Languaging Diversity
Volume 3

Languaging Diversity Volume 3:

Language(s) and Power

Edited by

Elena Di Giovanni and Francesca Raffi

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

Languaging Diversity Volume 3: Language(s) and Power

Edited by Elena Di Giovanni and Francesca Raffi

This book first published 2017

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

LANGUAGE, DIVERSITY AND POWER

ELENA DI GIOVANNI AND FRANCESCA RAFFI

Writing, reading, translating, interpreting, reporting and re-telling are all activities which draw different cultures and languages together. Diversity is often at the core of these activities, which generate lingua-cultural encounters and clashes, in turn leading to new beginnings and generating new spaces. Contacts among cultures and languages inevitably involve negotiations, and negotiations are based on power relations.

Power, as reflected in language use, points to the constantly shifting world order, the politics and policies shaped, enforced or rejected by individuals, communities, nations and beyond. Power in language use can be detected at micro- and macro-level: from daily spoken interactions in monolingual or multilingual settings, to the writing and translating of international documents, business reports, audiovisual products. Language use is, in fact, never neutral, even when it is used in its meta-function, i.e. to explain language use itself. In short, we could say with María Calzada Pérez[1] that "all language use is ideological", where the concept of ideology spans the public and personal spheres of our lives, as individuals or members of different groups and communities.

Languages as used by peoples throughout the world are also expressions of diversity, often very positively: language variety across or within national boundaries mirrors the active life, the thriving of languages. India is a great example of such livelihood and diversity, but also Nigeria, or Papua New Guinea, where 852 languages are reported to be spoken today[2]. To remain within Europe, Spain and Belgium are more or less peacefully multilingual countries, whereas the UK, although not officially multilingual, has cities where approximately 200 languages are currently known to be used[3].

Diversity is, however, not always as pure a concept as it might be taken to be in relation to linguistic pluralism: it often implies asymmetry in cultural and social terms, sometimes subjugation and injustice.

Language, diversity and power are key concepts around which all chapters in this book revolve. These concepts bring with them, implicitly or explicitly, many others: identity, negotiation, border-crossing, representation, migration. If taken all together and read out in random sequence, these words evoke many disciplines that have these notions at their core. In relation to language-based studies, they have held primary roles in many strands of linguistics (corpus linguistics, critical discourse analysis, sociolinguistics, etc.), but also of translation studies (audiovisual translation, literary translation, etc.), and of literary studies in mono-cultural or comparative form. Beyond language-centred fields of study, language, diversity and power are central to many a discipline: sociology, psychology, political science, history, postcolonial studies, to mention but a few, broad fields. Theories and concepts from these fields inform the chapters which make up this volume, where linguistic aspects are central but are never seen from a purely language-based disciplinary standpoint. Moreover, the chapters in the two sections of this book ("Languages, Cultures and Power", "Power in Translations/Translation and Power") span decades and continents, providing analyses which are either diachronic or synchronic, or occasionally combine both. From Romania to North America and its native populations, from post-war Italy to Central Africa in colonial days, the chapters in the following pages offer views on the past and present in relation to language use, diversity, and the enforcement or dismissal of power.

The first section gathers contributions where language, diversity and power are all central. In the first chapter, Raluca Levonian investigates how relations of solidarity and power how identity and otherness are represented in Romanian political discourse, relying on a corpus of parliamentary declarations and speeches delivered between September and December 2015. Her analysis brings to light the construction of self-and-other binary positions in the texts, whereby the migrants and refugees are placed on a median position between identity and otherness.

Power relations are in the spotlight also in Adriano Laudisio's chapter, centred upon TV series staging the professional and private lives of lawyers and judges and relying on the use of specialized terminology. Relying on a sound theoretical framework which includes genre and discourse analysis, but also studies on legal language, Laudisio discusses a host of examples of specialist-to-specialist and laymen-to-witness/client interactions and concludes that in fictional legal contexts power is associated with knowledge of law and language is shaped differently according to the persuasive intentions of the speakers.

Chapter 3 goes back in time, to look at the development of cinema in Central Africa by the British colonizers. Author Elena Di Giovanni offers a critique of *The African and the Cinema*, a 1937 book reporting on the Bantu Educational Cinema Experiment which saw the production and distribution across Central Africa of 35 films. The chapter offers an analysis of the project−and the films within it−from the point of view of film semiology, visual anthropology and language-based studies.

Power, as exerted in contemporary mass-media, is at the core of chapter 4 by Venuti and Fruttaldo, in which the authors offer an analysis of the representation, in the US, British, and Italian press, of the main actors and events related to the US Supreme Court ruling on same sex marriage, in 2015. Focusing on articles in leading newspapers and relying on a theoretical framework mainly based in discourse analysis, the authors concentrate on the way the news value of eliteness is discursively constructed in the corpus under investigation.

Diversity, as represented in the British press in relation to the 2015 Paris terrorist attacks, makes the object of the fifth chapter, by Cesare Zanca. The author sees diversity in relation to inclusiveness and the way such a relationship has been challenged by Jihadist-inspired attacks and their accounts in the press. Diverse diversities are, therefore, at the core of his study on newspaper articles, based on a comparative, corpus-based analysis of both qualitative and quantitative nature.

Expressions of power and the relations behind its exertion can be found even in the work of a single author, such as Italian 19th century novelist Alessandro Manzoni. In chapter 6 of this book, Costanza Geddes explores the many nuances of the language used by Manzoni in his masterpiece, *I Promessi Sposi*, to reflect power, by exposing, denouncing, advocating for it through the voices of his characters.

