Security in the Periphery of the EU

- The European enclaves Ceuta and Melilla
The purpose of this study is to describe how the EU relates to its territorial enclaves, Ceuta and Melilla located within Morocco. As this study is based on the theoretical foundations of the Copenhagen School it has focused on how the EU relates to its enclaves in terms of security. More specifically its aim was to uncover if a securitization of the enclaves had been initiated by the EU, the nature of the process and whether the securitization has been successful. The area of threat was recognized as immigration or specifically illegal immigration through the enclaves. The study was conducted using a qualitative text analysis, the Anglo-Saxon direction of discourse analysis found in the writings of Chantal Mouffe and Ernesto Laclau. The material consisted of EU official documents relating to the enclaves. The discourse analysis was conducted by the deconstruction of the discourse using concepts like nodal points, floating signifiers and the search for temporary closure of discourse. The analysis uncovered the securitizing move, the referent object and an audience acceptance of the threat. This has led to the legitimization of unconventional measures and the realization of the securitization of the enclaves.
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**List of Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>Critical Discourse Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>Critical Security Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENP</td>
<td>European Neighbourhood Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUROMED</td>
<td>The Union for the Mediterranean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRONTEX</td>
<td>Frontières Extériures (External Borders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSS</td>
<td>Traditional Security Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIVE</td>
<td>Sistema Integrado de Vigilancia (External Surveillance Integrated System)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

1.1 Challenges of the European Enclaves?

The European Union (EU) consists of 27 member states in Europe. Out of these 27 countries, eight have territorial areas located outside the county’s geographical area. These areas, territorial enclaves, are to different degrees constitutionally bound to their European government and in extension to the EU. Many of these territories are the remains of Europe’s colonial past geographically located outside of the European continent. The colonial notion itself creates a complex relationship between enclaves and European states. European enclaves are further interesting in relation to the ever-closer integration project of the EU, which invokes many questions for potential academic research. How are the territorial enclaves represented in the institutions of the EU? Can we speak of a European identity among the citizens of the EU in the enclaves outside of Europe? How does the EU relate to its territorial enclaves and what are the security implications of such a relationship? The subject of this thesis will concentrate on the last mentioned question of the relationship between the EU and its enclaves in North Africa. I will approach this relationship through the focus on the Spanish enclaves, Ceuta and Melilla geographically located on then north coast of Morocco.

Enclaves or exclaves are areas belonging to one nation but geographically surrounded by one or several other nations. The surrounding nation of an autonomous area can refer to it as an enclave whereas the nation the area belongs to will refer to it as an exclave (EUR-lex.europa 2010). The same area can thus be referred to as an enclave or an exclave depending on from which nation’s perspective the area is discussed. In order to avoid confusion, I will use the term enclaves for the Spanish areas in Morocco as they are most commonly referred to as such. Within the EU a territorial enclave is referred to as a “territory or territorial unit administratively attached to an authority or state with which it is not contiguous” (EuroVoc 2010). When Spain entered the EU in 1986, the country had five small enclaves in Morocco. Ceuta and Melilla are two of them.

Ceuta and Melilla are both considered as territorial cities of the EU and have been under European sovereignty since the 15th century. Ceuta and Melilla are situated on the North Western Mediterranean coast of Africa. The land distance between the cities is approximately 300 km. Ceuta and Melilla have a high symbolic importance as the meeting place of Spain and Morocco, the EU and Africa, Christianity and Islam, the global north and the global south, colonizing country and
colony etc. The cities constitute a border often referred to as the “border of borders” (Ferrer – Gallardo 2008: 305). Migration from Africa is a current issue of debate on both national and European level often relating to border policy. With this background I have chosen a security-focused perspective in order to approach the EU-enclaves relationship.

1.2 The Border of Borders

The borders of Ceuta and Melilla have been debated for a long time, but the complexity increased through the inclusion in the Schengen Agreement. They then became multi-level borders being borders of Spain and Morocco, and of the EU and Morocco. Ceuta and Melilla are further the only land borders between Africa and the EU. Until the 2004 enlargement of the EU, Spain has been one of the countries highly assisted by the EU structural funds. Ceuta and Melilla have both been subjects of structural improvement and attempts to increase living conditions in the enclaves. After Spain joined the Schengen Agreement in 1991, tight border requirements where implemented at the external borders. For the Spanish-Moroccan border this had big impact as the cross-border mobility now implied visa requirements. This impact was especially significant in the enclaves of Ceuta and Melilla as the cities were depending on cross-border interaction. Because of this the enclaves were given the status of “frontier zone” enabling bilateral trade with the neighboring Moroccan provinces. These special arrangements and the status of “frontier zone” have contributed to the Ceuta’s and Melilla’s becoming gateways for immigration to the EU (Ferrer et al. EUDIMENSIONS). Because of this the borders of Ceuta and Melilla have received increasing attention in security questions of the interregional relationship between Europe and Africa.

Ceuta was first to become surrounded by barbed-wire border fences in 1993. In 1996 the fences surrounding Melilla were complete. In addition, an SIVE (External Surveillance Integrated System) control system was installed, an advanced coordinated system of radars and video cameras. Further, restrictive Spanish immigration policies were adopted, creating tensions within the enclaves and between Spain and Morocco (Zapata-Barrero & de Witte 2007: 86,87). In May 2000, at a joint press conference after an official visit by the Spanish president, Moroccan Prime Minister Yousouffi described the enclaves as "representing a danger to our economy and for illegal immigration” (Gold 2000: 29).
In the past ten years there has been an increase in the attempts to cross the borders to the enclaves, resulting in tragic events in 2005 when more than 4,000 would-be illegal immigrants attempted to storm the fences first at Ceuta and a week later at Melilla. The storming resulted in deathly shootings of 11 immigrants (ibid). The events were much reported in the media and the images of Africans climbing barbed wire fences created much debate with headlines like “the storming of Fortress Europe”. This led to a further increase of focus on the challenges of Ceuta and Melilla by both Spanish and European authorities. A third metal fence was installed and the barbed wire fences were raised from three to six meters of height (ibid).

The EU’s response to migration is often described as dived into three policy areas, namely; common asylum and migration policy, cooperation with third countries and tight border controls (Gebrewold 2007: 10). In 1995 European-Mediterranean Partnership, also called the Barcelona Process, was initiated. The Barcelona Process aimed at strengthening the EU’s external relations with its Mediterranean neighbors. High on the agenda was promoting security and stability in the area. This has since been one part of the formalized cooperation between the EU and Morocco. In 2008, the Barcelona Process was relaunched as the Union for the Mediterranean (EUROMED). In addition to EUROMED, the European Neighborhood Policy (ENP) has been of great relevance to North Africa. ENP aims to deepen the EU’s bilateral relations with its neighboring countries (European Union External Action 2010). Another framework for cooperation is the EU-Morocco Association Agreement first signed in 1996.

