case study of the New Labour administration in the late 90s and early 2000s. The historical background begins with the year 1905 and covers sections up to World War I, interwar period, World War II, post-WWII, and the 1970s-1990s. This historical context utilizes primary and secondary sources from historical research, legal studies, migration studies, and international relations and political science to illustrate the context in which immigration policies have been crafted throughout British history. Likewise, this timeline illustrates the impacts of external events on immigration policy, as well as the social attitudes related to some of the reactions to immigration and policies.

Chapter IV and Chapter V are the bulk of the critical analysis of this thesis. The New Labour administration's dealings with immigration policies are analyzed

through some of the theoretical approaches discussed in Chapter II. Additionally, emerging technologies and media play a significant role during New Labour's long, formative term (1997-2010). Overlapping elements of political communication, visual communication, and the Internet and social media will therefore be discussed alongside the traditional forms of securitized speech (politicians, authoritative figures, speeches, manifestos or party propaganda, etc.).

This project concludes by looking at the impacts of over 100 years of immigration policy in Britain. Particularly, this relates to the "hostile environment" of the Conservative Party under PMs David Cameron and Theresa May, as well as the Brexit Britain post-EU referendum under PM Boris Johnson. These examples are given in order to illustrate the cumulative impacts of immigration legislation and the securitization process, which arguably is difficult to deconstruct.

CHAPTER II: THEORY & LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 SECURITIZATION THEORY

In social science, it is often said that concepts can be subjective and discursive. Relatedly, inconsistencies resulting in "collective conceptual ambiguity, lack of precision, and the widespread use of different terms for describing the same phenomena…" can muddle findings, thereby challenging "the accumulation and integration of research results, theory building, and the thorough explanation" of the concept at hand (Van Aelst, 2017). Securitization theory builds on contested notions, including the fundamental concept of security.

While Van Aelst et. al. (2017) asserted the difficulties posed by lack of consensus, they acknowledge the benefits of a flexible and contestable concept, including the ability for researchers to "select the specific version of a concept that suits them and their research interests best." In fact, a basic search for security-related topics in a research depository will be reveal thousands of results across a variety of fields. A study by Gad and Peterson (2011) indicated that there was an increase in articles on securitization and ISA papers particularly in the early 2000s, around ten years after the theory's introduction in *Security: A New Framework for Analysis* (Buzan, 1998). Over the years, this theory has been applied to various phenomena such as health and AIDS/HIV (McInnes, 2013), European Union borders (Neal, 2009), and climate change (McDonald, 2012).

This study utilized the analytical framework provided by the securitization theory, derived from the work of Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver, Jaap de Wilde, and the Copenhagen School broadly. Within this body of thought in international relations and security studies, the theorists placed an emphasis on components of a

securitization process and new sectors it could impact, thus creating a constructivist operational method. These ideas shifted attention from traditional philosophies within security studies which were grounded in the militaristic realm and realist theory. Security as a concept and study evolved since World War I and II, where after the field of international relations is typically said to have established itself in the study of state and international actor behaviors. Likewise, the end of the Cold War ushered in the necessity to adapt ways of thinking within security studies: what else could become a threat other than another state's direct militaristic actions?

Ole Wæver, a proponent of securitization theory, argued that one approach was to switch from a strict focus on the security of the state (i.e. national security) an look toward a broader or alternative focus on the security of people, either individually, globally, or collectively. Through this line of thinking, there emerge five sectors within which security could be necessary for the existence of people: military, political, economic, societal, and environmental (Kilroy, 2018). When a threat to security is identified, the securitization process can begin with four components: a securitizing actor or agent, the existential threat, a referent object, and an audience. It is important to note that "security" is treated not as an object condition but as the outcome of this process of the social construction of security issues (Williams, 2003). Moreover, this process builds by examining "securitizing speech-acts," through which threats become represented and recognized.

Wæver (1995) regards security as a speech act. "By uttering 'security,' a state-representative moves a particular development into a specific area, and thereby claims a special right to use whatever means are necessary to block it" (Waever, 1995).

The questions that are inherent in securitization theory involve what it means to be secure, how security is achieved, what should be secured (and who should be doing the securing), and what is the nature of security studies in human-centric critical security thinking. This approach shifts from the traditional way to view security issues, which was dominated by realism, power dynamics, and theories such as the security dilemma.

Realism theorizes that states are the central actors in an anarchical system, and threats to state security come externally from other states. In an interview, Wæver articulated further his ideas on the implications of non-military issues being framed as security threats. He stated that the way we think about security depends on the referent object and level of analysis. Humans, communities, regimes, states, and nations can be referent objects. Referent objects are things that are declared to be existentially threatened and that have a legitimate claim to survival (Färber, 2018).

What really makes something a security problem? Security problems are developments that threaten the sovereignty or the independence of a state. These developments are particularly rapid or dramatic, deprive it of the capacity to manage by itself. This in turn undercuts the political order, and the threat must be met with maximum effort (Wæver 1995).

The actor, such as the state, has the referent object that needs to be protected. An existential threat, meaning one which undermines or potentially eliminates the existence of the actor's security, is identified. Thus begins the securitization process, as the enunciator must convince the audience that the threat is a security issue – this means that the actor can utilize extraordinary measures or responses that can prioritize or accelerate an urgent response. If the issue cannot be moved into the securitized sphere of discourse, the securitization fails.

A core tenant of the securitization process is the speech act. According to securitization theory, the utterance of "security" itself is the act (Lupovici, 2014). When the elites frame the issue as necessitating extraordinary means of response, it also becomes a securitized concept.

In response to this influential theory and its related bodies of thought, a healthy amount of criticism of its tenants can be observed. Some scholars challenge the emphasis on semantics of security (Balzacq, 2005; Roe, 2008; Stritzel, 2007; Wilkinson, 2007), whereas some apply it to underrepresented cases such as those from outside the Western politics (Lupovici, 2014; Gad & Petersen, 2011; Vuori, 2008; Wilkinson, 2007). Like many theories, it is also criticized for the perceived lack of clarity on some concepts such as the referent object (Floyd, 2007) and successful securitization (Roe, 2008). Additionally, some scholars have begun to view the theories as Western centric, aiming to analyse "the foundational role of racist thought in securitization theory" by demonstrating "that the Copenhagen School securitization theory is structured not only by Eurocentrism but also by civilizationism, methodological whiteness, and antiblack racism" (Howell and Richter-Montpetit, 2019).

Färber (2018) argued that securitization theory tends to neglect methodology, asserting that very few of the empirical studies that employ securitization explain their methodology but emphasize ontological concerns. Likewise, their article criticizes the ambiguity of the conceptual framework of securitization theory. Essentially, from this Waltzian understanding of theory as depicting the organisation of particular realms and the connections among its parts securitisation is structured around the core idea that security is to be conceived as a speech act. Thus, Wæver argues that securitization stretches into other areas and may, therefore, be combined with a

number of other theories as it offers criteria for the delineation of security issues (i.e. exceptionalism, securitizing move, audience acceptance). To Färber (2018), Wæver does not form a single methodology and instead argues for a pluralization of methodologies.

In defense of common criticisms against the securitization theory, Williams (2003) argued that the core claim of the speech-act is not only a sociological tenant. He argued that via a speech-act, securitization is located with the realm of political argument and discursive legitimation and security practices are thus susceptible to criticism and transformation (Williams, 2003). Thus, securitization theory is connected to "recent explorations of the role of argument, action, and ethics in constructivist theories of International Relations" (Risse, 2000 as cited in Williams, 2003). Williams (2003) articulated an additional need for securitization to incorporate the role of televisual images within political communication. He argued that contemporary political communication is embedded in the spread of visual images, and the processes of securitization takes on forms, dynamics, and institutional linkages that cannot be fully assessed by focusing on the speech-act alone (Williams, 2003). Thus, the securitization theory should develop to accommodate a broader understanding of the "mediums, structures, and institutions of contemporary political communication" in order to adequately address questions of both empirical explanation and ethical appraisal in security practices (Williams, 2003).

CHAPTER III: HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

INTRODUCTION

At its core, this thesis operates upon a central claim: Britain has exhibited cold feet regarding its immigration policies. Arguably, policies have been both welcoming and restrictive. At some points, they could be considered overtly hostile, as described by the modern approach of the "hostile environment" manifested by the Conservative Party under both PMs David Cameron and Theresa May. Nevertheless, throughout history, migration to Britain was impacted substantially by war and empire, and policies were influenced by new arrivals to the Isles. This chapter looks at the historic migration flows and respective policy enactments to outline governmental reactions and attitudes toward the flows of peoples to Britain.

This analysis begins with a preface which sets the stage for discussions of the years 1905-1948, encompassing World War I, the inter-war period, and World War II. Landmark immigration legislation and its impacts on domestic politics will be analyzed. Further, the post-World War II migration patterns are explored, with emphasis given to the shifts caused by the end of the British Empire and the establishment of a new international world order. The analysis will then cover several relevant pieces of immigration legislation before leading into the substantive section of New Labour's Immigration policies, which will then follow with a discussion on post-New Labour immigration legacies impacting current critical political debates in Britain.

These central themes for these analyses rest on long-lasting debates in Britain on what it means "to be British," identity and social relations, the extension of rights to immigrants, and the future of the role of immigration in Britain after its withdrawal

from the European Union. Each of these themes builds upon the central argument of this thesis regarding Britain's relationship toward immigration, including the heightened securitization of migration, immigrants, and the perceived threats thereof.

PREFACE

Before World War II, British immigration policies were centered on similar arguments and themes as modern day. In 1709, the passage of the 1709 Naturalisation Act was predicated upon the assumption that large numbers of foreigners would come to the Isles, thus providing economic expansion. This was the first example of the British government introducing legislation to encourage migration for economic benefits (Somerville, 2007). In essence, the assumptions were correct, and a substantial inflow of skilled foreigners from Germany and France moved to Britain during this period. The Act was one of the first which evidenced the impact of immigration controls, as well as the benefits and perceived downsides of migration into the country.

Influences of events happening outside of Britain have significant effects on immigration policies. For example, scholars identified the earliest forms of passport and visa systems use during the expansion of the nation-state and Napoleonic reign (Somerville, 2011). One of the main concerns was to keep out foreigners who could be hostile to the country, especially during times of war (Torpey 1998 as cited in Somerville, 2011). In 1793, the passage of the Aliens Act of 1793 reflected one of the first British legislations to deal with the mass movement of migrants, particularly refugees emerging from the turmoil of the French Revolution. Into the 1800s, legislation regarding the regulation of arrivals to Britain were influenced by mass migration of Polish and Russian Jewish populations. Events occurring outside of

British borders inevitably influenced the movement of people to the Isles, and therefore, impacted immigration policy and social attitudes.

Importantly, during these times, Britain shifted into associating immigration policies with identity and demographics. In fact, the policies were focused on the protection of the British identity, which coincided with the decline of the Empire and the extension of political rights to new groups (Somerville, 2011). The following discussion looks at the historical context of changes to British law and policies and how these changes influenced the social, cultural, and political dynamics of immigration.

3.1 1905-1948: WARTIME MIGRATION & POLICIES

This section covers the build up to World War I, the inter-war period, and World War II. One of the central themes of this time period is the evolving notion of "us and them," essentially strengthened by the transformative years of wartime. However, the "us and them" dichotomy was not only based on war, but also on race and ethnic divides. These decades saw an increase in non-white immigration which would continue for years to come. Immigrants arrived from various parts of the world, including the British Empire's colonial territories, European countries, and Ireland. Immigration policies were impacted by war-time measures, as well as social and cultural pressures related to domestic attitudes toward new arrivals.

1905 ALIENS ACT: FOUNDATIONAL IMMIGRATION CONTROLS

Many British immigration policies were influenced by external events estimated to encourage or require mass movement of people to Britain. One of the

most influential pieces of immigration control legislation was the 1905 Aliens Act. The Act is often seen as one of the influential precursors to increasingly restrictive immigration policies in Britain. Crafted against the backdrop of the persecution of Eastern European Jews and their migration from the Russian Empire, the 1905 Aliens Act outlined the "undesirable immigrant," which was backed by criteria for exclusion for immigrants (Bashford & McAdam, 2014). In the late 1880s and into the early 1900s, around 150,000 Jews settled in Britain.

Importantly, this Act filled a gap between policy and its enforcement capabilities. Specifically, up until the Act's passage, there were no systematic or universal regulatory measures upon which entrants to Britain were assessed. The Act enabled the "power to prevent the landing of undesirable immigrants," as well as the power of the Secretary of State to make expulsion orders. The criteria for the "undesirable immigrant" were as followed:

(a) if [the immigrant] cannot show that he has in his possession or is a position to obtain the means of decently supporting himself and his dependants (if any); or
(b) if he is a lunatic or an idiot, or owing to any disease or infirmity appears likely to become a charge upon the rates or otherwise detriment to the public; or
(c) if he has been sentenced in a foreign country with which there is an extradition treaty for a crime, not being an offense of a political character, which is, as respects that country, an extradition crime within the meaning of the Extradition Act 1870; or
(d) if an expulsion order under this Act has been made in his case.

It is important to note that the Act was not based solely on exclusions. There were provisions outlining the exemptions made for the persecuted classes, which included the extension of protections through the legal process of asylum.

This Act's outlining of the exceptions to the above criteria for undesirable immigrants was an important reflection of the extension of asylum to persecuted classes. The Act included provisions on protected classes, which stated that exceptions would be granted to those proving their persecution on religious or political grounds. Before the Act was passed, the standard practice was consistent with international law in that asylum was the privilege of states to extend, rather than a right for individuals (Bashford & Adam, 2014). Several other points of novelty by way of immigration policymaking were the Act's broadening of the protections for political offenses (including protections related to extradition) and its inclusion of "persecution" as a basis for admission to the country.

OPPOSITION & CRITICISM

Moreover, there existed a sense of contradiction between the Act and its enforcement on behalf of the government. At the time, a pending Liberal electoral landslide would defeat the Conservatives roundly. A short article published by the *London Daily News* in February 1906 stated:

"Under the Aliens Act, grievous inhumanities are being perpetuated in England's name. So it behoves us to direct attention to the operations of this legislative legacy from the black days of [Prime Minister Arthur Balfour, Conservative Party].

The origin of the Act may be briefly recalled. Assuming that Liberals would oppose the measure, the late Government thought they saw their way to an effective election cry – "We tried to protect you against the unfair competition of the foreigner!""

This excerpt reflects on the political motivations for passing the Act, which arguably could be considered as electoral strategy. The writer of this passage, along with others such as the notable Member of Parliament Rufus Issacs, believed that the Conservatives aimed to celebrate this Act as a proclamation to the rising calls from

those worried about poverty, the labor market, and working class politics. The Conservatives lost their electoral bid, but the Act could be a symbolic gesture toward the worries of the impact of immigration (specifically the increased competition in the labor market).

In March 1906, another article published by the *London Daily News* accounted for a harrowing speech delivered by MP Walter Rothschild. The speech detailed the deadly fate of rejected refugees refused admission to Britain and returned to Russia. The article's commentary added:

> "It is like condemning a man to death to send him back, when his only crime is that he wishes to escape from a country that denies him the right to exist. Scarcely a day passes without the Act being made to look ridiculous in some form or another."

These comments reflect the calls for humanitarianism regarding refugees or the destitute attempting to enter Britain. Recalling the stipulations outlined by the Act for the undesirable migrant, one of the main concerns was the possibility of an entrant becoming a financial burden on the state. This assertation could be due to the lack of funds produced upon inspection or due to an inhibiting medical condition. Regardless, the opposition to the Act stemmed from claims that rejected individuals were being denied inhumanely, and further, that there were no real routes available for redress once the decision was made.

In modern research, the Act has been referred to as a "pallid and confused attempt at control," a "highly unsuccessful piece of legislation," and "incoherent and timid" (Wray, 2006; Pellew, 1989). These assessments stem from analyses on the political context, legal framework, and administrative structures of the Act (Wray, 2006). Moreover, Pellew (1989) engaged with the Act through the administrative

problems within the Home Office, which was tasked with the enforcement of immigration policies. Their research argued that the civil servants tasked with enforcing the Act were not pleased with its interpretations and requirements. Nonetheless, the administrative responsibilities tasked to the Home Office set up the foundation for future immigration controls, such as the upcoming 1914 tightening of migration controls during World War II.

