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Introduction

In December 2016, the Office for National Statistics (ONS) revealed that Britain’s net migration for the year ending June 2016 was +335,000 (ONS, 2016). Included in this figure were successful asylum applications, which had undergone their sixth consecutive increase to reach 44,323 (ONS, 2016). Even before these statistics were released, British newspapers had begun reporting on the arrival of refugees, asylum seekers and migrants to Europe using the noun phrase “migrant crisis”. All national newspapers adopted the term to refer to incidents involving any or all three social groups, whether they were in Europe, or settled in the UK and therefore included in ONS’s figures. A conflation of terms in the media is not new, nor is a recognition of its problematic nature; the homogenisation produced by collective terms disregards nuanced motivations for movement among the three social groups (Goodman and Speer, 2007). Per United Nations definitions, applied by ONS during data gathering, an asylum seeker has applied for protection as a refugee but is awaiting a response, whilst a refugee has already been granted asylum (UNESCO, 1998). The asylum application is determined by the degree to which persecution produces fear of remaining in the applicant’s country of origin; both ‘asylum seeker’ and ‘refugee’ thus recognise external factors influencing movement (UNHCR, 1951). Conversely, a migrant decides to migrate without an external compelling factor (UNESCO, 1998). Given the different motivations for movement and their connotations, newspapers’ synonymous use of ‘migrant’, ‘refugee’ and ‘asylum seeker’ is a simplification that potentially (re)produces prejudices against all three social groups (Burroughs, 2015).

Britain’s political landscape, dominated by the May 2015 general election, increased the already vast number of articles on refugees, asylum seekers and migrants in the UK press. Fuelled by the rising popularity of the nationalist United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP), all major politicians were engaged in debates about immigration, and right-wing newspapers regularly quoted anti-immigration arguments. In response to UKIP’s rhetoric, the Conservative Party promised a referendum on Britain’s European Union (EU) membership and subsequently won the election (Conservative Party, 2015). Polarised campaigns followed, with the Leave side employing immigration-based arguments, such as the claim that if Turkey, a country with a population of 76 million, became a member state, immigration would ‘be out of control’ (Vote Leave, 2016). A similar argument was that, given Europe’s increasing net migration, the only way for Britain to reduce its immigration figures would be to leave the Union and ‘be in charge of our own borders’ (Vote Leave, 2016). Most British newspapers took an official stance on the election and the referendum; the right-wing national tabloid *The Express* openly acknowledged its ‘crusade’ to leave the EU while it continued to report on the “migrant crisis”. As the general election and referendum discussions focused heavily on immigration, the newspaper’s representations of refugees, asylum seekers and migrants had the potential to become implicated in political debate. This dissertation investigates to what extent *The Express*’s socio-political ideology influenced its representations of the three social groups from 1st January 2015, four months prior to the general election, until the EU referendum on 23rd June 2016.

A topoi analysis of fifty news articles uncovers *The Express*’s wider argumentative trends, which the subsequent Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA) of two representative articles relates to discursive representations. While topoi analysis and CDA are not frequently combined, the former highlights the link between representations and the justification for their social consequences, and thus supports the latter in investigating normalised prejudice in institutional discourse (Wodak, 2001). Both analytical methods acknowledge the importance of socio-political context when analysing power relationships in language (Wodak, 2001), and are thus appropriate for this dissertation’s overarching objective, which is to answer the following research questions:

1. How were discursive representations of refugees, asylum seekers and migrants constructed linguistically by *The Express* between January 2015 and June 2016?
2. What were the central topoi used?
3. How far did socio-political ideology influence discursive representations of the three social groups?

Background

Studying racist practices in western media, van Dijk (1991) acknowledged that minority ethnic groups were frequently depicted as a problem or a threat. These categorisations legitimised the in-group’s indignation towards non-western people and reinforced social inequality. Negative representations of minority groups were also identified by Reisigl and Wodak (2001), who found a stereotype of immigrants...
as aggressive, criminal, male foreigners inclined to commit sexual attacks. The discourses of criminality and danger that underpin these findings continue to pervade immigration reporting contemporarily (KhosraviNik, Krzyzanowski and Wodak, 2012; Don and Lee, 2014). Furthering van Dijk (1991), Wodak (1996) uncovered a racial discourse of difference within which ethnyonyms such as ‘Syrians’ formed the basis of out-group categorisations. As Wodak (2008) explained, the use of an ethnic marker of difference developed the deictic argument that migrants belonged outside of the in-group’s country. Seemingly neutral descriptions thus served the ideological function of reinforcing social distance.

While uncovering common tropes, researchers have identified the linguistic practices through which discriminatory ideology is disseminated. One recurring framework is van Leeuwen’s social action and social actor representation model (1995, 1996), which illustrated how social groups are homogenised and dehumanised to distance them from readers, and how social actors can be denied agency or rendered invisible in representations of social actions. Reisigl and Wodak (2001) illustrated the ideological significance of these linguistic practices when applying them to petition discourse, elucidating their contribution to an underlying anti-immigration ideology. Two prominent strategies for social actor representation, found regularly in immigration discourse, are ‘differentiation’, where apparent differences between in-group and out-group members are emphasised, and ‘functionalisation’, where social actors are defined by their actions, such as ‘stowaways’ (van Leeuwen, 2008). The former technique produces discursive “othering” and undermines solidarity, while the latter performs dehumanisation; both serve to prevent personal identification and empathy.

Underpinning the research above is an awareness that representations are not ideologically neutral; as O’Doherty and Le Couteur (2007) argue, labels are chosen specifically for their connotations, and, in cases of institutional discourse, may be political (Goodman and Speer, 2007). The interplay between naming, evaluation and ideology is arguably most problematic in news stories. As Teo (2000) claims, newspapers’ discursive representations are typically accepted as factual, which minimises the likelihood that subtle discrimination will be recognised and challenged. The public’s attitudes towards migrant groups depend upon media reporting (van Dijk, 1991), and discourse and social practice are dialectic (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997). The veiled discrimination contained within linguistic representations of ethnic minority groups thus has the potential to ideologically influence a vast number of people. When repeated over time, these representations can become normalised ways of conceptualising ethnic minority individuals (Nolan et al., 2011). Baker (2006) has termed this normalisation the incremental effect of discourse.