1.3 Societal Security

This thesis attempts to provide an insight in the relationship in terms of security between the EU and its territorial enclaves in North Africa, Ceuta and Melilla. A relevant theoretical approach to this relationship, is the Copenhagen School and its core concept of ‘Securitization’. Securitization is a Post-Cold War theory that aims to widen the security concept beyond the narrow field of military capacity. The theoretical assumptions of the Copenhagen school will be further explained in the theoretical framework. However, I wish to here introduce the concept of societal security and its importance to the understanding of the challenges in the relationship between the EU and its enclaves.
In the widening of the security concept the Copenhagen School identified five areas of security. Most influential was the conceptualization of societal security. Societal security is an attempt to define the process of an issue being lifted to the security agenda without implying that the state, or its individual citizens are being militarily threatened. Rather, the threat is directed against a particular kind of society (Hough 2004: 106). Societal security is concerned with the organizing concept of identity. The Copenhagen School defines a society as being concerned with “identity, the self-conception of communities and of individuals identifying themselves as members of a community” (Buzan et al. 1998: 119). In this definition, the concept of societal security could also be understood as identity security. The three most common issues that have been viewed as threats to societal security are: 1) Migration, 2) Horizontal competition and 3) Vertical competition. Migration is a threat to societal security in the sense that it causes a change in the composition of a population and as a result of this the societal identity. The second and third areas of threats are forces taking place within a society, which constitutes a substantial threat to the identity of the society. Horizontal competition is change brought by the influence (cultural or linguistic) of neighboring countries. Vertical competition is driven by an integrating or secessionist regional project threatening the societal identity (Buzan et al. 1998:121).

Migration is key to the understanding of the contemporary situation in the enclaves of Ceuta and Melilla. It is also an area of high importance to international security. Migration is “a complex phenomenon that is influenced by economic, political, socio-cultural, historical and geographical factors” (Emmers 2007: 117). Economic and political situations in the countries of origin cause refugees to leave their homes. Facing restrictive immigration policies and reduced legal immigration policies, many turn to illegal methods to enter or remain in a specific country. Undocumented migration has increasingly become linked with organized crime making it an even bigger security concern.

Changes to a collective identity may also be seen as a natural response to shifting circumstances. Studies of societal security is therefore seldom concerned with right or wrong, rather it seeks to understand a peculiar threat and the defense mechanisms of societies (Roe 2007: 171).
1.4 The Aim of the Study

The aim of this study is to investigate the security discourse articulated by the EU in relation to the enclaves. It is the ambition of this study to attain insight and understanding of the EU as a security actor on its geographical periphery. The general research question that I will attempt to answer will be:

• How does the EU as a security actor relate to its territorial enclaves outside of Europe: Ceuta and Melilla?

As my theoretical framework is based on the works of the Copenhagen School, the sub-questions will attempt to relate the EU – enclave relationship to the process of securitization. In order to identify the EU’s perception of security in relation to the enclaves, I will pose the following sub-questions:

• Which are the expressed security threats relating to the enclaves Ceuta and Melilla?

• Is a “referent object” threatened by the situation in the enclaves and how are these threats expressed?

• Has a process of securitization of Ceuta and Melilla been realized and if so, what has been the result?

2. Previous Research

The study of the enclaves Ceuta and Melilla is of scholarly relevance, as it is a subject that has been academically neglected compared to many other border areas. The US -Mexican border is one example of where similar challenges have been scrutinized in research with approaches such as international law and political violence (Nevins 2002) feminism (Spener & Staudt 1998), foreign policy (Andreas 2009) etc. The US-Mexican border challenges has certain similarities with the enclaves in Morocco as the border has come to symbolize more than national and geographic separations and they have become the practical realization of the EU immigration policy. The
enclaves have not received nearly as much attention as the US-Mexican border or been approached by many theoretical angles, but rather been limited to be of concern to geopolitical studies.

Ceuta and Melilla have been studied in several projects of geopolitics and border research (e.g. Gold 2000, Ferrer-Gallardo 2008, Zapata-Barrero & de Witte 2007). In these studies migration has been identified as one of the challenges of the enclaves’ special characteristics. The enclaves have also been discussed in debates around concepts such as “Fortress Europe” and “Schengenization” (e.g Gebrewold 2007, Saddiki 2010). Both are metaphors for the gated community of the EU and often mentioned in association to EU immigration policy. The notion of gated community is of relevance in a dual sense, referring to the borders of the EU and the fences surrounding the enclaves.

The theoretical approach of securitization in studies of immigration is not uncommon (e.g. Hough 2004, Emmers 2006). The securitization of immigration has also been traced as a process in EU discourse (e.g. van Munster 2010). In order to connect the current social debate with the ambition of academic contribution, this study will thus be conducted through a security-focused approach. I wish to conduct similar tracing to that of van Munster, but concentrating on the EU discourse in specific relation to the enclaves. I will thus attempt to contribute to the empirical tracing and theory development of securitization and the contemporary understanding of the EU-enclave relationship. Further the increasing interconnection of migration, security and development in EU policy has not been adequately discussed in an academic level (Gebrewold 2007), an area of concern that this thesis might highlight.

3. Theoretical Framework

3.1 Security Studies

The traditional school of thought within Security Studies, a sub-discipline within International Relations came, from the Realist approach to the international system and focused on power politics and national interest. Security was viewed in terms of military capacity (Hough 2004: 2). The end of the Cold War marked a great change in the international system. New problems were arising that paid no respect to national borders; global warming, terrorism, epidemics, economical crisis and
illegal immigration are examples of such “new” global security issues. The stakeholders involved in security questions were no longer limited to be only nations. International organizations, non-governmental organizations and multi-national corporations gained influence in international relations. In the post-Cold War era we have also seen an increasing shift of power from national to regional or international levels and the concept of ‘pooling sovereignty’ is becoming increasingly popular. There was thus an academic strong need to reevaluate the concept of security and its core actors. Since the 1990’s, there has been a divide within Security Studies in two schools of thoughts; the advocates for the traditional focus on political and military issues, and the critical school attempting to widen the focus to include the economic, societal and environmental sectors to the security context (Buzan et. al 1998: 239).

3.2 The Copenhagen School

The traditional approaches and the new alternative approaches are often separated and categorized under the collected names Traditional Security Studies (TSS) and Critical Security Studies (CSS) (Buzan et al. 1998: 203). The common understanding of the perspectives within CSS is the complexity of the security concept and the emphasis of the need to view security and threats within its context. These approaches represented a rather significant change to the conception of security (Hough 2004: 8). Besides the emphasis on the widening of the security concept, the different perspectives of CSS vary a lot. One of the most successful theorization often linked to CSS is the Copenhagen School. The ”Securitization” term was first coined by Barry Buzan in People, States and Fear published 1991. At a conference at the Conflict and Peace Research Institute (COPRI) in Copenhagen securitization was further developed through the cooperation of Ole Wæver, Barry Buzan, Pierre Lemaitre, Morten Kelstrup and Jaap de Wilde, who together presented a new framework for analysis of security.