3.2 CHANGING POLITICS & PHILOSOPHIES

THE INFLUENCE OF FOREIGNERS: ANARCHISTS AND SOCIALISTS

One of the major concerns throughout the development of British political thought, especially in the 1700s and 1800s, was the concern over revolutionary European fervour reaching the Isles. Against the backdrop of European revolutions, revolts in overseas territories, and the American Revolutionary War, the fear was solidified by the consistent threat of rebellions and insurrections. Arguably, this insecurity could be said to be an underlying influence upon the hesitance to accept foreigners into Britain.

Moreover, the 1700s and 1800s saw an evolution of political philosophies toward the role of government and the nation-state. Shifts in views on the rights of the citizenry, as well as citizenship itself, were integral to the debates about domestic politics and of overseas territories. Recalling the first attempts to regulate entries to Britain, the government were concerned primarily with hostile foreigners or the spread of revolutionary thought.

POVERTY & ANTI-SEMITISM

As with the 1905 Aliens Act, the extension of regulatory powers was impacted by the desire to have control over the restriction and exclusion of certain groups. In this

instance, the legislation was influenced by increased movement of the Jewish populations fleeing persecution. The political atmosphere was marked by the encroachment of rebellious movements, chiefly working class labor politics (including socialism), Irish nationalism, and the campaigns for women's rights. The economic situation of the late 1880s (the economic downturn "Long Depression") exacerbated the claim of the threat posed by immigrants to the labor market, which in turn, demanded some form of accountability and regulation.

Poverty in Britain exacerbated the tensions brought about by immigration. Increased anti-immigration agitation and anti-Semitism was evidenced in political and journalistic spheres, as well as within groups dedicated to campaigning against immigration. Particularly, the East End of London was notable for its poverty and for its high population of foreign settlement, including Jewish migrants.

Arnold White, a journalist, penned an investigatory account of the East End in *The Problems of a Great City* in 1886, building up to several attempts to run for Parliament with anti-immigration and anti-Semitic sentiments. His account blamed impoverished foreigners for the substantial problems faced. White's views were shared by others who formed such activist groups such as the British Brother's League (BBL). This militant group mobilized as an anti-immigrant pressure group aiming to restrict the acceptance of poor migrants to Britain.

In a letter to the editorial board of the *Tower Hamlets Independent and East End Local Advertiser* (1901), William Stanley Shaw, organizer of the BBL, outlined the views of the group regarding the argument to end pauper migration: it maintained a continuous stream of the unemployed, it impacted the unskilled and makes their lives "intolerably hard," it enabled "bloodsucking landlords" to raise rents and take advantage of the community, it negatively impacts sanitation laws, it corrupts children

due to the things seen and heard in the community, and it drives away the best working men to other countries such as the United States and Canada. Further, Shaw asserted that the religious identity of the poor migrant had no importance, it was only the lack of financial means which motivated their group to mobilize against immigration.

An article in the *East London Observer* (1901) accounted for a BBL meeting which celebrated a passed resolution "protesting against the continual influx of pauper aliens into [Britain]" amid a packed audience in the school hall in Bethnal Green. The hope was that this resolution would spread similar sentiment throughout East London and "thoroughly educate public opinion upon this pressing problem." Further, the BBL meeting decried the impact of foreign migrants on the English community, stating that the "English workpeople had been driven out of their homes" and left without jobs due to the "pauper invasion" and the "inrush of filthy humanity," citing the "scourings of Russia, Roumania, and elsewhere" as the culprits. Notably, the meeting called attention to the assertion that they were not making attacks on the Jewish population; rather, the object of the BBL was to prevent poor migrants from entering the country and disrupting the local community, referring to the groups as "hordes of destitute foreigners" lowering the standard of living and ousting the native population.

CONCLUSION

Ultimately, the passage of the Act reflected a shift in British political thought regarding the government's roles in regulation and immigration broadly, as well as the establishment of the first set of guidelines for the extensions of powers for determining immigrant worthiness. The Act is one of the first examples of broad,

reactionary immigration legislation rooted in domestic pressures. Indeed, the passage of the Act was marked by a confliction within the Liberal groups who were tasked with imposing its regulations in 1906. Bradshaw and McAdam (2014) argued that the disinclination to regulate the entry of aliens is key to understanding the paradoxical nature of British immigration legislation.

Thus, the shift from crafting immigration policy as a response to security threats symbolized the furthering of the notion of the "us and them," and the deserving and undeserving migrant. The political atmosphere leading up to and during the first World War reflected a change in the domestic politics of working-class individuals, as well as the role for the elites and institutions tasked in dealing with new challenges. These sentiments, as well as the foundation laid by the Act, carried over into the start of World War I in 1914.

3.3 1914: WORLD WAR I RESTRICTIONS

Following the passage of the 1905 Aliens Act, Britain observed significant domestic political obstacles. The years leading up to the start of World War I in 1914 saw an increase in suffragette movements (the call for women's right to vote), various labor movements including socialist and working class politics, Irish nationalism, and a shifting role for the aristocrats and political elites in British society. Some of the described movements involved violence and threat to property, while other groups remained non-violent. Advances in social provisions, such as the introduction of unemployment and maternity benefits, were overseen by a Liberal government.

Additional historical context is necessary to understand the dynamics of immigration and its relationship with security of the state in the minds of policymakers. Swan (2016) pointed out that poor economic conditions in Germany

and Austro-Hungarian empires resulted in large numbers of men seeking employment in Britain, and in the 1910s, there were over 40,000 Germans in the country. Further, there was an industrial and military rivalry between Britain and Germany, fuelled by tensions brought by paranoia and fear of espionage. The establishment of the Secret Service Bureau, a precursor of the military and counter-intelligence agencies such as MI5, and an early unofficial Aliens Register list came from the 1910s period building up to WWI (Swan, 2016).

World War I began in 1914 and involved the United Kingdom declaring war on Germany (August 4, 1914) and Austria-Hungary (August 12, 1914). This was also followed by declarations against Turkey (November 5, 1914) and Bulgaria (October 15, 1915). Shortly after declaring war on Germany, Parliament passed the 1914 Aliens Restriction Act[1] which built off the previously discussed 1905 Aliens Act.

1914 ALIENS RESTRICTION ACT

The 1914 Aliens Restriction Act is a slight outlier in terms of its scope and aims. As a wartime legislation, its extraordinary powers and limitations reflect the context in which it was enacted. However, it is still important to note that the security measures taken by this Act were influential in terms of the ensuing post-war legislations and the normalization of securitizing immigration and immigrants. The social impacts of these legislations can arguably be said to have securitized the foreign national in the eyes of the British public, as wartime efforts to control, regulate, and track foreign residents inspired mistrust.

[1] Several related orders-in-council were consolidated as the Aliens Restriction Order 1914.

The Act restricted foreigners' rights of entry and exit to the United Kingdom, as well as their rights within the country. The legislation introduced restrictions on the movement of foreigners within the country, and often, men of military age who were categorized as alien enemies were interned (National Archives, 2017). Moreover, aliens were required to register with the Home Office, and those interned were cared for by the War Office. Swan (2016) enumerated the "alien enemies" categories, which were comprised of people we would now describe as "Poles, Czechs, Slovakians, Romanians, Slovenians, Croatians, Serbians, some Italians and Ukrainians" and upon the Ottoman Empire's entrance into the War, "Syrians, Iraqis, Afghans, Lebanese, Palestinians, and Israelis" were added to this list.

The practice of internment of alien enemies reflected a serious reversal of the fundamental basics of the otherwise liberal political order in Britain. Saunders (2003) argued that internment "fundamentally constitutes an arbitrary but selective detention system, which ignores the writ of habeas corpus, the keystone of English law" thus defying "all the premises upon which English civil and political culture is embedded." However, the mass registration, internment, and regulation of foreign residents contributed to a sense of control within the British borders. During wartime, the "enemy within" narrative drove the notion of insecurity and division, while simultaneously providing credence to the government's authoritative measures and the establishment of agencies tasked with immigration regulation.

An article published by the *Edinburgh Evening News* in October 1914 titled "Clearing Out the Aliens" described notice given to 113 alien residents (88 Germans, 24 Austrians, and a Hungarian) to be removed from Edinburgh, a "restricted area," and into a "free area." This notice came alongside an understanding that this forced move may be financially draining for the residents, but it was required legally as per

the Act's ordinances. A restricted area could include "large stretches of the eastern and southern coastlines, naval bases, and military garrison towns" (Swan, 2016). Details of the enforcement of the Act's punishments for disobediences were given in the *Harrogate Herald,* with an article declaring in bold the "heavy penalties for non-compliance." Many alien enemies had lost their jobs and were isolated from the British communities; some were sent to detention camps (Swan, 2016). The publication noted that failure to register all aliens within a boarding house, apartment, or lodging house could result in a £100 fine[2] or six months' imprisonment. The registration stipulation also included an obligation for every resident or visitor to sign a statement avowing their citizenship or nationality.

Importantly, this war-time policy removed the asylum clause extended by the 1905 Aliens Act. Bashford and McAdam (2014) argued that this period in British policy making was reflective of the late 1700s in which the focus was on the national security tradition of alien laws aiming to exclude foreign hostiles (338). Swan (2016) argued that this wartime legislation was influential in that it gave the impression to the British public that the "enemies within" were being regulated and watched. Swift's article noted that the first few months of WWI brought about anxieties and mistrust of foreign residents, but on the whole, the Aliens Restriction Act and its related orders were effectively executed and thus contributed to the impression that "the alien problem was under control" (Swan 2016).

[2] According to online inflation calculators, this fine would be equivalent to approximately £10,000 in 2021. This means that today's prices are 103.48 times higher than average prices since 1915, according to the Office for National Statistics composite price index.

ANALYSIS: IMPACTS OF THE ACT

One of the major impacts of the Act was the practice of internment and its influences on the trajectory of immigration policy in Britain. Internment was a serious reversal on some of the liberal aspects of British political order. Additionally, internment was an extraordinary measure taken by the government in order to bolster the claim of security threats from within. Narratives of the "alien enemy" and "alien friend" further drove the common theme throughout British immigration policy: the "us vs. them" mentality. This theme is a constant motivator for crafting restrictive and extraordinary measures.

The Act's passage came alongside social and political tensions within Britain and Europe. As discussed, external events had just as much impact on British immigration policies than internal issues. Mass movements of refugees, for example, from Europe and Russia, as well as movement of Irish nationals and some groups from the British Empire, were of course notable, observable, and highly impactful. As noted, tensions between Britain and Germany were already palatable. However, one of the most important aspects of this period was reflected by its shifts in governmental practices.

The Victorian era stimulated the industrialization and liberalization of Britain and began the process of globalization that we understand today. Shifts in the role of government in relation to the electorate reflected changes in the political order of the state, the responsibilities of the elite classes which traditionally governed the country, the growing power and mobilization of the working and middle classes, and the guidance necessary for protecting and enabling a liberal economy to expand.

Moreover, increased institutionalization of the government brought about new agencies, responsibilities, and capabilities to deal with, including counterintelligence, terrorism (especially in relation to Ireland), and immigration regulation. During wartime, the executive powers in Britain were expanded. Additionally, the liberal nature toward immigrants, as well as the rights given to residents or citizens, were put to the test due to extraordinary measures taken by the government to negate potential security threats.

Ultimately, WWI introduced the foundation for the British immigration debate: it established legal and policy practices, regulatory capabilities, security agencies and practices, the newsprint media and its ability to impact or reflect public attitudes, mobilization for certain groups such as anti-immigration activists, and the tests to the tenants of the liberal political order.

3.4 INTERWAR PERIOD

After the conclusion of World War I, the “interwar period” (1918-1939) reflects the period between the end of WWI and the beginning of World War II. The interwar period is known to represent a significantly transformative set of years marked by social and political change. The catastrophic nature of WWI inevitably impacted Britain economically, politically, socially, culturally, and militarily. Generations of men were killed at war. Shifting responsibilities for women during wartime carried over into the interwar period, resulting in some changes in gender roles and norms. Political movements, such as the rise of communism or the nationalism movements in Ireland, reflected change was afoot globally. Empires were dismantled and rearranged; economies were disrupted. The world was transformed by WWI, and it vowed to never undergo such violence, catastrophe, and strife again.

One of the most critical aspects of the post-WWI period was the establishment of some of the fundamental elements of modern international relations. Importantly, the notion of "security" was paramount in terms of the state's responsibilities, foreign relations, and internal, domestic politics. Immigration became part of the discussion, once again, in terms of "friendly" and "enemy," reinforcing the theme of "us and them" in British society. Justified by the extraordinary circumstances of wartime, measures taken in terms of immigration regulation included a range of practices, such as border checks and entry stipulations, registration of foreign residents, and internment of some peoples within British borders. Technological advances meant that the nature of warfare changed, thus creating new security challenges. Carrying over into the interwar period and to the beginning of World War II in 1939, immigration and its relation to security of the state was a normalized part of political debate.

Mass movement of people after World War I was markedly different compared to the historic movements before the war. Since the war's conclusion, movement of people to Britain had been mostly shaped by different push factors (war, oppression, disaster) compared to the primary pre-war pull factor for immigrants (economic incentives, family networks), as well as by added governmental stipulations such as quotas or legal restrictions. Keeling (2014) noted that changes in post-World War I migration policies in Europe, especially for Britain, were impacted by mostly external events such as post-war economic conditions, refugee flows from Franco-Prussian War, Balkan wars, Russian Civil War, and the rise of fascism in Europe. In North America, worries about the mass movement of refugees and displaced peoples from Eurasia resulted in limits which capped overall immigration and added stipulations on nationality quotas.

NOTABLE LEGISLATION: ALIENS ACT OF 1919

At the conclusion of World War I, Britain was tasked in handling foreign residents, as well as the rebuilding of major parts of its state and society. In doing so, Britain extended immigration restrictions present in the previous Aliens Act of 1914 and the British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act 1914. The Aliens Act of 1919 continued a majority of the emergency powers enacted during wartime. Notably, foreign residents were required to register with police (see *Aliens Order 1920* for details), subjected to employment restrictions and medical inspections, and possibly deported if found guilty of a crime, promoting sedition or unrest, or if their deportation was "conducive for the public good." Foreign arrivals to Britain were required to enter only through certain ports[3] and subject to inspection, especially related to their financial means. Movements of refugees, especially from rising Nazi Germany and a war-torn Spain, provided the backdrop for much of the immigration to Britain in the interwar period.

3.5 WORLD WAR II

Like World War I, emergency wartime powers in Britain were extended to immigration controls. Great Britain declared war on Nazi Germany in 1939, thus entering World War II. The experiences of World War I laid a foundation for wartime behavior, including but not limited to the regulation of immigration and resident foreigners. Technological advances spurred by decades of advances in military equipment, science, and medicine also carried over into transport capabilities. Thus, the movement of people was facilitated like never before, with large vessels, new

[3] The newfound challenge of air arrivals also required regulation. However, arrivals by sea outpaced air arrivals for most of the post-war period.

forms of transport, and faster communication bringing opportunities for more people to move across the world. However, a large amount of the migration in the 1930s and 1940s accounted for peoples fleeing fascist movements in Europe.

Notably, Nazi Germany enacted policies restricting the rights of several groups, which led to the outright persecution of these peoples. Refugees to Britain came in waves, particularly from the 1933-1937 and 1938-1939 periods. Against the backdrop of a poor global economy and Great Depression, wealthier migrants were able to move easily compared to other classes of individuals; however, immigration still was portrayed as an economic threat to local labor markets.

The perceived threat of immigration disrupting poor economic conditions was not limited to the working-class sectors. Skilled laborers were also subject to restrictions and stipulations. Not only were highly skilled immigrants subject to regulations, but professional bodies and employers were hesitant to accept migrants into the fields. For example, the British Medical Association and British Dental Association espoused concerns over the quality of immigrants' educations and backgrounds. These fields also saw lower employment of immigrants; between 1935 and 1937, 183 doctors and 78 dentists were admitted to work in Britain, consistent with the Home Office's policy of admitting exceptional cases (Pistol, 2020).