KhosraviNik (2010) claimed that argumentative structures are equally as important in ideological manipulation as linguistic structures; he highlighted metaphor as a significant tool in producing discursive discrimination. The importance of metaphor was illustrated in Reisigl and Wodak’s (2001) discussion of collective symbols — metaphors which describe the impact of immigration. They found representations of immigration as a flood, burst containers (Musolff, 2015), and invasion (Goodman and Speer, 2007). While metaphors provide concrete conceptualisations of the movement of vast groups of people, they are also inherently ideological; invasion constructs migration as a threat, while burst containers suggest that the host country is overflowing. Reisigl and Wodak (2001) demonstrated that the arguments implicit in metaphor can be uncovered through topoi analysis, a method which has recently seen an academic resurgence to deconstruct subtly encoded anti-immigration attitudes (Gabrielatos and Baker, 2008). They defined topoi as the connection rules between an argument and its conclusion, and outlined numerous recurring topoi in anti-immigration discourse, such as ‘threat’, which portrays immigration as dangerous. Topoi analysis challenges the subtle ideological assumptions that contribute to discursive discrimination, and thus serves as a complementary analytical method to CDA.

In her Discourse Historical Approach to CDA, Wodak (2001) emphasised the importance of analysing texts through reference to their historical, socio-political and setting-specific contexts. This is particularly crucial in the case of discourse about immigration, which is increasingly a matter of political debate (King and Wood, 2001). Baker et al. (2008) found that UK immigration reporting increased during political events, and that discursive representations of asylum seekers, refugees and migrants formed “political rivalry discourse”, which was used to criticise policies that opposed a newspaper’s socio-political ideology. Using the same primary data, KhosraviNik (2009) argued that quantification rhetoric dehumanised out-group members and reduced them to political statistics (Potter, Wetherell and Chitty, 1991; O’Doherty and Le Couteur, 2007). Wodak (2008) also noted that migrants were political scapegoats, blamed for citizen dissatisfaction, and theorised that identity categorisations were fluid, with newspapers’ constructions of migrant identities changing in response to socio-political contexts, such as ongoing political events. This dissertation extends existing research on the interplay between newspapers’ discursive representations and their socio-political agendas, using Britain’s decision to
leave the EU to explore how The Express's engagement with the immigration debate during a year of democratic decision-making influenced its (re)production of discrimination through discursive representations.

Methodology

Data collection
A sample of 50 news articles from The Express was collected from LexisNexis. All articles were published between 1st January 2015 and 23rd June 2016. A search for migrant OR immigrant OR refugee was performed to ensure articles were representative, as British newspapers use the three referents interchangeably (Gabrielatos and Baker, 2008). The 1,766 search results were sorted by relevance, and, to avoid selectivity, every tenth article was chosen for sampling.

Topoi Analysis
The purpose of the topoi analysis was to uncover the broader argumentation trends underpinning The Express's immigration reporting, and to reveal any subtle parallels with contemporary political rhetoric. The 50 articles were coded based on the presence of 9 topoi: number, advantage, definition, threat, humanitarianism, responsibility, burdening, culture and abuse (Reisigl and Wodak, 2001). As set out by Reisigl and Wodak (2001), topoi were frequently conceptualised in formulaic terms, such as 'if X is advantageous, it should occur', or 'if X is a burden, it should be avoided'. As topoi are not mutually exclusive, they were understood to inform one another, adding depth to each argument. Appendix A includes a copy of the coding table, alongside a list of article titles and dates. Where articles are quoted in the analysis, the accompanying number corresponds to the article's location in the list.

CDA model
After the initial topoi analysis, further sampling was performed to select articles for CDA. The sample was first narrowed to articles including the three most common topoi, and then reduced to those with the most frequent conclusions to ensure texts were representative. The two longest articles were chosen to allow for an in-depth analysis. Although Wodak’s CDA work on discriminatory discourse has been influential, this dissertation followed KhosraviNik’s (2010) model, as it recognises the importance of considering the interplay between macro-linguistic mechanisms, such as topoi, and micro-linguistic mechanisms – the language of discursive representations. As this dissertation’s overall objective is to analyse both wider anti-immigration discourses and more localised performances of ideology, KhosraviNik’s (2010) tripartite model was deemed the most appropriate. The model considers which linguistic techniques are employed, how they achieve an ideological effect and why this ideology is contextually significant.

Stage One: Social Actors
Stage one analyses the referential strategies through which social actors are named. KhosraviNik (2010) advocates identifying the linguistic techniques which perform discursive categorisation and considering why these choices are ideologically important. For example, the linguistic techniques of functionalisation and differentiation could be considered in terms of their role in dehumanising social actors and obscuring agency (van Leeuwen, 1996). By uncovering these techniques and their semantic value, sociolinguists can identify attitudes towards social groups and interpret them in relation to socio-political context.

Stage Two: Social Action
Stage two considers the actions attributed to social actors and how they are linguistically represented. Strategies include backgrounding, where social actors that were previously referred to in a text are not attributed directly to an action (van Leeuwen, 2008), and deagentialisation, where actions appear impervious to human agency (van Leeuwen, 1995). KhosraviNik (2010) stresses that social action representations contribute to ideological manipulation in a text; the semantic value of social actions must therefore be examined. For example, deagentialisation could be considered in terms of its representation of immigration as uncontrollable, and the social panic this consequently produces. This stage also analyses quotation patterns, as they are understood to perform ideological alignment between speakers and the writer, inserting evaluation into otherwise objective articles (van Dijk, 1991).
Stage Three: Argumentation

Stage three analyses the presence and qualities of arguments for or against social actors. The motivation for including specific arguments must be considered, particularly in relation to socio-political context. KhosraviNik (2010) offers many argumentation strategies; this dissertation focused on metaphor because, as outlined above, it is both descriptive and ideological, containing inherent attitudes towards the situations that it represents.

Analysis

Topoi Analysis

26 of the 50 articles analysed were from 2015 and 24 were from 2016. Across the year, three common topoi were identified. ‘Definition’ appeared in 17 articles from 2015 and 15 from 2016. ‘Number’ was found in 14 articles from 2015 and 13 from 2016. ‘Threat’ appeared in 11 articles from 2015 and 12 from 2016. Articles were also filtered by conclusion. In 2015, 16 articles concluded that the UK required stricter immigration policies or reduced immigration figures, articulated in phrases such as: ‘Campaigners yesterday pointed to [immigration] statistics to underline calls for greater Government action’ (18). In 2016, 8 articles argued for lower immigration figures or harsher policies, while 12 concluded that Britain should leave the EU, typically phrased as, ‘The only safe option in light of the EU’s inability to deal with the migrant crisis is to vote leave’ (4).

