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Illegal immigration into Britain has become a rallying cry for nationalistic political parties. Newspaper articles have been shown to influence the salience of political issues, and thus it is important to look at how illegal immigration is framed and for the purposes of this paper two British newspapers were used: The Guardian and The Daily Telegraph. For this paper 212 articles were examined 108 from The Guardian and 104 from The Daily Telegraph. These newspapers represent two different political viewpoints, The Guardian being the more liberal newspaper, and The Daily Telegraph being more conservative. Each of these newspapers framed both legal and illegal immigration in different ways. Frame analysis was used to look at the messages these newspapers were sending their readers. The Guardian typically framed illegal and legal immigration in a more positive light, and The Daily Telegraph typically framed illegal and legal immigration more negatively. The articles were coded based on the framing in which illegal immigration was presented. The specific frames found in the articles consisted of: ID Cards, United States Illegal Immigration, Tragedy, Racism, Law and Order, Articles about Other Countries, Exploitation, Temporary Workers, and Amnesty
CHAPTER 1
LITERATURE REVIEW

British Fears of Illegal Immigration

Immigration to Western Europe did not begin in earnest until after World War II. The first wave of immigrants to Western Europe were mainly from Southern Europe and entered countries as guest workers to help with reconstruction. These workers were expected to be temporary guest workers, who would help rebuild Western Europe, earn extra money and return to their countries of origin. This did not happen, however, and most of the migrants stayed in the countries they had migrated to after forming a new life for themselves. This was not a problem while the economy was expanding and jobs were plentiful, but when the “oil crisis” hit, economies slowed and the need for migrant labor decreased.

This downturn in the economy quickly led politicians to call for a tightening of immigration policy. Politicians quickly saw the problem of immigrants and other “non-citizens” as employees in jobs that had become increasingly competitive. Public fears over jobs being taken by “foreigners” quickly led to more restrictive immigration policies in countries throughout Western Europe.

Immigration in Western Europe has become increasingly politicized over the last decade. Efforts to curtail immigration have led to the notion of “Fortress Europe.” Many countries in Western Europe have enacted laws to curtail immigration and many have officially claimed to be non-immigration countries, effectively saying that they will no longer welcome immigrants into their countries. With immigration on the increase during the late 1980’s and early 1990’s and with the elimination of internal boarders the isolation of a “Fortress Europe” from unwanted immigrants has gained momentum since the end of the cold war with the threat of mass immigration from former communist countries (Bade 2004).
Many immigration fears have stemmed from sensationalized stories of immigrants “flooding” into a country. Not only has the news media sensationalized the number of immigrants entering various Western European countries, but they have also sensationalized the threat of immigration from former communist countries. Though this mass immigration has yet to materialize, it has nonetheless become a perceived lingering threat.

The sensationalization of immigration by the media has helped shape public opinion against immigration. While immigrants make up only 7% of the total population of Great Britain only 6 percent of Britain’s believe that there are too few immigrants, while between 66 and 68 percent believe that there are too many (Simon and Lynch 1999). This climate of restricting immigration has led to an increase in undocumented workers. This unforeseen consequence has been the primary reason why illegal immigration has become one of the top political issues in Britain.

Illegal immigration comes in many forms. From the visiting “tourist” who overstays their visa to the immigrant with no documentation who is oftentimes smuggled across the borderer for a fee. According to Bade 2004, most illegal immigrants enter the receiving country in one of four ways. The first form consists of those who enter the country legally, but then become “illegal” when they overstay their visas. The second form involves using forged documents to gain entry and employment into the receiving country. The third form consists of human smuggling. Immigrants with no documentation seek out an individual who can get them past whatever boarder security may exist in exchange for a fee, sometimes these go-betweens are referred to as “travel agents.” The final group consists those who are actual criminals that have been convicted of crimes in other countries and use immigrant enclaves as a means to cross into another country and escape jail or prosecution.
Many have come to view the term “illegal immigrant” as derogatory and stigmatizing, lumping those who are looking for a better life with those who are attempting to flee prosecution or have fled once convicted of a crime. Those who do not like the term “illegal immigrants” usually prefer “undocumented immigrants” or “undocumented workers.” These are usually expressed across the political spectrum with those on the right preferring “illegal immigrants” while more those with more leftist views are likely to refer to “undocumented immigrants.” These political ideologies also effect how people interpret illegal or undocumented immigration.

There are many ways of interpreting the growth of the “illegal” movement. For some it represents the growing undesirability of ‘mass’ migrations and the need to control and manage migration in the face of apparently increasing pressures for people to migrate. For others it is almost the reverse – a reflection of the fact that the ‘natural forces’ of migration will always overcome regimes of control and containment (King 2002).

The problem of distinction is also compounded by the fact that a “legal” worker may work in the “illegal” or informal sector, while an “illegal” worker may work in the legal or formal sector without problem. Thus, describing a worker as “legal” or “illegal” becomes much more difficult, but this does not stop the government from attempting to “control” its boarders and the number of immigrants it allows, especially during times of economic hardship.

When undocumented immigrants are perceived to be making a contribution to the receiving countries economy, they are generally tolerated, but when the economy is in recession or stagnant, this tolerance evaporates. The government typically places pressure on the illegal immigrants to leave. Governments also react to perceived negative effects of illegal immigrants, such as crime domestic violence, and undermining the “dominant culture” (Appleyard 2001). Many of these perceived negative effects are stereotypes that have been perpetuated by the media.

British policy towards immigrants and illegal immigration has resulted in a habitual residency test for receiving public benefits, by 1980 benefits were not available to those defined
as “persons from abroad” (Morris 1998). One of the requirements of entry was the understanding that an immigrant would have “no recourse to public funds.” However, until 1985 this only applied to Income Support, but by 1985 public benefits were defined using new rules which stated: “For the purpose of these rules the term ‘public funds’ includes Supplementary Benefits, Housing Benefit, Family Income Supplement, and housing under the Housing (Homeless Persons) Act 1977” (HC503, para 1). However it remained unclear how to enforce these rules and whether they were legally enforceable because they contradicted previous laws without repealing them, such as the Housing Act of 1977.

The entry condition of “no recourse to public funds” did not of itself debar local authorities from offering homeless provisions as this limitation was not cited in homeless legislation. Acceptance of such provision, however, could be viewed as a breach of conditions of entry, rebounding on the immigration status of the individual concerned and possibly triggering charges against the authority for harboring an illegal immigrant (Morris 1998).

This is just one example of the unforeseen consequences of hastily enacted policy. In their haste to enact laws that would deter and restrict immigration, the British government did not foresee the enforcement problems that would ensue.

This paper will look at the research on media influence on public opinion, how public opinion shapes public policy, and current media discourse on illegal immigration. The media’s influence on public opinion gives it a unique ability to shape not only opinion, but through that opinion also have an influence over policy. Because there are difference along the political spectrum on how to deal with illegal immigration, the content analysis will look at two British newspapers The Guardian, representing the leftist side of the political spectrum, and The Daily Telegraph representing the right leaning side of the political spectrum. It is important to recognize both sides of the spectrum because currently the left leaning Labour party is currently in power, and the right leaning Tories have attempted to use illegal immigration to make gains where leftist parties are generally perceived to be “weak” on illegal immigration. It is predicted
that there will be a more understanding attitude towards illegal immigrants in the Guardian, while there is likely to be a more negative attitude portrayed in the articles from the Daily Telegraph.

**Media Influence on Public Opinion and Public Policy**

Aside from personal opinion, virtually all of the information that the public uses for their decision making and opinion forming comes from some source of media, and the media also represents much of policy maker’s information on public opinion. “The mass media is the primary conduit between the public and policy makers; Policy makers follow the media trends in public opinion, and the media are the public’s primary source of information on what the policy makers are doing” (Soroka 2003). These mass media outlets may take the form of newspaper, television news, radio, and most recently the internet. The media has the power to determine what it will present to the public. In this way it can shape what is on the public’s mind. The media, especially the major newspapers and news stations, such as the New York Times, L.A. Times, Washington Post, CNN, Fox News, etc., influence what other news outlets carry as well. When one of the major newspapers presents a story it is often picked up by local newspapers, and the same holds true for the major networks, the news gets broadcast through their affiliates and potentially makes its way to every television set in the country.