Other sectors of the labor market were also hesitant to welcome migrants into the mix. At the time of poor economic conditions worldwide, one of the most vulnerable populations were the working-class laborers. Shopkeepers, merchants, and other lower skilled laborers were often denied admission to Britain because their careers were deemed to be in competition to the local market, which was already saturated.

Despite these factors, Britain still took in substantial amounts of refugees and migrants during the build-up to and height of World War II. One of the major key takeaways, however, was the impact of WWII on the post-war immigration landscape. Not only was Britain a key player in shaping the international system after WWI and WWII, but it also needed to craft its future. Rebuilding the global economy and statecraft after back-to-back world wars was in itself a challenge; however, Britain also faced significant obstacles domestically.

3.6 POST WORLD WAR II

Post-war immigration to Britain has been one of the most influential points in modern British history. The end of the war brought significant changes to the international world order. Inevitably, global migration patterns were influenced by the wars; particularly, migration to Britain was characterized by movements of refugees and displaced peoples, as well as the unemployed seeking economic opportunities against the backdrop of a global economic depression. Simultaneously, Britain was undergoing serious change in regard to its relationship with Empire. Previous, the British Empire had stretched across the globe and encompassed millions of British subjects. Yet, at the close of WWII, Britain needed labor. With back-to-back catastrophic total wars, Britain experienced a major loss of generations of men. Still, there was a need for the rebuilding of the economy, domestic infrastructure, and social services. Thus, the government enabled immigrants to move to Britain from its overseas territories to fill labor shortages.

1948 BRITISH NATIONALITY ACT

Importantly, this move was one which enabled the movement of migrants from the West Indies and South Asia. The 1948 British Nationality Act (1948 BNA) created new pathways of legal migration to the United Kingdom, established the category of "Citizen of the United Kingdom and Colonies," outlined stipulations of naturalization and other immigration practices, and granted certain key powers to the Secretary of State. Essentially, this landmark legislation was one which opened migratory pathways that would change Britain's political and social landscape for years to come.

One of the most influential points in Britain's post-war immigration history was the arrival of the *Empire Windrush*. In 1948, the *Empire Windrush* set sail for Britain, carrying its crew and hundreds of migrants to the UK from the West Indies. The newly established British Nationality Act 1948 extended the Citizen of the United Kingdom and Colonies categorization to British subjects across its Empire. The Caribbean countries sent forward a steady stream of migrants, approximately half a million in about twenty years.

WINDRUSH GENERATION

The inaugural group of migrants arriving on the Empire Windrush were described in newspapers across Britain. Research within the British Newspaper Archive database brought up several examples of the narratives crafted around these first arrivals. The *Bradford Observer* described the migrants as looking "to seek the work they could not fight in their own country." Generally, it was expected that the first group of initial migrants were eligible workers.

According to some migrants interviewed, their trip Jamaica to England on the Empire Windrush costed £28 for the passage and £5 upon sailing off. According to the Home Office Inflation Calculator, this is equivalent to £1,208 or $1,560 in 2019. These fees were often paid with life savings or pooled amongst families. The background of West Indies workers lies in the first half of the twentieth century, as these groups produced a large amount of exports in fruits, spices, sugar, coffee, etc. Labor was cheap and rates of unemployment remained high in many low skilled sectors. Sometimes, large-scale projects, such as the construction of the Panama Canal, allowed for mass migration of Caribbean workers. According to Phillips & Phillips (1998), a high degree of mobility was a normal and routine fact of life for many "active and enterprising Caribbeans."

One major narrative to be considered within discussion of the Windrush Generation is the allure of economic opportunity in the United Kingdom. *The Daily Mail* quoted migrants saying, "We won't be disappointed in England," "Nothing could be as bad as what we have left…," "We want to help England," "We'll work as hard as anyone for you," and "Give us a chance…". These quotations set the tone for the eager migrant workers hoping to embark on a journey to the symbolic Motherland; however, replies in the same article negate their positive outlook:

> "I could not honestly paint you a very rosy picture of your future. Conditions in England are not as favourable as you think. Various reports you have heard about shortage of labour are very misleading. The shortage is not general. Unless you are highly skilled, your chances of finding a job are none too good….
>
> Hard work is the order of the day in Britain and if you think you cannot pull your weight you might as well decide to return to Jamaica, even if you have to swim the Atlantic.
>
> No slackers will be tolerated."

Additionally, an account was given by a Jamaican businessman who stated, “Some think the streets in Britain are paved with gold, and there will be a lot of disappointed men among them” (*Daily Mirror*, 1948). These quotations serve as evidence of the discussion surrounding the initial Windrush arrivals – there were celebratory welcomes, and there were stark warnings of what would be waiting for the migrants when they made it to Britain.

The truth was somewhere in the middle. The Windrush migrants were particularly recruited into areas of work shortage and nationalized industries, such as the newly established National Health Service (Wardle and Obermuller, 2019). These migrants also took on lower skilled jobs. As thousands of arrivals came over the ensuing years following the British Nationality Act, social and political attitudes toward migration were influenced by the patterns. According to Hansen (2000), the British Nationality Act was not designed to induce or encourage mass migration to the UK. The implications of these migration flows from the former colonies included criticism of the “great influx of undesirables” possibly arriving as a result of this Act (Clement Attlee said in 1948).

In addition to the economic pulls of the UK, it is important to note that there was a sense of connection between the Commonwealth countries and the “Motherland.” One can analyse this connection through the lens of colonialization, race, or power dynamics. Of course, during this initial movement of post-war migrants, it is important to note that the Caribbean was a steady source of serviceman for Britain. The first group of recruits from this area arrived in the 1940s and were of higher social class; these groups were made into fighter pilots of the Royal Air Force, and eventually, would lead the fight for colonies’ independence (Phillips & Phillips, 1998). Despite a segregated troop service, Jamaicans and recruits from the West

Indies served in both the British and American militaries. After the war, thousands of troops returned to their homelands with connections to Britain. Increased travel capabilities between these distant lands were serviced by a number of former troop ships transporting former serviceman, and some of the ships, such as the Empire Windrush, would take individuals back to Britain to start the post-war revitalization.

POLITICAL AND SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF POST-WAR MIGRATION

Primarily, the criticism of mass migration was rooted in the political elite's reversal on the allowances given to "coloured" or non-white immigration from the former colonies. Simply put, there were grievances about non-white immigration and political support for adding further restrictions to who could be given the right to live in the UK. For example, Winder (2013) points out that the narrative on Irish migration to the UK is considered acceptable on the basis of race. Their research shows that the basis of acceptance of migrants relates substantially on racial similarities of native citizens, rather than that of subjecthood or new forms of citizenship given to former colonies. The popular account described the government as actively having "brought" migrants to do poor jobs that the citizens did not wish to do, although there are contradictions between what the government aimed to do and sentiments brewing in the background. Phillips & Phillips (1998) argued that based on their research into a series of letters between the Government in Jamaica and the Civil Service, the Civil Service was mostly concerned with the influx of workers with whom they had no relationship: no details, no way to regulate movements, and no control by sanctions.

After the war, the British people faced difficulties in rebuilding their economy and society at large; as discussed, the country did face a labor shortage, and there were newly established essential services such as the NHS which demanded more

workers. However, the scene was not entirely prosperous or abundant with economic opportunity. Post-war austerity introduced more rationing of food, and there were countless stories of homelessness, poverty, ill health, and poor social conditions. In 1948, production increased and aside from some domestic tensions there were indications that Britain was performing more successfully than before the war (Phillips and Phillips 1998).

Despite this uptick in economic and social performance, there were indications of mixed responses to migration into Britain. Particularly, the Labour government and its relationship with the British Nationality Act revealed internal conflictions. Likewise, polarizing speech by anti-immigration figures such as the Conservative MP Enoch Powell, famous for his Rivers of Blood speech decrying colored immigrants as alien invaders and listed alleged complaints from his constituents about immigrants' criminality, demanded the response of the government. Discourse on what it meant to "be British" and who deserved to have that right was the center of the political and social thought for years to come. Additionally, the increased association between migrants and crime became a centerpiece upon which immigration policy would be crafted in the UK.

THE 1950-60s: RACE RELATIONS & LABOR

Into the 1950s, a saturated labour market followed the post-war economic boom in Britain. Social tensions were exacerbated by racial and anti-immigrant sentiments. Certain areas across Britain were more prone to having larger amounts of migrants, including industrial cities and London. After the war, housing was a standard issue across all demographics. Specific districts of London were more open to migrants, and therefore, the large congregations became synonymous with their

residence. These areas tended to be those with unsavoury pasts or histories, whether factual or by association, and included connections with crime, prostitution, dirtiness, and poverty. The association had consequences. Migrants were identified with negative reputations of these places in which they lived, such as the East End, Clapham Common, Battersea, south London, Notting Hill, Notting Dale, Islington, Hackney, and outside of London included cities such as Birmingham, Manchester, Nottingham, Leeds, and Luton.

Particularly, these consequences are best illustrated through a series of violence and destruction during riots in Nottingham in the north of England and in Notting Hill, an area of London, in 1958. The general explanation given for the cause of this riots includes tensions between "Teddy Boys," or white working-class men who dressed in Edwardian clothes and fought both amongst themselves and with other groups. Social tensions between white working class and non-white migrants can best be illustrated academically through the shift in media coverage about the role of migrants in British society. As discussed, the initial groups were more or less celebrated or reported neutrally, but as time went on, migrants became more associated with threat and the pressure that migrants put on resources such as housing or welfare provisions (Phillips and Phillips 1998). This sentiment was also reflected in certain policies which targeted "domestic threats" such as "black marketeers, spivs, and smugglers."

COMMONWEALTH IMMIGRANTS ACT

These social (and race-related) tensions, along with the necessity to address the labor market and continued flows of migrants, the government aimed to alter legislation on immigration policies. In 1962, the Commonwealth Immigrants Act

established the need for a British passport or birth right in order to have citizenship and its entailed rights; moreover, those who did not fall into this category needed a work voucher to enter the UK. This legislation was amongst the first of many to further restrict who and how many could enter the UK for work and living.

A few years later, a Labour government introduced the Commonwealth Immigrants Act 1968 which limited the right to citizenship to those born or naturalized in the UK or had parents or grandparents who were born or naturalized in the UK. The powers of deportation were outlined in this legislation. This legislation is said to be a response to the influx of Kenyan Asians, who held British citizenship, but were migrating to Britain for political reasons. These policies nonetheless impacted migrants who were attempting to move to the UK from the former colonies, as they restricted the amount of people who would fall into the accepted legal categories.

The Windrush Generation still qualified for the right to abode (or the right to live) in the UK as per the updated code of immigration policy in 1971. The Immigration Act 1971 introduced new categories of immigrant: partial and non-partial immigrants. These categories outlined the rights entailed to each type of immigrant, ranging from full citizenship rights to those with limited leave to remain in the UK. Penalties for violating this limited leave to remain included fees and deportation. Spencer (1997) argued that this policy negated or ended the rights of non-white migrants from the Commonwealth to move to the UK, whereas the rights of white settlers were strengthened. Nonetheless, the Windrush Generation who were settled in the UK since the 1950s fell into the legal categorization and held the right to abode. This stipulation was furthered by their residence of at least five continuous years.

THE 1970S-1990S

By the 1970s, the British Empire had been dismantled and the European Community was an established entity, one which Britain would hope to enter. The aforementioned social and political race-based tensions were side-stepped by industrial issues, but they never strayed far from the surface. Bringing fringe politicians and their political group supporters into the mainstream allowed for the major parties to discuss these sentiments, as well as their anthesis. This period saw the "anti-racism" politics, Anti-Nazi Leagues, and demonstrations against racist, anti-immigrant groups such as the National Front. A newly established social event, the Notting Hill Carnival (often referred to simply as "Carnival"), ushered in additional public support and celebration of cultural diversity in Britain. Since the riots in this area, there was a substantial increase in attention to the issues faced by migrants, such as poverty, lack of adequate housing, continued racism, etc. Additionally, it can be argued that an uptick in public liberal sentiment toward broad concepts such as "diversity" and different cultures helped bring about acceptance and encouragement of ethnic celebration (Phillips & Phillips 1998).

However, this iconic success for the advancement of the Caribbean citizens was not without issues. In 1976 and in subsequent years, the Carnival was subject to violence and rioting, mostly associated with tensions between black youths and law enforcement. An interview with Paul Gilroy, academic and historian known for contributions to race studies, showed that the views of Caribbean and non-white people were of the belief that they were unfairly targeted and associated with criminality:

> "We're watching that idea being created. It's created through arguments about mugging and street crime, it's created through arguments about black culture and recreation, clubs, and youth clubs…. All of these things fold into a larger explanation which says, 'Black people are generally predisposed to be criminal, and it's their culture which produces the criminality. It's their family life which sanctions it. It's the conflict between generations which reproduces it as a pathology, and we good, noble British people are at a loss to know how to intervene in that cycle of criminal pathology'" (Phillips and Phillips 1998).

Entering this discussion into the public's consciousness, it was also marked with the countering of black youth against racism.

THE 1980s-90s

BRITISH NATIONALITY ACT

In 1981, the British Nationality Act was introduced by Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. It abolished the Citizen of the United Kingdom and Colonies category and introduced the groups of British Citizen, British Overseas Citizen, and British Dependent Territories Citizen. Only British Citizen category entailed the automatic right to abode and entry within the UK. Additionally, this legislation made alterations to the notion of jus soli or birthright citizenship. Importantly, it would be one of the most impactful pieces of legislation on the Windrush generations.

1990s: EUROPEAN UNION MEMBERSHIP

Entering the 1990s, British immigration policy could be categorized as restrictive and highly regulated. However, a new shift recognized flows of refugees and asylum seekers from other areas outside of the Commonwealth. Additionally, with the United Kingdom entering the European Union, it was now subject to the freedom of movement of EU citizens stipulation. The freedom of movement concept allows for EU citizens to move, settle, and work within other Member States without

heightened restrictions compared to non-EU countries (such as the Commonwealth nations) all of whom would need a visa. The increased attention and securitization given to asylum seekers and irregular migration at border entries to the UK, as well as new flows of EU citizens and accession states of Eastern Europe, provided new challenges – as well as new distractions. A series of amendments and new legislation aimed to tighten controls and increase security capacities regarding immigration were enacted through the 1990s and 2000s, especially in the post-9/11 policies.

CHAPTER IV: NEW LABOUR

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, British politics endured a transformative period marked most notably by the 2016 referendum on European Union membership, which resulted in a narrow vote in favor of leaving the bloc. Additionally, the United Kingdom experienced a Scottish referendum on independence in 2014, as well as several general elections and changes in leadership. Reflecting upon the state of affairs in 2021, the UK has battled through controversy and uncertainty regarding its post-EU plans, a global pandemic, and domestic challenges. Undoubtedly, an increased attention to the UK's political manoeuvring is warranted, especially considering the obstacles it is facing.

One of the most impactful areas of study is arguably the influence of immigration on British politics. Historical migration patterns to the British Isles come alongside substantial changes in policies. Many policies were restrictive, reactionary, and aimed to reduce overall migration flows. At the same time, immigration policies have been altered at some points in time, allowing for increased flows of migrants or new avenues for certain groups. Yet, it can be argued that British governmental policies toward immigration have been hot-and-cold.

The whiplash of immigration policy changes is encapsulated by the legacy of the New Labour government (1998-2007) led chiefly by Prime Minister Tony Blair. During this time, the rate of law-making in immigration policy was extraordinary. Attention given to migration was also characterized by its relationship to security

matters. Heightened awareness of perceived threats to security was matched by increased focus on crime, immigration, and terrorism. New Labour oversaw substantial institutional changes, such as the shifts of the Home Office's responsibilities and the establishment of several new offices and organizations dealing with a range of areas such as counterterrorism and immigration applications. Throughout the creation of these institutions, approaches to immigration were crafted through numerous Parliamentary Acts, policy strategies, and white papers. The decade of governance under New Labour was undoubtedly a transformative period for British politics.