Securitization is referred to as a “more extreme version of politicization” (Buzan et. al 1998: 23). Politicization is the process within which a non-political issue is lifted to a political level, meaning the issue is included in public policy requiring government attention. Securitization goes further in the transformation of issues (objects or subjects) through current discourse to existential threats requiring measures that go beyond normal political procedures. A securitized issue does however
not imply that it has been politicized as securitization can be initiated by other actors than the state (Buzan et al. 1998: 24).

The aim of the Copenhagen School was to construct “a more radical view of security studies by exploring threats to referent objects, and the securitization of those threats, that are non-military as well as military” (Buzan et al. 1998: 4). The scholars participating at the Copenhagen conference came from different theoretical backgrounds but adopted a social constructivist framework for the security analysis, emphasizing that security is constructed or as they put it, made by acts of securitization. Despite of this the founders of the Copenhagen School do not agree with the association to CSS as they claim their constructivist view is limited to the concept of security compared to CSS constructivist approach to social relations (Buzan et al. 1998: 203-207).

3.3 Securitization

In order to understand the process of securitization and de-securitization as presented by the Copenhagen School it is important to define what security and more importantly international security is. The Copenhagen School offers a definition to security: “It is when an issue is represented as posing an existential threat to a designated referent object but not necessarily, the state, incorporating government, territory and society. The special nature of security threats justifies the use of extraordinary measures to handle them” (Buzan et al. 1998: 21). With a background in this definition, the Copenhagen School claims that the existential threat can only be understood in relation to the particular character of the referent object in question. In order to understand the context of the referent object, the security concept is widened to five sectors of analysis: the military sector, the political sector, the economic sector, the societal sector and the environmental sector. ¹ The security categorization in sectors is a result of new issues in the post-Cold War security settings and can be viewed as identifying specific types of interaction and relationships (Buzan et al. 1998: 27).

¹ In short the sectors can be described as following. The military sector is concerned with the relationships of forceful coercion; this is the core subject of traditional security studies. The political sector is about relationships of political and governing authority. The economic sector involves all relationships and interaction of trade, production and finance. The societal sector consists of relationships of collective identity. The environmental sector, finally, is charged with the relationships between human activity and the planetary biosphere (Buzan et. al 1998: 7).
By identifying the sector of analysis and the referent object, the context of the securitizing actor is revealed. The process of securitization consists of two steps. First the process is initiated by an existential threat to a referent object. The referent object can be either an individual or groups possessing a legitimate claim of being threatened. A securitizing actor next initiates the securitizing move. This is most commonly a state actor such as a government, political elite or military. The securitizing actor can however also be a non-state actor, for instance a civil society group although it is unusual. The second step through which the process is complete is when a relevant audience accepts the threat as a security issue. This is when extraordinary measures are legitimized. De-securitization logically refers to the reverse process of making an issue un-threatening. The securitizing move is made though speech-acts, a discursive representation of an issue as an existential threat to security, the use of language of security (Emmers 2004: 111).

Viewing security form a constructivist perspective it is clear that an existential threat is a subjective notion, the speech-act is consequently of high importance as it is through a convincing discourse that that audience’s acceptance can be obtained. It is important to consider that the Copenhagen School argues that securitization, at least in principle, should be resisted because of its potential negative political effects on society. It is rather the de-securitization of social relations that is a desirable outcome in security politics (van Munster 2009: 127).

3.4 Securitization and Discourse Theory

The importance of the role of speech-acts in the process of securitization leads to a second theoretical approach in this study, the emphasis on discourse. The description of a speech-act in securitization has been both a contribution and a subject of controversy in discourse theory (Stritzel 2007: 358). Securitization is therefore often put in relation to discourse theory. In this study, discourse analysis will be the chosen method technique, however it is also important to incorporate discourse theory in the theoretical discussion.

According to the founders of securitization, the defining criterion of security is textual (Buzan, et al. 1998: 176). The identification of the discourse and the rhetorical structure is thus an important part of the theoretical and methodological framework of securitization. Within discourse theory language is viewed not as a neutral instrument for communication, but a social activity formed in a
social context (Bergström & Boréus 2005: 326). This assumption can also be found in the constructivist foundations of securitization. In order to uncover what many of the perspectives within CSS and the Copenhagen School claim to be a more dynamic and ontologically reflective view of security, the discourse is central.

Discourse analysis is both a theory and a method in social research. As discourse analysis has gained influence in the social sciences there are many directions of research. The basic theoretical foundations within discourse theory can be traced to a combination of post-structuralism and Marxism. The social dimension of discourse is influenced by the Marxist emphasis on social phenomenon. Post-structuralism has contributed to the importance of context and meaning. What in Post-structuralism often is referred to as “destabilizing meaning” is an approach to textual analysis that can be found in discourse analysis (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002: 25). Discourse analysis can be divided in two schools: the Continental direction (sometimes referred to as the French direction) and the Anglo-Saxon direction. The Continental direction is often associated with its prominent representative Michel Foucault. Researchers such as Chantal Mouffe and Ernesto Laclau represent the Anglo-Saxon direction of discourse analysis. What differs these directions from each other is the Anglo-Saxon connection to structural linguistics that receives little attention in Foucault’s definition of discourses. The direction of method used in this thesis is the Anglo-Saxon, based on the writings of Laclau and Mouffe.

In the integration of securitization theory and discourse theory it is important to note the different views of the articulating actors. Securitization theory puts much emphasis on the actor whereas discourse theory undermines the role of the actor in the focus on the discourse. In Laclau’s and Mouffe’s discourse theory, actors are understood as subject positions determined by discourses. However everyone does not have equal access to all subject positions but are often categorized by class, ethnicity, gender etc. One of the tasks of discourse analysis is to uncover how people or groups are categorized and to what extent this affects their possibilities for action (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002: 55). Actors of securitization are not the fixed point of analysis; rather it is the practice of securitization that is key to the understanding of power politics (Buzan et al. 1998: 32). A focus on actors can hence be motivated by the contribution to the contextual understanding. Both theories acknowledge that actors play role in power politics.

2 A third direction of discourse analysis, although often discussed separately, is critical discourse analysis (CDA). CDA is often separated from the traditional discourse analysis and aims to expose veiled power structures through the critical examination of discourse (Bergström & Boréus 2007: 308, 321).
3.5 Theoretical Limitations

The Securitization theory developed by the Copenhagen School as an attempt to revaluate the concept of security, has received much scholarly attention. In any study using securitization as a theoretical framework it is however also important to be aware of the theoretical limitations.