Page and Shapiro (1984) went so far as to say that the news reported in the New York Times “ultimately finds it’s way, in diluted form, through other newspapers, magazines, television news, and word of mouth to the general public, and in this way the New York Times may not be a bad indicator of the general thrust of the news that reaches the citizenry. Their article demonstrates the effect that a single major newspaper can have on the rest of the media as well as the general population. Jordan (1993) also found that the content of the New York Times editorials correlated with television commentary indicating that the New York Times news may
drive television agendas. Jordan’s findings indicate that major newspapers can have a significant influence on setting the agenda for what will become popular news and what is considered newsworthy.

Jordan’s New York Times study also found that newspaper articles had a significant correlation with changes in attitudes towards the subject matter that the articles were written about. It is likely that the New York Times itself did not have this impact because a very small percentage of the American population reads the New York Times, as stated before, however, many other newspapers pick up stories printed in the New York Times, as well as network and cable news channels. This potential influence by one publisher has many implications, such as who decides what gets printed?

Soroka 2003 found that mass media plays a significant role in driving public attention to foreign affairs, which indicates that the media can influence what the public becomes interested in. He found that the changing importance of foreign affairs for the public is reflective in large part of the mass media content and that changes in public opinion towards foreign policy can have an impact on policy making. It is important to note, however, that many of those who report on issues where public opinion may affect policy making may not be knowledgeable about the subject of which they are reporting on. This is especially true on complex issues such as immigration. With economic, social, and cultural aspects to consider it is likely that those who are writing the articles that could influence the public are not educated on the issue. With such a politically charged issue, some write articles with an ideological agenda using hot-button terms with the specific intent of changing public opinion toward their ideological preference.

This has important public policy implications because policy makers also use the media to gauge public opinion. The issues that are presented in the media and the manner in which
they are presented can influence policy makers because they may believe that the media is portraying an issue is indicative of public opinion. At the very least policy makers are likely to believe that the media through their portrayals are influencing public opinion thus driving policy makers to adopt policies that they perceive as being what the public wants based on what the media is portraying. This is shown in Yanovitzky’s (2002) study on media effects on policy attitudes and actions: “it suggests that the impact of news coverage on the process of policy making is primarily manifested in the timing and intensity of public response to public problems as well as in the nature of the policy solutions pursued. In other words when public opinion is at its most intense, which the policy makers judge based on media coverage of an issue, policy makers are most likely to pursue policy changes based on public opinion. These policy changes due to their nature of being at the whim heightened public awareness and opinion are likely to be responsive rather than preventive measures used to assuage public opinion and appear to be doing something to correct whatever the perceived problem is.

Due to the relationships that have been found between the mass media and public opinion, it is necessary to look at topics that are on the media’s front burners. Since policy makers respond to the public and the public responds to the media, studying the nature and degree of the media influence on public opinion is crucial (Soroka 2003). It is also important to look at policy implications that stem from public opinion. Due to the fact that the media holds sway over public opinion, it also holds some sway over public policy since policy is often enacted due to perceived public opinion.

**Public Opinion and Immigration Policy**

Public opinion has been shown to have significant impacts on public policy. When the public perceives that there is a problem and their opinion becomes negative, often times there is a response by policy makers to enact policies that will assuage those public fears and turn public
opinion more favorably towards those in power. This is not always the case and much research has been conducted to determine why. These studies generally look at how much public opinion effects policy, whether this changes with the salience of the topic, and how generalizable the findings are. There has been a large amount of attention paid to communication, especially persuasive messages, and according to Payne (2001) persuasion is considered the centrally important mechanism for constructing and reconstructing social facts.

It would be difficult to find someone who believes that public opinion always shapes public policy, but it would be equally difficult to find someone who believes that it never does. Public opinion is likely to effect policies which are especially important to the public, that are relatively simple, and that can be handled by the legislature with straightforward uncomplicated policies. Of course, very few of these issues exist, and many have equally logical arguments from multiple parties, which can make public understanding difficult, though the public may still have a strong opinion. To look at how much public opinion effects policy Burstein (2003) conducted a review of articles published in major journals and literature reviews. He found that in those articles he reviewed that: “Public opinion effects policy three-quarters of the times its impact is gauged, its effect is of substantial public policy importance at least a third of the time, and probably a fair amount more, and issue salience does affect the impact of public opinion on policy (Burstein 2003). Burstein’s findings serve as a jumping off point for looking at the effects of public opinion on immigration policy.

Several studies, as well as anecdotal evidence suggest that public opinion towards immigration, especially illegal immigration, have had impacts on immigration policy. In a exploring the effects of public opinion on immigration policy in Britain, Saggar (2003) states that: “Public attitudes constrain the scope of parties and governments. Certainly, policy
proposals to liberalize areas of immigration policy will be highly circumscribed. Public opinion thus acts as something of an over-arching constraint on policy and political discretion.” Much of this opinion is based on sensationalized accounts of the numbers of immigrants and asylum seekers in Britain. Though the immigrant population in Britain consists of roughly seven percent of the total population, a survey found that citizens of Britain believe this number to be between twenty-five and thirty percent. This misinformation makes it difficult for politicians to make effective policy to appease the population, which also places policy makers in the difficult position of going against public opinion. Thus media influence on public opinion, when it comes to immigration, has placed many policy makers in an untenable situation. On the one hand they need to appease the public and appear to be effectively handling what the public perceives as a national problem, and on the other hand politicians understand from polls and surveys that the public is misinformed about the number of immigrants as well as their impact on the social resources.

In the case of Britain, the immigration issue is even trickier because of the possibility of the European Union taking control of a super-national immigration policy that would affect all member countries. Public opinion could force member countries such as Britain to resist EU attempts at harmonizing immigration policies. This possibility looms large as the more negative attitudes the public has towards immigration, the less likely they are to want international actors holding more power than their own government over immigration. The problem arises because the public may believe that if the EU takes over immigration control issues, then they will no longer have a say because their country’s government would no longer hold final say on what type of immigration policy is enacted.
According to Luedtke (2005) public opinion is pushing against harmonization of immigration policy. He found that there is an effect of the public opinion towards immigrants on public support for harmonization. Those who have more negative attitudes towards immigrants are more likely to reject the idea of policy harmonization. This could stem from the fact that those with lower education tend to have less favorable attitudes towards immigrants and also tend to have a more deep rooted national identity, which would make them less likely to support taking the control of immigration away from their country’s government because they are more likely to have more faith in their government than in the governance of the EU.

Since attitudes towards immigrants and immigration have been shown to be tied to whether one prefers EU handling of immigration or the individual nation-state, it also stands to reason that their attitudes towards immigration and the EU will have an effect on their opinion about the enlargement of the EU. Devreese and Boomgaarden (2005) found that individuals’ negative attitudes towards immigrants led to a lower acceptance of European integration. This has interesting implications for the role of media in influencing public opinion.

With 66-68 percent of the public sharing negative views of immigration, it is likely that the media has aided in portraying immigrants and immigration in a negative light. The effects of public opinion on policy, and in the European case on the acceptance of the EU, the media has a wide range of influence. Thus, a content analysis of newspaper articles is an important step to look at how the media portrays illegal immigration. Illegal immigration is one of the most pressing issues in British politics, and has been placed there primarily because of the media sensationalization of the issue, which has turned it into a publicly perceived “problem.” Turning illegal immigration into a publicly perceived problem has led to policymakers on both sides of
the ideological spectrum to condemn undocumented workers and illegal immigration hoping that rhetoric will be enough to assuage public opinion without being forced into quickly enacting policies have not been fully explored.
CHAPTER 2
METHODS AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

There are several methods used in content analysis research. The method that has been implemented for this project utilizes framing theory. Finnemore and Sikkink (1998) view framing as the central mission of those attempting to persuade an audience to embrace the normative idea they support. Framing is the process that news organizations use to define or construct a political issue or controversy. “By framing social and political issues in specific ways, news organizations declare the underlying causes and likely consequences of a problem and establish a criterion for evaluating potential remedies for the problem (Segvic 2005). Framing is the way in which articles and issues are organized and made sense of.

The underlying assumption of frame analysis is that a frame is a necessary property of text. All texts, regardless of how clear or abstruse they may be, are comprised of packages of integrated idea elements held together by some unifying central concept, called a frame (Gamson & Lasch, 1983). According to Creed et al. (2002) frame analysis is a technique for approaching a text by attending to its diverse idea elements with the following question: What holds these elements together? The goal of frame analysis is understanding how certain idea elements are linked together into packages of meaning, potentially encoded into soundbite-like-signifiers that stand for those packages of meaning, and deployed in texts and/or other forms of media.

