Luiza-Maria Filimon

"'They met with a bunch of migrants in Calais…': Reviewing the Use of Dog Whistles in the Tory Discourse Surrounding Immigration"

There are many underlying causes that have put the United Kingdom on the path to leave the European Union (EU): some of them are economical (austerity) and technological (microtargeting) in nature, others can be traced to an embryonary Euroscepticism built into the very fabric of the accession process to the EU, but above all else, the Brexit would not have been possible without being endorsed by mainstream vectors. In this case, the main architect and chief enabler being the Conservative Party. While UKIP may have overseen the campaign to stoke nationalist fears prior to the referendum, the Conservative Party had also engaged in a discriminatory rethoric often times framed as appeals towards strengthening the national economy or the security of the state. After all why entertain the prospects of a potential Brexit if there was no "probable cause" to undertake such an initiative to begin with? The refugee crisis from 2015 exemplified such practices: while Prime Minister Cameron promised that "UK will fulfill its moral obligations" (Sparrow 2015), Home Secretary Theresa May talked about how the asylum policy in place at that time was flawed given that it was seen to be in the service of those she described as "[the] wealthiest, the luckiest and the strongest" (*BBC News* 2015). Rebordering efforts were soon to follow: the one kilometer long and four-metre high Calais border wall was completed in December 2016 even though the refugee camp from the region had already been dismantled prior to the construction of the security barrier. The article examines the discursive framing on immigration employed by the Conservative Party in the period leading to the referendum and afterwards as well as the extent to which the party engaged in dog whistle politics in light of the party's voter base views on immigration. Finally, it takes into account the material effects (rebordering) such discourses can have on policy-making.