2015

Definition

The definition topos follows the premise that if a social actor is named ‘X’, they carry the qualities contained in the meaning of ‘X’ (Reisigl and Wodak, 2001). 2015 articles feature ‘genuine refugees’, described as ‘those who genuinely qualify for asylum’ (19), and illegal immigrants, labelled ‘those who have sneaked in illegally’ (19) or ‘everyone who would rather live in a prosperous Western country’ (16). Immigrants are criminalised through the adverb ‘illegally’ and depicted as sly in the verb ‘sneaked’; the alternative to illegality is a financially motivated economic migrant, indicated in ‘prosperous’. Both social actors are depicted as exploiting the UK’s asylum system for personal gain, a representation which is employed to justify either “root and branch” reform (19) of the UK’s asylum system, or the expulsion of migrants ‘by force’ (16). Both conclusions draw on the moral necessity to oppose asylum abuse, and are embedded in quotes by British and Australian politicians, with whom the writers ideologically align themselves via quotations (van Dijk, 1991). Moreover, ethnonyms such as ‘Pakistanis’ and ‘Indians’ (49) cite countries without known persecution, explicitly classifying social actors as migrants rather than asylum seekers. This categorisation is constructed to demonstrate the need for an asylum system reform by indicating that it is being abused by people who are not genuinely in need. Where social actors are, per UN definitions, asylum seekers or refugees, they are labelled ‘Syrian migrant[s]’ (46) or ‘migrants fleeing war’ (3). As ‘migrant’ lacks the emotional connotations of plight, The Express’s lexical choices obscure ethical concerns with a stricter asylum system adding to existing suffering.

Threat

The topos of threat posits that if an action is dangerous, it must be prevented (Reisigl and Wodak, 2001). The Express links migration to violence and terrorism to justify implementing harsher immigration policies; migrants are ‘violent in their determination to enter the UK’ (2) and ‘blood will be shed’ (29) due to their behaviour. The adjective ‘violent’ represents the act of migration as a threat to the UK. The inherent violence in ‘rising migration’ is positioned as ‘the unintended consequence of making [migrants’] living conditions better’ (2); harsher living conditions are thus presented as necessary to reduce migration and prevent aggression. The graphic imagery of ‘bloodshed’ envisions the consequences of migration in terms of a damaged human body, metaphorically implying danger towards British individuals and visualising harsher immigration policies as self-defence. Nominalisations such as ‘a high threat of terrorism’ (13) and ‘the rise of extremism’ (16) further contribute to the sense of threat; deagentialisation obscures human agents to represent terrorism as the natural consequence of migration (van Leeuwen, 1996). Images of terrorism are embedded in articles which, through quotations, claim that the terror threat requires ‘boats carrying migrants to Europe’ to be ‘turned back […] by force’ (16). By re-contextualising immigration as a terror threat, The Express conceptualises harsher immigration policies as terrorism prevention strategies.
Number
If the number topos proves another topos true, a specific action is justified (Reisigl and Wodak, 2001). In 2015, numbers are used to evidence the topos of threat and burden. Numerical figures substantiate the need to take ‘decisive action’ (6) against immigration by measuring the threat to in-group security. The ratio in ‘they now outnumber police 10 to 1’ (6) quantifies the discrepancy between the number of migrants whose actions require police attention and the number of police available to supervise them, rendering immigration a security problem which requires a political solution to fix ‘the UK’s leaky borders’ (6). Numerical quantification also depicts migration as a social burden; in ‘1,500 migrants overwhelmed Greece’ (29), the number and verb ‘overwhelmed’ are mutually constitutive in highlighting unsustainable migration levels. ‘1,500’ acts as the implicit evidence that ‘the problem with migrants [must be] brought under control’ (29), implying that a reduction in immigration figures is necessary to ease pressure on host countries. Non-numerical quantification also supports the representation of immigration as overwhelming by likening its effect on EU countries to a ‘tsunami’ (12) and a ‘flood’ (23). Natural disaster metaphors represent migration as an uncontrollable, violating phenomenon, conceptualising the call to ‘control’ immigration metaphorically as a disaster prevention strategy (Reisigl and Wodak, 2001).

Definition
In 2016, The Express frequently refers to ‘migrated migrants’ (1); ‘moneyed’ stresses that migrants do not require financial aid and thus delegitimises their entry into the UK. The newspaper similarly claims that ‘refugees are shunning […] asylum in France because of the perceived riches […] in the UK’ (1). ‘Refugee’ typically connotes desperation, but ‘shunning’ and ‘riches’ imply deliberate manipulation of asylum services to select a country based on financial gain. The emerging imagery of financial exploitation serves to undermine readers’ sympathy and provoke indignation. The Express’s proposed solution is to revoke EU membership, typically constructed as, ‘The […] crisis comes as Britain prepares to vote on membership of the EU’ (1). The association between ‘crisis’ and EU membership implies that the EU’s policies facilitate Britain’s exploitation; a leave ‘vote’ is thus subtly positioned as a defence of British interests.

Migrant social actors are also criminalised in nouns such as ‘gangs’ (14), and Turkish people are scapegoated as inherently violent in ‘murderers and terrorists from countries like Turkey’ (41). The reference to Turkey is political, echoing the Vote Leave (2016) argument that if Turkey joined the EU and Britain remained, Britain’s immigration levels would be uncontrollable. Given the contextual parallel, The Express implies that the underlying threat to the UK is Turkey’s potential EU membership and Britain’s own existing membership. Furthermore, EU nationals are subjected to ‘them vs. us’ rhetoric (Wodak, 2008), instantiated in phrases such as ‘European Islamists’ (4). The depiction of EU citizens as radicals likens them to Turkish ‘terrorists’, constructing a new, threatening out-group that includes non-EU and EU citizens. The category membership shift, based on changing attitudes towards the EU, emphasises an ideological separation between British and European selves, linguistically performing Brexit prior to the referendum (Wodak, 2008).

Threat
Migration is frequently depicted as a threat, articulated as ‘the border threat’ (1). ‘Border’ employs container and invasion metaphors to define an in-group according to geographical territories (Reisigl and Wodak, 2001). Distinguishing between the in-group and out-group based on borders renders mainland Europe an out-group by default, and subtly denies unity between Britain and the EU. Continuing the nationalist tone, migration is conceptualised as invasion, illustrated in ‘Britain’s besieged borders are under unprecedented attack’ (5). Through this martial semantic field, The Express positions ‘the French government’s decision to fund [a] new [migrant] centre’ (5) as facilitating the violation of Britain’s in-group space by incentivising migrants to attempt to gain access to the UK. By attributing the blame to ‘the French government’, The Express echoes the political argument that Brexit is the only way for Britain to ‘control our own borders’ (Vote Leave, 2016).