The Copenhagen School is often criticized for not offering a comprehensive theoretical base. Some of the concepts and processes of securitization are claimed to be underdeveloped and the transformation of security studies is said to be in the beginning stages. The differences between politicization and securitization are not adequately clear and needs clearer definition. This critique is often expressed through the lack of empirical understanding of the success or failure of a securitizing move (Balzacq 2005: 171). Further the speech act view of security is claimed not to offer adequate grounding upon which to study security practices in real situations (Stritzel 2007). Stritzel also highlights that the emphasis on the semantic side of the speech act articulation undermines the role of social and linguistic influences. Another area of discussion is the Eurocentric focus of The Copenhagen School, as much of the experience derives from European security concerns. For instance the societal sector security is linked to the existence of a collective European identity (Emmers 2007: 116, 117). This is rather unique for Europe and leads to a difficulty of applying the societal sector analysis in other parts of the world. The second theoretical approach of discourse theory has also faced criticism; these limitations and considerations will be discussed in the following methodological discussion.

The theoretical limitations often expressed in relation to the Copenhagen School are concerned with the lack of comprehensive theoretical base and underdeveloped concepts. I will take these notions into consideration in the continuation of my research and attempt to be clear and concise in order to strengthen the credibility of my results.
4. Methodology

4.1 Case Study: Ceuta and Melilla

I have chosen to conduct a qualitative discourse analysis by the means of a single case study. Because Ceuta and Melilla autonomous cities independent from each other, it would have been possible to approach their relations with the EU through a comparative case study analysis. Although this angle might have been fruitful I have in this study chosen to view them as a one case phenomenon. This decision is based on the fact that the EU in its official documents often refer to Ceuta and Melilla together and the challenges of the two cites appear to be very similar. For instance, the fences were built (and stormed) almost simultaneously. Further, in order to make a successful comparative analysis of Ceuta and Melilla it would have been necessary to use a different methodology and other material than I have chosen.

A single case study offers possibilities for an in-depth analysis with the aim of understanding the peculiar relationship between the EU and the enclaves in Morocco. I will not treat the enclaves as a case of border challenges as they are usually studied, but rather view them as a case of the EU’s contemporary attitude towards migration and its land border to Africa.

The hermeneutic and social constructivist basis of discourse analysis leads to the conclusion that this study will not aim to contribute to generalizing knowledge. Although academic research should have a generalizing ambition, unique case studies may offer an in-depth understanding to a certain phenomenon, which I hope to highlight in this thesis. The ambition of generalization can also be obtained through a contribution to theory development and this study may thus contribute to the empirical understanding of securitization.

4.2 Data Selection

The material used to conduct the analysis in this thesis will be primary sources; official documents issued by the EU relating to the enclaves Ceuta and Melilla. I have chosen official documents because securitization is a discursive practice that can be traced in articulation. It was therefore necessary to focus on statements that can be accessed through EU official documents. Further, the focus of this study is the security relationship between the EU and its enclaves, which would be
hard to trace without the use of official documents. The background information, theoretical framework and methodology, however, will be supported by secondary sources. These consist of books and published articles on the related subjects.

The primary sources of the study consist of 5 documents issued by institutions, policies or agencies belonging to the EU. I have chosen to use documents published by different agencies with the ambition of limiting the material to be of specific relevance to the enclaves. I have chosen to focus much attention on the directly relevant documents issued by the Commission and documents under the framework of ENP, this because they have much influence on the enclaves and the bilateral relations with Morocco. I have limited the selection of sources to documents published after the enclaves were included in the Schengen Agreement, and after the fences were complete in 1996.

In order to ensure the validity of the research, it has been important to consider how to view the EU as a security political actor. The question of how the EU’s authority in collective security policy shall develop has been a complex discussion at the centre of the European integration project (van Munster 2009: 17). The integration and cooperation in security questions has been an ongoing process. Since the material used in this study is selected from the years after the Schengen Agreement entered into force, I will view the EU as an entity in the articulation of security.

4.3 Discourse Analysis

The methodology of an academic study should be based on the research question and aim to provide for the best analysis to answer this (Bergström & Boréus 2007: 258). According to the Copenhagen School in studies of securitization, discourse analysis is the obvious method. This is motivated “since we are interested in when and how something is established by whom as a security threat” (Buzan et al. 198: 176). The ambition of the discourse analysis used in Security – A New Framework for Analysis is to uncover discourses by hermeneutic and methodological searches for arguments that take the rhetorical and logical form defined as security. Because of the time available for this study, the method for discourse analysis will be somewhat more systematic than what is suggested by the Copenhagen School. This is also motivated by the critics of the theoretical framework of the Copenhagen School saying its methodology is too vague and lacks guidance for systematic comparative and empirical analysis (Stritzel 2007: 358).
Both the securitization theory and the basis of discourse analysis derive from Social-Constructivism. The epistemological basis for the methodology of this thesis is thus based on a Constructivist view of reality as socially constructed. The method of discourse analysis originates from linguistic studies and is concerned with the analysis of language. Discourse analysis offers a qualitative method and an understanding of how actors, groups or agents seek to represent their actions in text and language (Marsh & Stoker 2010: 264). Because of the connection between securitization theory and discourse theory, it could be fruitful to use any of the directions of discourse analysis in a study of securitization. However, Foucault’s emphasis on ideology and the undermining of the articulating actor could easily misdirect this study from the focus on securitization. CDA is also less suited for my thesis as the purpose is to understand EU as a security political actor in relationship to its territorial enclaves, rather than unveil power structure. In Laclau and Mouffe’s version of discourse analysis the definition of discourse is a system of signs that is given meaning through the act of articulation. This definition works well with the concept of speech-acts through which securitization is realized. The use of discourse analysis to trace political process will also serve to help me understand the nature of the relationship between the EU and the enclaves.

4.4 Systems of Signs

In the studies of Laclau and Mouffe, discourses are seen as “worlds” that encompass all social practices. This assumption leads to the conclusion that all social phenomena can be studied through discourse analysis (Bergström & Boréus 2005: 314). Further, it is through discourse that the identities of social actors can be uncovered. Laclau and Mouffe’s theory is unique in its combination of discussing discourse in terms of Marxist hegemony and Post-structuralism.

The central linguistic component of Laclau and Mouffe’s discourse analysis is what they refer to as the logic of signs. A sign itself has no meaning but is given meaning through articulation or articulatory practice. A sign itself, without articulation is called an element and when articulated it becomes a moment. The overall articulation of signs forms the discourse. The aim of the discourse is to turn elements into moments through closure. The articulation is understood as a struggle by actors with the ambition of reaching the acceptance of an audience. The struggle surrounds the
specific elements that will enable actors to achieve hegemony by closing a discourse so that the elements are given frozen meanings as moments. These specific elements are called floating signifiers. A discourse may however never be closed by hegemonic prevalence because of what Laclau and Mouffe call the field of over determination. This prevents the transformation from elements to moments to ever be fully completed. The field of over determination in explained as the surplus of meanings competing about articulating elements into moments. The elements are of polysemic nature and will always have multiple potential meanings. The competitions of articulation are attempts of reducing the polysemy. Closure is established through a temporary stop to the fluctuation of meanings of the signs. These attempts that are never completed but may succeed in a closure, are the entry point for the discourse analysis (Laclau & Mouffe 1985: 110).