This thesis looked at the New Labour government's approaches to immigration through the analytical lens of securitization theory. Scholars have reflected on the legacies of Blair's government in various eras, including the "War on Terror" and the "Special Relationship" with the United States, post-9/11 security infrastructure building, international development, and social and economic policy. Research on this decade of British politics includes securitization as a phenomenon ubiquitous with the post-9/11 and 7 July 2005 London Bombings (7/7) security apparatus and institution building. Moreover, significant attention has been given to the role of the British media and rhetoric in regard to the crafting of security issues.

To add to the expansive body of work on New Labour's immigration policies, this thesis aimed to engage with existing research by tracing the patterns of rhetoric relevant to the process of securitization of migration, particularly in regard to asylum-seekers, refugees and migrants from certain regions of the world. This research utilized numerous white papers, policy strategies, political speeches and campaign materials, and various forms of media such as television shows, documentaries, and Internet communications. Furthermore, this project grappled with an ongoing and

complex issue in British society: the notion of identity through the establishment of in-group and out-groups. The relevance of this research is marked by the current global conversations about race relations, social and economic inequalities, humanitarian crises, and the future of the United Kingdom in its post-EU endeavors.

One of the central themes throughout this research rests on foundational research by critical security theory scholars, including the Copenhagen School and scholars such as Ole Wæver and Barry Buzan. Shifting from the dominant perspectives, securitization theory emerged as a way to analyze processes by which states determine threats to security outside of the traditional scope of threat, such as military conflict. Since its articulation, securitization theory has become a core tenant of security studies, and as such, it has been utilized as a lens through which to analyze expanding policy areas, such as the military, economy, society, environment, and politics.

4.1 NEW LABOUR: A PROFILE

The New Labour administration was led primarily by Prime Minister Tony Blair from 1997-2007 and followed by PM Gordon Brown from 2007-2010. “New Labour” refers to this specific period of British politics under the Labour Party. New Labour is not a distinct party from the Labour Party, but rather, it symbolizes an ideological shift from previous administrations or party groups. The New Labour period is marked by unique characteristics which have become synonymous with this administration. These characteristics include the embracing of market economics and a synthesis of capitalism and socialism, “spin doctoring” in the media, significant changes to the immigration system, a crackdown on crime, increased attention to

social justice and multiculturalism in Britain, and Britain's participation in the "War on Terror" alongside the United States.

Scholars debate the "new" in New Labour. Allender (2001) provided an extensive literature review which collated research on New Labour into five categories. Particularly, three perspectives reflect the major arguments comprising the academic discussions on New Labour's ideologies: 1) those who suggest that New Labour is merely a product of spin; 2) those who stress the continuities between Old and New Labour; and 3) those who suggest that New Labour is continuous with Thatcherism (Allender, 2001). Moreover, this work looked at one of the key facets of New Labour's ideological and political approaches: modernization. The New Labour administration essentially aimed to shift from the "old Labour's" branding and labelling, thus symbolizing a modern political party capable of ushering Britain into the 21st century while dealing with a plethora of complex issues built up from years of Conservative rule.

THE LABOUR PARTY: BACKGROUND & IDEOLOGIES

The Labour Party's beginnings are rooted in the rise of working-class politics in Britain. Trade unions, social democrats, and democratic socialists comprised the foundational numbers of the traditional Labour Party. The Labour Party can be characterized as ideologically "left" in the political spectrum. Labour have been contenders in British Parliamentary elections since the 1900s. For a long stretch of British political history, the Labour Party served as one of the two top contending parties. Its main competition is its counterpart, the Conservative Party, although Britain operates within a multi-party system which sees the variant success of a range

of political groups. As of 2021, the Labour Party has had six Prime Ministers in power.

The ideology of the Labour Party is rooted in working-class politics and identities. The rise of the Labour Party comes alongside the social and political changes described in Chapter III, spurred by back-to-back total wars and waves of economic and cultural change. The Party was built off the momentum of the trade union movement; eventually, the influences of the World Wars ushered in the adoption of principles of nationalization, common ownership, and Marxist ideologies. Moreover, the Labour Party have been traditionally influenced by redistributive and Keynesian economics, social justice and elimination of inequalities, and pro-Europeanism and globalization principles.

NEW LABOUR SHIFTS

The ushering in of the "New Labour" ideologies has arguably been the result of changes to the size and characteristics of the working classes in Britain. As evidenced throughout the historical analysis of British immigration policies, most of the external and internal events influencing legislative changes have come alongside drastic social and cultural changes.

However, in modern day, the middle class has expanded to overcome most of the political territory previously occupied by the working-class strata. A study by Heath & Jowell (2001) on New Labour's changes during this time period revealed that the size of the working class in Britain continuously declined after the post-WWII period, and thus, some of the electoral results reflect a decline in voting percentages. This also comes alongside a decline in trade union membership and council housing.

Moreover, the characteristics of the working and middle classes have changed. During this transformative social and economic period, it was widely believed that class boundaries were beginning to blur; socioeconomic mobility meant that "more affluent members of the working class, particularly home-owners in the southeast [of England], were converging with the lower middle class in their aspirations and lifestyles, and crucially, were becoming detached from the Labour Party" (Heath & Jowell, 2001). Assuming that this assertion was correct, the remaining Labour core support would be gleaned from the "most disadvantaged sectors of the working class, those in less skilled jobs, and in the declining stock of council housing" (Heath & Jowell, 2001).

NEW LABOUR, NEW LIFE FOR BRITAIN: TONY BLAIR

The manifesto publication *New Labour, New Life for Britain* (1996) was the initial rebranding of the Labour Party under Tony Blair and outlined a "Third Way" centrist approach to British politics. Tony Blair was the Leader of the Labour Party from 1994-2007 and Prime Minister of the United Kingdom from 1997-2007. Blair was a Member of Parliament for Sedgefield, a constituency in the County Durham in Northern England, from 1983-2007. An Oxford graduate, Blair studied law and became active in political activities with the Labour Party shortly after his graduation. According to his memoirs, his political beliefs were impacted by socialism, leadership roles, and his time at university. His long premiership oversaw major historical events, such as contributions to the Northern Ireland-Ireland peace process, Britain's participation in the War on Terror and other military interventions (Iraq 1998 & 2003, Kosovo, Sierra Leone, Afghanistan), devolution of parliamentary powers, increased immigration, and crack down on "anti-social behavior" (crime).

New Labour, New Life for Britain was a political manifesto for the rebranded Labour Party under Tony Blair, and it outlined several key shifts for "a different political choice" between the "failed Conservative government" and "a new and revitalized Labour Party." The key areas encompassed by this manifesto: industrial relations, economic management, education, health, crime, governmental accountability, welfare reform, Europe/EU membership, and the environment. Notably, immigration was not a central concern in this document. In 1997, New Labour won the general election, thus ushering in opportunities for change and modernization as per their agendas due to a massive record-breaking Labour majority in Parliament.

4.2 NEW LABOUR: IMMIGRATION POLITICS & POLICIES

The aim of this thesis is to analyze the immigration policies and related political processes during New Labour's government. Due to these constrictions, it is not possible to attend to every aspect of the administration's legacies. However, a sizable amount of scholarly literature on New Labour has covered elements of its governance that inevitably overlap with immigration. Further discussions on securitization in foreign policy, the environment and climate change, membership of the EU, and participation in military intervention can be found outside of the scope of this project.

NEW LABOUR: 1997-2001

Somerville (2007) divided Labour's first term in government into two immigration policy phases. Immediate changes were made in the 1997-2001 period. These changes were administrative, such as the scrapping of the "primary purpose rule" in dealing with immigrant marriages and the clearing of backlogs with increased

asylum seeker claims. This first phase comes alongside a white paper published in 1998 entitled *Fairer, faster, and firmer: A modern approach to immigration and asylum.* This white paper asserted that the complex and slow system needed to be fixed in order to deal with the challenges of immigration, as well as the negative side effects such as "abusive claimants" and "racketeers" and the high cost to tax payers.

The language of the white paper is straightforward and clear. In terms of securitized language, this white paper focused more on the threats to genuine immigrants than those perceived against native citizens. For example, the white paper noted that potential abuse of the asylum-seeking process "threatens to undermine proper controls of immigration." Moreover, there is an emphasis on the existence of immigration-related crime networks. These are characterized as predatory networks aiming to take advantage of the vulnerable populations. Networks such as these are focused on fraud, smuggling, drugs trafficking, fake document rings, and money laundering. There is a distinction between made between these criminals and the vulnerable populations targeted, as well as genuine applicants and entrants. To add some context to this emphasis, there was an observable increase in human trafficking during this time period due to asylum seekers turning to alternative ways of entry into the EU member states after long waits for decisions on applications or rejections (Stevens, 2001). In terms of combatting crime and terrorism, the white paper discusses the frontier controls of the UK borders and strengthened capabilities for immigration enforcement officers.

The white paper laid the foundations for the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999. The Act "significantly extended the use of civil and criminal sanctions in immigration matters" by "expanding existing offences of entering [the UK] by deception, sanctions on carriers, particularly road haulers, and greater police powers,

including the use of force, for immigration officers" (Somerville, 2007). Moreover, a critical element for the administrative processes of the immigration system was introduced: new restrictions on the right of appeal (in cases of failed applications), as well as the ability to classify cases as "manifestly unfounded" (Somerville, 2007). There were additional restrictions that came out of this legislation, including the expansion of the "safe third country" concept and the ineligibility of asylum seekers for social security benefits (the introduction of a new agency to deal with welfare support supplanted this area either way).

The Act increased the criminalization of immigration. Some of the priorities of the previously discussed white paper and the Act related to detection, prevention, and punishment of immigration and asylum law offenders (Stevens, 2001). Additional areas of concern were employer liability (only those with leave to remain or permission to work should be eligible for paid work), "sham marriages" (suspicious marriages arranged for immigration purposes to circumvent rules or regulations, chiefly between a non-EU or UK national and someone with leave to remain or UK/EU citizenship), deception and facilitation of entry (essentially, someone circumvents restrictions on leave to remain or attempts to avoid or postpone immigration enforcement actions), carrier's liability (has to do with the transportation of unauthorized entrants to the UK, particularly a problem for lorry drivers crossing into the British territories) (Stevens, 2001).

All these areas of concern laid the groundwork for the further expansion of the law enforcement capabilities of immigration policy. With the increasing of powers to immigration officials, the criminality of immigration becomes almost synonymous: the officers are looking to "crack down" on fraudsters and illegal entrants, thus giving the impression that immigration is a security-related process. Detention and

deportation became two major responsibilities of immigration bodies. The focus shifted from the facilitation of movement of people to the scrutiny and restriction of movement only to those deemed worthy of legal entry.

The first phase of immigration related legislation during New Labour's first few years included the discussed white paper, the Human Rights Act 1999, the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999, the Race Relations (Amendment Act) 2000, and *Full and equal citizens: a strategy to integrate refugees* white paper in 2000, and an Anti-Terrorism, Crime, and Security Act 2001. The 1999 Immigration and Asylum Act is argued to be one of the most restrictive tightening of controls since 1905 (see *Chapter III*, Aliens Act 1905) as the expansion of penal powers meant that immigration was now solidly part of the law enforcement apparatus. Cohen (2002) argued that the Act exhibited the tightest controls since 1905, as exhibited by the removal of the right to appeal for some cases, new strengthened powers for immigration officers to arrest and to gather information (fingerprints, search procedures, and surveillance). In this view, extraordinary measures taken to combat the perceived threats to the "proper controls of immigration" systems meant that it was necessary to increase jurisdiction, enforcement, and extradition capabilities in order to protect the integrity of the UK.

"PHASE 2": 2001-2007

Somerville (2007) designated the second phase of Labour's policymaking as being characterized by attaching economics to migration, as well as a shift from reactive to pro-active policy making. He pointed out that the 2002 white paper entitled *Secure borders, safe havens: Integration with diversity in modern Britain* included the concept of "managed migration," which asserted that migration could be a welcomed

benefit for the economy. Legislation enacted in 2002 included the Nationality, Immigration, and Asylum Act, followed by the 2004 Asylum and Immigration (Treatment of Claimants, etc.) Act, and then the 2006 Immigration, Asylum, and Nationality Act (IAN). These pieces of legislation emphasized immigration control, particularly with an increasingly restrictive stance on asylum and unauthorized migration while upholding the value of economic migration (Somerville, 2007).

Secure borders, safe havens: Integration with diversity in modern Britain elaborated on the ways in which immigration policies were needed to secure the UK's territorial integrity, as well as to help combat immigration-related crimes. However, one of the major motivations for this white paper is the asylum and refugee influxes arriving off the back of unrest in the Middle East and other areas. A foreword by the Home Secretary David Blunkett showed that the New Labour government understood the pull factors bringing the migrants to the UK's borders: "the perception that Britain is stable and attractive place in which to settle," due to successful economy and job opportunities, the universality of the English language, and global communication spreading the word about the UK.

THE EUROPEAN UNION

The white paper goes on to say that the UK must handle asylum seekers a bit differently than their European counterparts, chiefly in the introduction of internal identification procedures (entitlement cards). During this period, membership of the European Union was in a different stage than as seen in recent years; the EU was starting to develop as a supranational entity in the early 1990s. The Euro was established in 1999 (although the UK opted out), and the EU underwent enlargement in 2004 and 2007 with two groups of Eastern European countries joining the bloc. In a

document published by the EU, it is asserted that predictions of a massive inflow of workers from Central and Eastern Europe did not come true; it argued the nationals from the enlargement groups comprised less than one percent of the working age population in the original member states. However, the exceptions were the UK (1.2%) and Ireland (around 5%), peaking in 2006. It further argued that enlargement was not a risk to security because EU citizens benefitted from a more stable Eastern European region. Membership of the EU was contingent upon meeting criteria such as adopting democratic principles. Thus, it was argued that the appeal of EU membership brought about the incentive to transition and reform peacefully to democratic states.

The Labour stance on the European Union has changed over time, ranging from the 1983 policy on withdrawing from the European Community (EC) to a more pro-European shift in the 1990s. On the other side of the bench, the Conservative Party has been notably more overtly Eurosceptic over the years; however, a vocalization within the party has celebrated the business opportunities brought by European integration. Under New Labour, Tony Blair delivered several EU-centric speeches at party conferences in 1994, 1995, and 1996. Additionally, the 1997 Labour manifesto brought forward matters on EU membership, such as the use of the Euro. An overarching theme in each of these speeches and related documents was the need for Britain to become a leader in the global community vis-à-vis the European Union. The celebration of this opportunity was motivated by the perceived economic benefits of membership of the EU. With the global economy facing looming recessions and financial crises, as well as the need to modernize to meet new expectations in a globalizing world, Blair wanted to bring the UK into the Single Market and to revitalize the British economy.

CLARIFICATIONS OF IMMIGRATION FLOW TYPES

Importantly, a distinction between types of immigration to Britain under New Labour can help better understand the securitization process and its assumed targets as a result of rhetoric and politicization. As noted in the start of this thesis, immigration refers to the movement of non-nationals to settle in a state outside of the country of origin. Mass migration refers to the movement of large groups of people from a specific geographic region to another, and this movement can occur for a myriad of reasons. Illegal or irregular migration is movement that takes place outside the regulatory norms of the sending, transit and receiving country. Asylum-seekers are those looking to claim the legal protection of asylum in a third-party host country, and if granted this status, are known as refugees. During New Labour's government, an embracing of the EU freedom of movement principle meant that millions of people across member states were eligible to live and work in the UK.

It can be argued that the focus of the securitization of immigration under New Labour and subsequent administrations is on 1) irregular and illegal entrants; 2) migrants from specific regions of origin; and 3) asylum-seekers and refugees. For New Labour, asylum-seekers and refugees became one of the focal points of immigration policy. In the build-up to New Labour's first win to government, the UK saw an increase in asylum-seekers in the late 1980s and early 1990s, bringing asylum to the forefront of discussions within British politics.

DOMESTIC SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF IMMIGRATION

Moreover, the underlying theme of the 2002 white paper was that Britain would be open to genuine applicants but "not open to abuse," symbolized by the "two-way street" requiring commitment from host community, the asylum seekers, and long-term migrants.