Crime and terrorism constitute further threats. Crime is nominalised in ‘increased crime’ (1) and ‘migrant related crime’ (30); the lack of verbs backgrounds the criminal agent, positioning crime as the natural consequence of immigration (van Leeuwen, 2008). Murder is often the alleged act, contributing to a moral binary of an in-group of ‘innocent people’ and an out-group behind ‘murderous attacks’ (26). This emotionally charged division forms the evidence that condemns European ‘politicians who have heeded the warning on uncontrolled immigration too late’ (26). ‘Migrant crime’ is thus constructed as the result
of lax EU immigration policy, with the implication that Britain’s EU membership constitutes its exposure to danger. Moreover, The Express cites ‘Anti-Brussels campaigners’ who argue that terrorism is the product of a ‘porous external border’ which allows migrants to ‘establish UK terror cells’ (4). That migrants have terrorist intentions is presupposed; the condemnation is of the EU border policy that allows these individuals to enter the UK. Van Dijk (1991) states that quotation patterns illustrate ideological alignment between a quoted speaker and the writer; by embedding this quote in its article, The Express accepts terrorist attacks as the product of EU border control and aligns itself with the Leave campaign.

The Express also draws on sexual attacks committed by asylum seekers and immigrants in Germany to develop a discursive out-group based on the criminals’ profiles. The newspaper reports that ‘Middle Eastern men’ sexually assaulted ‘scores of women’ (26), “Arabic” men” sexually abused ‘white women’ (42) and ‘immigrants’ committed ‘mass sexual harassments’ (35). The sexual threat becomes racial through ethnonyms, and is gendered, producing a collective of sexually threatening, male foreigners. Although Reisigl and Wodak (2001) also identified this stereotype, it acquires new significance here given its absence in 2015 articles. Locating the assaults in Europe – ‘Cologne’ (26), ‘Stockholm’ (35) – and claiming that they have caused ‘loss of confidence in the EU’ (26), the newspaper characterises the threat as the product of EU immigration policy.

Number
Numerical quantification serves the dual function of dehumanising the out-group and reducing it to statistics which justify anti-EU ideology (KhosraviNik, 2009). The deagentialisation of ‘1.8 million border breaches’ (4) reduces the agents of ‘breaches’ to an abstract force repeatedly violating Europe’s borders, and disregards human motivations for entry (van Leeuwen, 1995). Through the claim that ‘the record figure prompted more calls […] for Britain to get out of the EU’ (4), The Express explicitly associates high immigration levels with Europe, and implies that Britain’s EU membership is an inherent threat. Moreover, the mutually constitutive number and invasion lexis in ‘an army of 20,000 migrants’ (1) envision immigration as a targeted threat to the UK, metaphorically conceptualising harsher immigration policy as national self-defence. This negative representation of UK-bound immigration is embedded in calculations of increasing EU asylum applications – ‘123 percent […] to over 1.2 million’ (24); percentages surpassing 100% are constructed to depict EU migration levels as unsustainable, emphasising the need to ‘quit the EU’ (24).

CDA
Article one (see Appendix B) was published on 15th June 2015, a month after the British general election. Article two (see Appendix C) was published on 23rd January 2016 while the EU referendum debate dominated UK politics. 2015

Social actors
Pre-modifying ‘asylum seekers’ with the noun ‘army’ (l. 9), The Express implies a belligerent motive behind desire for British asylum and envisions asylum seekers as a threat. Censure permeates the claim that the ‘army’ views Britain as a ‘promised land’ (l. 10), ridiculing the hope of permanent residence as delusion. Conflating terms to produce a collective identity (Gabrielatos and Baker, 2008), The Express refers to the same social actors as ‘refugees flocking’ (l. 31). ‘Flocking’ constructs a dehumanised and animalistic representation; by denying refugees human characteristics, the newspaper prevents empathy with their situation. A third epithet, ‘migrants’ (l. 13), is shrouded in blame: the premodifier ‘brazen’ presupposes the shamefulness of migration and suggests that migrants wilfully disregard this. A discourse of illegality further homogenises the three social groups in ‘those who have no right to enter’ (l. 62-3). The infinitive ‘to enter’ emphasises physical movement rather than the need to escape persecution, disregarding personal motivations such as desperation. Focusing on illegal entry enables The Express to justify equal condemnation of all three social groups.

A discourse of difference further contributes to the construction of an out-group (Wodak, 1996). The third-person pronoun ‘they’ and first-person pronoun ‘we’ in ‘they don’t want to stay […] we have heard that’ (ll. 23-24) perform discursive othering, explicitly segregating the in-group and out-group into two opposed collectives. Othering becomes racial through the proper nouns ‘North Africa’, ‘Sudan’, ‘Somalia’ and ‘Eritrea’ (ll. 8-9), which emphasise country of origin as a source of inherent difference. Beyond the racial distinction, the criminalisation of the out-group distinguishes it from the in-group through a moral dichotomy. In the noun phrase ‘lawless community’ (l. 6), the out-group is depicted as disorderly, producing an implicit distinction between the in-group and out-group as those who respect
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law and order and those who do not. The noun phrase ‘the clandestines’ (l. 49) positions illegality as the out-group’s defining characteristic, and is ambiguous, interpretable as a reflection of ‘lawless’ behaviour or the claim that the group has ‘no right to enter the UK’. Together, racialisation and criminalisation render the out-group inherently other in values and in culture.

The representation of the out-group as one embodied characteristic is echoed in the functionalisation of ‘Migrant Josif’ (l. 52) (van Leeuwen, 2008); the premodifier ‘migrant’ disregards the multifaceted nature of human life and Josif’s personal history. Similarly, numerical referential strategies perform dehumanisation, positioning social actors as ‘hundreds’ (l. 11) and ‘the numbers’ (l. 11). Both terms reduce social actors to evidence of unsustainable immigration levels and disregard motivations for movement (KhosraviNik, 2009). *The Express’s* referential strategies thus deny migrants, refugees and asylum seekers their humanity, representing them as a threat to British social order.

