IMMIGRATION IN CURRENT POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Jarmila Androvičová[*]

RESUME
The article introduces the discursive analysis as a fruitful method within the study of social and political processes. Using the example of current situation in the area of international migration we try to show how this method can provide the critical questioning of certain premises taking for granted in current political and academic discourse. In the first part we describe the concept of discourse and the method of discursive analysis in general, and later we try to find the historical roots of the current political discourses about migration that dominated the political and public sphere in the second half of the 20th century. At the same time we try to outline certain significant changes the political discourse referring to migration has passed through these decades. Several remarks are made in the conclusion comparing the situation in the Western Europe and in our social context.

Key words: *political discourse, discursive analysis, immigration, nationalism*

RESUME
Článok predstavuje analýzu diskurzu ako prínosnú metódu skúmania sociálnych a politických procesov. Na príklade súčasnej situácie v oblasti medzinárodnej migrácie sa pokúšame ukázať akým spôsobom môže táto metóda prispieť ku kritickému zvažovaniu premís, ktoré sú v súčasnom politickom i akademickom diskurze považované za samozrejmé. V prvej časti popisujeme koncept diskurzu a metódu diskurzívnej analýzy vo všeobecnosti, v ďalšej časti sa pokúšame nájsť historické korene súčasných politických diskurzov o migrácii, ktoré dominovali v politickej a vo verejnej sfére v druhej polovici 20. storočia. V článku tiež poukazujeme na niektoré dôležité zmeny, ktorými politický diskurz týkajúci sa migrácie prešiel v posledných desaťročiach. V závere sa stručne porovnávame situáciu v Západnej Európe a v našom spoločenskom kontexte.

Kľúčové slová: *politický diskurz, diskurzívna analýza, imigrácia, nacionalizmus*

---

[*] Mgr. Jarmila Androvičová, is an Assistant Lecturer at the Department of Political Sciences, Faculty of Political Sciences and International Relations, Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica, e-mail: jarmila.androvicova@umb.sk.

Introduction

Words are the acts. As demonstrates pointedly J.L. Austin in his book „How to do things with words" (Austin, 2004). Words form the concepts and concepts reshape and construct social and political reality. It is not completely the truth that things that do not have name do not exist, but it is the truth that way in which the thing is labelled gives it its unique, special being. It juxtaposes the named object to certain position in relation with the surrounded objects. It ranges it somewhere. It ranges it thanks to the power and to the system of power, it is bestowed the capacity to create and reproduce power - the power hidden in the pronounced and as well as coming from the pronounced. To familiarise with a new word, new term, is a big change in the life of a man and society. Something new emerges, something that (seemed to) not exist before. And so it is with the so called „immigration problem".

In literature and in academic discourse, we can often find the references to the fact that there are different forms of migration, qualitatively different patterns of movement of people that can be named „migration". Despite this real diversity, we can observe the forming of certain common, probably more intuited than defined, associations of the term „immigration". The term becomes so frequent and used for designation of exact and concrete forms of the immigration process, that in certain politically relevant discourses, it nearly merges with them. In the European, Western political discourses, its „pure" form as the „immigration", „immigrants" is more likely to be identified with the immigration of culturally different people from the less developed countries of the world to the countries developed with an advanced democracy and functioning economy. In the terms of S. Castles it is „the immigration from the poor South to the wealthy North" (Castles, 2003). Nowadays, we could claim that when we pronounce the term „immigration", it is like we would pronounce also the term „immigration problem". The attention devoted to the problem tells us that the extent of the problem is considerable and profound.

This is the relevant aspect that is emphasized by the so called social constructivist approach to the social problems. Social problem does not exist unless it is perceived as a problem in the discourse. The construction of phenomenon as a social problem needs certain conditions to be fulfilled, the common definition of the phenomenon as a social problem has to be constructed. Migration and immigration, as anthropologists emphasize, are the natural components of functioning of human societies. Why then nowadays,

certain forms of immigration are conceptualised as a social problem and others are not? What is the way they are conceptualised and what intentions stand behind. Are these intentions influenced by the dynamics of power struggle? Is it possible to append these intentions to the concrete subjects or are they explicable by some abstract social structures or forces? These are some of the questions the scientists following the so called discursive analysis tend to ask.