Laclau and Mouffe use discourse analysis to trace political process through the mapping of the struggle over making a meaning fixed. Sometimes the process goes so far that it leads to a meaning being conventionalized and we think of it as natural. A discourse is established through the totality of moments in relation to other moments and by the partial fixation of meaning around certain points called nodal points. The nodal points are central to the understanding of discourse as they are privileged signs “around which the other signs are ordered; the other signs acquire their meaning from their relationship to the nodal point” (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002: 26). Nodal points have no meaning in themselves as they are floating signifiers in an ongoing struggle of discourses. In the specific discourse they become points of crystallization. The meaning of the nodal points is understood through the logic of equivalence, which forms chains of signs creating either positive or negative association with the discourse. In order to illustrate the meaning of nodal points and the logic of equivalence the example of the Nazi discourse is often mentioned. In Nazi discourse a nodal point is the word “Jew” forming positive association with “motherland” and negative association with “democracy”. The word “Jew” in the Nazi discourse is the nodal point as it links all the other signs together and centers the discourse. Without the nodal point the discourse would loose its meaning (Bergström & Boréus 2005: 317).

In order to understand the influence of discourse, Laclau and Mouffe introduce the field of discursivity, a field of excluded possibilities of ways in which signs could be related creating meaning of the discourse. This can be understood as everything outside the discourse. The exclusion of possible meanings is an attempt to stop the changing meanings of signs in relation to each other and create a unified system of meanings. The field of discursivity stores the surplus of
meanings that signs have in other discourses but are excluded from the specific discourse in order to
distinguish the unity of meaning. This exclusion is central to Laclau and Mouffe’s discourse
analysis as the discourse is studied in relation to its field of discursivity.

4.5 Laclau and Mouffe’s Antagonism and Hegemony

Two central concepts in Laclau and Mouffe’s theory are antagonism and hegemony. The concepts
expresses Laclau and Mouffe’s criticism against Marxism. Antagonism in traditional Marxism
refers to the antagonistic relationship between the classes, the working class and the class owning
the means of production. Laclau and Mouffe dismissed the idea of predetermined identities. Rather,
antagonism in Laclau and Mouffe’s definition refers to the situation in which social actors are
unable to maintain stable identities because they are open to the influence of articulation from
opposing interests. Antagonism is found when discourses collide. A social antagonism refers to the
situation when different identities mutually exclude each other. When this happens an individual
discourse constitutes a threat to the existence and fixity of meaning and the contingency of the
discourse is revealed (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002: 48). Antagonism is thus contributing to the
struggle over articulation and creates an obstacle for the crystallization of meaning and identity.

The centrality of hegemony in Laclau and Mouffe’s writings derives from the works of Antonio
Gramsci who attempted to explain the Marxist idea of the ”transformation of consciousness”. The
transformation of consciousness refers to the process within which the working class recognizes its
position in society and its true interest. It is through the transformation of consciousness that the
revolution is born in the quest of changing the antagonist relationship between the classes. Gramsci
claimed hegemony rather than economic determinism was the key to understanding people’s
consciousness. Hegemony can be understood as the organization of consent, a superstructure
entailing subordinated forms of consciousness. Rather than economically determined ideology, the
production of meanings that become naturalized in a society is key to the ruling classes. Laclau and
Mouffe further developed the concept of hegemony in discourse claiming “there are no objective
laws that divide society into particular groups; the groups that exist are always created in political,
discursive processes” (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002: 33). The concept and influence of hegemony is
thus closely connected to discourse as they both imply the fixation of elements into moments and
the influence of Gramsci’s hegemonic superstructure in society is the basis of the power of a successful closure of discourse.

When conducting research using discourse analysis it is important to be aware of criticism often directed at its assumptions and results. In the use of discourse analysis, it is important to consider what kind of knowledge the research can produce. Absolute knowledge within the perspectives of social constructionism is impossible as there is no context-free or neutral base for truth-claims. This is one area of critique as it can never determine realities or good from bad. However discourse analysis is well suited for the uncovering of “taken-for granted, common-sense understandings, transforming them into potential objects for discussion and criticism and, thus, open to change” (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002: 175). One of the areas of critique in Laclau and Mouffe’s approach is the definition of the field of discursivity. The field of discursivity is of high importance, as the discourse is always constituted in relation to what it is not. Little explanation of what the field of discursivity really is and how it is structured is given. The structuring of the alternative meanings would give us knowledge of the competing discourses (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002: 27).

4.6 Analytical Tools

The discourse analysis offered by Laclau and Mouffe’s writings is to a large extent aiming towards theory development. Little description of the stages of analysis or practical tools is given in their discourse analysis. However, the key component in the view of Laclau and Mouffe’s analysis can be identified as a deconstructionist method (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002: 24). I will attempt to integrate the theoretical framework of securitization with a discourse analysis influenced by the thoughts of Laclau and Mouffe and aim towards uncovering a unified system of meaning through the deconstruction of discourse.

In order conduct the research using discourse analysis I will proceed from the sub-questions posed in the aim of the study. They follow:

- Which are the expressed security threats relating to the enclaves Ceuta and Melilla?
- Is a “referent object” threatened by the situation in the enclaves and how are these threats expressed?
• Has a process of securitization of Ceuta and Melilla been realized and if so, what has been the result?

The first two questions are concerned with the first step of securitization in which a securitizing move is made. The first question is focused around the securitizing move made through a speech-act and the second question seeks to identify the referent object. The third question will lead the analysis towards a discussion on the second and final step of securitization in which a relevant audience accepts the threat and extraordinary measures are legitimized.

5. Tracing the Articulation of Threat

The following text analysis has been made looking for articulations where the enclaves of Ceuta and Melilla are put into a security discourse. This is studied by looking at the chains of equivalence. Such chains were detected in several of the documents leading to the second step of mapping out nodal points. I will discuss the results of the text analysis in the chronological order in which the documents were published. I have numbered each quote in the order they follow and the underlines are my identifications of the signs, moments and chains giving the discourse its meaning. I will not discuss all texts in each part because of the lack of space in this thesis but point out the documents and passages highlighting the articulation of threat, the identification of referent object and finally the audience’s acceptance.