The white paper described these incidents as a "vivid picture of fractured and divided communities." Reminiscent of the race riots in the not-so-distant past, these moments revealed the dangers lurking in the domestic reactions to immigration policies, as well as the tangible human cost of legislation. Two years later, the additional legislation further reduced asylum appeal possibilities, increased the potential for withdrawing support, introduced the idea of asylum seekers undertaking community work in return for accommodation, and widened third country removals (McKee, 2004 as cited in Somerville, 2007).

Mentions of the two-way street were reflective of domestic tensions between migrants and native citizens, particularly in Bradford, Oldham, and Burnley. In 2001, there were a series of race-related riots in Bradford, Burnley, and Oldham. In Bradford, a northern working-class town, anti-immigrant groups such as the British National Party (BNP) and the National Front (NF) clashed with opposition. Over the course of several days, there were incidents of violence and destruction of property targeting migrants in the local communities, as well as police officers. Reminiscent of the riots in the 1950s, there was a racial element to the violence, with white citizens facing off with south Asian residents and both groups at odds with the police. Ray & Smith (2002) analyzed the context of the spread of unrest in these areas and identified long-lasting, highly impactful factors such as increased racial violence, mistrust and

disillusionment with institutions and the police, the overt presence of the anti-immigrant British National Party and far-right groups, and overarching social issues such as poverty and unemployment.

The BNP was founded in 1982 by a former chairman of the predecessor, the National Front, and support for the group rose in the early to mid-2000s. It is ideologically categorized as far-right, fascist or neo-fascist, hard Eurosceptic, populist, ultranationalist, white nationalist, and ethnic nationalist. A study by Ford & Goodwin (2010) showed that the social distribution of white membership of the BNP (2002-2006) skewed toward males, those 35-54 years of age, and those resident in the North and West Midlands. Working status was almost half-and-half, and both low skilled and skilled labor classes were represented in the 30% ranges.

In surveys (2002-2006) asking BNP supporters about the top "most important problem facing Britain," nearly 60% of respondents indicated that immigration was the top issue.[4] Another important revelation was a deep dissatisfaction with the government performance of all political parties, as well as a pessimism regarding the economy. Approximately 92% of BNP supporter respondents indicated that they were dissatisfied with the government, 85% were specifically dissatisfied with the Labour leader, and 69% believed that the economy would worsen. These figures also match the deeply embedded pessimism displayed by UKIP supporter respondents.

Thus, one of the major concerns of the New Labour government was community cohesion, especially in regard to migrant integration. There was an overarching problem, however, of perpetual cycles of poverty, unemployment, and low social

[4] In the same survey, Labour and Liberal Democrat supporters reported that Defence/Foreign Affairs/Terrorism was the top issue. Conservatives and UKIP supporters indicated immigration as the top issue.

development in areas across Britain; exacerbated by the impending expansion of globalization, tensions were most obvious in the deprived areas most vulnerable to the whims of economic development. Support for the BNP was stronger in areas with concentrations of less educated, white working-class voters from unskilled or low skilled backgrounds. Presence of a sizable and observable out-group population, such as Muslims or south Asian ethnic groups, also impacted support at the local authority level in key wins for BNP (Bowyer, 2008 as cited in Ford & Goodwin, 2010). Ford & Goodwin's (2010) analysis concludes with a suggestion that mainstream parties such as New Labour were unable to provide a convincing response to deeply embedded anxieties about immigration, thus giving way to the emergence of the BNP. Importantly, if one recalls the traditional background of the Labour Party, one remembers that the voter base was working-class, often residing in the Midlands or North regions of England. Areas of long-lasting Labour support saw the recruitment of BNP members and higher polling numbers. In these authorities, the rise of the BNP has gone hand in hand with the decline of the ruling Labour party (Ford & Goodwin, 2010).

IMMIGRATION POLICY LEGACY

In sum, the New Labour administration oversaw numerous key changes to the immigration system issued through agenda-setting white papers and policy strategies, parliamentary acts and bills. Throughout the following years, several legislative enactments and white papers related to immigration focused on themes such as 1) terrorism and crime, 2) asylum and refugees, 3) control of borders and immigration system, 4) race and multiculturalism, 5) economic migration and skilled labor, 6) immigration enforcement capabilities.

Research conducted for this thesis identified the following from 1997-2007: 2 white papers, 10 parliamentary acts, 6 policy strategies, 1 policy plan, and 1 parliamentary bill. The timeline of these enactments seems to be spread evenly across the administrative years, with the main observable pattern being in the theme of the works. Utilizing Somerville's (2007) phase one and two for the New Labour administrative terms, it can be observed that phase one (1997-2001) saw a flurry of parliamentary acts immediately enacting some of the points made in the foundational agenda-setting white paper, *Fairer, faster and firmer: A modern approach to immigration and asylum* (1998) published by the resounding successful New Labour party for electoral purposes.

Four parliamentary acts focused on human rights, immigration and asylum, race relations and terrorism and security were issued during this time-period. In the second phase (2001-2007), an additional white paper set the tone for the term: *Secure, borders, safe havens: Integration with diversity in modern Britain* (2002). This white paper was followed by the Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act (2002) and shortly after a five-year plan for border security, *Controlling our borders: Making migration work for Britain* (2005). This plan's publication was followed by a key policy strategy focusing on race relations and social equality.

The following years (2005-2007) saw the foundation for the increasingly securitized policy for immigration in Britain. In 2005, the Prevention of Terrorism Act was enacted, followed by strategies on integration for refugees and significant changes to the immigration system for skilled migration. A series of enactments ensued, including additional tweaks and overhauls to the immigration system chiefly related to combatting perceived threats such as terrorism and radicalization. Phase two culminated in the passage of the UK Borders Bill in 2007.

CHAPTER 5: SECURITIZATION OF IMMIGRATION UNDER NEW LABOUR (1997-2007)

"Globalism scours away distinctions at the surface of our identities and forces us back into ever more assertive defence of inner differences – language, mentality, myth, and fantasy – that escape the surface scouring. As it brings us closer together, makes us all neighbours, destroys the old boundaries of identity marked out by national or regional consumption styles, we react by clinging to the margins of difference that remain."

This chapter will analyze the legislation under New Labour, as well as the contextual communications, events, and impacts of the administration's deliberations on immigration to Britain. The scope of this analysis covers the 1997-2007 premiership of Prime Minister Tony Blair chiefly, although PM Gordon Brown entered into leadership toward the end of New Labour's reign of power. Additionally, it is important to note that this analysis utilizes emerging methodologies of studying the process of securitization. It assumes that securitization of immigration has occurred during this administration, in occurrence with a sizable body of scholarly work.

INTRODUCTION

Students of international security undoubtedly quickly sense the patterns of the emerging security apparatuses in major Western powers in the "post-9/11" world. The terrorist attacks in the United States on September 11, 2001 (9/11) triggered declarations of "war on terror." Although this calling is abstract and symbolic, the "war on terror" inevitably ushered in significant changes to the international community. Foremost, a flurry of highly restrictive measures, as well as far-reaching governmental powers, were enacted to combat potential threats. Over the years, this has included updates to the UK's Terrorism Act 2000 after the declaration of the "war

on terror," the Anti-Terrorism, Crime, and Security Act 2001, and the Terrorism Act of 2006.

However, it is important to dissect one major conflation consistent throughout Britain's experiences with immigration: "the foreigner" and "the threat." The process of securitization of immigration has arguably occurred since the government's involvement of its regulation, but the key moments throughout history show obvious relationships drawn between immigrants and existential threats. These included wartime justifications for extraordinary measures against foreign residents of hostile aliens, such as detention, deportation, or rejection of entry. Further, the post-war associations of migrants and threats to the local economy were also often layered with race-related sentiments.

During the New Labour administration, and arguably as soon as the 1970s, the "threat" of immigration was not necessarily associated with European or Western migrants, but rather it was related to the illegal or irregular entrants, asylum-seekers and refugees, and those deemed to be the "out group" culturally or racially. A study by Ford (2011) looked at disaggregated data on British attitudes to migration from seven different regions; the study's results indicated that preferences were given to white and culturally-proximate immigrant groups. Ford (2011) pointed out that throughout Britain's experiences with mass migration, Polish refugees, labor flows from Mediterranean Europe and Ireland received little backlashed compared to the organized public resistance against South Asian and Caribbean migrants, evidenced by race riots and the rise of anti-immigration groups with strong grounding in racist or xenophobic philosophies. Thus, it is important to separate the overall process of immigration and certain subsets of immigration (specifically, irregular/illegal/unauthorized migration, ethnic groups, and classifications such as

refugees/asylum seekers) in this discussion of securitization. Simply put, the threat is seen from only certain aspects of immigration, whereas other areas are welcomed. This is best evidenced through the welcoming of highly skilled, Western, and white/culturally proximate immigrants, compared to the hostility and scrutiny toward applicants or entrants not fitting into these categories. However, it can be conceded that New Labour did address the issues surrounding race relations and integration into the community through policy statements and other communications, as well as engaging legislation.

Further, this thesis argues that it is not only those in political power who contribute to the securitization process of immigration; the electorate, media, and unelected political groups play major influential roles. Particularly, in the case of New Labour years, it is critical to not only understand the context in which legislation was enacted, but also the roles of non-governmental actors and the British media. Scholars, including those critical of the securitization theory's methodological approaches, have sought to expand the ways in which the theory can be applied or utilized. In this project, the analysis aimed to build off a strong body of literature dedicated to the "securitization theory" and its impact on immigration policy and attitudes by looking at 1) the language (rhetoric and speech acts) of politicians and non-governmental actors in justifications for legislation and 2) emerging media's role in political communication (i.e. securitization of immigration) including social media, the Internet, and broadcast media/television. In doing so, the main purpose of this analysis is to gain a better understanding of how these elements of political communication contributed to the overall increasingly securitized state of affairs in Britain under New Labour.

5.1 SECURITIZATION: THREAT IDENTIFICATION

Under the securitization theory, analysis is contingent upon identifying the "who, what, why, and how?" of the process. First, this section will discuss the "who?" and "what?" of the securitization of immigration under New Labour. The following table outlines three main actors categories in the securitization process, as well as a set of perceived threats asserted by each:

Main Actors	**Perceived Threats**
New Labour Government	1) terrorism/non-state actors emerging through clandestine entry with intentions to commit acts of terror; 2) irregular/unauthorized migrants, no intentions to commit acts of terror but disrupt immigration controls and security due to circumvention of regulations.
British Media (a range of sources, securitization occurring most often in right-wing media)	1) all above; 2) overarching political concerns, such as general opposition to New Labour, the ongoing wars, EU politics or principles of freedom of movement, etc.
Anti-Immigration Groups and Figures/British Public	1) all above; 2) economic concerns, i.e. disruption to labor markets or local economies, particularly salient to working-class communities built off sectors of the economy such as agriculture or manufacturing; 3) identity-based threats due to migrant inclusions, such as ethnic, national identity, religious, community cohesion concerns.

The common assumption is that the "security threat" behind immigration is posed by unauthorized migrants. For policy-makers and political figures, it is not often asserted that highly skilled migration poses a threat to any aspect of the state. Rather, common

themes are associated with unauthorized entrants who circumvent immigration regulations and undermine immigration controls. Additionally, observable themes from other actors in the securitization process include concerns over mass migration's impact on certain sectors of the economy (particularly salient with working-class communities built off chunks of the economy, such as agriculture or manufacturing, and are prone to vulnerability due to market saturation of laborers). Lastly, one of the largest overarching themes relates to threat to identity. It is asserted that migration of dissimilar individuals (race, ethnicity, religion, cultural aspects, etc.) negatively impacts community cohesion and undermines the identity of the state. Anti-immigration groups such as the British National Party began as explicitly anti-immigration due to perceived threats to community cohesion by the Middle Eastern migrants.

5.2 SECURITIZATION: WHY IS THE "THREAT" OCCURING?

It is important to understand the context in which New Labour enacted legislation on immigration. During the impressive length of New Labour's premiership, domestic and external pressures undoubtedly influenced the ways in which immigration policies were crafted. As discussed, the terrorist attacks of 9/11 (US) and 7/7 (UK) encouraged lawmakers to enact counterterror legislation. The heightened anxieties related to threats of terror in the Western world were reflected by new security measures at airports, governmental buildings, schools, and other places of business. Importantly, the British government recognized a need to update counterterror measures to match the modern threats occurring across the world. In an age of increased globalization allowing for transnational networks of communication and movement, it was undoubtedly a time of complex transformation. The Internet

and mobile technologies were becoming increasingly accessible, thus opening the door for new avenues of crime, as well as its prevention. Law enforcement powers were expanded at this time. The definition of terrorism was altered in order to include what could constitute acts of terror, incitement of terror, and the punishments thereof.

RADICALIZATION & TERRORISM

One of the motivating factors for the securitization of immigration was the assertion that the threat of terrorism was looming over the UK. The legislation aimed at combatting terrorist activity was also influenced by the belief that the threat was already inside the country.

Extremist ideologies and radicalization within communities was already a major concern. The 7/7 terrorist attacks, which were coordinated Islamist suicide bombings in London, influenced the governmental responses to restoring faith in the security of the state. One of the actions taken by the New Labour administration was to address the "glorification of terrorism" or the incitement thereof via speech acts. The Terrorism Act of 2006 introduced new offenses related to inciting or encouraging terrorism, the possession of terrorist publications or materials, the dissemination of terrorist materials, or the act of training or educating in skills for terrorist attacks. All these stipulations assume that the offender in question is under the jurisdiction of UK law, present in the country, and perhaps even a British resident or citizen.

New Labour's aims were also to focus on counter-radicalization and de-radicalism. The Prevent strategy codified by the CONTEST counter-terror approach dealt with the stamping out of "homegrown terrorism" by aiming to prevent radicalization, primarily in the Islamic communities. In 2008, the post-Labour approach led by the coalition government of Conservatives and Liberal Democrats

was actually a continuation of some of these themes – these included the "four p's" of the British counterterror strategy: prevent, protect, prepare, and pursue. Prevention was associated with radicalization as the cause of violent extremism. Protection was associated with the defense of "critical national infrastructure" and UK borders. Prepare was related to the development of response capabilities in case of terror attacks in the UK. Lastly, pursue was an actionable category associated with the power to "detect, disrupt, and prosecute terrorists at home and abroad." In order to capture the "hearts and minds" of potential terrorists, the UK approach was hoping to deter the domestic threats looming within, which usually were perceived to be Middle Eastern, South Asian, and African migrants.

All of the dedicated policies and programs beg the question: why was radicalization occurring in the UK? What were the grievances of the groups? These questions are best answered by security studies scholars in works dedicated to uncovering the motivations of terrorist groups. In sum, the most effective answer for the purposes of this thesis is to say that these groups were operating against the backdrop of significant disruption in the Middle East, war and other drastic conditions, and the perceived rejection within British society. Of course, this summary is nowhere near covering the complexity and nuance of terrorist recruitment; however, it lays out the foundation for understanding some of the concerns about "why" certain groups were heightened risks of threats to UK public under New Labour's securitization of immigration.

5.3 SECURITIZATION: THE TANGIBLE EVIDENCE

Lastly, the "how" of the securitization process will be the bulk of this analysis. When observing the ways in which one could see securitization in practice, some examples of the "extraordinary measures" taken by governmental powers to combat security threats are obvious and tangible: increasing budgetary spending for military capabilities, expanding intelligence capacities, or utilizing the use of force to combat threats. Some of the "speech acts" are obvious – outright statements declaring existential threats, looming anxieties of doom. The actors are straightforward – they are the policy makers, the politicians, the experts, the commentators. The audience is the electorate, the military, the law enforcement officials, the bureaucrats, the members of a political group.

This section joins with the sizable body of literature of securitization theory in that it will be analysing subsidiary processes which comprise the overarching phenomenon. The key elements to this analysation will be 1) the role of rhetoric (vis-à-vis the "speech act") in securitizing immigration and 2) the role of non-governmental actors in the process.

These non-governmental actors still fall under the New Labour umbrella, as they undoubtedly interacted and influenced with the legislative process. In this way, non-governmental actors include the British media and political groups and figures outside of the elected members of Parliament.