Discourse and discursive analysis

So we can tell that there is a common interest in studying the objects and processes within the social constructionist perspective and within the so called discourse analysis. However, there is one important difference. While social constructivists are focusing on description of the process of social construction of the phenomenon, the scientists following the discursive analysis try to explain the reasons and causes of establishment of certain discourses (concerning the constructed social problem) as dominant. Usually their aim is to explain the power intentions standing behind the processes of social construction. So, the subjects of analysis within the method of discursive analysis are different discourses present in the society and connected with the investigated object. But, why should we analyse the topic of immigration in connection with the immigration discourse? What knowledge can it bring to us? Let´s start with the explication of the very term "discourse". In the literature, we can find many different ways of defining what discourse is, and what the discursive analysis is.

Generally, the term discourse refers to some specific expository frameworks connected with the discussed topic that set up the discursive rules (what can be said, by whom, in which circumstances etc.). The discursive practices as concrete forms of action (of talking and writing) then stem from these expository frameworks. To study the discourse thus means to explain the origin and the persistence of certain discursive forms prevalent in the society as socially constructed. It means to dispute the universalistic claims of these discourses as the "objective vision" of the society by showing how and by which means they were constructed and gained their dominance. This is, however, the pure generalisation of the most common tuition of the term, and we should point out that there are many different concepts, theoretical nd/or methodological explanations of the term "discourse".

One of the most important sources of inspiration for studying discourses and power dynamics is the work of French philosopher and sociologist **Michel**

Foucault. His conception of power is his most important devise for the current social sciences. What is unique on his conception of power is that he perceives it as a power ever-present, power that is the part of every social interaction and relation and that is „*exerted from innumerable points and in interplay of unsteady and fluctuant relations*" (Foucault, In. Buraj, 2000, p. 100). Power that is in current modern societies exercised mainly through knowledge and through the internalisation of this knowledge into the norms, values, believes and ideologies. In order to be exercised and transformed into the specific knowledge about the world, knowledge that enables the existing power and consequent unequal relations to be confirmed and reproduced, power has to be legitimised by the discourse. In other words, it has to be transformed into certain specific discursive practices, that would control effectively who can talk, what and in which circumstances.

This fact is simply the transformation into the political level of the above mentioned Austin´s notion that words, texts are the social acts and social practices equal to all other human practices. As the every human action is regularised and controlled by certain rules, social norms, laws etc., so it is with the talking, writing and other discursive practices. The norms responsible for regulation are sometimes more, sometimes less visible. For example, the manifested defamation of the other races and nations is currently in our societies usually prohibited by the law. However, most of the discursive practices are regulated by the informal social norms that do not punish breaking of the rules by law, but by certain form of *social blaming reaction*. One is than obliged to follow the rules because of the risk of losing his/her prestige, popularity and consequently the position, money etc. It means in order to keep access to social goods one has to follow the discursive rules. Consequently, in order to keep power one has to form and control the rules that would be followed by others. This closely correspond with the Foucault´s conception of the so called disciplinary power techniques that rules the nowadays societies and that do not discipline bodies and minds by the repression but by the power of the words and images that attack our bodies in order to make us to behave in correspondence with the power intentions in the way that we believe these are our own intentions.

In Foucault´s view, there is no any strict division line between the rules and practices following these rules. His conception of power, as we mentioned above, is the conception of power ever present, not restricted to the political

subjects, but inherent to all social relations. It is not the institutional power, it´s the social power - the power reproduced from the bottom, from the everyday interactions that conform and form the discursive rules as they are enacted. As the norms form the rules for the discursive practices, the discursive practices as well form the boundaries of knowledge and the premises taken for granted that delimit the space of the established discussion.

What is behind the discursive boundaries, in other words, is in the prevalent discourse considered to be a taboo. For example, if the opinion that the nation state has the right to control the incoming people, goods etc. dominates, only the question „how to regulate" remains in the discussion. The very question whether to control or not is then irrelevant, better say prohibited. Any politician that would like to discuss whether to regulate at all would end up as ridiculous or even labelled as dangerous. Discourse is hence the tool of the political struggle and it´s on behalf of the dominant political elites to control the discursive frame. **Van Dijk**, one of the scientists following so called *Critical discourse analysis*, points out that „*a huge power of the word and image, caused by the dominant influence of the media on formation of the reality and public opinion, make the discourse to be one of the key devices of the power elites. These elites with the privileged access towards the creation of the discourse dispose with certain type of a symbolic power measured by the extension of their discursive ad communicative possibilities and means.*" (Van Dijk, 1993, s. 255)

In foucauldian tradition, analysis of the power inequalities reproduced and legitimized by the discourse is of a big importance. In other words, exerting of certain discursive practices ought to serve for integration of ones and exclusion of others. Discourse enables and supports these practices and at the same time it ´s dependent on them. Discourse has to be reproduced. In order to retain the hegemony, discourse must be able to capture and express effectively the important issues in regard of changing circumstances. It has to be transmitted horizontally (to address more and more social groups) and vertically (transition from one generation to another and forming of a new identities). What is important as well, discourse has to compete with other discourses. This stems from the fact that there is no one single discourse connected with certain topic, area or problem, but there are many discourses with different relations one to another and with the different power position.