5.1 The Securitizing Move

Securitization is a process initiated by the articulation of security, a securitizing move. Laclau and Mouffe define the practice of articulation as “the construction of nodal points with partially fix meanings” (Laclau & Mouffe. 1985: 119). It is hence important to study the articulation of threats in the discourse relating to Ceuta and Melilla to establish if a securitizing move has been made. In order to do this I will deconstruct the discourse looking for elements with meanings, hence the transformation into moments relating to threat. I will discuss potential alternative meanings of these elements in order to determine if the securitizing move has become a temporary closed discourse. The never-ending struggle over the fixation of meaning can be connected to the securitizing move and when a meaning is conventionalized through a nodal point, we can assume the securitizing...
move to be successful. The nodal points in this part of the analysis will thus not be related to a successful securitization but to the temporary closure of a threat discourse.

Both between Morocco and Spain and between Morocco and the EU there is a tradition of bilateral cooperation dating back to the first diplomatic relations established in 1960. The ENP was developed in 2004 with the objective “of avoiding the emergence of new dividing lines between the enlarged EU and our neighbors and instead strengthening the prosperity, stability and security of all” (http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/policy). In 2004, the Commission under the framework of ENP published the first report on Morocco (Country Report Morocco (SEC (2004) 569). Its purpose was to provide guidance for future action plans and to assess the future progress of the bilateral relations between Morocco and the EU. The enclaves, Ceuta and Melilla are not mentioned in the report. The following quote assess the migration situation:

1. “As part of the Association Agreement, Morocco and the EU have created a working party to deal with social affairs and migration. The party has identified and holds regular discussions on a number of practical questions relating to migration such as co-development, social interaction, visas, illegal migration, transit migration and better information, and practical cooperation projects”.

In the country report from 2004, migration through the enclaves is not brought up at all. The discussion of migration issues shows floating signifiers without fixed meanings. Migration is discussed in relation to social affairs rather than security and the migration related issues are not emphasized in the bilateral relations. Migration is not being portrayed as a challenge in the context of security and illegal immigration is not given special emphasis. Although migration from Morocco and through the enclaves were already on the increase in 2004, it is not mentioned in any security agenda, rather it is a social-political area for cooperation.

After the tragic events in September 2005 when the fences of both enclaves were stormed resulting in the shootings and deaths of several persons, the Commission issued a statement ‘Commission deplores tragic events in Ceuta and Melilla’ (IP/05/1212). Comparing this text to the country report published only the previous year shows a rather significant change in the discourse. It is clear that this text is directly concerned with security after the violent events, however the text analysis seeks
to examine if the enclaves themselves are lifted to become a security issue and if so, what is the nature of the security threat. The below four quotes were chosen from the statement:

2. “The Commission deeply regrets the tragic events in Ceuta and Melilla which led to the untimely death of several persons. It is necessary to intensify cooperation on tackling illegal migration with Morocco and the main countries of origin in Africa as part of a broader partnership on migration-related issues”

3. “Border guards are also risking their lives to save those of others who try to make their way illegally into the EU across the Mediterranean”.

4. “I know that the EU must do more to prevent and tackle illegal migration from Africa into the EU”.

5. “The EU aims to put in place a wide and innovative framework dealing with illegal migration in a comprehensive manner, making use of all the instruments the EU and its Member States have at their disposal”.

The chain of equivalence reveals a discourse centered around migration-related issues and in this discourse, migration appears to be a floating signifier given its meaning through the word illegal. Nodal points in the statement after the tragic events are thus the notion of illegal immigration. In each of the above quotes migration and immigration have become frozen moments, as they cannot be interpreted in other ways than in the context of illegal practices. In the very first quote, stated in the beginning of the document, the cause of the events is pointed out clearly, illegal migration. In the first sentence the tragic events are mentioned which are given their explanation in the second sentence where illegal migration is further pointed out as an area in need of intensified cooperation.

During the “storming” of the fences, the would-be immigrants were unarmed and the counter-defense resulted in a shooting were several people lost their lives (Zapaa – Barrero & de Witte 2007: 7). It would perhaps be expected that the management of the fences would also be an area in need of intensified attention. It is however illegal immigration alone that is portrayed as the force leading to the events at the enclaves. In the second quote it is again pointed out that illegal migration is causing EU border guards to risk their lives. The illegality of the migration is
strengthened by the ending “into the EU across the Mediterranean”, meaning non-EU citizens of African origin attempting to enter EU territory. The security threat is not expressed through the dangers that the would-be migrants are facing, but security implications for the EU border guards. This threat is the result of illegal migration. The Commission further makes a strong statement in the need to increase attention on the issues of illegal migration. In the fourth quote, like in the second, the word “tackling is used as the means necessary to address the issues. The word tackling in foreign policy conjures a feeling of threat in need of counter performance. This feeling is strengthened by the final sentence in the statement, quote five, where it is announced that this will be addressed using all “means available”. The severity of the threats is well expressed in the above quotes. The fifth quote itself can be viewed as a securitizing move aiming towards audience acceptance and unconventional measures through the use of all instruments at disposal.

Putting this statement into perspective of the events of 2005 further strengthens the securitizing articulation. This statement refers to the storming of the fences surrounding the enclaves Ceuta and Melilla. The body count at the events differs in news report but appears to be between 6-11. The deaths of 6-11 would-be migrants leading to the statement above puts the situation in the enclaves at the centre of the migration and external border management agenda of the EU.

The cause of the situation of the enclaves could have been described differently. For instance BBC News in the reports of the events choose to quote Spanish Prime Minister Jose Luis Rodriguez Zapatero stating, “urgent work is needed to reduce the poverty gap between Spain and Morocco” (BBC News 06-10-2005). This can be discussed in relation to the field of discursivity. Alternative meanings competing within the discourse could have been pointing out the storming of the enclaves as a result rather than the cause of migration policy at the external borders. Pointing at the poverty gap as a cause of the violent events of 2005 would be continuation of the discourse seen in the country report of 2004 and the stated aim of the ENP. As discussed above, the report put no security emphasis of migration issues and considered it an area of social affairs. In the official EU documents the chain of equivalence of the discourse is changed but other actors may still give the discourse of the enclaves and its immigration issues another interpretation and meaning.

The quotes above make the answer to my first sub-question very clear. There is indeed a threat expressed by the EU in relation to the enclaves and the threat expressed is illegal immigration. The securitizing move also gives us insight of the impact of the EU as “the move of securitization
depends on and reveals the power and influence of the securitizing actor” (Emmers 2007: 112). The full impact of the securitizing move and the power of the securitizing actor will depend on whether a successful securitization has been realized or not.

5.2 The Referent Object

The second part of the analysis is a continuation of the first step of securitization. I have attempted to identify, through discourse analysis, who or what is being threatened and how the threat is expressed. The speech-acts discovered will here be discussed in connection with its articulator and referent object. This leads us to understand the context of the referent object in the securitization process. The identification of the referent object is important in studies of securitization, but perhaps the most difficult part for empirical analysis. In this part the discourse analysis will attempt to uncover the security sector under threat and the power structure behind the securitizing move.