According to Pan (1993) framing analysis distinguishes itself from other forms of content analysis in two important ways. First, unlike more traditional approaches to content analysis, framing analysis does not conceive of news texts as psychological stimuli with objective meanings. Instead it recognizes texts as containing organized symbolic devices that will interact with the individual’s memory for meaning construction. Second, it accepts both the assumption of the rule-governed nature of text formation (van Kijk, 1988) and the multidimensional
conception of news texts that will allow for cognitive shortcuts in both news production and consumption.

Newspapers and other media make certain issues more salient and have the ability to put a certain ‘spin’ on what is being reported to lead the reader to see the problem or political issue in a certain light. For example, a newspaper article may state all of the negative aspects of illegal immigration, such as the fact that they are breaking the law by entering without documentation, but not mention the benefits that they provide, such as the economic benefits to corporations from the cheap labor that illegal workers bring. This allows the media to influence public opinion by framing issues in ways that can be either beneficial to immigrants or create greater anti-immigrant sentiment. Van Gorp (2005) explains this relationship as: “the linkage between, on the one hand, the journalistic approach of shaping the news within a frame of reference and according to a latent structure of meaning and, on the other hand, the stimulation of the public to adopt these frames and to view reality from the same perspective as the journalists do.” When the public adopts those frames which the media has presented, the media has exercised its influence over public opinion.

In forming these frames the media has the ability to not only effect the presence or absence of an idea, but can also emphasize one aspect at the expense of others. According to Dimitrova and Stromback (2005) this is subtly done in order to not alienate their audience: “The subtlety of framing is in the way it can construct reality, impact interpretations, and influence the audience responses and opinions toward a particular event after the event enters the public agenda.” In this way framing not only affects the salience of an issue, but also the audience’s perceptions. Political ideology can play a major role in the way an issue is framed, especially an issue as politically charged as illegal immigration.
According to Gamson (1983) for every frame, there is also its opposite. This is important because of the use of the media by various social movements for their causes. This can be seen in looking at different newspapers and is the main reason why this researcher looked at two newspapers that fall on different ends of the ideological spectrum. Anytime there are competing frames from competing news outlets, it is likely that those reading those newspapers already share the ideological views of that particular media outlet. According to Payne (2001) an individual is more likely to accept new claims if they are shown to be similar to already accepted ideas, and this idea of frame resonance potentially explains both the persuasive success of these instruments and their social function in the persuasion process.

Political and professional ideologies are fundamental to the way that information policy problems and dilemmas are perceived and how problems are screened and represented by different stakeholders (Rowlands, et al 2001). Following this reasoning it is likely that there will be different frames employed in the more rightward leaning Daily Telegraph than in the more left leaning Guardian. It is expected that there will be more favorable frames used in the Guardian than in the Daily Telegraph, however, this may be constrained by the fact that there is such negative public opinion towards illegal immigration that there will be less of a difference than an issue that was more evenly divided amongst conservatives and liberals. Because public opinion is very negative towards illegal immigration, it is also expected that overall there will be more negative portrayals of illegal immigrants.

For the purpose of this project there were a total of 212 articles analyzed, 104 from the Daily Telegraph, and 108 from the Guardian. These represent all of the articles concerning illegal immigration in each newspaper from January 1, 2005 through December 31, 2006. These articles were collected through online databases from each newspaper’s Webpage. The term
“illegal immigration” was used to search for articles in the database. Each article returned in the search was read to check the validity of the return to ensure that only articles concerning illegal immigration were examined. This is similar to the method used by Dimitrova and Stromback (2005) for article collection in their data analysis about the framing of the Iraq War.

The articles were coded based on the framing in which illegal immigration was presented. The specific frames found in the articles consisted of: ID Cards (Articles discussing the potential use of national ID cards); United States Illegal Immigration (Articles about the ongoing U.S. debate on Illegal Immigration); Tragedy (Articles describing a tragedy that happened to an illegal immigrant or a group of illegal immigrants); and Racism (consists of articles which describe racist attitudes towards illegal immigrants); Law and Order (Articles concerning law and order approaches to Illegal Immigration); Articles about Other Countries (Articles looking at policies, and outcomes concerning illegal immigration in other countries); Exploitation (Articles portraying illegal immigrants as being exploited); Temporary Workers and Amnesty (Articles concerning proposals on amnesty and temporary workers).
CHAPTER 3
RESULTS

A total of ten themes were used to depict illegal immigration and illegal immigrants. Most of these themes had articles framed negatively, positively, and neutrally, however, there were some which had only one frame, and some with two of the three. The themes consisted of articles on ID cards, U.S. Immigration, illegal immigrant tragedies, illegal immigration and race, Law and Order policies, other countries immigration policies (other than the U.S.), exploitation and human trafficking, temporary workers, amnesty, and current immigration policies and proposals.

Each of the themes listed will be gone over in detail from both newspapers. These breakdowns will show the differences in ideological approaches to immigration, especially illegal immigration and different views on what is in Britain’s best interests. Much of the commentary within these themes follows the ideological reputations of each of the newspapers, with many of the Guardian’s articles being more liberal and many of The Daily Telegraph’s articles being more conservative.

ID Cards

Both the Guardian and Daily Telegraph were critical of the ID cards that Tony Blair and the Labour party have pushed to curb illegal immigration and terrorism. The Guardian had no articles that portrayed ID cards positively, and the Daily Telegraph had only one article framing ID cards in a positive light, which is interesting considering, as will be shown later, the Daily Telegraph was much more likely to take a more anti-illegal immigration stance in many of their articles, and be more concerned with law-and-order immigration policies.

The Guardian was more likely to take a neutral look at ID cards than a negative one. During the period being studied there were eight neutral articles written on ID cards. Neutral
articles were those which took what one could consider a strict reporting of press releases concerning the use of ID cards and the way the government envisions their use or reporting on what other groups are saying about the ID cards. For example, one of the articles reported:

> The home secretary, John Reid, yesterday promised to introduce electronic border controls that will count in and out of the country the 90 million people who travel to Britain each year, but admitted the new system will not be fully running until 2014.

A second article reported the following

> The identity cards bill published yesterday will give the government the legal powers to set up the scheme and charge the fees it needs to recover the costs of enrolment, issuing and maintaining the cards and providing verification services. ID cards are to be introduced on a staged basis. First it will become compulsory for foreign nationals to register under the scheme, then it will be voluntary for UK nationals to register when they renew their passports.

There were also articles reporting on criticisms of the program as well, but these articles were reporting on the criticisms of others and not criticizing the programs themselves, and these were considered to fall into the neutral frame as well.

The Guardian had five articles portraying ID cards in a negative frame. These articles framed the ID cards negatively using civil liberties as the primary concern. One article went so far as to say:

> The government claims that national identity cards will help to counter terrorism, illegal immigration and ID fraud. That's rubbish, says Henry Porter, and in fact there is something much more sinister about them - they will fundamentally alter the relationship between citizen and state, and make slaves of us all

> Imagine handing over the keys to your home when you are out at work to allow some faceless bureaucrat to rifle through your desk and drawers, your photograph albums and children's school reports, your bills and love letters. That is the kind of access they are going to have, and it is going to grow as time goes by and we become accustomed to this unseen presence in our lives.

> Using civil liberties as a frame against ID cards has a powerful message behind it as most people are fond of their civil liberties and are loath to have any perceived infringements on them.
So framing ID cards as removing civil liberties is a useful tool to shape public opinion against ID cards. Using analogies comparing the use of ID cards to someone entering ones home also conjures up very negative connotations, and powerful ones as well considering the value placed on private property in most developed countries.

The Daily Telegraph reported the only positive look at ID cards in our sample. In this article the author attempts to allay fears of state infringement of civil liberties by asserting that “the case for ID cards is a case not about liberty but about the modern world.” This brings to the mind the old phrase “desperate times call for desperate measures.” These desperate times are connected to illegal immigration:

A national identity system will have direct benefits in making our borders more secure and countering illegal immigration…. I also want to see ID cards made compulsory for all non-EU foreign nationals looking for work and when they get a National Insurance number. This will enable us, for the first time, to check accurately those coming into our country, their eligibility to work, for free hospital treatment or to claim benefits.