The situation of equal power position of some discourses is very rare. Mostly we can perceive the dominance of one discourse on another. The result of dominance of certain discourse is then not only exclusion of certain groups but as well marginalisation of other alternative discourses. Claiming this, we then have to distinguish discourses „about the same" though discourses that are allusive to each other, which compete together in order to reinforce their own definition of a situation, but as well we have to distinguish discourses „about something else" which are also deeply interconnected. They can form the environment, in which the other discourses (about something else) succeed in, or contrary, exclude other discourses to the periphery of the social interest and political influence.

At the same time, the individual is simultaneously exposed to the acting in several discourses. Therefore, it is very important that the discourses would be at least to certain level reciprocally compatible. By this way, we can interpret and explain discourses with one another. This is one of the principle aims of Foucault´s genealogy. In other words, the power hegemony of one discourse is explicable by the dominance of another discourse, that is with the previous coherent, and hence forms the good conditions for its dissemination and reproduction, and share a certain inner logic with it.

These basic characteristics of a discourse were named by Foucault as a „*positivity of a discourse*". **Marek Nohejl** explains that Foucault´s positivity of a discourse: „defines the form of communication of all discursive elements (authors, books, texts) in certain period and thus perform the role of certain historical a priori, which is then the empirical framework of the possibility of occurrence of the utterances and determination of their coexistence with others." (Nohejl, 2007, s.124)

The factors of resumption and reproduction of the discourses can be, to the large extent, found in the basic characteristics of a „social". Discourse does not compose of all opinions and of everything what is in people´s minds. People are mostly able to escape from the boundaries set up by the discursive rules. Discourse is composed of what people express verbally and what, by this way, becomes socially shared. That means that between thought and pronounced, there is a certain boundary - given by the imaginary sieve, the thoughts and ideas have to pass through. I express what I believe will find sympathy at the recipient, which means it can bring me certain benefits in the interaction. One of the most important skills acquired during socialization is not to swerve from the

boundaries of the discourse. What we learn during the process of socialization is to recognize the basic rules of a discursive system we are a part of. To acquire this ability means to gain a big advantage, to gain the very important social capital. This basic characteristics of a „social", in the microanalysis of the interpersonal relations recognised by many classics of sociology (**G.H. Mead, H. Cooley**, etc.), enables from the inside the reproduction of the discourses.

Discourse of nationalism and the emergence of immigration problem

Following the above mentioned principles of discursive analysis, we can say that the current political discourse about migration conceptualize passing the boundaries as a significant act (Janků, 2006), and thus the immigration discourse can be seen as embodied in the discourse of modern nationalism. Specifically we could talk about so called "*methodological nationalsm*" (Wimmer, Shiller, 2008), whose core is the naturalisation of an optic of the nation and nation state in the different areas of interpretation of the world. In this view, the existence of a nation state as a basic structural unit of a society and as a basis for analysis is considered to be a self-evident and indubitable. The boundaries of a nation state are thus the important milestones that delimit something specific and internally culturally coherent. Thus crossing these boundaries has to be the subject of a control and regulation in order to preserve the specific and valuable - the nation and the national.

Discourse of a modern nationalism from this point of view „break new ground" for the immigration discourse in the way it is expressed in modern post-war period. Thus the roots of the current political discourse referring to immigration can be found in the ideas of the Great French Revolution, if we agree with the conception of forming modern nationalism by **E. Hobsbawm**. (Hobsbawm, 2000, s. 15) It is the truth that there have always been in the history certain rules for the preservation of the territory, but they were not based on the principle of the territory recognized by the international law that encodes as well the right of the nation for the self determination and label every individual as "citizen", which means not only to concede him specific rights but as well to impose to him certain limits – concerning the rights of other nation states citizens.

But the discourse of nationalism can serve only for explanation why the discourse of immigration became so important in politics as well as in public

sphere, it does not explain its concrete forms and dominant features. To continue with the explanation, we will move little further, into the period when the idea of nation state has been spread outside the Europe, into the post-war period, period of decolonization of the world.