Nowadays, power is undeniably in the hands of users, through social media and collaborative information systems. In chapter 7, Antonella Napolitano and Maria Cristina Aiezza offer an interesting analysis of fake reviews by *TripAdvisor*'s expert and novice users, in the UK and Italy, to see how these construct their identities and ethos in texts, with the aim to persuade potential customers. Relying on a multifarious theoretical framework, the authors combine content and corpus-based analysis to find out how difficult it might be to discern between genuine and fake content in reviews, in relation to more or less limited expertise.

In the second part of the book, translation comes steadily to the fore in relation to expressions of power, in five chapters that span decades and cover a vast array of topics. As Francesca Raffi puts it, in chapter 8, the intersection between language and power does not only occur in

multilingual contexts of evident conflict, but wherever the question of language difference mirrors asymmetrical political, social, and cultural arrangements. In her analysis of Italian cinema produced after World War Two, with a special focus on Federico Fellini and his masterpiece *Le Notti di Cabiria*, Raffi sets out to explore to what extent the political, social, and cultural asymmetries expressed by Fellini through the use of standard and non-standard Italian are preserved in the subtitled version for distribution on the British market.

Still within the realm of translation of audiovisual texts, but with a special segment of the audience in mind, Emilia Perez explores documentary films offering views of the 20th century oppression period in Slovak history and reflecting fascism, communism, the repression of religion and language, cultural and political oppression. In particular, she focuses on the decision-making process behind the creation of subtitles for the deaf and hard of hearing, for these extremely dense audiovisual texts. Looking at this translation process from an intersemiotic perspective and relying on concepts from communication and cultural studies, Perez also offers an analysis of feedback provided by a sample group of end users.

In chapter 10, translation is analysed from a strictly linguistic perspective, by focusing on the transfer of metaphors and metonymies in emotionally-loaded texts by novice translators. In their eminently theoretical contribution, Hanić and Pavlović draw from cognitive linguistics to explore how different conceptual systems (behind different linguistic systems) are able to relay metaphorical or metonymical meanings.

With chapter 11 by Lorena Carbonara, audiovisual translation comes again to the fore, with a focus on its power to (re)construct and convey cultural values, racism, linguicism, and stereotypes on a transnational level. Focusing on trailers for Western films, Carbonara reports on a cross-linguistic, corpus-assisted discourse analysis of the language used in the trailers to represent Native Americans. She focuses on notions of empowerment and disempowerment, with particular attention to semantic preference and prosody.

The second part of the book closes on a chapter by Tanja Pavlović, where the author explores directionality in translation as offered in translator training but also as required in professional settings, with a special reference to the case of university training in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In her politically-loaded contribution, the author offers examples of training and practice which reveal that the prejudice against L1-to-L2 translation is very often unmotivated and should, therefore, be overcome in contemporary translator training.

The volume thus closes on advocacy, on the urge for empowerment of translators, who are very often powerful mediators between languages and cultures. Language, diversity and power are indeed empowering notions, very often evoked throughout this volume with a proactive attitude.

Notes

[1] María Calzada Pérez, "Introduction", in *Apropos of Ideology. Translation Studies on Ideology - Ideologies in Translation Studies*, ed. María Calzada Pérez (Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 2003), 2.
[2] "Ethnologue. Languages of the World", accessed 10 august, 2017,
https://www.ethnologue.com/country/PG.
[3] "Manchester is Britain's city of languages", *The Multilingual Manchester Digest*, last modified 14 August, 2013
http://www.manchester.ac.uk/discover/news/manchester-is-britains-city-of-languages/.

LANGUAGES, CULTURES AND POWER

THE DOWNFALL OF EUROPE?
IDENTITY AND OTHERNESS IN ROMANIAN
POLITICAL DISCOURSE ON MIGRATION

RALUCA LEVONIAN

1. Introduction: Migration policies and discourse

Migration and security are currently priorities on the European agenda. Paradoxically, while the imperial past had a significant influence on the construction of the collective identity of certain European peoples (Pagden 2002, 20), contemporary political discourse against migration is indicative of a Europe under threat, since it runs the risk of being colonized by populations from outside Europe. Current research has shown that immigration is often discussed in association with security. For instance, Buonfino (2004, 24) points out that the current hegemonic discourse concerning government policy shows immigration as a security threat. De Giorgi (2010, 151) puts forward a similar idea, noting the emergence of a punitive tendency in European public discourse that is linked to the representation of migrants as illegal and prone to criminality and, therefore, a danger to Europeans. Den Boer (2008, 2) observes that some politicians take advantage of the increased anxiety over migration, noting that "solidarity, which arises from anxiety becomes the new binding political force".

The present study examines the way in which solidarity and power are constructed in the political discourse on immigration in a relatively new EU member state like Romania. As a starting point, it is assumed that, in the current international context, a state cannot decide unilaterally whether to reject or host migrants and, in the latter case, how to treat them. Migration and security policies express a way of relating to the foreign Otherness represented by migrants and refugees, and the stance taken by a state with regard to this topic is ultimately a manifestation of power, whether benevolent or unsympathetic. At the socio-political level, the

measures adopted by single states always bear the mark of internal and external influences, ranging from mainstream ideologies to the activities of NGOs and the adhesion to diverse international organizations. On a symbolic level, both positive and negative attitudes towards migration reinforce stereotypical images about the Other as well as about self. The decision as to whether to host migrants or not is, thus, an expression of power with the powerless persons at its centre.