**Social actions**

Contributing to the representation of the out-group as a threat is the social action of entry, which is encoded in terms of natural disaster and water metaphors (Don and Lee, 2014). Akin to the topos of threat, the claim that migrants ‘flood’ Britain (l. 1) likens immigration to a devastating and unpreventable natural phenomenon, evoking fear of destruction. The act of entering the UK is criminalised in ‘smuggle’ (l. 48), ‘sneak across’ (l. 8) and ‘stowing away’ (ll. 13-14); together, the verbs conceptualise entry as an illegal act requiring trickery and subterfuge. Criminalisation homogenises migration as calculated and illicit, and contributes to the conflation of the three social groups based on their alleged illegality.

Social actions also depict the out-group as disorderly; the claim that migrants are ‘disrupting the flow of supplies into the UK’ (l. 33) presents migration as a hindrance to British trade and highlights its role in destabilising in-group order. The image of disarray is extended in the disorderly connotations of ‘run[ning] amok’ (l. 34) and ‘running riot’ (l. 49), which visualise the out-group’s unrestrained presence in Calais as chaos and thus support the discursive dichotomy of in-group order and out-group disorder. Furthermore, citing a ‘migrant’ who claims that out-group members are ‘killing each other every night’ (l. 54), *The Express* characterises the out-group as inhumane for perpetrating acts of mindless violence rather than striving for solidarity and peace. A moral discourse of difference is thus introduced (Wodak, 1996), which implies that offering British residence to the out-group would increase disorder in the UK. Finally, the out-group’s portrayal as shameful is supported through the image of ‘brag[ging]’ (l. 13) and the claim that ‘they don’t want to stay’ (l. 23). Bragging depicts the out-group as abusers of the asylum system who willingly manipulate the rules to gain access to their preferred country. Social actions thus contribute to a violent and brazen out-group representation, which is constructed to validate the in-group’s indignation.

**Argumentation**

Underpinning the article is an argument in favour of implementing harsher immigration policies, which is depicted metaphorically as a means of recuperating Britain’s strength. When *The Express* claims to be ‘alarmed that no decisive action is being taken to tackle the scourge of illegal immigration’ (l. 15), the noun ‘scourge’ envisions immigration as a social burden. The verb ‘tackle’ and noun phrase ‘decisive action’ constitute calls for harsher immigration policies to eradicate the supposedly harmful affliction of immigration on British society. The container metaphor in ‘the UK’s leaky borders’ (l. 16) conceptualises Britain as a vulnerable space threatened with disintegration due to lenient immigration policies. Similarly, by depicting France’s social expansion through abstract verbs with abject connotations – ‘swelling’ (l. 11) and ‘stretching’ (l. 31) – *The Express* represents immigration as parasitical and suggests that Europe has no room for immigrants. These metaphorical images produce the nationalist vision of two countries weakened by immigration, subtly arguing that Europe’s immigration figures must be reduced to maintain Britain’s strength.

Though immigration is the presupposed ‘scourge’, the newspaper’s underlying condemnation is of ‘porous border controls’ (l. 13), which renders the problem political. This political argument is expanded through a quote from UKIP MEP, Steven Woolfe, who claims that Britain requires ‘a strong solution’ for ‘dealing with asylum seekers and illegal immigrants’ (l. 29), echoing the newspaper’s call for ‘decisive action’. These quotes perform ideological alignment between *The Express* and UKIP’s anti-immigration ideology (van Dijk, 1991), constructing a coherent political argument: the out-group’s shameful, disorderly and threatening representation substantiates the need for harsher immigration policies. Social actors are thus reduced to national “political rivalry discourse” (Baker et al., 2008).
Social actors
In 2016, discursive homogenisation positions the out-group as evidence of the need to leave the EU. Through the functionalised nouns ‘migrant’ (l. 4) and ‘applicants’ (l. 60), social actors are presented as merely an embodied desire to reach the UK (van Leeuwen, 1996), and their social experiences and personal identities are obscured. Numerical quantification adds to the homogenisation; the pre-modifier ‘1,253,820’ (l. 60) disregards individual attributes and represents the out-group as an indistinguishable collective. This figure is constructed to indicate the extent of the ‘migrant crisis engulfing Europe’ (l. 4); the reference to Europe politicises high immigration levels as the product of EU immigration policy.

As in 2015, a discourse of difference divides social actors by country of origin (Wodak, 1996) – ‘migrants from North Africa’ (l. 12-3). However, the noun phrase ‘Middle Eastern men’ (l. 15) transforms ethnic difference into a symbol of cultural otherness; the masculine, racial profile is positioned as the agent of ‘sexual assault’ (l. 15). The consequent identity of a male, foreign sexual predator is extended to all Middle Eastern males through the plurality of ‘men’ and the omission of those who did not commit sexual assaults, dividing the in-group and out-group into victim and sexual predator. Further depicting the out-group as threatening is the association in ‘terrorists claiming to be asylum seekers’ (ll. 13-14) (van Leeuwen, 2008). Under a veil of differentiation, where the verbal phrase ‘claiming to be’ purports to acknowledge two distinct social entities, The Express introduces social actors which conflates them (van Leeuwen, 2008). This discursive representation, rooted in real contextual events, suggests that it is difficult to identify asylum seekers with terrorist intentions before an attack occurs. The Express locates its discursive non-EU sexual predators and terrorists in the EU – ‘Paris’ (l. 14) and ‘Cologne’ (l. 15). By alluding to recent crimes committed by asylum seekers in Europe, the newspaper implies that EU membership is the source of Britain’s exposure to non-EU threats, and thus constructs an EU and non-EU threatening out-group.

Social actions
In a unique, context-driven twist on the violent migrant stereotype identified by Reisigl and Wodak (2001), The Express represents non-EU migrants as the metaphorical murderers of the EU. Claiming that ‘the EU could be killed off by the migrant crisis engulfing Europe’ (l. 4), the newspaper attributes Europe’s disintegration to the non-EU citizens behind the ‘migrant crisis’. However, their agentive role is backgrounded through the noun phrase, rendering their murderous qualities an unquestionable presupposition (van Leeuwen, 2008). Acknowledging but backgrounding the role of non-EU migrants in the EU’s disintegration focuses the article on Europe’s supposed inability to withstand contemporary pressures. Europe’s frailty pervades the extended metaphor of death in Manuel Valls’ quotes: ‘Europe […] could die’ (ll. 21-2), ‘the concept we [and] the founding fathers had of Europe’ could ‘disappear’ (ll. 24-5). These images of destruction are attributed both to the ‘migrant crisis’ and to Europe’s inability to ‘protect its own borders’ (l. 22); as EU immigration policy is positioned as equally as destructive as immigration, The Express constructs a collective non-EU and EU threat to Britain.