RHETORIC & POLITICAL COMMUNICATION

In an overview of the study of political discourse, Feldman (1998) pointed out that there has been an increasing interest in the language of politics, political rhetoric,

political speech, political style, and political discourse. These areas, according to the author, are interchangeable terms utilized by political officials, scientists and academic professionals, and journalists to denominate the relationship between language. Linguists distinguish between language as a vehicle of communication and speech as the use of that vehicle by a given individual on a given occasion (Feldman, 1998). “Political discourse” and “political language” are two additional terms which encompass similar, overlapping elements of communication. What each of these terms has in common, however, is that “the language of politics is the language of power” (Feldman, 1998). Thus, the language of politics is the language of power, and the language of power is the language of influence.

“Political rhetoric” is often used by communication scientists, which is also found routinely in studies featured in political science and international studies. Further, the study of speech is not just about the spoken word. Feldman (1998) argued that “speech” encompasses the exchange of symbols, written and spoken words, pictures, movements, gestures, mannerisms, and dress. When these broad conceptions of language and politics overlap, language is considered a “power strategy” (Feldman, 1998).

Further, the notion of “political discourse” as an element of international relations is analysed by Holzscheiter (2013). Discourse is the space where human beings make sense of the material world, attach meaning to the world, and where representations of the world become manifest (Holzscheiter, 2013). The analysis of discourse is thus the engagement with meaning, linguistic and communicative processes through which social reality is constructed (Holzscheiter, 2013). To add to this point, one can take into consideration the work of Reyes (2011) on “legitimization” in political discourse. Reyes (2011) looked at the ways in which

language is utilized for legitimization (to justify courses of action) through emotions (particularly fear), a hypothetical future, rationality, voices of expertise, and altruism. Legitimization in this context refers to “the process by which speakers accredit or license a type of social behavior” through “ a justification of behavior” (Reyes, 2011). Further, the enactment of legitimization is through argumentation, “providing arguments that explain our social actions, ideas, thoughts, declarations” toward the justification of a goal seeking support or approval (Reyes, 2011).

Analysing speech acts through the lens of securitization theory matches with the notions of constructivist methodologies and overlaps with the study of discourse and power. In a revisiting of the securitization theory, Balzacq (2015) showed that the theory seeks to explain how the security character of public problems is established. The constructivist nature of this approach indicates that meaning of experiences is constructed by perceptions. Language and discourse constitute the material world, as well as the ways in which threats are construed. As a result, the contextual meanings of discourse and the applied experiences are absolutely relative. Analysis of discourse through the securitization theory can be therefore focused mostly on the language, rhetoric, symbology, and impacts of speech acts. Securitized language, at its most basic interpretation, is “self-referential,” meaning that the utterance of “security” ushers in these associations (Buzan et. al, 1998). However, the added importance and influence of the audience is necessary to successfully complete the securitization process. Therefore, it is often asserted that securitization is highly associated with politicization. The politicization of issues, such as immigration, means that the discussion is part of the everyday dialogue for governmental activities; whereas, securitized issues mean that extraordinary measures must be taken due to existential threats, thus these issues are placed at top priority and above the normal capacity for

government decision making. They demand immediate attention, decision-making, and resources. Integral to this process is the constructing of the threat as necessitating a collective response and acceptance thereof as a security issue. Wæver (2011) noted that the threat agreement must justify extraordinary measures, establish threats which are potentially existential, and articulate the advantages of securitizing the issue. Since rhetoric is often utilized as a persuasive technique, it is inherently elemental to the securitization process and therefore worthy of further attention.

NEW LABOUR: RHETORIC

The New Labour administration utilized several thematic elements for its political rhetoric throughout the years. A hint is in its name. The shift to "New" in "New Labour" symbolizes the start of the party's usage of rhetoric and motifs to craft perceptions. Studies of New Labour use of rhetoric include globalization discourse for economic goals (Dye, 2014); the construction of the "centre" or centric party via "definitions, comparisons, ridicule, authority, and arguments about cause and effect, contradiction, and sacrifice to persuade voters that its policies were at the political centre" (Hindmoor, 2004); or the political discourse of the "Third Way" and the language of the government (Fairclough, 2000 see also Fairclough, 1995 for *Critical Discourse Analysis*).

New Labour has become synonymous with the utilization of rhetoric to "spin" stories through "spin doctoring." Spin doctors are "the people responsible for the media presentation of the Government and putting a media spin or angle on its policies and activities" (Fairclough, 2000). Media communications were more carefully handled and centrally controlled under New Labour than compared to previous governments (Fairclough, 2000). Against the backdrop of growing emphasis

for strong public relations and on-demand coverage, governments pay increasingly close attention to managing the political coverage of the news media, adopting the "permanent election" mentality requiring consistent control of media perception. With this considered, it is no wonder that the processes of securitization via rhetorical persuasion is associated highly with the New Labour government's legislation agendas. Moreover, the use of securitization to justify Britain's involvement in the War on Terror is a legacy of Prime Minster Tony Blair's time in power.

RHETROIC: PRIME MINISTER TONY BLAIR

As contemporary politics has become increasingly centred in the media, the prominence of leaders in the political process has increased, and no political analysis can ignore the political identity and personality of the leader (Fairclough, 2000). Identity and personality centrally involve language ("a distinctive repertoire" of usage), rhetorical style, and social identity. Fairclough (2000) detailed an analysis of Blair's rhetorical style. He noted that political identity is constructed. Importantly, his analysis showed that Blair's style was characterized by a degree of assertiveness via categorical, authoritative assertions and "getting tough."

Arguably, Blair's rhetoric for immigration can be categorized in two ways: 1) "getting tough" with the degree of assertiveness, and 2) openness, with the degree of welcoming. Often, policy papers or speeches utilized a mix of both rhetorical approaches. In a speech in 2004 given to the Confederation of British Industry on migration, Blair noted several key quips which would become iconic parts of his legacy:

"Immigration and politics do not make easy bedfellows. They never have. We need few reminders of what can happen when the politics of immigration gets out of hand […]

We will neither be Fortress Britain, nor will we be an open house. Where necessary, we will tighten the immigration system. Where there are abuses we will deal with them, so that public support for the controlled migration that benefits Britain is maintained.

[…]

It became increasingly apparent that our asylum system was being widely abused. The UN Convention on Refugees, first introduced in 1951, at a time when the cold war and lack of cheap air travel made long-range migration far more difficult than it has become today, has started to show its age.

[…]

Significant numbers of economic migrants have been arriving in the UK, destroying their documentation and then trying to claim asylum - often by pretending to be from a different country to that from which they have actually come.

By doing so they were undermining the integrity of our asylum system and making life far harder for the genuine refugees who really needed our help.

[…]

But once we sort out the asylum system, we must also continue to root out abuse of our broader immigration system. Though it remains the exception rather than the rule, there are very real examples of abuse in particular countries or with particular schemes, which the public, quite rightly expects us to deal with.

[…]

So over the coming months, we will do two things at once: make the argument for controlled migration as good and beneficial for Britain; act to root out the abuses that disfigure the debate and bring the system into disrepute."

Blair's laidback, jovial tone at the beginning of this important speech juxtaposes against his serious, solidified stances articulating the need to overhaul immigration at the relative start of his term (three years in). One of the key themes throughout his speech was the need to root out abuse of the immigration system. At the same time, he made apparent a willingness to change the system in order to help meet the

obligations of refugee and asylum protocols, although a crackdown on fraud is more consistent throughout this speech. This speech affirms two key themes: toughness on abuse and fraud and welcoming for genuine migrants.

In 2005, Blair made a speech about asylum and immigration:

"Concern over asylum and immigration is not about racism. It is about fairness.

[…]

But I never want this to be an issue that divides our country that sets communities against each other. We are a tolerant, decent nation. That tolerance should not be abused. But neither should it be turned on its head."

Blair's comments here show an assertion of theme: tolerance. Tolerance has a positive connotation, evoking thoughts of equity, peace, and harmonious coexistence. However, it also reaffirms the willingness to act when "abused," signalling the assertiveness of the policies and governmental control of immigration. The threat posed by abuse tends to reflect on the disingenuous access to resources. Common associations made between fraudulent applications taking the spot of "genuine" asylees, draining resources such as welfare or social services, and negatively impacting resources reserved for needy domestic citizens such as housing and employment opportunities. The "abuse" of tolerance of accepting asylum seekers is reflected by the continuous calls for measures to scrutinize entrants and require documentation, as well as restrictions to what services or resources entrants are entitled to once they are accepted into the UK or await decisions on applications.

The common themes of the abuse of the immigration system reflect this perpetual state of panic and concern. It also asserts a relationship of fraudulency to migrants/immigration, particularly asylum. Most of the mentions of abuse are given

alongside mentions of asylum. Despite this consistent association, Blair's statements revealed a secondary theme of welcoming for "genuine" entrants. This distinction between the two does not go further into detail, thus allowing for a vacuum so to speak where anyone can step in to imagine the culprits. This analysis assumes that the vacuum left from generalized securitized/politicized speech allows for the emergence of additional actors in the process. In this instance, the British media and non-governmental actors (i.e. people not elected into positions in Parliament) were able to fill those gaps and craft narratives around immigration which bolstered the government's claims.

5.4 THE BRITISH MEDIA & POLITICAL COMMUNICATION

The age of New Labour was what one might call a 'mediatization' of politics and government (Fairclough, 2000). Nowadays, the age of the internet has allowed for instant communications, 24/7 connectivity, and the "round the clock" news cycle. Anyone has access to a camera they carry in hand every day. The Internet connects billions of people instantaneously. However, the age of New Labour meant that the emergence of tech and media coverage was a somewhat novel phenomenon, which was utilized to disseminate carefully crafted political messages. Political leaders turned into media personalities (Fairclough, 2000). Spin doctors such as Alistair Campbell were capable of centralizing and controlling agenda-setting rhetoric for the media to disseminate. At the same time, there were critics of Blair and this new way of governance. The British newsprint media is well-known for being overtly politically affiliated. Newspapers often take political stances on issues. Despite seeming like an outdated source of news, the newspaper media industry is highly influential in Britain and politics generally. Numerous studies have already covered at

length the influence of newspaper media in British politics. An extensive report published by The Migration Observatory at the University of Oxford indicated that the public cited two influences on its views regarding immigration: day-to-day contact with immigrants/word of mouth from friends or colleagues and the media (The Migration Observatory, 2016).

The influence of television as a form of communication is also very important to consider in the narrative framing process. The coverage of the 9/11 events by the television channels of the world, the dramatic live images and the descriptions of those events in the media have altered the cognitive structure of our emotions (Reyes, 2011). Through collective memory or shared belief, a brief reference ('killed 3,000 of our citizens') is enough for the audience to understand that the political actor is referring to 9/11 (Reyes, 2011).

The rise of the internet and social media has allowed for continuous news coverage, as well as instantaneous communication. Arguably, these tools should strengthen collective memory, or at the very least, the ability to craft political dialogue in order to protect the core message and agenda. The framing of messages is now practically a new science, with public relations and communications experts now studying social media behavior as a way to analyze its impacts. Political discourse is of course one of the top contenders for social media messaging. As a result, it is something on the forefront of scholars' attention, especially in light of new challenges brought by the tech age.

Importantly, New Labour were considered to be the "first government genuinely committed to view that [media] presentation is part of the process of policy formation" (Fairclough, 2000). The role of the media in the securitization process, therefore, is unextractable. Regarding immigration, British media coverage has been

studied especially in relation to refugees, asylum-seekers, and particular immigration-related events, such as deaths of migrants or crimes. Innes (2010) reviewed the coverage of threat construction and framing of asylum-seekers in the British media, finding that these securitization processes are bolstered by the "construction of a perceivable 'out' group or threatening 'other' that legitimizes restrictive policy while reinforcing identity." In this vein, asylum-seekers are considered the threat and out-group, and in immigration policy 'genuine' asylum seekers are distinguished from categories such as 'economic migrants', 'bogus' asylum seekers and 'illegal immigrants' (Innes, 2010). King & Wood (2001) showed that media often utilized phrases with negative connotations such as 1) phoney or bogus refugee(s) or asylum-seekers; 2) economic migrants (referring to asylum seekers); 3) economic refugees. The authors argued that these categories, especially the "phoney or bogus" pejoratives, helped craft themes emerging within the media coverage of immigration. These themes included 1) the genuineness of asylum-seekers' claims; 2) social welfare problems; 3) the "numbers game" i.e. how many immigrants were coming to Britain; and 4) racism/xenophobia. Thus, these categories serve as the basis for the construction of asylum seekers as a threat and are reinforced by extraordinarily restrictive measures taken to reduce the perceived threat.

Arguably, the British media were able to step into the rhetoric vacuum and capitalize on the securitization process in order to effect political goals. This was more often the case in right-wing affiliated media, which are more likely to frame migration (particularly refugee movements, asylum, and mass migration) as negative (Berry et. al, 2015). Bigo (2002) and the Paris School built off the securitization theory in viewing the security discourse surrounding migration. Key concepts in this area articulated by Bigo (2002) included "managers of unease" (those who reinforce

the securitized image and have some sort of authority to do so). Tabloid media in this regard was considered “fear mongers” (Bigo 2002).

The language utilized by the British press is the key factor for understanding how securitization is enabled. Common rhetorical themes emerge throughout reviews of media pieces on immigration. Uses of the metaphorical “flood” illustrate the perceived uncontrollable, overwhelming influxes of mass migration. Repetitive use of “bogus,” “phoney,” and “so-called” descriptors to refugees and asylum-seekers reinforce the notion that asylum-seekers aim to game the system with false claims of persecution, thus gaining access to Britain’s social welfare and economic benefits.

A previous mention of the research done on the threat themes presented by the three major actors (as argued by this thesis) indicated that the British media had a unique role in the narrative framing of “threat to British identity.” Innes (2010) asserted that in British immigration narratives, the identity of the excluded group (the out group and the perceived threat) is responsive to change in the international and domestic environment, thus the identity of the “other” changes over time in accordance with British interests and identity narratives.

This view is in accordance with the arguments made in Chapter III regarding the history of in and out groups throughout mass movement of people to Britain; these groups were historically based on race, ethnicity, nationality (especially during times of war) and cultural factors such as religious identity. Immigrants, therefore, are constructed as a homogenous group that represents the “other” against which societal identity is constructed (in-group) (Innes, 2010). Further, it is arguable that this dichotomy reinforces the worthy/unworthy immigrant narrative. This is reflected throughout British history and in modern politics. The celebration of the highly skilled migrant or the immigrant from Western or culturally-proximate countries is in

stark contrast to the narrative of the fraudulent, poor, and drain to resources posed by the asylum seeker, refugee, or culturally dissimilar migrant.

MEDIA MOTIVATIONS & AFFILIATIONS

Media sources who had a vested political interest in pushing anti-immigration narratives could have had several overarching motivations: 1) political gain (undermining New Labour politics for opposition gain), 2) anti-immigration sentiments (range of concerns from threat to economy, identity; racism, xenophobia, etc.), and 3) political opposition to the European Union, globalization, etc. A review of media pieces on immigration revealed thematically that blame was placed more often on politicians for EU migration; discourse around illegal migration placed blame on the migrants themselves (The Migration Observatory, 2016).

The Migration Observatory 2016 report on British media provided expert insight into the thematic discourse derived from popular tabloids (*The Daily Mirror, Daily Star, The People, The Sun*), mid-markets (*Daily Mail (Mail on Sunday), The Express (Sunday Express)*), and broadsheets (*The Daily Telegraph, Financial Times, The Guardian, The Independent, The Times*). The findings were collected into three methodological categories. First, a frequency analysis reported that near the end of New Labour's administration, there were 576 articles published mentioning immigration, from this point articles declined in number but remained in the high hundreds. "Mass" was the most common way of describing migration from 2006-2015, with press mentions of immigration's scale and pace occurring more often than legal status.