2. Romania on the migration route

After the fall of the communist regime in 1989, Romania rapidly became a "parent country" for work migration, a trait that was further enhanced by the access to the European Union in 2007. The National Report on Human Development for 2007 indicated that about 2 million Romanians were working abroad on long-term assignments at that time (Ghinararu et al. 2007). In the following years, the number of Romanian work migrants increased, leading to the "brain drain" phenomenon, which was emphasised by the Labour Minister, Mariana Câmpeanu, in an interview for *The Financial Times*. She acknowledged that the migration of young persons and highly qualified workers had reached alarming proportions, especially in the context of a worrying reduction in the population, as the country's population had decreased by about three million at that time (Fontanella-Khan 2014).

The prolonged phenomenon of Romanian work migration seems to have contributed to a generally favourable attitude shown by Romanians towards foreign migrants. According to the EU Report on Migrant Integration (2011), Romanians offer three main reasons to explain the arrival of foreign migrants in their country. Two of these involve access to work and education, whereas the third reason relates to the migrants' passage through Romanian territory on their journey to countries further west. At that moment, some respondents even considered the possibility for migrants to fill the jobs of the Romanian employees who had left the country to work abroad. The findings of the 2015 Eurobarometer survey indicate that more Romanians accept immigration than those who disapprove of it, although the difference between the two is not very great. According to these data, the immigration of people from outside the EU was viewed as very positive by 12% of the respondents and as "fairly positive" by 35%. In contrast, 28% of the Romanians interviewed considered immigration to be "fairly negative" and only 10% declared that it was "very negative".

Although these results might serve to indicate that the population has a benevolent attitude towards migrants in general, the measures taken by the Romanian state in regard to immigration would indicate the opposite. The official data on the UNHCR website state that, since its opening in 1992, the UNHCR Office in Romania has collaborated with the Romanian governments to improve the asylum system and to implement integration programmes. However, Romania has received more than 36,400 asylum requests since 1991, but only approximately 4,981 of these requests have been granted. The low number of approvals may indicate a need for the improvement of the current legislation as well as a poor awareness on the part of the state authorities in regard to the migrants' and refugees' need for support.

3. Description of the corpus

The Romanian media debated the subject of refugees and migrants during the autumn of 2015. This was because the waves of refugees increased in that period, leading a state like Hungary to reconsider its border policies and to announce the closing of its borders to refugees from the Middle East. The intentions and decisions taken by the Hungarian authorities were included in the Romanian mainstream media and various politicians took a public stance either in the mainstream media, or on social media. On the one hand, the large numbers of refugees waiting at the western border of Romania seemed to indicate an impending humanitarian crisis but, on the other hand, as a member of the EU, in spite of its opposition, Romania was assigned a certain quota of migrants in September 2015 through the migrants' relocation system advanced by the European Commission, alongside the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Hungary (e.g. Hera 2015; Popescu 2015). This decision triggered the disapproval of Romanian politicians. In this context, politicians from the main parties considered it necessary to discuss the issue in Parliament, advocating diverse views on the position Romania should adopt.

The present corpus includes 11 political statements delivered in the Deputy Chamber of the Romanian Parliament between September and December 2015. All the texts have been retrieved from the records available on the Romanian Deputy Chamber's official website (www.cdep.ro). The statements selected belonged to politicians from both main political parties, the centre-left Social Democratic Party (*Partidul Social Democrat*/PSD) and the centre-right National Liberal Party (*Partidul Național Liberal*/PNL). They were selected with the aim of obtaining a relatively equal number of political statements for each

political party in order to avoid any bias in the interpretation of the results. As Table 1-1 shows, four statements were issued by members of the PSD and six statements by members of the PNL. Only one statement was made by an independent deputy.

Deputy	Political affiliation	Number of political statements included in the corpus
Ioan Benga	Social Democrat Party	1
Remus-Florinel Cernea	Independent	1
Vlad-Alexandru Cosma	Social Democrat Party	1
Gheorghe Dragomir	National Liberal Party	1
Andrei Daniel Gheorghe	National Liberal Party	3
Vasile Horga	National Liberal Party	1
Sorin-Avram Iacoban	Social Democrat Party	1
Ovidiu-Cristian Iane	National Liberal Party	1
Cosmin Necula	Social Democrat Party	1

Table 1-1 The authors of the statements and their political affiliations

It is of note here that these statements were not issued in the context of a debate aiming to produce a new law. Political statements are delivered by Members of Parliament either verbally or in writing on topics of interest at a given moment. However, these statements are not necessarily related to the topics or laws being debated in the same parliamentary session. In the case under examination, almost all the speakers put forward very general proposals or advocated general measures, which indicates that parliamentary discussions concerning migration are still at an early stage. However, this analysis may shed light on the manner in which various types of foreign Otherness are constructed in the discourse of the Romanian political élite.

4. Research aims and method

The main aim of the present study is to identify the social actors who appear in the parliamentary speeches under analysis here, besides Romania

and the Romanian authorities, and whether positive or negative evaluations are associated with them. The second aim is to assess the kind of power relations that exist between these actors, and whether the speakers prefer a discourse of compliance or one of resistance. The hypothesis in this research is that, in the corpus, the migrants are mostly presented in a negative manner and are largely portrayed as a dangerous Other.