Similarly to the Guardian the Daily Telegraph had articles reporting on the ID cards in a neutral way. There were a total of seven articles which reported on ID cards in a neutral way, and these were more along the lines of straight reporting as opposed to attempting to evoke the authors’ opinions and thoughts on the subject. These articles tended to report on what others saw as the pros and cons of ID cards and were generally fairly short in length compared to the commentaries that took on an attempt to portray ID Cards in a positive or negative light.

Finally, the Daily Telegraph also had seven articles which framed ID cards in a negative way. The primary thrust of the arguments appeared to be simply that they did not believe that they would work. There was little talk of civil liberties as in the Guardian, and the costs of the project were of a concern as well.

A decision not to proceed with the ID scheme needs to be taken soon, because the start-up costs are beginning to soar. It should have been killed off in Parliament, but Labour MPs, apart from 20 brave souls who rebelled on Second Reading, were either too bovine or too wedded to their party’s spooky authoritarianism.
They were also fed, and swallowed, a good deal of guff about the efficacy of an ID system that, over the years, has been hailed as the answer to illegal immigration, terrorism, crime and benefit fraud.

One article took a different twist on the cost of the cards and attached it to taxes and the negative images of government waste.

At long last, the government has given us a clear and comprehensible justification for introducing identity cards: to levy more money from us. As we report today, ID cards will not be a one-off cost. We shall be expected to pay to update them whenever we change our address or circumstances. And should we neglect to do so, should we, for example, forget to hand in the card of a deceased relative, we shall be subject to gargantuan fines.

This was the opening paragraph of one article, which argues the only reason the government wants to use ID cards is an effort to get more money out of ordinary citizens. It is also important that the author tied this to ordinary citizens rather than people who may purposefully commit fraud; connecting to the potential of any citizen possibly having large fines for simple mistakes creates a sense of the little people versus the government. Knowing that most citizens will make every effort to comply with the law and hanging the threat of potential failure to comply, through no fault of their own, implies that the system is set up against them, and thus stokes the “us against them” flames.

United States Illegal Immigration

There were a surprising number of articles in both newspapers concerning the illegal immigration debate in the United States with a total of fifteen from The Guardian and seventeen from the Daily Telegraph. Most of these articles were neutral, and The Guardian had twice as many positive articles about illegal immigrants and illegal immigration in the U.S. than did the Daily Telegraph. Finally, both newspapers had few negative articles, though it should be noted that the Daily Telegraph had one more negative article four, than positive, three, The Guardian had three times as many positive, six, as negative, two.
The neutral articles in the guardian ranged from those reporting on the protests against a bill passed in the House of Representatives in New York City and Los Angeles to President Bush’s struggle within his own Republican party to best deal with the estimated twelve million illegal immigrants already in the United States. One of the Guardian articles which reported on the protests had this to say:

It is being billed as The Great American Boycott 2006. Tomorrow, international labour day in the US, thousands or perhaps millions of people are expected to join in a nationwide boycott to protest against proposals that would toughen existing immigration laws.

Two of the articles also reported on the split within the Republican Party over illegal immigration and how best to both “seal the boarders” and “process” the large number of illegal immigrants already in the US.

With opinion polls charting a steep decline in support from the conservatives who have been the president's bedrock, Mr Bush promised to deploy as many as 6,000 national guard troops along the 2,000-mile frontier as part of a $1.9bn (£1.01bn) programme to seal off America's border. He also plans to increase the border patrol force.

These neutral articles offered detailed accounts of the current debate and political climate surrounding illegal immigration and illegal immigrants in the U.S.

While the neutral reporting in The Guardian focused on the debate in the US as well as the protests, the neutral articles in the Daily Telegraph focused on conservatives being unhappy with President Bush’s immigration policy, the deployment of U.S. military to the boarder with Mexico, and finally with the civilian groups taking matters into their own hands. While these articles were neutral in their reporting, the articles focused on conservative themes, such as “sealing off the boarders.”

President George W Bush last night sent thousands of troops to the Mexican-US frontier in an eye-catching gesture to tighten border security and raise the morale of his mutinous conservative supporters.
While reporting on them in a neutral way, the articles on civilian groups, such as the Minute Men were, conservative in subject matter, for example:

The Minuteman Project is the brainchild of Chris Simcox, the editor of Tombstone Tumbleweed the newspaper in the town best known for the Gunfight at the OK Corral.

"Our aim is to send a message to Mr. Bush and Congress that they have not listened to the demands of citizens," he said as he deployed teams every few hundred yards along five miles of border. "We are modeling what homeland security should look like. There should be National Guardsmen every 2,000 yards from the Pacific to the Gulf of Mexico. You can't find a greater threat to the US than right here."

While these articles were reported on in a neutral manner, the subject reported on were on the conservative side of the immigration debates, as many of The Guardian articles were written neutrally about liberal themes such as protests supportive of illegal immigrants.

The positive looks of illegal immigration in the United States, from the Guardian, focused on the value of productive labor that the immigrants bring, as well as positive looks at the protests supportive of illegal immigrants. One of the articles posed the question of whether or not the Hispanic community, which the author argues has historically attempted to make itself invisible due to the high number of illegal immigrants, is finally over its “terror.” They argue that the protests are a sign that even the illegal immigrants are tired of hiding in the shadows and being exploited:

Yet that is precisely what the west has been doing - demonizing migrant labourers politically and targeting them legally, even as it depends on them economically. This has made anti-immigration legislation difficult to challenge. Not because migrants are hard to reach - businesses find them easily - but because they are difficult to organize as their fates are vulnerable to the whims of their employers and of the state. The result was a community that, until recently, was hidden in plain sight. A community that had essentially been trying to remain invisible suddenly concluded that their invisibility was only making them more vulnerable.

This exploitation of migrant labor, especially of illegal workers, was a common theme in the portrayals in the Guardian. The argument being that historically the United States has allowed
illegal immigrants into the country to do work that its citizens would not do, at least not for the wages being offered, and exploiting the workers by paying very low wages due to the threat of being deported.

Migrant labourers are crucial to the US economy. Yet xenophobia among a militant minority of the public allied with opportunism among a majority of the politicians has conspired to demonize them. The Minutemen, a vigilante group that started out hunting down illegal immigrants on the border, now targets day labourers. In December, the House of Representatives passed one of the most draconian anti-immigration bills for a generation.

Each of the positive articles in the Daily Telegraph were about the protests supportive of illegal immigrants. They did not focus on the exploitation of immigrants and the protestors attempt to organize to be recognized, but instead were about the “power of immigrants” in general. This power seems, to come solely from the large numbers of protestors, as this is what the articles focused on, for example:

The metropolitan melting pot is home to millions of both legal and illegal immigrants and, although estimates varied wildly, at least 500,000 demonstrators were thought to have taken part in some form of action on Monday.

The articles focused on the political implications of these large numbers of protestors and who would come out on top between the two major political parties in the U.S. The protests were portrayed in a positive light, but they did portray the illegal immigrants themselves in a positive light, they barely mentioned them at all.

One of the two negative articles in the Guardian was not negative towards illegal immigrants or immigration, but instead negative towards policies in the U.S. and towards what the author considered vigilantes patrolling the U.S. boarder. The article was written in a negative tone towards immigration policy in the U.S. however, thus it was considered to have a negative frame. The article argued that individuals who were patrolling the boarder on their own would create problems for the “real” immigration officers:
Hundreds of anti-immigrant activists were gathering in Tombstone, Arizona, yesterday to begin a month-long unofficial patrol of the border with Mexico. To greet them, hundreds of immigrants’ rights activists planned to travel to the desert of Arizona from across the southern US. And caught in the middle, are the thousands of undocumented immigrants who try to cross the border from Mexico each day, and the hundreds of US government border patrol agents who try to stop them.

The second article was negative towards illegal immigrants in the U.S. The author went so far as to say that “everyone thinks they have the right to live in the United States.” The also mentions what she perceives to be a double standard in that the people who expect to be able to enter the U.S. are from countries with strict immigration policies and border control policies, of their own.

The negative articles in The Daily Telegraph looked primarily at the political expediency of President Bush wanting to grant “amnesty” to the existing illegal immigrant population in the US, and of the breaking of the law by people entering into the U.S. illegally. According to one article, the corporations who backed President Bush in his reelection gain too much from illegal immigration for the president, or congress for that matter, to do anything to truly “seal” the boarders:

Immigration across the Rio Grande is too useful to America and, through remittances, too lucrative for Mexico for either side to summon the necessary determination to seal an immensely long, and often harsh, border. Mr. Bush's tinkering should not blind us to the fact that the benefits of the present situation outweigh the disadvantages.