The non-EU out-group is also said to perpetrate tangible crimes. ‘Murderous’ immigrant ‘attacks’ are placed in binary opposition to ‘innocent people’ from a victimised in-group, and are positioned as the result of ‘uncontrolled immigration’ (ll. 29-30). ‘Uncontrolled immigration’ is also depicted as facilitating the ‘gang rape’ (l. 30) of European women by Middle Eastern men. The inherently criminal and predatory nature of non-EU migrants is presupposed, and is discursively supported by a contextual reference to attacks perpetrated by asylum seekers in Germany. Despite crimes also occurring in non-EU countries, The Express’s emphasis on incidents in an EU member state implicitly associates violence and sexual threats with the EU. Britain’s EU membership is thus subtly represented as dangerous. Overall, social actions contribute to the underlying argument that non-EU migrants are destroying the EU, which is also complicit in its own disintegration.

Argumentation
Underpinning the negative representations of EU and non-EU citizens is an argument in favour of leaving the EU, upheld by interweaving metaphors. A natural disaster metaphor permeates the present continuous verb ‘engulfing’ (l. 4), representing the ‘migrant crisis’ as an uncontrollable pressure contributing to the EU’s metaphorical death – ‘killed off’ (Reisigl and Wodak, 2001). The ‘migrant crisis’ is labelled a ‘challenge of the 21st century’ (l. 42) which the EU is incapable of withstanding, causing an imminent ‘collapses[e]’ (l. 41). ‘Collaps[e]’ and ‘killed’ personify the EU as a vulnerable, fragmented self, threatened with the violence of non-EU migration. Non-EU citizens form a destructive out-group, but the personified imagery of disintegration also implicates the EU by rendering it weak, presenting a two-fold danger to Britain if it remains a member state.
The influence of socio-political ideology on discursive migrant, refugee and asylum seeker representations in *The Express*

In the claim that ‘the only safe vote in the referendum is […] to leave’ (ll. 42-3), *The Express* juxtaposes danger with safety, representing Brexit as the necessary protection against a crumbling former in-group and a destructive out-group. By envisioning the disintegration of the EU, *The Express* undermines the solidarity between Britain and other EU member states and discursively performs their separation prior to the referendum. In an almost verbatim echo of the Vote Leave (2016) campaign, the newspaper acknowledges its ‘crusade to get Britain out of Europe’ to ‘control our own affairs’ (ll. 8-9). The destructive representations of non-EU migrants and EU immigration policy are thus explicitly, and dialectically (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997), linked to a political campaign; discursive exclusion is performed to advocate a democratic vote for social exclusion via Brexit.

Discussion

2015

Throughout 2015, *The Express* provided regular coverage of the European “migrant crisis”, citing rising immigration levels in its call on the incoming government to implement harsher immigration policies. Through a conflation of terms (Gabrielatos and Baker, 2008), non-EU migrants, refugees and asylum seekers were reduced to one homogenous collective of illegal immigrants exploiting the British asylum system for financial gain. Their ‘brazen’ attitudes were intended as a source of indignation and evidenced the need for British asylum system reform. Existing negative stereotypes of non-EU migrants as dangerous (Burroughs, 2015), criminal (Don and Lee, 2014), violent (Reisigl and Wodak, 2001) and terrorising offered an available argumentation strategy for *The Express* to translate indignation into nationalist sentiment, positioning harsher immigration policies as British self-defence. This argument was extended by envisioning immigration metaphorically as invasion and thus a war on British people, a strategy also identified by Goodman and Speer (2007). Container metaphors visualised the UK as a vulnerable in-group space threatened with repeated violation of its border security (Musolff, 2015), provoking *The Express*’s nationalist call for harsher immigration policies to recuperate Britain’s strength.

Articles repeatedly claimed that the UK’s failing border control and lenient immigration policies facilitated threats by producing unsustainable immigration levels; these arguments reduced social actors to abstract statistics (KhosraviNik, 2009). Van Dijk (1991) claims that quotation patterns perform ideological alignment between a writer and quoted speakers; by citing UKIP politicians, *The Express* aligned itself with an explicitly nationalist, anti-immigration ideology. As the media influences the public’s perception of refugees, asylum seekers and immigrants (Nolan et al., 2011), the newspaper’s homogenisation had the potential to (re)produce prejudices against all three social groups (Burroughs, 2015). By reducing social actors to “political rivalry discourse” (Baker et al., 2008), *The Express* contributed to the dissemination of anti-immigration ideology throughout the general election that made the EU referendum a reality.

2016

In 2016, discriminatory representations of non-EU migrants, refugees and asylum seekers acted as supporting evidence in the newspaper’s ‘crusade’ to leave the EU, which ran alongside the official Vote Leave campaign. *The Express* adopted Reisigl and Wodak’s (2001) stereotypical immigrant attributes of aggressive, criminal, and predatory male foreigner, but imbued them with further significance by grounding them in recent terrorist attacks and sexual assaults. Relying on the contextual knowledge that the attacks took place in EU member states, *The Express* framed the incidents as the natural consequence of inadequate EU immigration policy; EU membership was thus positioned as Britain’s primary exposure to threats.

Echoing official Vote Leave (2016) rhetoric, *The Express* scapegoated Turkish people to support its political agenda. Where the Vote Leave (2016) campaign implied that Turkey’s potential EU membership posed an immigration threat to Britain if it remained in the EU, *The Express* applied KhosraviNik et al.’s (2012) violent and criminal stereotypes to Turkish people, representing them as inherently murderous and terrorising. The result was a delineation of the disparate political perceptions of Turkey by Britain and other EU member states, with negative representations constituting clear “political rivalry discourse” (Baker et al., 2008). EU citizens were also categorised as an out-group when described as European Islamists; this subtly linked EU citizens to Turkish people and non-EU migrants through a discourse of terrorism, creating a destructive out-group of both EU and non-EU citizens. The movement of Europeans from the in-group to the out-group confirmed Wodak’s (2008) theory that social group categories shift according to newspapers’ socio-political ideology, and highlighted how this fluidity enables newspapers to manipulate representations in support of a political agenda during times of
democratic decision-making. Linguistically differentiating British and European political beliefs undermined EU solidarity, fore grounding the need for a solely British self.