The texts will be analyzed from the general perspective of critical discourse analysis (CDA). This framework has been chosen because of its focus on "the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context" (Van Dijk 2001, 352). Moving beyond the understanding of language as a reflection of the social context, language is seen as constituent of "social processes and practices" (Fairclough 2001, 19). The definition of power adopted in this study is that of "an asymmetric relationship among social actors who assume different social positions or belong to different social groups" (Reisigl and Wodak 2009, 88). An important contribution to the study of power brought by CDA is the emphasis on the veiled manifestations of power in discourse. In this regard, Fairclough distinguishes between economic, political and ideological power, defining the last type as "the power to project one's practices as universal and 'common sense'" (Fairclough 2001, 27). A similar viewpoint has been expressed by Van Dijk, who rejects a depiction of power relations as relations between "villains and victims", highlighting the fact that dominance is produced through a joint effort (Van Dijk 1993, 255).

The methodology used in this research is based on the social action approach advanced by Van Leeuwen (2008), one among the main research directions grouped within the CDA general framework. According to this perspective, social practices are "socially regulated ways of doing things" (Van Leeuwen 2008, 6) that are represented in the texts produced in a specific society or context. Starting from the investigation of texts, it is possible to reconstruct the discourses on social practices, which encompass "contextually specific legitimations of these social practices" (Van Leeuwen 2008, 105). Van Leeuwen proposes a sociosemantic inventory that can be applied to the discursive construction of social actors. The various strategies individuated can be grouped around the main line of inclusion – exclusion and clarity – ambiguity in the individualization of the actors. The strategies employed by the speakers in order to foreground or background the main actors and the relations constructed between them discursively have been taken into account throughout the analysis of the texts.

5. Discussion of the results

The relation between the in-group represented by the Romanian state and the out-group formed by foreigners is constructed at a crossroads between the need to assert the power and autonomy of the state and the need to demonstrate solidarity with other states and peoples in the face of a humanitarian challenge. Three major approaches to the migration issue have been identified in the texts analyzed, each of them being grounded in a specific understanding of solidarity: (1) the humanitarian approach in which solidarity is understood in the broadest sense; (2) the legal approach in which solidarity is defined as adherence to the conventions signed by the Romanian state and (3) the national approach in which solidarity with the Romanian citizens is advocated first and foremost. These three perspectives will be discussed in the following sections.

5.1. The humanitarian approach

This approach focuses on the representation of the newcomers as war refugees, while backgrounding other possible causes of migration. When the speakers refer to the humanitarian approach, they generally advocate policies of state care for the refugees, who are portrayed as people in need and whose fundamental human rights have been disregarded. From this perspective, the refugees are constructed as "victims" through a general strategy of passivation, whereas the agent role is allocated to the "powerful" states or to transnational structures and authorities.

The humanitarian approach can also be seen in the speakers' employment of the strategy of personalization (Van Leeuwen 2008, 46), as they construct the migrants as "human beings" and, moreover, as "real people", instead of anonymous masses or numbers. In the corpus under examination, this goal is realized through the repetition of the Romanian plural noun *oameni*, signifying "people" or, in a broader sense, "human beings". For example, the preference for this term is visible in the statement made by the politician Gheorghe Dragomir, who highlights the drama of the refugees at the beginning and the end of his speech:

EXAMPLE 1
"Imaginile apocaliptice cu oameni disperați, extenuați, care riscă totul și forțează frontiere în căutarea libertății au devenit nelipsite în jurnalele de știri ale

BACK TRANSLATION
The apocalyptic images with desperate, exhausted people, who risk everything and force the borders in their search for freedom have become commonplace in the

televiziunilor din întreaga lume. Sunt oameni ajunși la capătul puterilor la ei acasă, acolo unde războiul, foametea și ororile statului islamic îi obligă să fugă în căutarea unei vieți decente. [...] Chiar dacă nu există soluții miracol pentru această criză umanitară de proporții, sunt convins că Europa, dar și România sunt capabile să ofere soluții reale, pentru că nu putem rămâne indiferenți la drama semenilor noștri, indiferent de religia lor." (Gh.Dragomir, September 10, 2015)

news bulletins of TV channels all over the world. They are people who have been wearied in their countries, where the war, the famine and the horrors of the Islamic state force them to flee in the search for a decent life. [...] Even if there are no miracle solutions for this huge humanitarian crisis, I am sure that Europe and also Romania are able to offer real solutions, because we cannot remain indifferent to the drama of our equals, no matter what their religion is. (Gh.Dragomir, September 10, 2015)

This example shows how the personalization of migrants can be used in two ways. At the beginning, the speaker emphasises the dangers faced by the refugees in their homeland, through the accumulation of nouns with a strong negative meaning ("the war, the famine and the horrors of the Islamic state"). Starting with this description, the politician constructs a detailed image of the refugees by using adjectival pre-modifiers ("desperate, exhausted people") and a series of attributive clauses ("who risk everything and force the borders", "who have been wrecked in their countries"). The Romanian words selected convey the idea of a crisis that has reached its apex. Seen from this perspective, the aid given to the refugees becomes the duty of every state. Through emotionally laden adjectives, they are presented as people who cannot resist any longer because they have no psychological or physical resources (*disperați*/ "desperate"; *extenuați*/ "exhausted"; *ajunși la capătul puterilor*/ "wearied").