Thus these articles argue that the correct policy would to be to “seal” the boarders, but politicians lack the political will to do this.

The second type of negative articles were those that portrayed those entering into the United States illegally as criminals who deserve to be prosecuted. This ties in with the first type in the sense that there should be more “border control” but these focus on the criminality of illegal immigration rather than on how best to solve the “problem.” These articles use the
“stealing” of jobs from native workers as problematic and argue that border enforcement is the only way to deal with illegal immigrants.

**Tragedy Stories**

There were articles in both newspapers which depicted tragedies involving illegal immigrants. Most of these tragedies involved large groups of illegal immigrants, either attempting to enter a country (some of the articles involved tragedies in other countries) and articles about illegal immigrants being the victim of tragedy when already within their destination country. It is important to note that none of the articles in either of the papers portrayed the victims in a negative light, and generally showed a sympathetic view of the victims.

There were a total of eight articles concerning illegal immigrant tragedies. These articles would all be classified as positive in the sense that they portray the victims in a sympathetic way. These include articles concerning a tragedy involving Africans from Zimbabwe who were attempting to enter into South Africa:

Dite residents told officials they saw the large group try to cross the river, which is currently a raging torrent because of heavy rains. The group held hands to form a human chain, but the surging current swept them away, according to witnesses. Zimbabwe’s state newspaper, the Herald, said the number of dead could be as high as 60. Thousands of desperate Zimbabweans cross the border to South Africa each week, fleeing food shortages, unemployment and state repression, according to human rights groups.

There were two articles concerning this tragedy as well as two concerning an ongoing trial involving a “gangmaster” who is accused of allowing twenty-one Chinese illegal immigrants to die:

Gangmaster Lin Liang Ren, 29, from Liverpool, is accused of 21 counts of manslaughter - which he denies. He is also charged with perverting the course of justice with his girlfriend, Zhao Xiao Qing, and of conspiracy to facilitate illegal immigration. An hour later, the jurors were taken out to watch the tide coming in and covering the sand. They remained on the hovercraft and were shown the Kent and Keer channels and
how the water quickly filled them up and covered the cockle beds.

These articles not only viewed the victims sympathetically, but also showed the “gangmaster” as someone who exploits illegal immigrants and that this exploitation is what led to their deaths. This could also be seen as being positive of illegal immigrants in the sense that they are definitely negative to those who would seek to in some way exploit them.

The Daily Telegraph had articles concerning tragedies involving illegal immigrants as well, though there are fewer of them, six in all. Nearly all of the articles, five in all, were of the story concerning the Chinese immigrants who died at the hands, or due to the neglect, of the “gangmaster.” These articles were similarly negative towards the “gangmaster” and predominantly followed the murder trial of the gangmaster. These articles while sympathetic of the victims were much more likely to be about the trial than the victims themselves:

Some managed to swim to safety or were rescued but at least 21 were drowned," Tim Holroyde, QC, prosecuting, told the jury at Preston Crown Court. "It is the prosecution case that their deaths were caused by the criminal negligence of Lin Liang Ren. He was responsible for them and he completely failed to take proper care for their safety as they worked in the cold and dark."

On the second day of Lin's trial at Preston Crown Court, Timothy Holroyde, QC, prosecuting, summed up the cocklers' predicament as "truly dreadful". He said: "They were far from home and unable to speak sufficient English to summon help, in the cold and dark, with no obvious route back to shore even if they could swim and with the water rising swiftly and inexorably." The tragedy might have been even worse. "Seventy Chinese workers had been due to travel to the bay from Liverpool that night but they had insufficient transport," Mr. Holroyde said. Only Lin's workers made the trip.

The other article concerning an illegal immigrant tragedy was one that did not appear in The Guardian concerning illegal immigrants attempting to enter Spain. These individuals apparently have tried to enter through other countries in more hospitable areas, but have been caught by Algerian or Moroccan authorities and dropped them off on a 140 mile stretch of desert:
They were almost all young men in their twenties from countries as varied as Mali, Cameroon, Congo, Gambia, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Nigeria, Sierra Leone and Senegal. Despite their different origins, they had one experience in common: they had all been rounded up by Moroccan police and abandoned in the desert. Exhausted, some sick and all suffering from hunger, they also had one common goal: to reach Oujda without being caught by the police. There they can continue their journey to Europe and join the ranks of what Spain regards as an invading army of illegal migrants, or beat a retreat and head home via Algeria. All feared that, if caught before Oujda, they would be returned to the desert where dozens of their fellow travelers are believed to have perished. All were survivors of a mass expulsion of immigrants heading towards Europe that Moroccan security forces began a week ago.

Racism

There were thirteen articles concerning racism in the Guardian and all of them took an anti-racist view, and many of them associated the politics of the Tory Party as well as the British National Party (BNP). Most of the articles were concerned with the potential immigration policies if the Tory Party were to return to power and the use of fear of other races as part of their campaigning strategy. In contrast there was only one article in The Daily Telegraph concerning racism, and its main concern was that there was a fear of the police to be accused of being racist and thus preventing them from profiling based on race.

Seven of the thirteen articles concerning race in The Guardian contained references to negative tactics by the Tories and BNP towards immigration policies and associated their views of immigration as having racial undertones.

"Asylum and immigration" are the public words that tell of unspoken passions on race, Britishness, Islam and other things winked and nudged at in "Are you think what we're thinking?"

Many Australians watching the current campaign in the UK are wondering how low Crosby will go. For a start, he's employing the same script as in the Australian election of 2001. He suggested that Australia was being "invaded" by illegal refugees and asylum seekers who were said to have direct links with terrorism.

The far-right British National party is claiming that Africans are being paid up to £50,000 to move into its number one target seat to protect the majority of a government minister. The party has poured activists from the south of England, Scotland and Northern Ireland into Barking, the east London seat that the children's minister, Margaret Hodge, holds with a 9,500 majority. Voters are being canvassed by 50- to 60-strong teams of BNP activists and targeted with a series of inflammatory leaflets.
These articles present a picture of conservative politics in Britain using race and connecting race and ethnicity to being “British” in an effort to gain and advantage in their elections. This extreme form of nationalism and its effective use implies that there are people who this tactic will work on. This is not likely the target audience of The Guardian and thus it is interesting to show how they use this connection being made by the more conservative parties between race and immigration to look at the opposition parties negatively.

There was also an interesting article looking at the fact that the Tory party’s choice for Prime Minister. Michael Howard was the son of an immigrant himself. They question why this is not brought up considering the party’s rhetoric against the then current immigration policies and a desire to make immigration more difficult. The article also accuses Howard of using race as a way to galvanize people around making immigration more difficult, especially for asylum seekers who often arrive from African and Middle Eastern countries.

The rest of the articles were centered around the need for illegal immigrants as part of maintaining a certain standard of living, and that most attempts to prevent immigration or illegal immigrants were due to racist and/or nationalistic ideologies:

Have you ever thought about what Britain would look like if the effects of postwar migration were suddenly reversed? Tellingly, most of parliament, our corporate boardrooms and newspaper editorial meetings would look much the same. But quite how these people would get to work, as public transport in most major cities stalled and minicabs became scarce is another matter.

Economically, without the huge pool of cheap labour emanating from the developing world, documented or not, we simply could not function as we do at present. Politically, if Britain's last election campaign is anything to go by, without scapegoating and marginalizing that same pool of labour it appears our political culture would be unable to function. So we are left despising the very people on whom we depend, and immigrants are left with the worst of all worlds - economically exploited and socially demonized. Vulnerable to unscrupulous employers, opportunistic politicians and racist hatemongers, they work simply to exist in a place where their very existence has become an affront.
These articles focused primarily on the exploitation of illegal immigrants not only in their labor but as using them as political pawns in power struggle between the Labour and Tory parties. This “double bind” leaves illegal immigrants and even guest workers in the predicament of being fearful of not only being exploited but of being ignored by the only people with the ability to help them, namely the British government.

The lone article overtly talking about race in the Daily Telegraph was concerning the author’s belief in the need for ethnic/racial profiling. The author believed that the police were fearful of being called racist and thus were not doing their job effectively when dealing with minorities:

The fight against terrorism is being hampered because a growing number of police officers are reluctant to stop and search suspects of foreign appearance, a Police Federation leader said yesterday…officers were often reluctant to challenge foreign-looking people for fear of attracting racism complaints which might threaten their career.