When the press described immigrants and migrants, 3 out of 10 mentions were with the descriptor "illegal," followed by EU/European, many, new, more, African,

Jewish, Polish, Irish, and recent. Regarding refugees, the top descriptor modifiers in newsprint were Syrian, Palestinian, Jewish, many, political, Iraqi, other, and more. One of the most prevalent themes in media's discussion on immigration focuses on perceived problems, rather than achievements, in addition to the scale and pace of mass migration. Lastly, an additional takeaway regarding the media's framing of immigration as a security issue relates to how the blame is placed. Articles placed the blame for perceived problems with the government in power nearly 50% of the time, but illegal migration's blame was also placed significantly on migrants themselves nearly 50% of the time.

These findings are crucial to the understanding of the role of the media in framing security issues. In order to justify extraordinary measures, as well as the general acceptance of security threat, the media play an indispensable role in disseminating rhetoric and crafting narratives. The tabloid media "generated the dominate narrative that constructs the general understanding of immigration threat issues", as this media have "generally adopted the image of the immigrants as a criminal and perpetuates this image in public understanding" (Innes, 2010).

Readings of studies on British media, tabloid articles, and academic texts on rhetorical analysis helped frame the assertion of this thesis that the media played a significant and unique role in the securitization process. One of the common themes found during the research process was the "threat to identity" posed by mass migration. Linkages between "culturally dissimilar" migrants and threats to community cohesiveness were juxtaposed against the New Labour government's attempts to reinforce integration, race quality and community cohesion through numerous speeches and publications.

The “us and them” narrative was pushed by certain sources of British media, chiefly those with right-wing leanings. Thus, it can be understood that there is a third actor in the securitization of immigration under the New Labour administration: the “us.” The following section will discuss the final element of this research project’s understandings of securitization applied during this time: non-elected individuals, political figures, and political groups. Non-elected is the key descriptor, indicating that these individuals operate outside of the decision-making arenas; instead, these figures influence public opinion, lobby for legislation or change, and comprise the backbone of the narrative of the “us” versus the “other.” They are the in-group, those who are threated by the out-group. They are the backbone of the securitization process, without which there would be no real democratic acceptance of the extraordinary measures taken regarding immigration. Likewise, they are the useful tool of the narrative crafters: the audience. They are the British public at large, as well as those within the electorate who gain momentum for anti-immigration or pro-immigration stances.

5.5 THE AUDIENCE: BRITISH POLITICAL FIGURES, GROUPS, AND ELECTORATE

In order to accurately capture the role of the securitization audience, it must be theorized as an active agent, capable of having a meaningful effect on the intersubjective construction of security values (Côté, 2016). Côté’s (2016) article addressed the role of the audience in securitization, chiefly 1) who is the audience? and 2) how does the audience engage in the construction of security? Importantly, the author’s construction of the audience strays from the traditional view in that it accounted for “securitization theory’s linguistic and intersubjective character,

addresses this theoretical/empirical conflict, and improves our understanding of how groups select and justify security priorities and costly security policies" (Côté, 2016).

This section adopts the framework provided from this article's analysis. One of the key assumptions derived from this article is that the audience is "capable of having an independent effect on securitization outcomes." An extensive literature review featured in this article covered the sizable empirical work in the identity of the audience, such as the general public within the democratic state (Roe, 2008; Abrahamsen, 2005; Hughes, 2007; Hayes, 2012). Additionally, two themes became apparent: "securitizing actors and audiences engage in repeated, contextually situated interactions" and "audiences actively engage in the securitization process" (Côté, 2016). Taken together, Côté's research argued that these overarching themes indicated that securitization is "highly intersubjective" and an "iterative process involving interactions between contextually situated securitizing actors and active audiences."

The traditional conception of the audience in the securitization theory was defined as "those the securitizing act attempts to convince to accept the exceptional procedures" (Buzan et. al, 1998). Due to the nature of this research project, the audience of the securitization of migration under New Labour will be considered the British public at large. This audience is the backbone of the "us" in the "us and them" construction threat-narrative. They are the in-group juxtaposed against the out-group. However, not all individuals within this audience will accept the narrative. The argument is not that the electorate accepted the securitized nature of immigration; rather, it is that the government attempted to craft this narrative in order to gain political and electoral support.

As a result, it really was only necessary to convince enough voters that there was a threat posed by immigration and that New Labour were the only ones capable of eliminating it. In this way, it is arguable that threat construction narratives can be vested in the interest of political parties to gain support, i.e. "fear mongering" or spin doctoring an image of the government saving the public from a threat that may or may not be genuine. However, the aim of this project is to discuss the evidence which indicates that the audience was wholly necessary in the securitization process.

Whether or not the threat was genuinely perceived is not the purpose of this analysis; rather, it is the assumption that the government utilizes threat-perceptions to garner support for its policies. This section focuses on those who are not within the elected government but may have political affiliation thereof or are in accordance with the threat-narrative regarding immigration. These include political groups and figures operating outside of the decision-making arena (Parliament). This section's purpose is to add to the discussion of the overarching theme of the perceived threat to identity posed by immigration. This theme was consistently observed through readings about right-wing political materials disseminated throughout this time period.

Particularly, the use of academic books such as *Fortress Europe: dispatches from a gated continent; No go zones: how Sharia Law is coming to a neighbourhood near you*; *The making of anti-Muslim protest: grassroots activism in the English Defence League; Loud and proud: passion and politics in the English Defence League; 7/7: the London bombings, Islam, and the Iraq War; UKIP: Inside the Campaign to Redraw the Map of British Politics; Flying Free; The Purple Revolution;* and *Revolt on the Right: Explaining Support for the Radical Right in Britain* helped further an understanding of the political, cultural, and social environments which have sparked a

wildfire within British politics leading up to momentous successes for right-wing aims, such as Britain's withdrawal from the European Union and electoral success of the Conservative Party in a post-New Labour world.

Immigration is one of the most salient issues utilized in political discourse stemming from New Labour's role in altering the political landscape surrounding migration, multiculturalism, counterterrorism, and the role of political leaders and the media in information dissemination (as well as public perceptions). Public attitudes became an increasingly studied area, with barometers established and pollsters' work becoming a scientific method. Arguably, the explosion of globalization allowed for increased technology to influence the way political science was conducted. Access to data and communications during the early to mid-2000s increased exponentially. So, it is important to understand that it was only the spread of heavily crafted narratives by the government, but it also opened the door for new political groups to form and mobilize. Chapter III discussed the role of working-class mobilization in regard to anti-immigrant groups briefly, as reflected by the British Brothers League; additionally, Chapter IV mentioned the establishment of anti-immigrant groups descending into mob violence in several race riots.

These groups have existed throughout history undoubtedly, and plenty of scholarly attention has been given to their political aims. This section argues that the securitization of immigration process under New Labour was contradictory. The influence of securitization of immigration under New Labour arguably changed the landscape of British politics significantly in that it accelerated the divide between the public further. The "us and them" narrative split further domestically, isolating class and region in a volatile manner, reminiscent of post-war social relations. This section argues that the audience for securitization is undoubtedly influenced by New Labour

rhetoric and impacted in tangible ways which in turn carry over into the political arena at the ballot box. Political figures are able to capitalize on the securitized environment of panic and threat in order to politicize their movements, thus perpetuating the sense of anxiety and contestation between groups.

Isolating one audience in particular, the British electorate, Prime Minster Tony Blair (as cited in above sections) gave speeches about immigration and published numerous white papers and policy strategies outlining agendas. The language utilized was often authoritative and aggressive to clamp down on fraud/abuse, but at the same time welcoming and encouraging tolerance. The audience may have been the public at-large, which obviously was successful in that it resulted in New Labour being first elected overwhelmingly and re-elected for several terms. However, there were key facets of the public which were influential in building off the securitized nature of immigration in order to mobilize brands of politics espousing wholly anti-immigration, anti-multiculturalism, and anti-migrant (ethnic specific) beliefs. As a result, it is often argued that the securitization of immigration contributes to community unrest, ethnic or race-related hate crimes, and the lack of integration of migrants into society.

THE "LOSERS OF GLOBALIZATION"

Readings conducted for this thesis project showed that certain parts of the British public audience responded strongly to the securitization of immigration. These groups tended to be right-wing on the political spectrum. Arguably, these groups were most impacted negatively by the increasing processes of globalization. This included membership of the European Union, especially after the enlargement added millions of new potential migrants to the pool. The EU has a freedom of movement principle

which means in essence that EU citizens can move freely between member states to settle, work, or short-stay.

The enlargement period introduced Eastern European migrants to the mix, allowing for new opportunities for employment in countries with poor economic climates. Certain sectors within British society were more susceptible to economic labor disruptions due to the saturation of the labor market by mass migration. Studies into the success of political groups such as the United Kingdom Independence Party founded in the 1990s as a Eurosceptic, anti-federalist party indicated that specific subsets of the British population were more likely to mobilize under the umbrella of groups with anti-immigration sentiments. Goodwin & Milazzo (2015) found that electoral support for UKIP, a notoriously anti-immigration party, in 2014 was strong among what would be called the "left behind" strata in Britain or the "losers of globalization." These areas across Britain were undoubtedly impacted by the processes of globalization disproportionately. Strikingly, these groups gained support in the traditionally working-class, Labour-leaning areas. It is argued that this was a reflection of New Labour's weakened bond with its traditional, working-class supporters who felt economically left behind and culturally under threat (Goodwin & Milazzo, 2015).

Literature on the rise of Euroscepticism (rejection of European Union or its policies to varying degrees) and anti-globalist movements points to possible discrepancies between resource allocation, incomes, and educational and employment opportunities as factors for rejection of the praises sung for globalization. These factors characterize the 'have and have nots' argument, which is normally ascribed to right-wing political groups and their supporters. However, the rejection of capitalism, neoliberalism, global governance, and transnational corporations, which is usually

ascribed to left-wing political groups rejecting elements of globalization, emerged alongside the right-wing objections to processes of globalization. While these elements overlap across the political spectrum, the dichotomy between the right and the left is further amplified by the methods by which groups chase their goals, rhetoric used, and plans for bringing about change.

The question remains as to what processes of globalization cause the rifts, the widening gaps between the 'winners and losers' in the British public audience. Where does the boundary between benevolent progress and socioeconomic divide begin? Likewise, there are two distinct political sides to the backlash against globalization: the left and right. The 'left' and the 'right' refer to a spectrum of political beliefs. For these sides, there are overlapping critics of globalization, but there are also distinct points which drive different factions and policies. March & Rommerskirchen (2015) found that radical left parties' successes are "strongly rooted in demand-side factors, such as poor economic conditions, high societal Euroscepticism, and above all, a legacy of past RLP success…. [there is] an intrinsic linkage between anti-EU and anti-globalization sentiment, indicating that RLP support increases where globalization has perceived negative socio-economic impacts."

Furthermore, Ford & Goodwin (2014), researchers with expertise in fringe right-wing politics in the UK, argued that the emergence of the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP) indicated a division of the left, not just the right. After decades of feeling "ignored and marginalized" by Labour (especially the recent reign of New Labour), the traditionally leftist party in the UK system, a number of voters who have not benefitted from globalization's "higher taxation, redistribution, and greater state intervention" have sought political representation elsewhere (Ford & Goodwin 2014). Likewise, UKIP provided a voice for the highly Eurosceptic and

anti-establishment factions of right-wing politics, namely the Conservative Party in the UK (Ford & Goodwin 2014).

These characterizations are marked by additional demarcations such as attachments to national identity, economic insecurity, and resentment over cultural shifts. Globalization poses several challenges to each of these elements, notably through higher amounts of immigration and changes in the economy which impact certain sectors disproportionately. Inglehart & Norris (2016) suggested that "less secure strata"[5] of society were prone to be more sceptical of globalization's impact on their pocketbook. Supporters of anti-immigration groups such as UKIP and BNP were notably in favor of high restrictions on immigration, and were highly likely to be dissatisfied with the established parties' handling of immigration after the 2008 financial crisis, which had long-lasting effects for many economically insecure areas of Britain[6] (Ford and Goodwin 2014).

These lingering, post-financial crisis impacts were bolstered by left-wing scepticism of the ability of international, neoliberal institutions to control the excesses of globalization and mediate between unchecked capitalism and increased social welfare. Yet, the cutbacks and austerity measures imposed across Europe and within the UK exacerbated economic and social tensions, which came as a counter to the safeguards promised by EU participation. Income inequality has risen in most

---

[5] "Less secure strata of society – low-waged unskilled workers, the long-term unemployed, households dependent on shrinking social benefits, residents of public housing, single-parent families, and poorer white populations living in inner city areas with concentrations of immigrants susceptible to the anti-establishment, nativist, and xenophobic scare-mongering of populist movements" (2016, 2).

[6] The most economically insecure areas of Britain were also the more likely to be highly Eurosceptic, as the results of the EU referendum vote indicated areas such as Boston and Skegness (76% for leave) were marked by the large number of migrants disrupting the local agricultural and low-skilled job market, as well as low amounts of integration.

advanced industrial democracies in recent decades, broadly parallel to and "possibly reflecting increased European and international economic and political engagement" (Burgoon 2012). Related impacts of income inequality include "subjective insecurity, more criminality, longer and more irregular working hours, shortened life-spans, declining social and political trust, and subject unhappiness" (Burgoon, 2012).

Thus, as the electorate becomes economically insecure, they can be expected to turn inward and shy away from the promises of globalization's economic and social prosperity.[7]

THE WINNERS OF GLOBALIZATION

Literature on the emerging divide between the "winners and losers" of globalization has characterized the winners of globalization as young and middle aged, well-educated, internationally-minded, highly connected (technology, etc), left-wing and a consumer of left-wing media, socially liberal, pro-immigration, and more likely to self-identify as European and be a member of the Labour Party, Green Party , Lib Dems, or Scottish Nationalist Party (Hobolt 2016; Ford and Goodwin 2014). They may also be working class, but these individuals have acquired in-demand skills which are adaptable to the modern economy. Likewise, geographically, the winners are more likely to be central to larger, metropolitan areas, including university towns. These individuals would be more willing to support immigration and reject the securitization of migration, migrants, or out-groups.

[7] This is not exclusive just to the UK, notable amounts of high unemployment, austerity measures, and increased competition for jobs across the EU has resulted in similar sentiments in other EU countries.

The support for globalization is marked by the hyperglobalist nature of modern time. Barriers to trade are lower than ever, and therefore countries are becoming more fluid and cooperative, which also brings forward positive side-effects such as cultural and social exchange between nations. They focus on globalization's potentials – stretched social relations, quality of life, and living standards, as well as sharing of cultures and understanding among nations (Held, 2004). Hyperglobalism sees globalization as (positively) leading to the decline of singular national identities and cultures, instead opting for a more homogenized global culture in which differences become less marked and culture is consumed without preference. Thus, supporters of these sentiments are most likely to approve of the direction of the European project, including increased integration, globalization, and the free movement of people in a borderless society.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE AUDIENCE

What does this mean for New Labour? Some attribute Britain's embrace of globalization under New Labour as the start of its demise into the current day post-Brexit Britain, divided amongst class and political affiliation with an unperceivable future. This project assumed that the major audience for the threat-framing of immigration (particularly the threats to the immigration system and terrorism) was the British public; New Labour did not necessarily argue for economic threats of migration. In fact, New Labour were in favor of integrating economics and migration into the political consciousness in Britain. The established point system laid out a scale to rank the value of migrants in relation to their perceived economic benefit to the country. However, certain types of groups such as refugees and asylum-seekers, as

well as illegal entrants, were portrayed as drains to the system's economic and domestic resources. Thus, it is not to say that New Labour securitized immigration as an economic threat. However, globalization (a process for which New Labour is not at all entirely responsible, but were accepting of) was a process inherent to the changing landscapes of Europe, the US, and most of the developed world. Neoliberalism, capitalism, and related processes were adopted in most major power states. New Labour were powerless to avoid these processes. However, by entering immigration into the securitized arena, it allowed for other groups within the audience to take up arms in relation to other qualms, such as perceived threats to identity and local economies/labor markets.

These concerns were exacerbated by the processes of globalization. Mass movement of migrants into communities centered on manufacturing or manual labor, for example, resulted in electoral support for parties espousing the need to limit or end immigration. While these connections may be spurious or overly simplified in reality, the migrant becomes the scapegoat for unwanted economic or political conditions. It is difficult, if not nearly impossible, to de-securitize without years of attempts to do so. Therefore, it is argued that the major impacts of moving immigration into the security arena were two-fold: 1) the audience became highly divided as a result of political parties / groups taking on anti-immigration stances as a way to mobilize support; 2) the audience was divided by those who accepted the securitized nature of immigration and those who accepted globalization/all forms of immigration as a welcomed process to Britain.