Although the humanitarian crisis becomes almost tangible, the refugee is constructed as a distant Other through a process of victimization. The presentation of the Other as a victim may trigger compassion but, at the same time, a distance emerges between the in-group and the out-group represented by the refugees. The emphasis placed on their misfortune indirectly highlights the better situation of the (Romanian) co-nationals. The politician acknowledges this difference in his closing remarks when he sustains the idea that the refugees should enjoy a similar treatment to the in-group members. He uses the Romanian plural noun *semeni*, whose

literal definition is "the one who is similar to another; human being" (DEX 1998, 967). His closing remarks thus aim to realize a conciliation between the existing nationals and the otherness represented by the refugees.

The speakers who employ a humanitarian approach show a preference for plural nouns like *oameni* ("people") and *semeni* ("equals", "brothers") instead of terms like *refugiați* ("refugees") in order to identify the foreigners. This is an attempt to come closer to the refugees. The migrants are portrayed as individuals in the references to their families and their responsibilities to their children. The presentation of the foreigners as belonging to a family network highlights their similarity to "us"; they no longer appear as isolated – and potentially dangerous – individuals, but as sons, husbands, fathers or brothers. The idea of a possible terrorist threat is thus diminished. A number of politicians who advocate a humanitarian approach go further and outline the necessary measures for the integration of the newcomers. In the following excerpt, a Social-Democrat politician shows the integration of refugees in Romanian society as a necessity motivated by common goodwill:

EXAMPLE 2

"Acești refugiați sunt oameni pe care nu poți să-I tratezi decât ca pe semenul tău. Problema primirii acestora nu se pune în termenii de izolare într-un țarc cu sârmă ghimpată și de a li se arunca mâncare peste gard. Oamenii aceștia trebuie cazați în condiții decente și corecte, trebuie să își găsească o slujbă, copiii lor trebuie să meargă la școală." (C. Necula, September 17, 2015)

BACK TRANSLATION

These refugees are people whom we cannot treat otherwise than our brothers. The issue of hosting them does not mean isolating them in a paddock with barbed-wire fences and throwing them food over the fence. These people need to be hosted in proper and decent conditions, they need to find a job, their children need to go to school. (C. Necula, September 17, 2015)

The politician insists on the idea that everyone is entitled to fundamental human rights as a common denominator for hosts and migrants alike. The subject of human rights is used in the corpus to criticize Hungary's decision to isolate the refugees at the border and refuse them access. By describing the attempt to isolate the refugees, the speaker re-contextualizes (e.g. Van Leeuwen 2008, 12-14; Blackledge 2005) the decision of Romania's neighbour, highlighting its infringement of the universal principles of human rights. The criticism is reinforced by the

speaker's insistence on the definition of the refugees as "people" and "our brothers" and by the rejection of the opposite viewpoint through the use of negative verb forms ("you cannot treat otherwise", "does not mean isolating them").

Even in humanitarian speeches, the depiction of the refugees as inferior to "us" is still present. Generally, the speakers who take this approach tend to represent the migrant as lacking access to economic resources, as being marginalized, as a victim of the "others". Thus, the migrant is placed on an intermediate position between identity and otherness. He is not a member of the in-group, nor an openly declared enemy, but a victim of external hostile forces. This hybrid status is constructed through the introduction of specific terms associated with the idea of threat. This was the case with a political statement made by Vasile Horga, who generally represented the refugees as people in need. Like other speakers, he acknowledged the refugees' need to be assisted and integrated in the host society. However, he presents their arrival as an "invasion" of Europe. The threat posed by the refugees was further sustained by the observation that assistance to the refugees is offered at the expense of the Romanian state.

EXAMPLE 3	BACK TRANSLATION
"Oamenii care astăzi invadează Europa nu o fac nici de dragul aventurii şi nici din prea multă iubire pe care ne-o poartă. O fac pur şi simplu de nevoie, o fac pentru că în ţara lor este aproape imposibil să mai trăiască şi o fac mai mult de dragul copiilor lor care merită o viaţă mai bună. […] Ei sunt oameni asemenea nouă şi de aceea trebuie ajutaţi, chiar dacă preţul ajutorului va fi un pic mai rău pentru noi. […]" (V. Horga, September 17, 2015)	The people invading Europe today do not do this for adventure and neither because of too much love for us. They do this merely because of need, they do this because in their country it is almost impossible to live and above all they do this for the sake of their children who deserve a better life. […] They are people like us and for this reason they should be helped, even if the price of the aid will be a bit worse for us. (V. Horga, September 17, 2015)

While mostly advocating a policy of care for the refugees, this political statement includes negative terms connected to their arrival and assistance. Although the topos of consequences (Wodak et al. 2009, 41) is introduced only as a peripheral element, in the form of a concessive construction (*chiar dacă preţul ajutorului va fi un pic mai rău pentru noi* /"even if the

price of the aid will be a bit worse for us"), it still indicates that the text bears the traces of a nationalist or Eurocentric stance.