In the authors view the reluctance of police to appear racist has hampered the ability of Britain to protect itself from a number of problems, illegal immigration, terrorism, and crime in general.

**Law and Order**

Issues concerning law and order immigration policies comprised, by far, the largest single theme for both newspapers with a total of thirty articles concerning law and order in The Guardian and forty-eight in The Daily Telegraph. It is important to note that there was not a single negative article concerning law and order approaches in the Daily Telegraph while there were eleven in The Guardian. There were only five positive articles about law and order tactics and policies in The Guardian, whereas there were forty positive articles in The Daily Telegraph. Finally, there were fourteen neutral articles in The Guardian and Eight in The Daily Telegraph.

The negative articles in The Guardian primarily revolved around incidents in detention centers that the authors felt were a direct result of law and order policies, and negative views of
using law and order policies for “controlling boarders.” There were a series of problems exposed in detention centers where those who were denied amnesty or otherwise caught in Britain illegally were sent pending deportation. There were several articles about the detention center Harmondsworth where poor conditions led to a “riot” by those in detention.

The prison inspection team says it had serious concerns over the way Harmondsworth was run by United Kingdom Detention Service, with 44% of detainees reporting they had been victimized by staff and 60% saying they felt unsafe in the centre. More than 2,000 failed asylum seekers and illegal migrants pass through Harmondsworth each year and those interviewed by the prison inspectors described the custody officers as "aggressive", "intimidating", "rude" and "unhelpful", especially towards those who could not speak English.

These articles were highly critical of the conditions faced by those detained at Harmondsworth and there were similar articles concerning the use of “gangmasters” which are licensed by the state. These “gangmasters” are sanctioned to work with immigrants in areas such as agriculture and fishing where immigrants are typically housed on-site. While the Gangmasters Licensing Act (due to come into force next month) was debated in the aftermath of the Morecambe Bay tragedy and a crackdown was carried out against illegal Chinese immigration, gang-labour exploitation continued. Now Polish workers are working under similar conditions to the Chinese. Led by Polish gangmasters, the workers, with no experience at sea, confide that the worst thing about the work is the lack of safety. Nothing has changed.

These articles were also very negative towards the fishing industry which employed and profited from the use of migrant workers and “gangmasters.”

There were also articles concerning policy and debate which The Guardian viewed negatively. The main argument concerned the general elections where authors from The Guardian felt that the Labour party was being drawn “rightward” by the more conservative Tory party as well as the NBP.

The very fact that the Labour government is about to announce a package of detailed immigration policies will be enough to put the wind up some of its supporters. Nothing that Charles Clarke can say today will dispel some of these critics' suspicions
that, merely by addressing the immigration question at all, the government is pandering to a rightwing agenda set by the tabloid press - and worse. The fact that the tempo is so obviously being set by a Conservative party that seems unable to get electoral traction any other way only strengthens these concerns.

The idea that the debate on immigration was being dragged to the right was a common theme even in The Guardian articles concerning race.

The neutral law and order articles concerned mainly reporting of stories with law and order themes without giving them a positive or negative “spin.” These were articles where the author was reporting rather than attempting to change opinion. Many of these had to do with announcements from the government or the political parties concerning policies and potential policies concerning immigration, such as a report by the government that there would be an addition 400 officers assigned to locate illegal immigrants. While this may be a law and order approach to dealing with illegal immigrants it was not portrayed positively or negatively by the author. Another interesting article described a new way the government was considering deporting illegal immigrants or those denied asylum:

Britain is to take part in a plan to organize joint charter flights to deport illegal immigrants across Europe, the home secretary, Charles Clarke, confirmed yesterday. Interior ministers from France, Germany, Italy, Spain and the UK, agreed to organize charter flights that will pick up illegal migrants in each country before flying them home. The scheme will effectively set up a discrete charter airline, already dubbed "migrant-air", that will cut the cost of deportations and reduce the need to send those being deported back home on commercial airlines.

Though they were fewer, neutral articles from The Daily Telegraph were similar in that they mainly concerned policy announcements from the various political parties during the election and various statements made by the government concerning reports on the number of illegal immigrants and government reports concerning illegal immigration or immigration in general. Almost half of the articles reported on a new law that would allow businesses to be fined for employing illegal immigrants, for example:
According to The Sunday Telegraph, John Reid, the Home Secretary, is considering tougher sanctions on directors whose companies give work to the estimated 570,000 foreigners illegally in Britain.

A new Immigration and Asylum Bill, the fourth since 1997, aims to make it easier to penalize firms, gangmasters and employment agencies which knowingly employ large numbers of illegal immigrants. They face a criminal prosecution resulting in a two-year prison sentence.

There were five articles in The Guardian which were considered pro law and order. These articles generally argued that there needed to be more done in order to prevent illegal immigrants from entering, and that due to current policies it is easier in Britain to gain entry and stay illegally than in most Western countries. These articles while not critical of illegal immigrants were critical of policies that did little to prevent people from overstaying visas and of the policy that enables people from more countries to enter without a visa:

The UK has the most generous visa arrangements of any western developed country, a situation that could aid illegal immigration, the conference heard. Britain demands visas for visitors from 104 countries, compared with 132 for most other European countries, 158 for the US and 161 for Australia.

"The UK knows perfectly well it will bring more illegal immigrants, but it wants to cling to its relationships with its former colonies," he said. Passport holders from rich nations faced the fewest restrictions. Dr Neumayer said the study showed that rich countries systematically use visa restrictions to keep out visitors from countries that are poor, undemocratic and experience violent conflict. At the same time, citizens from those richer countries are enjoying much better access to poorer countries.

These articles talk much less about what is traditionally thought of as “border security” such as an increase in the number of officers dedicated to removing illegal immigrants, these were mainly concerned with how illegal immigrants enter the country rather than how to remove them or any negative implications of having a large population of illegal immigrants.

The Daily Telegraph on the other hand viewed law and order very positively and authors openly supported the more conservative policies of the Tories and often heavily criticized the Labour party for being lax on immigration, particularly illegal immigration. One of the more
interesting frames was that while the Guardian viewed the debate moving rightward, The Daily Telegraph viewed it as “coming together.”

In many ways, the policies of the two major parties are coming together. After presiding over record levels of immigration, the Government intends to introduce a points-based system next year that will seek to attract only those who make a positive contribution to the economy while effectively shutting the door to low-skilled workers from outside the EU.

Whereas The Guardian saw this change in the Labour party moving to more restrictive policies as a negative, one author in The Daily Telegraph saw the move by the Tories of dropping the idea for making the reunification of families more difficult, as a positive step towards compromise.

There was also a great deal of ridicule by authors in The Daily Telegraph that the British government does not know how many illegal immigrants are in Britain. One of the Home Office employees made a statement that he was unsure how many illegal immigrants were in Britain, and the Daily Telegraph ridiculed the office and the Labour party for being “clueless” on illegal immigration, and finally all but accused the Home Office of lying during the election after the government finally did release estimates concerning the number of illegal immigrants in Britain:

The number of illegal immigrants living in Britain could be as high as 570,000 or as low as 310,000, the government said yesterday when it published the first official figures on the subject. The Home Office report follows Tony Blair’s insistence during the election campaign that it was impossible to provide an estimate. Interviewed on Newsnight during the campaign he refused to give a precise figure, despite being pressed 18 times by Jeremy Paxman to do so.

The majority of articles were critical of the Labour party and Tony Blair over immigration policy and not deporting illegal immigrants in a timely manner. They argued that illegal immigrants were lost track of and that the government outright ignored tips concerning illegal immigrants:
The Home Office was accused last night of ignoring tip-offs about illegal migrants working in the black economy. Employment agencies said they had told the Immigration Service of people with false papers but it took no action.

Several articles seemed to revel at what their authors perceived as incompetence on the part of the Home Office:

In most weeks, the news that the Home Office had accidentally repealed an extremely important law would have caused quite a stir. Yesterday, however, the fact that it may now be perfectly legal to carry a forged passport, because of yet another blunder by this most chaotic department of state, made only a short item on page six of my edition of The Daily Telegraph. We have all become so used to tales of monstrous incompetence - dangerous criminals lost without trace, no attempts made to trace illegal immigrants or to enforce deportation orders - that we greet each new instance of bungling with a weary shrug: "Oh, well, it's New Labour's Home Office. What do you expect?"