In the post-war period, the immigration into the Western European countries (Great Britain, France, Switzerland, and Germany), which experienced at that time a strong economic growth, intensified. The flow of immigrants coming from the economically less developed European countries continued, e.g. Italy, Spain, Yugoslavia, Turkey, and the flow from the former colonies into the former colonial world powers continued as well. In the first case of immigrants from economically less developed countries, the base for legalisation of this flow was the systematic negotiation of bilateral agreements based on the support of temporary labour migration, which was the formulary for missing workforce. In the second case of the immigrants from former colonies, at the beginning we even do not speak about international migration, as it was the movement of the people in one country (as for example British Empire). This was the reason why this immigration was in the first years considered to be unproblematic and accepted as natural and legitimate. Even after the liberation of the former colonies, they were still considered to be a part of the country, what favoured the atmosphere of relatively unproblematic acceptance of these immigrants. (Hargreaves, McKinley, 1997) In both cases, however, the situation has later changed. This change was supported and accelerated by the specific discursive turn that was the reaction on certain new occasions that created the immigration problem.

In the case of immigrants from the former colonies, the change of the public view was related with the structure of incoming immigrants as well as with the increase of their numbers. Originally, the migration of the so called „colonial elites" (it means intellectuals, personalities from social and political life that in most cases had received their education in colonial centres - Paris, London) was changing into the „*economic migration*". In the first years, the typical idea of an immigrant was the idea of an intellectual travelling with British or French passport, disillusioned by the fact that the fight for independence in his/her country, in which he/she had been engaged, ended up into the regime, in which the illegitimate governance of colonial elites was replaced with the legitimate governance of corrupted and authoritarian local elites. This idea, however, soon disappeared from the public discourse. Instead of it, the idea of the less

qualified worker from the third world employable in such branches where the native citizens did not want to work appeared.

The change of the general perception of the „immigrant", the negative common feelings connected with the „new" type of migration also appeared due to the fact that the planned temporary migration was changing into the resident one. It was a big failure of the key presumptions of the temporary stay of foreign workers, that were part of the official agreements, and thanks to that the recruitment of the workforce had reached such a support in the public discourse. In the seventies, the oil crisis blocked the economic growth in Western Europe; consequently the labour force of immigrants lost its importance and governments of the receiving states gradually adopted the restrictive policies and concentrated on the protection of national border together with the policies of restriction of the access toward the work permits and residence permits. The only way to get to the country remained the asylum right together with the internationally accepted right for family reunification.

In this period the dominant public discourse was changing rapidly and contra immigration rhetoric intensified. (Castles, 2001) Various arguments were used to give reason to the enthroned restrictive immigration policies. The primacy had the pragmatic arguments emphasizing the financial expenses related with the receiving of the immigrants as well as often proclaimed problem that immigrants "stole" the work opportunities that could be utilize by the domestic population.

The problem was born. Of course, it was not an ungrounded reason of such a mind set. No wonder that after the time of complete neglecting of any social investments specifically for foreign workers living on the territory of host states for years, the immigrant communities suffered from specific economic, social and educational deficits. It became evident that it is impossible to maintain the order in immigrant communities without an attempt to improve their social and economic positions. The opinion that the responsibility for the current state lied on the domestic political elites was, however, very rare and reserved to the several immigrant defenders - the partisans fighting for human rights and the rights of immigrants.

The argument of high-priced free immigration regimes was indeed applied also to other specific groups of immigrants, to those who followed the migration even after the cancellation of the active recruitment of labour force, mainly, thanks to the legislation of the right for family reunification and through the

asylum right. Specifically, the high costs and overexertion of the asylum systems, testified by the many „false" applications that system had to cope with, was one of the most serious arguments used against the non-Europeans, ethnically and culturally different immigrants. The fact, that pragmatic argumentation based on the economic rationality was in many cases the guise for the cultural racism, is quite probable and undoubted.

On the other hand, we argue, that even though the immigrant ambient was considered to be a different, and immigrant communities were considered to be the enclaves of cultural otherness invading the integrity of the host society, the idea of immigrants as a cultural threat for western societies was not as common in the discourse at that time as it is today. Many immigrant communities were considered to be dangerous or even criminal and state was called-up for the responsibility. Nevertheless, the problem was considered to be more the problem of public order than the problem of cultural menace.

Consequently, the immigrants were asked to integrate into the host society. The new concept of integration replaced the before favoured concept of assimilation. Moreover, this concept proclaimed that the integration of immigrants should not be one-way process of their accommodation to the norms and values of the host society, but as well, it was presupposed that immigrant could keep part of their culture and cultivate it within the host society. Thus the whole process of integration should have ended in some kind of unproblematic coexistence of immigrants and host societies.