Besides a reductive, emotional construction of the refugees as an out-group, the humanitarian approach often reveals an idealized representation of the in-group. Romania's position as a sovereign state is glossed over in the statement quoted above. The name of the state is never even mentioned; instead the speaker uses an inclusive "we" that can refer to both Romanian and European citizens or people of the "civilized" world. Europe is, thus, constructed as the ultimate standard of civilization:

EXAMPLE 4	BACK TRANSLATION
"O mare civilizaţie precum cea a Europei nu poate sta pasivă şi nu se poate târgui cu privire la tratamentul pe care trebuie să-l acorde acestor oameni alungaţi din ţara lor de nesfârşitele războaie interetnice şi a căror singură vină este aceea că nu mai au un loc al lor sub soare." (V. Horga, September 17, 2015)	A civilization as great as the European one cannot remain passive and bargain the treatment which should be given to these people driven away from their country by endless interethnic wars and whose only fault is that they no longer have a place of their own in this world. (V. Horga, September 17, 2015)

The humanitarian approach to the migrant crisis expresses a benevolent exercise of power, advocated by the Members of Parliament as one of the major authorities of the state. Seen from this perspective, Romania has the power to change the fate of the migrants and refugees by hosting them or providing them with general assistance. The speakers who take this approach include Romania among the European states that offer their citizens better conditions than other extra-European states. Thus, the otherness represented by the refugees leads to a re-evaluation of the Romanians' status. Traditionally, Romania belongs to the group of Eastern European states that have faced the challenges associated with a long post-Communist transition. The imminent presence of the refugees has caused many politicians to gloss over the historical and political divisions between Western and Eastern Europe and create a cohesive in-group formed by all the EU member states. The divided view of the world is still present, but in a different form that contrasts powerful states with less economically developed ones. Humanity becomes the key value that can overcome this power differential. Romania's membership within the EU is thus understood from a cultural perspective, instead of being limited to the

mere fulfilment of its duties. The speakers refer to the need to protect fundamental human rights as a core value of Europeanism.

5.2. The legal approach

Like the humanitarian perspective, the legal approach derives from Romania's status as an EU member. In contrast to the previous approach, though, the core values associated with European identity are no longer taken into account. Although policies of care are still advocated, the motivation is completely different: Romania must abide by European law and accept the necessary quota of refugees because it is an EU member state. The speakers bring the common EU laws and policies into the discussion in order to justify the need to accept the migrants and/or refugees. Viewed as an obligation, this decision is strictly based on rational rather than emotional reasons. This approach was mainly advocated by one Liberal deputy, who clearly dissociated himself from his colleagues and tried to end the debate in this manner:

EXAMPLE 5
"România şi-a asumat responsabilitatea respectării acestor prevederi în momentul în care le-a semnat şi a aderat la respectivele organisme internaţionale. […] Iohannis şi opoziţia pot specula chestiunea cu refugiaţii oricât, pentru că adevărul este că, dacă Uniunea ne impune o anumită cotă de refugiaţi, suntem obligaţi s-o acceptăm, dat fiind caracterul temporar şi excepţional al acestei măsuri care transcende interesele economice şi comerciale ale statului membru UE. Stimaţi colegi, să primim refugiaţi de război este o obligaţie şi nu un subiect de gargară!" (O.C. Iane, September 17, 2015)

BACK TRANSLATION
Romania has taken the responsibility to respect these prescriptions in the moment when she signed them and adhered to the corresponding international organizations. [...] Iohannis and the opposition may speculate on the refugees' issue as long as they want, because the truth is that, if the Union imposes on us a certain refugee quota, we have the obligation to accept it, due to the temporary and extraordinary character of such measure, that transcends the economic and commercial interests of the EU member state. Dear colleagues, to accept war refugees is an obligation, not a small talk topic! (O.C. Iane, September 17, 2015)

In Ovidiu Iane's political statement, the noun *oameni* ("people") never appears. Instead, the status of the migrants and refugees is explained through references to international laws. Furthermore, he repeats the term *refugiaţi* ("refugees"), whose legal definition has been explained at the beginning of the declaration. The refugees no longer count as human beings in this view, but as a group, a quota imposed on the EU states. They are thus treated through the strategy of assimilation (Van Leeuwen 2008, 37) and reduced to the status of an anonymous group mentioned in a treaty or to a number presented as the quota of persons allocated to Romania.

Throughout his speech, Ovidiu Iane emphasizes the need for Romania to respect the international treaties and obligations. For Romania, he uses the verbs *a se obliga* ("to take on the obligation"), *a fi obligat* ("to be bound to"), *a-şiasumaresponsabilitatea* ("to take the responsibility"). In contrast, the verb associated with the European Union is *a impune* ("to impose"). Two major agents, Romania and the European Union, are thus introduced and an asymmetrical relationship is constructed between them. The human factor is completely left out of this relationship, which is limited to the duties that must be fulfilled by Romania.

According to the legal approach, Romania's status is acknowledged as inferior in comparison to other states or to the central EU structures, from a legal as well as from an economic point of view. By keeping the debate exclusively focused on Romania's duties, the speaker suggests that,on the international stage, power is held only by certain states and even that constraint is exercised on Romania in certain situations.

5.3. The national approach

Claims to national sovereignty usually characterize the discourse of parties or party leaders with radical or nationalist views, especially in opposition to pluralist approaches. In this case, solidarity is understood in a restricted sense, as a core value that could lead to the salvation of the in-group in the face of an imminent danger. The topos of disaster (Wodak et al. 2009,42) is employed as an argument for a gradation of priorities: the foreigners are tolerated, provided that they do not get in the way of the wellbeing of the citizens of the host state. The speakers who advocate this approach consider that the care for the own fellow nationals should be given priority over the foreigners' needs. The refusal to host or aid the migrants or further their partial acceptance with the introduction of certain conditions represents a manner of asserting the power of the "own" state in the discourse.