This dissertation provided original findings through a CDA of a 2016 article which envisioned the metaphorical disintegration of the EU. In a subtle twist on the violent migrant stereotype identified by Reisigl and Wodak (2001), non-EU migrants were constructed as the metaphorical murderers of the EU with the disruptive power to undermine a historical European self. The EU was depicted as complicit in its own disintegration due to its immigration policies. By constructing the EU as a fragmented entity ruined by the violence of non-EU migration and its own inability to regulate immigration, The Express grouped non-EU migration and EU membership into one collective threat to Britain. This threatening out-group paralleled the Vote Leave (2016) campaign’s nationalist rhetoric, and linguistically realised the ideological separation of the UK and other EU member states prior to the referendum. Through this subtle ‘crusade’, The Express attempted to persuade its readership to vote to leave the EU.

Considering that discourse and social practice are dialectic (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997), The Express’s discursive exclusion of European and non-EU citizens during the months prior to the referendum held the power to (re)produce prejudices against these individuals in society (Burroughs, 2015). As the media influences public perception of migrant groups (Nolan et al., 2011), embedding negative discursive representations within its immigration reporting and linking them to anti-EU sentiment had the potential to subtly reinforce Vote Leave (2016) arguments. Through its news reporting, then, The Express disseminated a political ideology rooted in the social exclusion of refugees, asylum seekers and migrants.

Conclusion

This dissertation has provided an original analysis of the influence of socio-political ideology on discursive representations of migrants, refugees and asylum seekers in The Express. Rooting its linguistic analysis in socio-political context, it has documented a shift towards the construction of an EU out-group based on the negative stereotypes traditionally directed towards non-EU citizens, and has illustrated how this related to the newspaper’s crusade to leave the EU. Accepting the dialectic nature of discourse and social practice (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997), this dissertation has highlighted the possibility that The Express’s dissemination of Vote Leave (2016) rhetoric contributed to the social exclusion of a Brexit vote through negative discursive representations.

The subtle nature of linguistic exclusion and its link to socio-political ideology was uncovered by combining topoi analysis with CDA. This methodology allowed for an analysis of argumentation trends throughout the year, alongside a close linguistic analysis of how those arguments were realised. A 7,000 word dissertation could not analyse the thousands of immigration articles produced by The Express during this period; future studies might add to these findings by combining CDA with corpus linguistics to cover a more extensive period, or by examining post-referendum articles to investigate whether EU citizens now form the predominant out-group. Nonetheless, by linguistically analysing the link between discriminatory media discourse and socio-political ideology, this dissertation has embellished existing sociolinguistic research, and has outlined an agenda for future work.
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Appendix A: Topoi coding, accompanied by a list of article titles and dates

Table 1. Topoi coding and article conclusions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Threat</th>
<th>Humanitarianism</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Burdening</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Abuse</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/6/2016</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leave the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/12/2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/8/2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harsher policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/4/2016</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leave the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/2016</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harsher policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/6/2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harsher policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/7/2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/9/2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leave the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/3/2016</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leave the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/9/2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5/2016</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harsher policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/9/2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leave the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/7/2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harsher policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/8/2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Migrants are bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1/2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harsher policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/10/2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harsher policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/9/2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harsher policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/10/2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration is bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/4/2016</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leave the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/4/2016</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harsher policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/9/2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Migrants are bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/3/2016</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/4/2016</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Migrants are bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/1/2016</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leave the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/8/2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Migrants are bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/5/2016</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/8/2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/1/2016</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Migrants are bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/2/2016</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/4/2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase support for truckers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/5/2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harsher policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/4/2016</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leave the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/1/2016</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Migrants are bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/9/2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/1/2016</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/7/2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Migrants are bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/9/2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/1/2016</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leave the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/5/2016</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leave the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/3/2016</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leave the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/5/2016</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leave the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/6/2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harsher policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/4/2016</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leave the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/12/2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harsher policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/2/2016</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/5/2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Migrants are bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8/2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9/2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce immigration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 27 1 32 23 4 3 15 5 3
Article titles and dates

Articles are presented in the order they appear in the table above.

9. Little, A. (2016). And still they come...EU deal fails to stem the tide. The Express. 21st March.
25. Chapman, J. (2016). Jail for couple who flew in migrants for just one day to rip off £1.6m in benefits. The Express. 9th April.
34. Little, A. (2016). Plan to scrap UK’s asylum opt-out. The Express. 7th April.
35. Dawar, A. (2016). Mum’s grief as ‘angel’ is killed by asylum boy. The Express. 27th January.
37. Pilditch, D. (2016). One in two Londoners will be an immigrant within 15 years. The Express. 5th January.
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44 Ingham, J. (2015). Truckers’ fury as chaos costs £750,000. 26th June.
46 Dixon, C. (2015). Pilot jailed for flying in a migrant...as the man he helped gets asylum. 2nd December.
NEW WAVE OF MIGRANTS TO FLOOD BRITAIN;
4,000 queueing in Calais to cross Channel. Hundreds arrive
in tent ghetto every day

The number of migrants now queueing up to enter Britain illegally has reached crisis point
with 4,000 living in a crime-ridden ghetto in Calais.
Experts predict the population of the lawless community will explode this summer as the
refugee crisis across Europe spirals out of control. There are now thought to be around a
million migrants looking to sneak across the Mediterranean from North Africa.
For the army of asylum seekers fleeing war-torn Sudan, Somalia and Eritrea all roads lead to
the promised land of Britain.
Each day hundreds arrive in northern France, swelling the numbers of a vast tent city which
has its own mosque, farm and shops.
Braven migrants openly brag how they can bypass our porous border controls by stowing
away on lorries bound for Dover.
Alarmed that no decisive action is being taken to tackle the scourge of illegal immigration the
Daily Express, which has led the way in exposing the scandal of the UK’s leaky borders, took
the first British politician inside the dusty tent city, dubbed the “Jungle”; to see the chaos
unfolding.
Ukip MEP Steven Woolfe said: “It’s simply shocking to see the numbers already here.
It’s not a camp anymore it’s a ghetto, a thriving community and staging post for getting to
the UK.