This "*integration discourse*" became very favourite and common among the defenders of the rights of immigrants, but as well it pervaded the academic discourse. This argumentation enabled the defenders of rights of immigrants as well as the immigrants themselves to compete with the prevalent hostile attitudes and to form the alternative discourse. It was possible to explain the situation as rooted in the poor economic, social and educational conditions immigrants had to cope with. The defenders of immigrants thus could identify the responsibility of the political elites as those who hadn´t thought out the whole situation and who were not aware of their responsibility for that.

From the moral point of view, it was possible to vindicate the immigrants and perceive them as victims of ongoing macro-social changes, connected with the processes of globalisation - the discourse that soon gained such popularity and strong explicative potention. Moreover, new theories of multiculturalism were applied in the areas of different policies. These agenda was articulated

mainly by the political parties situated on the left part of the political spectrum, but as well, by many organisations of growing nongovernmental sector.

The theories of multiculturalism were based on the idea of diversity as a source of value and benefits for the whole society that was considered to be one of the fundamental elements of civic society. This was the common feature of multiculturalism, however we should say that the different models of multiculturalism differ considerably, in the theory (here it is mainly the dispute between so called communitarian model of multiculturalism based on the respect toward the group rights of ethnically different, and liberal version, based, on the other hand, on the equality of the people regardless of their origin and affiliations), as well as in the political practice (different national models of multiculturalism, for example, specific French, Canadian and British, etc. model).

The main ideological opponents of multiculturalism seemed to be mainly nationalism, cultural racism, certain type of cultural conservatism. These ideological opponents, however, did not look like a strong challenge into the future at that time. On the contrary, it was presupposed they would be sooner or later overcome, and pushed out from the politically dominant discourses. These assumptions were contained in quite optimistic visions that multiculturalism had introduced.

Of course, another ideological opponent of multiculturalism in its fight for the greater rights of immigrants was also the above mentioned „economic rationality" discourse that presupposed that immigrants will be welcomed only in the case they will be useful and economically profitable for the state. Not even with this challenge multiculturalism had to contend completely without arguments. The natural arm in this fight was and still is the unfavourable demographic development of Western European countries populations. It enabled to think of the idea that immigrant population could be a cure and replacement for the decrease or very poor increase of the native born population. However, in current situation – in knowledge based economies, even this factor is used to divide the immigrants into the wanted, those who are skilled and educated, and unwanted, those with the insufficient education and qualification.

That time, this situation enabled the defenders to ask more social rights for the immigrants, mostly the access to education, more precisely the culturally sensitive education, housing, etc. To educate within multiculturalism was,

however, not only the task for immigrants but also for the natives. And they should have educated themselves in the way that the space for the mutual intercultural communication should have been created and hence it would enable the better integration of the immigrants, in the sense of the optimal integration when the immigrants retain certain part of their culture, and at the same time, they try to live in conformity with the host culture.

The crisis of multiculturalism

Multiculturalism should be understood as a significantly important discourse fighting for the dominance in public and political area mostly in the eighties and nineties. However, along with the rise of multiculturalists´ conceptions, we can observe a certain criticism related with the multiculturalism as such, or with a certain version of it. It can be said that practically with the appearance of multiculturalism also the „crisis of multiculturalism" has emerged. The critical remarks were connected with the term "multiculturalism" itself, which has been heavily criticised for introducing the conception of culture as an enclosed entity, the so called essentialist view, instead of the right one - dynamic and constructivist (Glazer, Goldberg, Baumann In: Grillo, 1998 s.194). In the political area, we can observe the ongoing resignation on building up the explicitly multicultural policies.

The crisis of multiculturalism is manifested mostly in the fact that the original premises, visions and arguments of multiculturalism lost their interpretative power and were many times discredited in theory as well as in practice. The reason of this crisis of multiculturalism is not represented even by the very fact that multiculturalism has been discredited, but also by the fact that multiculturalism in its key statements and premises did not expect such a development. On the contrary, it was in its core the optimistic vision that presupposed the successive weakening of its critiques by reason of clearly provable advantages of multicultural arrangement of modern societies and consequently providing the high quality of life for immigrants and for ethnic minorities living in nation states. It means the crisis of multiculturalism stemmed from the fail of these optimistic visions (which didn´t fulfilled sufficiently or rapidly enough), crucial for the multiculturalism. Towards these straightforward challenges the multiculturalism is able to resist only in the restricted way, and it seems to be discredited even by the fact that it still has to resist.