In the corpus under analysis, the national approach could not be linked to a specific political ideology, as it was employed by two politicians with different ideologies, one from the National Liberal Party and the other from the Social-Democratic Party. Their statements show diverse ways of conceiving of, and asserting, national sovereignty. In his statement, the Social Democrat deputy, Cosmin Necula, insisted on the difficulties faced by the Romanians working in western European states. The assignment of a migrant quota to Romania was seen as a further imposition on the Romanian state in addition to the already unfair treatment of Romanian work migrants in diverse western European states. The politician does not construct a relation of opposition between two precise states, such as Romania and France for example. Instead, a relationship is formed between Romania as an extended in-group, encompassing both state authorities and citizens on the one hand, and some EU politicians who discriminate against Romanian work migrants on the other hand. In the excerpt below, the speaker addresses two foreign ministers by name and uses the verbs and pronouns in the second-person plural. In this manner, the speaker simulates a direct dialogue with foreign politicians, aiming to give a symbolic – even if delayed – reply to their previous statements:

EXAMPLE 6
"Domnule prim-ministru al Franţei Manuel Valls, domnule ministru de externe al Austriei Sebastian Kurtz, acum câteva luni vă era teamă şi nu mai rezistaţi sub presiunea românilor care munceau cinstit în ţările dumneavoastră. Vă pregăteaţi să le tăiaţi din drepturile sociale, desconsiderându-i faţă de propriii dumneavoastră cetăţeni. Cred că fără voia dumneavoastră aţi început să aplicaţi principiile Uniunii Europene." (C. Necula, September 17, 2015)

BACK TRANSLATION
Mr Prime-Minister of France Manuel Valls, Mr Foreign Affairs Minister of Austria Sebastian Kurtz, a few months ago you were afraid and could not resist under the pressure of the Romanians working honestly in your countries. You were preparing to cut their social rights, disregarding them in comparison with your own citizens. I think that, unwillingly, you have begun to apply the EU principles. (C. Necula, September 17, 2015)

The Romanians are represented as working "honestly" (*cinstit*), a Romanian word that means "honesty" and, in this context, it also acquires the meaning of "legally". A parallelism emerges between the representation of Romanian citizens and that of Romania in relation to the other EU states:

both are characterized by honesty, sincerity and a marked intention to adhere to norms and regulations. In this excerpt, the manifestation of power remains discursive, as the speaker addresses the foreign politicians and ironizes their "fear" of honest Romanians. Still, this is only a rhetorical device aiming to show the stance taken by the speaker who considers that the European Union allows discrimination and abuses. An urge to action is expressed by M.P. Necula at the end of his speech. His conclusion seems to take the form of a description of the state of affairs. However, the use of markedly evaluative terms indicates that the conclusion is in fact an exhortation: the other M.Ps are asked to take a decision on the migrant issue by claiming for Romania the right to decide for itself:

EXAMPLE 7

"Este clar că în momentul de faţă România se află la o răscruce de drumuri. Trebuie să decidem dacă vom flutura un steag european şi concomitent să izolăm cu sârmă ghimpată refugiaţii, aşa cum fac vecinii noştri, sau să ne comportăm cu adevărat pe baza principiilor Uniunii Europene, primind oamenii în condiţii decente şi oferind o viaţă normală acestora, dar cu respectarea dreptului de a ne decide singuri şi în mod realist cu privire la numărul de refugiaţi pe care poate să-l găzduiască ţara noastră." (C. Necula, September 17, 2015)

BACK TRANSLATION

It is obvious that at present Romania finds itself at a crossroads. We have to decide whether we wave an European flag and at the same time isolate the refugees with barbed wire, as our neighbours do, or behave ourselves truly according to the EU principles, receiving the people in decent conditions and offering them a normal life, but maintaining the right to decide for ourselves in a realistic way the number of refugees that our country can host. (C. Necula, September 17, 2015)

In Cosmin Necula's statement, the refugees are represented as "people" and emphasis is placed on the need to treat them decently. The politician thus shows his commitment to European values, in a similar way to the politicians espousing a humanitarian approach. The difference arises from the distinction between "us" and "them": in this case, the in-group is formed by a Romania that adheres to European values, while the out-group is formed by other European states and the EU authorities that paradoxically only apply EU principles selectively.

Only one politician out of the nine M.Ps whose statements have been analysed here expressed a radical view on the topic of migration. The deputy A.D. Gheorghe, a representative of the National Liberal Party, had more to say on the topics of terrorism and immigration in the Romanian Parliament. On September 10 and September 17, 2015, he expressed his disagreement with the policy of the migrant quota:

EXAMPLE 8	BACK TRANSLATION
"[...] nici doamna Merkel, nici domnul Juncker, nici Comisia Europeană nu au fost capabili să dea o soluție. Au venit cu aceste cote de imigranți, aceste cote care vor crește permanent, pentru că, prin aceste cote, se deschide calea încurajării traficului de persoane și a rețelelor mafiote care se ocupă cu transportul ilegal de persoane din Orient, Asia și Africa, către Europa." (A.D. Gheorghe, September 17, 2015)	[...] neither Mrs Merkel, nor Mr Juncker, or the European Commission have been able to provide a solution. They have come up with these quotas of migrants, these quotas that will increase endlessly, because, through these quotas, an opportunity is created in order to stimulate the human trafficking and the mafia networks dealing with the illegal transport of persons from the East, Asia and Africa, to Europe. (A.D. Gheorghe, September 17, 2015)