Solution
"They don't want to stay in Italy, Germany or France because they see Britain as the only
place where it's easy for them to get jobs, healthcare and benefits - and we have heard that
from their own mouths.
"They say Britain is the only place they feel they can go and live.
"They know once they're there they can settle, bring their families and will not be removed.
Our leaky borders encourage people to come here.
"Until we find a strong solution on dealing with asylum seekers and illegal immigrants this will
continue."
Refugees are flocking to Calais at such a rate they now outnumber police 10 to 1 - stretching
flimsy security arrangements to breaking point.
The violence engulfing the port town is disrupting the flow of supplies into the UK, with
truckers saying their lives are at risk as migrants run amok with machetes, knives and
baseball bats. Industry experts say the situation is "simply unsustainable" with £10million of
contaminated UK-bound produce having to be binned since the New Year.
It is feared the squat on a patch of wasteland just a mile from the ferry terminal could double in
size within months.
Philippe Mignonet, the deputy mayor of Calais, said: “The number will grow, no doubt.
"The British government says it is our responsibility when they perfectly know the destination
of the migrants is not Calais but England.
"We are fed up with that attitude. I more and more have the feeling they do not have the
courage to come over to face the reality and talk to us.
"I feel very frustrated that I never had any contact with any English minister, not any phone
call.
"By working together Calais, England and Lampedusa would help to force Europe and the
United Nations to take their responsibilities."
Police are largely helpless to prevent migrants trying to smuggle themselves into the UK, with
one exasperated Border Force official saying: “The clandestines are running riot”. The rise in
organised gangs operating smuggling rackets is leading to more than 100 attempts to cross
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51 the Channel every day - double the rate of last year.
52 Migrant Josif, 25, fled Sudan and spent five months passing through Albania, Montenegro, Serbia, Hungary and Italy before arriving in France in his bid to reach the UK.
53 Describing the chaos he said: "It's a ghetto and people are killing each other every night. The population is too high. It has created a ghetto between different nationalities."
54 Mr Woolfe will prepare a dossier on the horrific scenes he witnessed and challenged other politicians to visit Calais with him. He said: "This is a damning indictment of a failure across Europe to take decisive action. Some told me how Italian police beat them, gave them a map and told them 'that's the way to France' and ultimately the UK - that's simply shocking."
55 Alp Mehmet, of MigrationWatch UK, said: "We must continue doing everything possible to prevent illegal entry into the UK including putting in place more resources for the task."
56 The Home Office said: "We continue to strengthen the security of our borders to stop those who have no right to enter the UK. The maintenance of law and order on French soil is the responsibility of the French government."
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MIGRANT CRISIS WILL KILL OFF EU;

Even France’s PM says Europe is on brink of disaster Europe is in very grave danger...and could die

THE EU could be killed off by the migrant crisis engulfing Europe, the French Prime Minister admitted yesterday.

Manuel Valls became the first senior EU politician to admit that the dream of ever closer integration is falling apart.

His comments reinforce the Daily Express's crusade to get Britain out of Europe so we can control our own affairs.

And they were seized on by campaigners as proof that the "only safe vote" in the in-out referendum is to leave the EU.

Mr Valls was speaking as the crisis continued yesterday with dozens more migrants from North Africa drowned trying to seek sanctuary in Greece. Terrorists claiming to be asylum seekers played a leading role in the atrocities in Paris last year and scores of women were sexually assaulted by Middle Eastern men in Cologne on New Year's Eve. The attacks in the German city were replicated in other parts of the country, as well as Austria and Scandinavia.

Mr Valls said the loss of confidence in the EU as a result of the attacks and the failure to control borders because of the Schengen agreement on free movement meant the whole project could die.

Speaking at the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, he admitted: "It's Europe that could die, not the Schengen area. If Europe can't protect its own borders, it's the very idea of Europe that could be thrown into doubt.

"It could disappear, of course - the European project, not Europe itself, not our values, but the concept we have of Europe, that the founding fathers had of Europe.

"Yes, that is in very grave danger. That's why you need border guards, border controls on the external borders of the European Union."

But Mr Valls was condemned for being among the many politicians who have heeded the warnings on uncontrolled immigration too late to protect innocent people from murderous attacks and gang rape.

Ukip spokeswoman Diane James said: "It's a shame that it has taken events like the attacks on the women of Cologne and the terrorism in Paris for politicians in the EU to get real."

"For years many of us who live and work in the communities that we represent have understood that the policies advocated by the elites in Europe rarely make a positive difference to people's everyday lives." She added: "We have long identified the weaknesses of the Schengen agreement which allows uncontrolled access across the continent. So to the French Prime Minister we say, 'Welcome to the real world'."

A spokesman for the campaign group Vote Leave said Mr Valls' comments underlined why David Cameron's renegotiation cannot be enough to persuade British people to vote to stay in the EU. He said: "This is further evidence that the EU is collapsing around our ears because it cannot cope with the challenges of the 21st century. It shows that the only safe vote in the referendum is a vote to leave."

Mr Cameron admitted yesterday that Europe was experiencing "very great" pressure from migration and should respond by supporting refugees in countries surrounding Syria. He told Al-Jazeera TV: "The pressure on Europe is very great because of the movement of people into Europe and the support they require.

"It's better if you can meet people's needs in the region, because their first choice is
The influence of socio-political ideology on discursive migrant, refugee and asylum seeker representations in *The Express*

Actually, I think, to return home to Syria as soon as they can.”

However, former Labour Prime Minister Tony Blair claimed the EU can survive the migration crisis.

In an interview in Davos, he said: “It can survive it but it's going to be a big challenge.

And if you did get terrorist activity coming in on the back of it, it would be a huge political problem.”

Mr Blair said there was “a genuine desire to be generous” to refugees but Europe needed to respond to public concern about security.

“There's an issue of numbers. How many people can Europe absorb? But there's also an issue of security. Can we be sure exactly who is coming in? Those two issues combined make it a tough political challenge.”

Data compiled by the EU's statistical office Eurostat showed that 1,253,820 applicants and their dependants have lodged asylum claims in the 28 member states since the refugee crisis began. Last month the total for 2015 officially passed one million. The final tally will be higher as several countries have not yet provided figures for November and December.

Analysis of the figures revealed earlier this month that the number of people seeking asylum in the UK passed 5,000 in a month for the first time in at least six years.

Mr Cameron is “not looking very likely” to secure a good enough deal to justify keeping Britain in the EU, former Tory leader Lord Howard said yesterday.

The peer delivered a pessimistic assessment of his successor’s chances as the Prime Minister travelled to Prague on the latest leg of his diplomatic offensive before next month’s crunch summit on his demands for European reform.

A deal at the European Council on February 18-19 is widely seen as essential if Mr Cameron is to hold the in-out referendum before the summer.

But Lord Howard made it clear that he would be surprised if any deal was sufficient to convince him to back continued membership.

“I am waiting to see what the Prime Minister is coming up with,” he told BBC Radio 4’s Today programme. “I have always wanted the United Kingdom to remain in a genuinely reformed EU.

“It is not looking very likely, I have to say, that we are going to see a genuinely reformed EU.

“We will have to wait and see. I have great respect and admiration for the Prime Minister. He may surprise us. He has been rather good at surprising us in the past.”
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