One of the hypotheses that could explain the crisis of multiculturalism is that the term itself has become an empty and does not serve for a designation of a real form of organization of society; it has become only ideological phrase. This could mean that the ideas typical for multiculturalism do have a chance to survive but they have to find a new "shelter", they have to be reinvented under some new conception, the conception that would reflect better the dynamic development that have undergone in this area. The conception should as well be compatible with the currently dominant discourses and their requirements toward the immigration discourses or to have such an influence to be able to change them into the way appropriate for these ideas and conceptions. Just to make sure, to be compatible does not mean to be tributary to them; it means to be compatible in the sense of formulation of the premises and arguments that should match with the logic of these discourses.

The question remains whether such a new conception would be able to overcome the same risks and whether it would not undergo the same process as it was with the conception of multiculturalism - namely the methodological problems connected with its application as well as problems of inner fragmentation or the tendency toward its waste ideologization.

The discourse of crisis of multiculturalism has enjoyed the advantageous position of the critique of the basic ideas of relatively new discursive framework. The position of the critique is always the more advantageous in argumentation struggle. The reasons are understandable. To find the inconsistencies and discrepancies inside certain discursive practice is much easier than to build a new one - positively formulated. Of course, it depends on the power position of the discourse which means that the discourse with a sufficient institutional support could overcome these obstacles and succeed. But we should say that discourse of multiculturalism was not in such a position. Its institutional support was poor as it only very slowly has interfered into the law, education and other areas.

Today, the situation in the sense of "critic versus positive" position could be turned upside down. The politically dominant seems to be the anti-immigration discourses, or some specific and interconnected discourses such as the anti - Islamic or anti - Muslim discourse. This discourse created the connection of image of Muslim immigrant with the image of terrorist or at least of religious fanatic in Western countries. Of course, we can observe the discourse

that strives for an active deconstruction of this conception, that tries to show that this is the inadmissible simplification, but it seems to be still weaker.

To analyze the position of both discourses - multicultural and anti - immigration discourse, we have just introduced in a very simplified way, from the position of their power position requires much deeper analysis. It would be useful to describe the concrete arenas (politic debates, laws, education etc.) in which the struggle persists and as well, to identify the subjects responsible for spreading and reproduction of these discourses together with the institutional conditions that enables their persistence and popularity.

Choosing the discourse of multiculturalism and in its opposition the anti-immigration discourse as representatives of two politically relevant and competing discourses we wanted to point out a certain historical development, a certain discursive turn that appeared in the conceptualisation of immigration questions and questions of coexistence among different ethnics and cultures. As we mentioned above, in seventies in the Western Europe the immigration problem was perceived much more as a question of public order, that was needed to be established and so the condition was either to send immigrants back home (in rhetoric of anti-immigration discourse) or to effectively integrate the immigrant communities (in multicultural rhetoric). To blame immigrants for violation of public order, the different arguments were used in the past than those that are used nowadays. The guilt was much more „personal", it means related with the fail of ability to adapt to the life in host society, to become the regular members of the society, inability to take care of themselves, etc.

Nowadays, the discussion about coexistence of different cultures in relation to the immigrant communities with the major society lies much more in the question whether at all such coexistence is possible. Quite often, in the relation to the actual anti-Islamic discourse in Europe the 11th September 2001 is considered to be a milestone that caused an important turn in this area. The period after the terrorist attacks on the World trade centre brought certain new terms into the dictionary of international relations, new slogans and new concepts used for describing the contemporary security situation. This change, even activated by the incident on another continent, was visible in Europe and touched the multi - million populations of immigrants. It became a symbol of the real division and disparity between two cultures that are dangerous to each other.

The guilty though seems to be the whole „strange" culture or society. The problem has been shifted somewhere into the global arena. The discussion about public order in nation state and about the tools how to get rid of immigrants or re-educate and integrate certain immigrant groups changed into the discussion on international security, security in Europe etc. The immigration is discussed as a security thread and the frame up-conspiracy theories presenting the ideas of the possible decay of European culture resulting from the incoming islamization of Europe are quite common in media, science and public discussions. This is significant feature for the changes our societies are passing through, the essentialization of the supra-individual, global or even abstract phenomena.