This excerpt was taken from the beginning of the deputy's statement. The speaker attempts to shift the focus of the debate from the hosting of refugees in general to the acceptance or rejection of the quota. Here, the refugees are again represented through the strategy of assimilation (Van Leeuwen 2008, 37), as a collective group or number instead of "real" human beings. Terms like "migrants" or "refugees" do not appear as subjects, but act only as modifiers to the term "quota". In the fragment given above, the politician speaks about "quotas of migrants", thus glossing over their situation as persons in need as well as putting forward the idea of a humanitarian crisis. Furthermore, he repeats the Romanian plural noun *cote* ("quota"), preceded by a demonstrative adjective for proximity, *aceste* ("these"), which enforces the idea that Romania is going to be required to host more persons than at present. When mentioning the policy of quota assignment, the politician introduces a series of lexical items with negative meanings ("human trafficking", "mafia networks", "illegal transport"). These terms suggest the idea of breaking the law, thus

creating a sense of guilt in all the EU states accepting this measure. The speaker avoids the terms "refugees" or "migrants", choosing instead to talk about "persons from the East, Asia and Africa". Thus, the newcomers are presented through the strategy of spatialization, "the reference to a place with which the actors are closely associated" (Van Leeuwen 2008, 47), which allows the speaker to gloss over their difficult situation.

This paragraph illustrates the speaker's view of the world as divided into two great geographical and symbolic areas, with Europe facing a threat in the form of people from Africa, the Middle East and the Far East. The danger comes from the constant flow of refugees or migrants that are represented as willingly occupying the territory of "old" Europe.

In his next political statement on this topic, the deputy proposed three possible solutions for the migrant crisis, taking into account the need to integrate the migrants and refugees into the host countries. In a third statement, made on September 24, 2015, he adopted a more radical view, claiming that it would be impossible for the refugees to conform to the rules of the host states because of religious differences. The topos of a pending crisis is developed here, as the speaker believes that the flow of migrants will put an end to the entire history of European civilization:

EXAMPLE 9
"Iar acest fapt ne trimite cu gândul la ceea ce înseamnă perspectiva Europei de mâine, o perspectivă a unei Europe care începe să semene tot mai puţin cu Europa pe care o cunoaştem cu toţii, cu Europa libertăţilor şi a democraţiei. O Europă creştină care moare pe zi ce trece. O Europă care într-o sută de ani poate se va confrunta deja cu o populaţie preponderent musulmană. Şi noi trebuie să ne gândim la ceea ce reprezintă cultura şi civilizaţia europeană, la ceea ce reprezintă interesele de siguranţă fizică, individuală ale cetăţenilor europeni şi trebuie să luăm măsurile". (A.D. Gheorghe, September 24, 2015)

BACK TRANSLATION
And this makes us think about the perspective of the Europe of tomorrow, a perspective of a Europe which begins to resemble less and less to the Europe that we all know, the Europe of the freedoms and of democracy. A Christian Europe which dies day after day. A Europe which in a hundred years will already face a prevalent Muslim population. And we must think about the meaning of the European culture and civilization, the physical, individual security of the European citizens and we must take the [necessary] measures. (A.D. Gheorghe, September 24, 2015)

It is interesting that, in this paragraph, the speaker uses the term "Europe" repeatedly, thus shifting the topic of the discussion from the arrival of migrants to Europe as the host. In this excerpt, the name "Europe" does not appear alone, but is accompanied by Romanian attributive post-modifiers. Moreover, the modifiers that refer to contemporary Europe carry a positive meaning, while those related to the future of Europe connote destruction. The speaker creates a conflict between two large population groups – the European peoples on one hand and the migrants on the other – that is purely based on the criterion of the religious faith. Religion becomes a supraordinate principle, grouping around it a series of values: the Christian religion is associated with freedom and democracy whereas it is implied that the Muslim religion does not necessarily respect such values. The Christian religion as a benchmark of European identity is further linked to culture and civilization, two essential traits that the migrants apparently lack. The deputy thus manages to vilify the migrants by depicting them as an already settled "Muslim population" that threatens the Christian citizens of Europe.

6. Conclusions

Although the corpus examined here is relatively small, the analysis demonstrates that three types of approach can be identified in political statements on migration, taking into account the relations of intra- and inter-state solidarity and power constructed by the speakers: firstly, an approach that is based on the humanitarian dimension; secondly, an approach based on the legal constraints and, thirdly, an approach that asserts the sovereignty of the state in relation to other foreign actors. The most commonly advocated approach was, however, the humanitarian one. That contradicts the research hypothesis and indicates that the speakers did not view the migrants as a significant security threat. Instead, the economic aspect of the migrant crisis was mentioned by most politicians, either in regard to the migrants themselves or Romania's capacity to sustain them.

As expected, the main actors identified in the analysis were the Romanian state and the more ambiguous group represented by the war refugees and/or migrants. Although they were not assigned the role of a hostile Other, the migrants and refugees were still placed on a median position between identity and otherness. Being foreigners, they do not belong to the in-group formed by Romanian nationals but, due to their misery, neither do they represent an imminent threat to the in-group. More surprisingly, the threat was represented by a close Other, formed by other