While most of the articles were highly critical of Labour, there were a couple of articles that supported the efforts of Tony Blair, which seems to indicate that he had capitulated to the conservative movement towards greater isolationism, at least in isolating Britain from the poorer and more unskilled immigrants of the world.

**Other Countries Immigration Policies**

There were many articles in both newspapers which looked at immigration policies in other countries in either negative or neutral ways, none of the articles reflected positive frames of immigration policies in other countries. Both newspapers had an equal number of both negative and neutral articles with six neutral articles and six negative articles in The Guardian and five neutral and six negative articles in The Daily Telegraph. There were differences between the two newspapers on why they portrayed various policies negatively, and on the type of neutral articles they published.

The Guardian’s negative articles usually looked at the law and order type approaches to immigration policies. Most of the articles looked at a plan to deport large numbers of illegal immigrants or to increase border security instead of offering increased immigration as a way of
combating illegal immigration. The authors seemed to take the view that the best way to prevent illegal immigration is to expand existing immigration so that those entering the country would no longer be considered illegal. For example, they were highly critical of a French raid on an abandoned building known for housing both illegal and legal African immigrants:

Up to 1,000 squatters, including 200 children, many from Ivory Coast, Mali and Senegal, were crammed into 300 small student rooms with improvised wiring, poor sanitation and damp. But only half were asylum seekers or illegal immigrants. The rest had legal status to remain in France but, support groups said, they could not find housing because of racism and discrimination.

As shown in this article, the authors imply race as a motivating factor, and they do this in other articles looking at policies or crackdowns in other countries. For example, one article looked at Spain’s guest worker program and argued that while Spain was increasing their guest worker program they were offering the visas to non African countries, which is where the majority of their illegal immigration originates from.

Spain is to hire 180,000 immigrants in their countries of origin next year in an effort to stem illegal immigration while satisfying its demand for cheap labour. But just 75 people will be recruited from Senegal, from where thousands of migrants set sail this year in packed wooden fishing boats for the Canary Islands - many drowning in the attempt… But he said it was hard to make a case for recruiting in sub-Saharan Africa. “It's much further, integration is more difficult and businesses want the easiest solution," he said.

Of the six negative articles in The Daily Telegraph there were actually two which frowned upon the law and order approach to dealing with illegal immigrants by other countries. One of these was a look at the idea percolating in Australia concerning using armed “prison” type ships to detain and hold illegal fishermen also referred to as “boat people.” The article refers to the use of boats to send the original “settlers” of Australia, criminals from Britain and argues that Australia is looking to it’s “convict origins.”
There were also negative articles concerning a lack of law and order policies in other countries. They were particularly harsh concerning Spain, arguing that they would be releasing 1,500 illegal immigrants into Europe:

But, under its liberal immigration laws, illegal migrants can be held for a maximum of 40 days. If officials then fail to establish their nationality, or discover that they come from a country such as Mali which has no repatriation agreement with Spain, they must be released. Most illegal arrivals will therefore have to be set free, officials said. Once released on the Spanish mainland, the migrants can make their way through continental Europe because of the border-free Schengen zone.

Unlike The Guardian, The Daily Telegraph published articles critical of Frances immigration policies, not because they were too harsh, but because they were too lenient, and they portrayed the squatters that were evicted, which was mention in one of The Guardian articles, as being a blight on the French government. They were a blight, not because of how the government treated them, but because there were so many illegal immigrants involved that the author believed should not have been there to begin with.

The six neutral articles in The Guardian and five neutral articles in The Daily Telegraph were similar in their reporting. The neutral articles of both newspapers, focused mainly on France and Spain. They focused on the upcoming elections in France and the center-right candidate who wants stronger border controls throughout Europe, and the more liberal Spanish government which granted amnesty to over 700,000 illegal immigrants. One of the articles in The Guardian reported on a speech given by Nikolas Sarkozy the center-right candidate in France criticizing the amnesty by Spain’s government:

France and Spain have become embroiled in a row over immigration after the French interior minister, Nicolas Sarkozy, criticized the Spanish government for an immigration amnesty that saw 580,000 foreigners receive work and residency papers last year. Mr. Sarkozy, who is expected to fight for France’s presidency on a centre-right ticket next year, said the socialist government of the Spanish Prime Minister, José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero, had been encouraging illegal immigrants to breach Europe’s frontiers.
While The Daily Telegraph did not report on the back and forth between France and Spain concerning Spain’s amnesty, they did report on policies put forth by Sarkozky concerning illegal immigrants in France:

Nicolas Sarkozy, France's interior minister and presidential hopeful, has unveiled tougher rules on immigration, making it easier to expel foreign workers or those refusing to integrate. Immigrants applying for lengthy stays would have to respect a list of obligations as part of a new "contract of welcome and integration". These include learning French and actively looking for a job.

It is interesting to note that the neutral articles of The Guardian focused mainly on amnesty in Spain, a human interest story in France and the spat between the two countries, The Daily Telegraph’s articles focused mainly on the law and order policies of France and the amnesty in Spain.

**Exploitation of Illegal Immigrants**

Exploitation of illegal immigrants was much more prevalent in The Guardian, twelve articles, than in The Daily Telegraph which had only two articles. These articles concerned the exploitation of workers ranging from working in the agricultural sectors to the sex trade in Britain. These articles placed illegal immigrants in a sympathetic light, which is likely why there were so many more articles in The Guardian than The Daily Telegraph.

Three of the articles in The Guardian looked at the sex trade and the exploitation of women by human trafficking in Britain. These articles were pressing for the government to take a more law and order approach to the problem, though this is difficult because many of the women enter the country legally, lured by individuals claiming to be hiring officials and getting the women work papers. Once in country however, they find that their lives and bodies are no longer their own:

In a disturbing picture of the violence suffered by the women, some of whom are as young as 15, officers have accounts of them being raped, threatened, stripped of
passports and forced into underground brothels on arrival in the UK. Many have been
tempted to the UK by promises of a lucrative summer job; others have come after
trafficking gangs posing as employment agencies insisted their parents sign consent
forms to permit them to travel.

These articles show these women sympathetically and recognize the difficulty of ending the
problem since many do enter legally.

While there were three articles concerning the sex trade, there were nine articles
concerning the exploitation of workers. These mainly focused on big businesses knowingly
employing illegal immigrants primarily for cheap labor. The main problem being that illegal
immigrants do not have any protection under the law since they are in the country illegally.
They have the choice to be exploited by businesses or to face deportation. They cannot go to the
government for assistance, and big businesses, especially in agriculture, fishing and construction
rely on this fear of deportation as a way to control their workers:

The companies most likely to employ illegal migrants are also the ones most
likely to fiddle their tax and national insurance, drive people round the countryside in
dangerous vehicles, ignore employment rights and undercut the minimum wage.
Although illegal workers are the most vulnerable, few of these employers only employ
illegals. Their exploitation is shared by legal migrants and the most vulnerable people
from the British workforce.

Many of the articles pushed for equal rights for all workers regardless of their
immigration status. The argument being that no matter what ones visa status workers should all
have equal rights. These articles also point to the violence both physical and psychological that
both illegal and legal immigrants must deal with because of their precarious positions in low-
skill jobs which the individual is generally easily replaced:

Supermarkets, catering chains and processing plants are accused of allowing a
system dependent on subcontracted labour to continue which permits not only abuse and
underpayment of foreign workers, but also identity fraud, large-scale tax avoidance,
crime and violence. Most important of all, several months of in depth interviews with
illegal migrant workers show how vulnerable they are to exploitation, intimidation and
abuse.
The two articles in The Daily Telegraph also portrayed exploitation of illegal immigrants negatively and the victims sympathetically. One of the articles focused on child slavery, and the other was a story of a pastor who paid “slave wages” to illegal immigrant builders. While the story on child slavery portrayed the victims, in a sympathetic light, the other story focused more on the pastor and the illegality of his actions rather than looking at the workers in a more sympathetic way, an example from the article concerning the pastor:

The leader of a newly-formed evangelist church was preparing to face his congregation last night to explain why he illegally shipped a group of African workers into Britain so that they could help build his house on "slave wages."

The story on child slavery portrayed the children positively and their smugglers as “ruthless” and described how parents often paid the smugglers taking their children because they believed they were going to live a better life.

The victims are smuggled into Britain or brought in on false passports by adults posing as relatives. They are put to work immediately, live in appalling conditions and are subjected to physical and sexual abuse.