The possible explanatory frame for the above mentioned turn from emphasizing the public order in the nation state towards the international context of immigration problem seems to be the concept of globalization. We have already mentioned that one model of mutual relations of different discourses is the model when one discursive frame is completely or partially explicable by another one. From this point of view, we could say that the national arena was simply too tight for the conceptualization of immigration problem and a new politically dominant discourse of globalization deduced the requirements to conceptualize social problems in accordance with the new discursive rules - global rules. In other words, for defence of the restrictive immigration policy (or any other policy or interest), it was not enough to refer to the problems of public order inside the nation state, as far as the key discursive rules and elements were connected with the concept of globalization, which means with the broader and international processes. This can be also connected with the requirement to construct the global enemy to reassure the global dimension of the problem.

However, we do not claim that the escaping from national arena in conceptualization of certain social problems means the weakening of the power of nation state. On the contrary, we agree with some authors who claim that the relation between globalization and power of nation state doesn´t have to be automatically reciprocal. In other words, the fact that the power of supranational institutions and processes gradually rise up doesn´t mean that the power of nation state decreases. The results of games of power dynamics can be different. „*Compelling as this view on post-nationalism and the role of migrant minorities may be, it has not gone unchallenged. To begin with, a number of*

authors have pointed out that the transfer of authority to the supra- and transnational levels has not yet progressed to a level where it can seriously challenge the nation-state's prerogatives. More specifically, in migration and ethnic relations politics, the development of common EU policies and coordination of the national policies of member states has been highly restricted by the endurance of the different national policy frameworks and attachments to the "public philosophies" that underpin them.“ (Favell, In Koopmans, Statham 1999, p. 656) „*For example, the Schengen Accord, implemented in 1995, is oriented toward better-coordinated and stricter controls on unwanted immigration.*“ (Koopmans, Statham, 1999, p. 656)

Taking into account the above mentioned opinions, we can conclude that the power of nation states in the implementation of the right to decide who gets in hasn´t been weakened, but on the contrary, it has been strengthened by the supra-national institutions which seem to give the legitimacy to the restrictive immigration policies of the nation states. The more intensive immigration to Europe is, no doubt, caused by many processes that are part of the globalization process, so they are the consequences of the globalisation. In many cases, however these consequences are tried to be resolved on national, regional or local levels. The attention is, for example, given more to the protection of national border then to the active solving of the causes of unwanted migration – no matter whether it is perceived as unwanted by domestic political elites or by immigrants themselves (so called forced migration).

The globalization is more the discursive frame that enables the dissemination of inevitable arguments that form an inseparable part of the restrictive immigration policies, than the practice of these policies. This is the reason why we understand the globalization being more the discourse than the real process, although we do not doubt that certain processes, described within the concept of globalization do exist. The ways these processes are discussed, described and constructed are, however, widely discursively formulated. The social problems are given the global dimensions while the real political power remains on the national or regional level.

Conclusion

In the previous text we have been concerned mostly with the context of Western Europe, where the very roots of the relevant immigration discourses, as they are reflected and expressed nowadays, can be found. In this context we tried to present the historical perspective as a fruitful for further understanding of the problem in question. The so called immigration problem will have been faced by the Central European countries later on. Moreover, in our context, the discourse on migration is transferred with certain differences and deformations. These differences are caused on the one hand by the different forms of migration and by its lower intensity, on the other hand by different general political situation.

In conditions of the Slovak Republic, the discourse of the expected increase of numbers of immigrants has been established. The most frequent term describing the position of Slovakia in the international migration area has been the term of the so called „*transit country*". It means the country through which the migrants are passing through, but they usually continue their journey further to the west. However, it has been presupposed that the situation of Slovakia should have been changed; that it will approach the position of a typical immigration country. Whether this has already become the truth or it will become the truth soon is not the question of our interest here in this discussion. For us, it is important to think of the fact, how this discourse has been established, and what are the key differences, in comparison with the Western European countries, which have to be taken into account when we want to analyse our context.

From the beginning of its modern history, the Slovak Republic has taken the path of convergence of its principles and institutional base to the Western countries models and institutions. And so it was in the field of immigration policy. The processes of building up of the institutional base were accompanied by the process of convergence of the arguments used to legitimate this new institutional framework. It was important to make legitimate the functioning of these new institutions not only in accordance with the present needs (as the Slovakia has been still the country with the relative low amount of incoming immigrants), but as well having in mind the future needs. In other words, for the institutions built up according to the Western countries model, the conditions similar to the situation in these countries were needed. This was explicit within the process of European integration, where certain requirements were needed

to be applied into the practice according to the general agreement inside the European Union. These requirements were often based not only on the universalist principles of the law, but at the same time they presupposed a certain common situation, that has already existed or that would soon be formed.