In October 2005 the Commission made an official visit to Ceuta and Melilla. The aim of the mission was to assess and better understand the size and characteristics of illegal immigration from Africa through illegal immigration channels by sea and via land borders. Further, the mission aimed to intensify cooperation with Moroccan and Spanish authorities in the areas of immigration. The mission report was published: Technical mission to Morocco, visit to Ceuta and Melilla on illegal immigration (MEMO/05/2005). The following quotes from the report will assist in the identification of the referent object:

6. “The large-scale and coordinated attempts to enter Ceuta and Melilla are a new phenomenon that is a clear indication of the mounting migration pressure on Morocco and Europe”

7. “However despite the presence of South Asian migrants, the essential problem lies with Sub Saharan citizens. Trafficking and smuggling of people is spreading and organized crime gangs are increasing in numbers and becoming more “professional” and increasingly violent. The situation is causing serious human suffering and international humanitarian organizations are under strain to cope with it”.
The sixth quote expresses the increasing pressure on Morocco and on Europe. The pressure is understood in quote seven where concrete areas of issues are pointed out. Trafficking, organized crimes and violence are all threats to society and in this passage Sub Saharan citizens are pointed out as the essential problem. This sentence is again understood in the context of illegal immigration. The threats of illegal immigrations, the spread of organized crime and trafficking are directed at the European society. The threat expressed in the enclaves is related to migration making the identification of the security sector natural. Migration is considered one of the most common threats to the societal sector.

The societal sector, as discussed in the introduction to this thesis, is mainly concerned with identity. Having pointed out the EU as the securitizing articulator and the body within which the referent object is found, it is rather interesting to discuss the societal sector. The EU is a complex regional integration project and in itself also constitutes a threat to societal security as vertical competition. Vertical competition refers to the societal sector within a nation whereas immigration may constitute a threat to a larger dynamic societal security, in this case European identity. I have in this thesis chosen to view the EU as an entity, and I will not discuss the potential antagonism within the European identity discourse. Such a debate cannot be traced in the documents used in this analysis as no internal comparison has been made. Rather the question of European identity as the referent object can be discussed in relation to Laclau and Mouffe’s ongoing discussion of hegemony, contingency and societal persistence. The concept of hegemonic superstructure is important to the influence of the political elite in a securitizing move. Further, essential in Laclau and Mouffe’s discourse theory is that everything is contingent. As discourses and articulations change, so does the reality. This dominant idea of the eternal ability of change is interesting in relation to the persistence within the societal sector. The Copenhagen School defines societal security as the “ability of a society to persist in its essential character under changing conditions and possible or actual threats” (Hough 2004: 106). The securitizing move may thus be viewed as an attempt to persist change perhaps most notably when the threat is directed at the societal sector.

In *Securitizing Immigration*, Rens Van Munster (2009) speaks of the emergence of a European threat environment. He claims the meaning of immigration has become a part of “a European security continuum that all includes issues such as terrorism, drugs trafficking, organized crime, and human trafficking” (van Muster 2009: 16). He further claims that the security continuum in Europe is more concerned with societal threats than of military threats and because of this the traditional
institutional environment plays a small role in threat management. Actors that work within the field of internal security and public order deal with the societal threats. Having considered this, the threats pointed out in both quote six and seven, could be argued as precisely what van Munster pointed out, threats to the internal security and public order in Europe. In extension, this means threats to the citizens of the EU. It is within these areas we retrieve the referent object although the threats to their very survival are difficult to determine.

Laclau and Mouffe speak of the importance of the hegemony of discourse in the transformation of consciousness, claiming it is rather the transformation of meaning that leads to the structure of a society. The process of securitizing immigration through the enclaves in Morocco can be discussed in relation to the EU’s hegemonic position and the field of discursivity. The framework within which, the EU cooperated with the neighboring countries, the ENP and the Barcelona process can be claimed to be hegemonic articulations of security where immigration was first a floating signifier but has been given a frozen meaning. Hence as successful production of the hegemonic understanding of immigration in terms of security has been realized (van Munster 2009:17).

Understanding the referent object has been the most difficult part of the discourse analysis. The identification of the EU as the securitizing actor is very clear in the discourse but retrieving the referent objects within the same dynamic was all the more difficult. Illegal immigration is like all other illegal practices a threat to any society upheld by the rule of law but how it is threat to the survival of the EU is given vague explanation in the documents. Perhaps the securitization of immigration has already led to the conventionalization of illegal immigration as a threat and the motivation of the existential threat is no longer needed.

5.3 Securitization of the Enclaves?

The third question and area of analysis integrates both steps of securitization and discourse analysis in order to answer if a securitization has been realized and what has been the result of the process. The final step of securitization is realized when the threat is accepted by a relevant audience and extraordinary measures are legitimized. The meaning of signs being conventionalized can be understood in relation to the final step of securitization where the audience’s acceptance of the threat is a fact and unconventional measures are legitimized. The floating signifiers, the field of discursivity and the never-ending articulating struggle are all concepts that can be put in relation to
the process of de-securitization. As an issue becomes securitized it can equally later be de-securitized through articulation. Hence the securitization, closure of security discourse, is temporary.

Laclau and Mouffe suggest that the focus of analysis is put on the specific expressions in their capacity as articulations (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002: 29). The two first parts of the analysis have proven that the first phase of the securitization process has indeed been initiated. However it is not the usage of language of security that transforms issues into security questions. The securitizing move must be followed by a consensual establishment of the threat sufficiently accepting to tolerate the use of counteractions outside of normal political procedures. In the case of Ceuta and Melilla it is rather difficult to establish what would be normal political procedures. This because they are in a unique situation constituting the only land border to Africa, a situation not found elsewhere in the EU. The surrounding fences themselves are perhaps indications of extraordinary measures however as the fences date back to before the securitizing move discussed above takes place after I will examine other measures.

The ENP continuously produce action plans and strategy papers for each country within the cooperation framework. The current strategy paper in place for Morocco refers to the period from 2007 - 2013 (enpi_csp_morocco-en). The following quote taken from the current strategy paper illustrates the role of migration management as an area of cooperation:

8. ”In relations with the EU Member States the issue of illegal migration is one of the principal sources of concern. In addition to the two million Moroccans who reside legally in the EU, one million are thought to be living there illegally. Morocco is also a transit country for illegal immigrants from sub-Saharan countries going to the EU”.

The quote shows signs of an audience acceptance of the severity of the threat of illegal immigration from and through Morocco into the EU. Illegal migration is again a nodal point and described as one the principal areas of concern in the bilateral relationship between Morocco and EU Member States. Comparing this description of the migration situation with the initial ENP country report from 2004, migration is placed in an entirely different context in the strategy paper. Being labeled a principal source of concern in the strategy paper may be viewed as an expression of relevant audience acceptance since this paper is formalized and accepted by all concerned parties. The
strategy paper however does not associate illegal migration with the enclaves specifically. The association is however made all the more clear in the next document issued by Frontex.