These cleavages resulted Labour's loss to the Conservative Party, the withdrawal from the EU after Leave victory in a divisive referendum, and continuous Labour losses in general elections. Straying from the traditional Labour working-class

bases was marked by the increased support for capitalism via globalization, thus disrupting the labor markets and some vulnerable sectors of the economy in Britain which gave way to technological advances, out-souring, and over-saturated labor markets. By isolating itself from its traditional bases over time, it can be argued that New Labour embedded the politicization and securitization of immigration into the political consciousness of Britain, solidified by continuous changes to the immigration system, parliamentary acts and attempts to force community cohesion on an disenchanted public, and distrust in the government as a result of spin-doctoring and highly crafted lies in order to promote governmental aims.

CHAPTER VII: CONCLUSION

This project intended to research a very complex, multifaceted, and nuanced history of immigration politics, policies, and rhetoric in Britain. One of the major takeaways from researching securitization theory, New Labour politics, and immigration broadly was that there are innumerable layers to the ways in which politics and social phenomena interact. The interdisciplinary nature of this study reflects the complexity of the questions; there exist so many ways to approach questions of political science that is becomes a daunting task to synthesize and digest. Yet, this thesis built off countless studies dedicated to applying securitization theories in various contexts.

The methodological approach was to first look into the historical background of Britain's relationship to immigration. An overview of British immigration policies since 1905 provided insight revealing that Britain has exhibited "cold feet" toward immigration. This approach bred the "welcome/unwelcomed" or "wanted/unwanted" dichotomy in migration, fuelled by social attitudes and political philosophies, as well as external events such as total war engagement with hostile nations. Extensive time spent in the British National Archives databases helped provide better context for how scholarly work on securitization is based. Primary sources from news articles showed the ways in which information about migration and related governmental policies was disseminated to the public. Chapter IV explored the primary case study of New Labour's governmental administration, which has become synonymous with globalization and numerous changes to the British immigration system. Further, elements of the securitization process (major actors, threat perception, referent objects

i.e. what is threatened, and the audience) were explored in the context of New Labour's rhetoric on immigration. It was found that the government was more likely to utilize securitization as it was related to immigration in regard to 1) terrorism and counterterrorism at home and entering from abroad and 2) abuse/fraud to the immigration system and domestic resources. The second major actor identified was the British media, which was arguably likely to use the same approaches as the government and the framing of a threat to British identity and culture. Lastly, the third major actor was the audience, including but not limited to the electorate, and political groups and figures that emerged from the New Labour years. Therein, major threat themes were perceived as terrorism, identity/cultural, and economic, amongst others.

The last section of analysis focused on the audience in securitization processes. It was argued that the British public was influential in the securitization process in two major ways 1) garners electoral/political support for political objectives by the New Labour administrations if the audience comes to believe that there is a threat posed and NL are the only ones capable of solving it; 2) the vacuum left by New Labour's rhetorical approach to securitization of immigration allowed for groups operating outside of the elected officials to effect change (i.e. emerging anti-EU, anti-immigration, and anti-federalist groups capitalizing off New Labour's demise).

The politicization of immigration has become so embedded that it is a given for its inclusion in security discussions. Ensuing governments outright called their immigration strategies a "hostile environment" and encouraged increasingly restrictive measures against migration. Further, this attitude culminated in the EU membership referendum in 2016. A campaign in favor to leave the EU, stemming from the rise of Euroscepticism and an overlapping displeasure with

globalization/mass migration, symbolizes the tangible influences of the securitization and politicization processes on the audience (i.e. the electorate), as well as the ways in which it can backfire. New Labour laid the foundation for the use of rhetoric to securitize and politicize issues such as immigration. Ironically, its competition turned the tables and further capitalized on perceived weaknesses in dealing with the threat-perceptions crafted by New Labour.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The limitations of this project meant that it was impossible to cover every aspect of the highly nuanced issue of the securitization of immigration. Countless studies have covered various aspects of this phenomenon. There is room for adapting securitization theory to include new forms of dissemination of information, such as social media and entertainment television. During New Labour's government and into the coalition administration of the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats, a popular television series, *The Thick of It*, satirized the spin-doctoring of the British media and the often disorderly handling of constantly changing policies and figureheads. The show poignant episodes showed the media and spin-doctors coordinating on media releases and the narratives surrounding mistakes such as the loss of immigration figures during the restructuring of departments and policies. While entertainment, television has a role in the dissemination of political information, as well as the way in which politics and history is framed. In the mid-2000s, a documentary series *UK Border Force* aired on Sky TV. This series followed the work of the expanded border agency and immigration forces emerging from the New Labour years. Every episode details immigration issues such as fraudulent applicants at the border, fake documents and visas, overstayers subject to deportation, human trafficking rings and deterrence

at port entries such as Dover, and illegal workers. This series illustrated the everyday work of immigration enforcement agents, while also highlighting some of the aspects of the dehumanization of immigrants in the process. Some immigrants are not portrayed as threats, but rather as not allowable into the UK for administrative reasons. Likewise, there are instances in which officials scrutinize information and are revealed to be incorrect about suspicions about arrivals. At the very least, media portrayals of the immigration process are important to understand, as they can undoubtedly shape the way that people view the government and the migrants.

Likewise, there is a limitation that needs to be addressed in this thesis: the opposition of securitization and the accepters of immigration. This relates also to the notion of de-securitization, i.e. the reversal of the securitization process and the removal of heightened priority and perceived threats in the political psyche. Further research into these areas would be beneficial for a stronger overview of this time period in British politics, as well as the implications for the post-Brexit Britain's attempts to reconsolidate a divided electorate and contradictory approach to immigration.

Lastly, an additional area of concern is the impact of securitization and rhetoric on immigrants themselves. This area is best left to those experts with the resources necessary to gather information ethically and humanely, especially in concern to refugees and asylum-seekers in vulnerable conditions. The impacts of legislation such as the reversal of the Windrush generation's rights to abode have shown that there are tangible, physical, and sometimes deadly costs to rhetoric and policy. Thus, it is crucial to analyze how this phenomenon impacts those it vilifies.

REFERENCES

"A Stepney Rip Van Winkle." (6 July 1901). *Tower Hamlets Independent and East End Local Advertiser.* Retrieved from https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/bl/0001963/19010706/113/0007.

Allen, W. (2016). A Decade of Immigration in the British Press. Migration Observatory Report.

"Aliens Restriction Act Now In Force. Heavy Penalties for Non-Compliance." (5 May 1915). *Harrogate Herold.* Retrieved from https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/bl/0001608/19150505/020/0001

Abrahamsen, R. (2005). Blair's Africa: The politics of securitization and fear. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* , 55–80.

Allender, P. (2001). What's New About New Labour? . *Politics: 2001 Vol 21 (1)* , 56-62.

Balzacq, T. (2005). The three faces of securitization: Political agency, audience and context. *European journal of international relations, 11(2),* 171-201.

Bashford, A., & McAdam, J. (2014). The right to asylum: Britain's 1905 Aliens Act and the evolution of refugee law. *Law & Hist. Rev., 32*.

Bigo, D. (2000). When two become one: internal and external securitisations in Europe. *International relations theory and the politics of European integration, power, security and community,* 171-205.

Bigo, D. (2002). Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*.

Burgoon, B. (2012). Inequality and anti-globalization backlash by political parties. *European Union Politics*.

Bushner, J. (2016). *The making of anti-Muslim protest : grassroots activism in the English Defence League.* New York: Routledge.

Buzan, B. W. (1998). *Security: A new framework for analysis.* Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Carr, M. (2012). *Fortress Europe: dispatches from a gated continent.* New York: New Press.

Côté, A. (2016). Agents without agency: Assessing the role of the audience in securitization theory. *Security Dialogue*.

Dye, D. (2014). New Labour, New Narrative? Political Strategy and the Discourse of Globalisation. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language.* Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2000). *New Labour, New Language?* Routledge.

Farage, N. (2011). *Flying Free.* Biteback Publishing.

Farage, N. (2015). *The Purple Revolution.* Biteback Publishing.

Färber, K. (2018). *The Absence of Methodology in Securitisation Theory*. Retrieved from E-International Relations: https://www.e-ir.info/2018/08/07/the-absence-of-methodology-in-securitisation-theory/

Feldman, O. (1998). *Politically Speaking: A Worldwide Examination of Language Used in the Public Sphere.* Praeger Publishers.

Ferguson, Y., & Mansbach, R. (2012). *Globalization: the return of borders to a borderless world?* Routledge.

Floyd, R. (2007). Human security and the Copenhagen School's securitization approach. *Human Security Journal, 5(37)*, 38-49.

Ford, G., & Goodwin, M. (2010). Angry White Men: Individual and Contextual Predictors of Support for the British National Party. *Political Studies*, 1-25.

Ford, R., & Goodwin, M. (2014). Understanding UKIP: Identity, Social Change, and the Left Behind. *The Political Quarterly, Volume 85 Issue 3*.

Fotopolos, T. (2016). Brexit, Globalization, and the Bankruptcy of the Globalist "Left'. *The International Journal of Inclusive Democracy, Vol. 12, Nos. 1/2 (Winter-Summer 2016)*.

Gad, U. P., & Petersen, K. L. (2011). Concepts of politics in securitization studies. *Security Dialogue*, 315-328.

Goodwin, M., & Ford, R. (2014). *Revolt on the Right: Explaining Support for the Radical Right in Britain (Extremism and Democracy).* Routledge.

Goodwin, M., & Miazzo, C. (2015). *UKIP: Inside the Campaign to Redraw the Map of British Politics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hansen, L. (2010). Taking Security Studies from the Word to the Image: Visual Securitization and the Muhammad Cartoon Crisis.

Hayes, J. (2012). Securitization, social identity, and democratic security: Nixon, India, and the ties that bind. *International Organization (66)1*, 63-93.

Heath, A. &. (2001). *The Rise of New Labour : Party Policies and Voter Choices.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Held, D. (2006). *Classic Reading and Contemporary Debates in International Relations.* Wadsworth.

Hindmoor, A. (2005). New Labour at the Centre: Constructing Political Space. *Oxford Scholarship Online: January 2005*.

Hobolt, S. (2016). The Brexit vote: a divided nation, a divided continent. *Journal of European Public Policy*.

Holzscheiter, A. (2013). Between Communicative Interaction and Structures of Signification: Discourse Theory and Analysis in International Relations. *International Studies Perspectives*.

Howell, A., & Richter-Montpetit, M. (2019). Racism in Foucauldian security studies: Biopolitics, liberal war, and the whitewashing of colonial and racial violence. *International Political Sociology, 13(1),* 2-19.

Hughes, B. (2007).) Securitizing Iraq: The Bush administration's social construction of security. . *Global Change, Peace & Security 19(2),* 83-102.

Huysmans, J. (2000). he European Union and the securitization of migration. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies, 38(5),* 751-777.

Inglehart, R., & Norris, P. (2016). Trump, Brexit, and the Rise of Populism: Economic Have-Nots and Cultural Backlash. *HKS Faculty Research Working Paper Series*.

Innes, A. (2010). When the Threatened Become the Threat: The Construction of Asylum Seekers in British Media Narratives. *International Relations* .

Kassam, R. (2017). *No go zones : how sharia law is coming to a neighborhood near you* . Washington, DC: Regnery Publishing.

Kearns, M. (2017). Gender, visuality and violence: Visual securitization and the 2001 war in Afghanistan. *International Feminist Journal of Politics, 19(4),* 491-505.

Keeling, D. (2014, June 23). *August 1914 and the end of unrestricted mass migration*. Retrieved from Vox EU: CEPR: https://voxeu.org/article/changes-migration-policies-after-1914

Kilroy, R. J. (2018). *Securitization. Handbook of Security Science.* Springer.

King, R., & Wood, N. (2001). *Media and Migration: Constructions of Mobility and Difference.* Routledge .

Lahav, G., & Courtemanche, M. (2012). The ideological effects of framing threat on immigration and civil liberties. *Political Behavior, 34(3),* 477-505.

Lupovici, A. (2014). he limits of securitization theory: Observational criticism and the curious absence of Israel. *International Studies Review, 16(3)*, 390-410.

March, L., & Rommerskirchen, C. (2015). Out of left field? Explaining the variable electoral success of European radical left parties. . *Party Politics, Vol 21(1)*, 40-53.

McDonald, M. (2012). The failed securitization of climate change in Australia. . *Australian Journal of Political Science, 47(4)*, 579-592.

McInnes, C. &. (2013). HIV/AIDS and securitization theory. *European Journal of International Relations, 19(1)*, 115-138.

Neal, A. W. (2009). Securitization and risk at the EU border: The origins of FRONTEX. . *JCMS: Journal of common market studies, 47(2)*, 333-356.

News, L. D. (n.d.). *London Daily News - Thursday 15 February 1906.* (". ". Cases.", Ed.) Retrieved from British Newspaper Archive: https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/bl/0000051/19060215/067/0003

Observatory, T. M. (2016). *A Decade of Immigration in the British Press.* Oxford: The Migration Observatory.

Pellew, J. (1989). The Home Office and the Aliens Act, 1905. *The Historical Journal, 32(2)*, 369-385.

Pilkington, H. (2016). *Loud and proud : passion and politics in the English Defence League* . Manchester : Manchester University Press.

Pistol, R. (2020). Refugees From National Socialism Arriving in Great Britain 1933-1945. In R. Pistol, *Refugees, Relief, and Resettlement.*

Rai, M. (2006). *7/7 : the London bombings, Islam and the Iraq War*. London: Pluto Press.

Ray, L., & Smith, D. (2004). Racist Offending, Policing and Community Conflict. *Sociology, Vol. 38, Issue 4*, 681-699.

Reyes, A. (2011). Strategies of legitimization: : From Words to Actions. *Discourse & Society*, 781-807.

Risse, T. (2000). Let's Argue!": Communicative Action in World Politics. *International organization*, 1-39.

Roe, P. (2008). Actor, audience (s) and emergency measures: Securitization and the UK's decision to invade Iraq. *Security dialogue, 39(6)*, 615-635.

Rudolph, C. (2006). *National Security and Immigration: Policy Development in the United States and Western Europe since 1945.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Saunders, K. (2010). ‘The stranger in our gates’: Internment policies in the United Kingdom and Australia during the two world wars, 1914–39. *Immigrants & Minorities: Historical Studies in Ethnicity, Migration and Diaspora* .

Somerville, W. (2007). *Immigration Under New Labour.* Bristol: Bristol University Press.

Spencer, S. (2011). *The Migration Debate.* Bristol; Chicago: Bristol University Press; Policy Press.

Steger, M. (2013). *Globalization: the greatest hits, a global studies reader.* OUP Catalogue.

Stevens, D. (2001). The Immigration and Asylum Act 1999: A Missed Opportunity. *The Modern Law Review*.

Stritzel, H. (2007). Towards a theory of securitization: Copenhagen and beyond. . *European journal of international relations, 13(3)*, 357-383.

Swan, J. (2016). Aliens (Restriction) Act 1914. *Criminal Law & Justice Weekly, Vol. 180*, 575-577.

Van Aelst, P. S. (2017). Political communication in a high-choice media environment: a challenge for democracy?. *Annals of the International Communication Association, 41(1)*, 3-27.

Vuori, J. A. (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)*, 65-99.

Waever, O. (1995). Identity, integration and security: Solving the sovereignty puzzle in EU studies. *Journal of international affairs*, 389-431.

White, A. (1887). *The Problems of a Great City.* London: Remington and Company.

Wilkinson, C. (2007). he Copenhagen School on tour in Kyrgyzstan: Is securitization theory useable outside Europe? *Security dialogue, 38(1*, 5-25.

Williams, M. C. (2003). Words, images, enemies: Securitization and international politics. *International studies quarterly, 47(4)*, 511-531.

Wray, H. (2006). The Aliens Act 1905 and the Immigration Dilemma. *Journal of Law and Society, 33(2)*, 302-323.