The article also places blame on the government for not doing enough to tackle the problem, and for the lax enforcement of border security as well as for punishing the children by deporting them, oftentimes leading to them being smuggled into the country once again.

**Temporary Workers and Amnesty**

This category concerning temporary workers and amnesty was the theme with the fewest number of articles. There were three positive, and two neutral in The Guardian, and one positive one neutral, and two negative in The Daily Telegraph for a total of nine articles. This was also the most specific theme, while others, such as the articles concerning exploitation varied on the topics covered within the theme, these were very specific. It is also important to note that there
were no negative articles concerning guest workers or amnesty in The Guardian, while there were two negative articles in The Daily Telegraph.

The positive articles in The Guardian included one looking at temporary workers and two looking at potential amnesty for illegal immigrants. The article about temporary workers focused mainly on immigrants from Poland looking for work and because of Poland’s entrance into the EU potential workers can now enter freely. However, because they are not British citizens, they do not qualify for any benefits, even homeless shelters turn them away because of their status:

But recent Polish immigration has also caused a range of problems, perhaps mostly poignantly for Poles themselves. "We help a lot of Poles who sleep rough in London when they first arrive," says Jan Moktzycki, president of the Federation of Poles in Great Britain. "If a newly arrived Pole tries to check into a homelessness shelter they will be told that they cannot stay because they are not allowed to receive benefits, which includes staying in a shelter. I think that is inhumane."

These workers are referred to as temporary workers because they are expected to return to Poland in a relatively short period of time because of the lack of government support. The theory goes that if people are not helped by the government, then they will not be able to maintain manageable standard of living and send money back to family members, and thus they will likely return. Of course this is a rather cynical view and one could also argue that they are simply attempting to save enough money to provide a higher standard of living in their home country.

The articles concerning amnesty focused on immigrants creating a new life in Britain. They would no longer have to work in the shadows and be exploited by employers who take advantage of their illegal status through low wages and poor working conditions. The concern is also about the contribution that illegal immigrants make to the economy. They provide labor for wages far below what national citizens would earn.
Any new system will not work if no action is taken to address the issue of people already working in Britain undocumented or in breach of immigration conditions. The sheer numbers involved make it obvious that any proposal to deport them all is simply impractical. Some badly paid sectors of the economy would be facing labour shortages if this were to be attempted.

The lone positive article in The Daily Telegraph was concerning temporary workers. This article notes that while borders may be open for travel, countries have no obligations to allow people entering the country to work within those borders. However, the article talks about Britain being one of only three countries in the EU to open it’s workplace up to Easter European countries like Poland. All other countries place barriers to work or strict quotas on the number of workers from Easter European countries, however as the reporter notes those barriers must come down by 2010 and Britain likely has a distinct advantage when this happens because:

By opening their borders from the start, it seems reasonable to assume that Britain, Ireland and Sweden have landed the cream of the new member states' crop - the workers with the most get up and go, the best English language skills, and those who want to make an honest go of their new lives.

Both of the neutral articles in The Guardian looked at temporary workers. These articles mainly gave demographics concerning which of the new EU countries these workers were coming from, the types of jobs they were entering into and totals for the number of new immigrant workers. For example this Guardian article states that:

The latest figures also show that by June this year, a total of 447,000 eastern Europeans had registered to work in Britain since May 2004 when Poland and seven other mainly former communist states joined the European Union. Most have come from Poland - 264,000 - and more than 82% are young, aged 18 to 34, with no dependents.

The neutral article in The Daily Telegraph looked at amnesty for illegal immigrants. This article gave estimates as to how many illegal immigrants would be given, and the reasons that those who are backing amnesty are giving for granting amnesty. The author notes a report from the
government stating how much extra revenue would be generated through taxes paid by newly
legalized workers, as well as the cost of deporting illegal immigrants:

Britain's 500,000 illegal immigrants should be granted an "amnesty" and allowed to apply for work permits in a move that would net around £1 billion a year for the Treasury in extra taxes... The bill for deporting each immigrant, based on the cost of enforced removal of asylum seekers, would be £11,000 per individual, meaning a total bill of £4.7 billion.

The sole negative article was in The Daily Telegraph and dealt with amnesty as well. This article looks at the perceived consequences of amnesty. For example the author argues there would be anger from other EU countries because once the illegal immigrants were made citizens they could freely enter other EU countries. The article uses this quote that sums up one of the authors main arguments against amnesty:

"It will not solve the problem; it will make it worse. It is an active incentive for people to come here illegally." David Davis, the shadow home secretary, said: "With our borders so badly protected, even speculating about an amnesty is highly irresponsible. An amnesty could lead to a massive, uncontrolled increase in the numbers coming here."
CHAPTER 4
CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

The primary expectation from the beginning of this project was that since public opinion towards illegal immigrants in Britain was predominantly negative, then the articles printed in popular newspapers would be negative as well. Since it was shown that public opinion is affected by newspaper articles, especially for salient issues that the public is already aware of, such as illegal immigration, it was expected that the number of negatively framed articles would outnumber the number of articles that were framed in a more understanding light. The term understanding is used as apposed to using the word “positive” to describe the articles that were not framed negatively because those articles though not framed negatively, did not attribute positive aspects to illegal immigration. The articles portrayed a more humanistic or understanding framing of illegal immigrants and the exploitation and tragedy that they face. The best light that illegal immigrants were portrayed in was as victims, either of exploitation or tragedy, but very rarely even in those circumstances were they ever truly “positively” portrayed.

While there were less negatively framed articles than anticipated, the differences between the newspapers were more in line with expectations. The Guardian in particular was in line with expectations, with negatively framed articles representing only 17 percent of the total sampled, and positively framed articles represented 49 percent of the total, with the remaining 34 percent being neutral. It was not surprising to find that there were nearly three times as many positively framed articles than negatively framed articles in The Guardian since the Guardian is considered a more politically left leaning newspaper.

The findings for the Daily Telegraph were also in line with expectations, with 58 percent of all articles being framed negatively, and only 12.5 percent of the articles were framed in a more positive, or understanding way. The remaining 29.5 percent were considered neutral. This
is a larger difference than that found in The Guardian with almost five times more negative articles than positive.

One explanation for this higher proportion is that The Daily Telegraph staff views illegal immigration as more of a “problem” that The Guardian views it as a situation to be sympathized with. Another explanation would be that The Daily Telegraph is simply a more political newspaper than The Guardian, or that The Guardian is more subtle in their reporting, thus using less opinion and more statistical information and quotations of government officials to make articles appear more neutral. The fact that there was an election in 2005 likely played a role in the number of articles in each of the newspapers, as well as why there were more neutral articles in The Guardian than in The Daily Telegraph. If The Daily Telegraph is a more political newspaper than The Guardian, then it is understandable that there would be fewer neutral articles and a larger difference between the number of articles sympathetic to illegal immigration and those that portrayed it in a more negative light. Though this is somewhat contradicted by the fact that immigration, illegal or otherwise, is a very hot button issue and there were more articles total in the sample from The Guardian than The Daily Telegraph.

One of the more interesting findings was that there were thirteen articles in The Guardian looking at racism in the public discourse on illegal immigration, while there was only one in The Daily Telegraph. Each of the articles in The Guardian decried the use of what they often referred to as “race baiting” by the conservative parties when attempting to gather support for their anti-immigration rhetoric. On the other hand the only article in The Daily Telegraph discussing race was more concerned that the police would not do their jobs properly for fear of being called racist. These are very different views of the importance of race in the immigration debate and show the differences in ideologies between the newspapers.
Along similar lines, the differences between the newspapers on policy issues, especially those of “border enforcement” and deportation. Articles concerning law and order policies and approaches represented almost half of all the articles in The Daily Telegraph sample, and forty of the forty-eight articles framed these policies in a positive way, eight were framed in a neutral way, and none of the articles framed law and order approaches in a negative light. On the other hand there were thirty articles in The Guardian representing less than thirty percent of the total, and of those articles only five framed these policies in a positive light, where eleven framed them in a negative way. These differences, once again display their ideological differences between the newspapers in the political realm.

Illegal immigration is such an important topic that there needs to be further research done on its portrayal in the media. A larger sample of articles would likely be beneficial, perhaps spanning over a two year period, or during a non-election year to mediate the political effect of an election on everyday portrayal of illegal immigrants in the media. This could possibly provide a more representative sample of what is “normally” represented in the media without the politically charged atmosphere of an impending election.
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