Frontex is an EU agency started in 2005, charged with the coordination of operational cooperation between Member States within the field of border security. The aim of Frontex is to strengthen the security at the external borders of the EU. Within Frontex, the Risk Analysis Unit makes annual risk analysis reports. The following quotes 9 and 10 are taken from an extract in the 2010 Risk Analysis (Frontex ARA 2010):

9. “The Western Mediterranean route includes the sea route from Northern Africa to the Iberian Peninsula, and the land route through Ceuta and Melilla”.

Ceuta and Melilla have been conventionalized as the land route for Western African illegal immigration. They are the only land border and the route for African immigrants hoping to avoid the dangers of the Mediterranean Sea route. The enclaves have gone from being portrayed as a new port for immigration attempts leading to increased security attention. In 2010 they are included in Frontex Risk analysis assessing the security situation at the external borders. The fact that Ceuta and Melilla are mentioned by name and not just included in the southern frontier or the Mediterranean risk assessment shows their significant security nature. This strengthens the audience acceptance seen in the previous strategy paper. The inclusion in the risk analysis is also a legitimization of extraordinary measures, this as the risk analysis by Frontex is the background for the agency’s preventive operations (frontex.europa.eu).

10. “Spain also reported refusals of entry in Ceuta and Melilla; a decrease of 61% from 492, 700 in 2008 to 193, 100 in 2009, due to stricter controls on the exit by Moroccan border authorities, as a direct consequence of a bilateral agreement with Spain”.

The final quote may also be an indication of a successful securitization. The decrease in illegal immigration is reported which may be a result of several factors. The financial crisis in Europe may have contributed through the decrease in job opportunities. However as several other channels for illegal immigration have experienced an increased pressure, we may also assume that the resulting measures of the securitization, conventional or not have had effects. History has shown that migration systems change and will continue to do so, the securitization of the enclaves may have
contributed to that change. In order to answer the third sub-question of successful securitization and its results, I will conclude that the securitization of the enclaves is a fact and its results are perhaps too recent to comment on. Given the final quote it is however possible that a de-securitization of the enclaves will be initiated and that we will see a less security oriented relationship between the EU and the enclaves in the future.

6. Conclusions

In conclusion of this thesis, the following chapter will summarize the results of the analysis and discuss the outcome of the general research question posed in the aim: How does the EU as a security actor relate to its territorial enclaves outside of Europe: Ceuta and Melilla? I will also consider how this thesis may have contributed to the research area.

6.1 The EU and the Enclaves - a Securitized Relationship

Ceuta and Melilla have been unique European territories ever since the Spanish and the Portuguese colonizers first conquered them. Being European cities in Africa, they marked a special border between the continents which was further complicated by their becoming of EU external borders and the realization of "Fortress Europe". Through the inclusion in the Schengen Agreement, they became "borders of borders" and territories in which EU migration policies have special significance. The relationship between the EU and the enclaves in Morocco is characterized by their status as the only land border to Africa and the securitization of Ceuta and Melilla is result of the immigration pressure because of their special location and enclave character. Securitization is one of the post-Cold War directions of security studies that have received much attention and recognition. Securitization is indisputably an interesting theoretical approach to the study of the political response to non-military threats. The securitization of immigration is an extensive area of research where the mapping of the discursive process can be followed in many directions. In this case study centering the enclaves, the discourse expressed by the EU in direct relation to Ceuta and Melilla has been rather limited which has enabled a systematic trace in the securitization process. The complement of discourse theory and analysis has proved securitization as a process traced through the system of signs developed by Laclau and Mouffe to be an advantageous combination.
Through the discourse analysis made by studying official EU documents relating to the enclaves I have come to certain conclusions. The enclaves were included in the Schengen Agreement in 1991, but given special status as "frontier zones" enabling restricted cross-border mobility. This special status however also led to increasing migration pressure and the enclaves became known as "the land route" to Europe. Migration to Spain through the enclaves were already a problem pre-Schengen, but the situation intensified leading to the strengthening of the barbed-wired fences surrounding Ceuta and Melilla. The events of 2005 marked a change of discourse in EU in relation to the enclaves. The enclaves became increasingly portrayed as a threat to the EU. In the following years, the enclaves were given special attention and lifted to be areas of security, they were securitized. The threat of immigration through Ceuta and Melilla were portrayed as threats to the societal security of the EU. The societal sector was hence the referent object in the securitization process although the specific referents of threat were vague in heir relation to "European identity". The securitization of the enclaves can be said to have gained audience acceptance through the conventionalization of their association with "illegal immigration" and their specific inclusion on Frontex Risk Analysis. The threat was legitimized and much bilateral cooperation and security focus has been directed at the enclaves.

A reappearing thought during the work with this thesis has been weather the securitization of the enclaves Ceuta and Melilla had already been realized through the building of the fences. The fences built by Spanish authorities could by themselves be viewed as the use of unconventional measures. The fences were partly financed by the EU structural fund. Considering the European experience of exclusion through the “iron curtain” that fell only a few years before the fences around Ceuta and Melilla were built, they could be argued to be rather unconventional. Securitization is however at its very core a discursive practice. The discourse analysis conducted shows a significant shift after the events of 2005 in emphasis on security articulated by the EU through official documents. I therefore consider the analysis valid in terms of the tracing of security articulation relating to the enclaves.

It has also been important to consider if I can say that the enclaves themselves have been securitized or if it is illegal immigration that have been securitized. My concluding thought after the results of the discourse analysis is that both enclaves and illegal immigration have undergone the process of securitization through the normalization of their association to each other.
6.2 The Results of Securitization

Aware of the political effects of securitization, the Copenhagen School argues that securitization should in most cases be resisted. The de-securitization of social relations is on the other hand emphasized as a positive outcome. With this in mind, what has been the results of the securitization of the enclaves?

The discourse analysis show that ”migration” has in the EU discourse of the enclaves become associated with illegal practices. The enclaves have become symbols for the illegal immigration issues. The securitization of immigration is a process important to follow and discuss. This development may indeed have political effects such as xenophobia and an acceptance of increasingly restricted immigration policies. In the later years we have seen a trend of right populist parties being elected in European parliament with immigration politics as their main objective. It can be discussed if this is a further result of securitization. This thesis have shown a discourse expressed by the EU in relation to the enclaves Ceuta and Melilla much different to that associated by the integrating and uniting project the EU stands for. At the external border the discourse show an increasing direction towards exclusion.

On a final note, future studies of the securitization of immigration and of EU external borders are needed and important in order to follow the development of EU immigration policy and its results. It is possible that we have not yet seen the full capacities of the political consequences of securitization and how it may effect the future of the EU.
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