Moreover, in the academic sphere as well as in journalism, we can observe certain hunger for the discussions about immigration, multiculturalism etc. There was a demand to open some new questions previously neglected. This is quite an interesting difference in comparison with the Western states and other immigration countries where the discussion about immigration appeared as a reflection of the current state, or even as it was, for example, in Germany, the immigration reality was denied in the discourse for a long time despite the facts and numbers which were showing something else. In our condition the discussion has occurred many times as hypothetical, based on the experiences from Western Europe and based on the expectations toward the future development in our country.

This means the discourse that is of a strong power position and has a good institutional support can influence the way the reality is perceived despite of the real social conditions and facts. This is the main reason, why social scientists should involve into their analyses the study of discourses. In the political science it is very useful to think of the discourse as a tool of legitimization of concrete political practices, as well as of the frame that delimit these political practices.

We understand the migration as one of the learnt ways of possible solving of individuals´ life and economic conditions which is connected with certain norms and evaluations. In current period highlighting the flexibility and movement, some kind of migration are appreciated as an active approach of solving the hard economic and life situation. For example the tools supporting the labour mobility from less economically developed regions are often the part of active employment policy, labour mobility is considered to be the part of universal free market principles which appear in arguments of politicians preferring the laissaiz-fair approach, that see the migration as a possibility for individuals to solve their unfavourable social and economic conditions, without being dependent on the social policy tools provided by the state. On the other hand, in the case of certain categories of migrants, the process of migration is connected with opposite moral evaluations inside the dominant discourses. To

reveal similar controversies, is one of the possible findings the discursive analysis can offer us to unmask the unequal distribution of power among different discourses.

References:
AUSTIN, J. L. 2004. *Ako niečo robiť slovami*. Bratislava: Kalligram, 2004. 183 p. ISBN: 80-7149-659-6
BADE, K. J. 2004. *Evropska migrace dvou staletí*, Praha: Lidové noviny, 2004. 497 p. ISBN: 80-710-6559-5
BURAJ, I. 2000. *Faucault a moc*. Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského, 2000. 185 p. ISBN: 80-223-1476-5
CASTLES, S. 2000. *Ethnicity and Globalization*, London: SAGE Publications Ltd., 2000. 228 p. ISBN: 0- 7619-5612-3
CASTLES, S. 2003. Towards a Sociology of Forced Migration and Social Transformation, In *Sociology*, n. 1 vol. 37 2003
CUTTS, M.(ed.) 2000. *The state of world´s refugees, Fifty years of humanitarian action*,
Oxford: University press, 2000. available at:
http://www.reliefweb.int/library/documents/ch01.pdf
FOUCAULT, M. 2006. *Rád diskurzu*. Bratislava: Agora, 2006. 66 p. ISBN: 80-969394-3-2
GRILLO, R.D. 2003. The essentialism and cultural anxiety. In *Anthropological theory*, vol. 3(2), pp. 157-173, available at http://ant.sagepub.com
GRILLO, R. 1998. *Pluralism and the Politics of Difference*, Oxford: Clarendon press.1998. 246 p. ISBN: 0-19-829426-3
HARGREAVES, A. G., McKINLEY, M. (eds.) 1997. *Post-Colonial Cultures in France*. London: Routledge, 1997. 299 p. ISBN: 0-415-14488-4
HOBSBAWM, E.J.2000. *Národy a nacionalizmus od roku 1780*, Brno: CDK. 2000. 208 p. ISBN: 80-859-5955-0
JANKU, K. 2006. Moderní migrace. Stěhování se zvláštním významem. In *Sociální studia*. Fakulta sociálních studií Masarykovy univerzity, 2006. 3 (4). ISSN 1214-813X, p.13-27
KOOPMANS, R., STATHAM, P. 1999. Chalanging the Liberal Nation State?, In *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 105, No. 3, pp. 652-696,

NOHEJL, M. 2007. *Jednání, diskurs, kritika. Myslet společnost*. Praha: Slon. 2007. 248 p. ISBN: 978-80-86429-71-7

VAN DIJK, T. A. 1993. The principles of critical discourse analysis, In *Discourse & Society*, vol. 4 (2), pp. 249 – 283, ISSN: 1460-3624

WIMMER, A., SHILLER, N.G. 2008 *Methodological nationalism, the Social Sciences and the Study of Migration: An Essay in historical epistemology*. In.: The Transnational Studies Reader. New York: Routledge. 2008. ISBN 978-415-95372-6